



International Civil Aviation Organization

South American Regional Office

Fourteenth Workshop/Meeting of the SAM Implementation Group

(SAM/IG/14) – Regional Project RLA/06/901

(Lima, Peru, 10 to 14 November 2014)

SAM/IG/14-IP/16

07/11/14

Agenda Item 8: Other business

FPL Errors

(Presented by IATA)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
<p>This working Paper, presents a resume of the working papers presented at the SAMIG13 and GREPECAS regarding to a proposal to help reduce the FPL errors and duplications in the collaboration with the Airlines, by using the current and existing technologies. This proposal could bring benefits to all the regions and states.</p>	
REFERENCES:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doc. 4444 PANS/ATM Chapter 11, appendix 2 and corresponding formats in Appendix 3 	
ICAO Strategic Objectives:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A - Safety B - Air Navigation Capacity and Efficiency

1. Introduction

1.1 Several reports were issued by the states as well as the airlines, providing feedback of different types of ATS incidents, due to the FPL with errors, duplications as well as rejections, lack of FPL, etc.,

1.2 As part of the analysis performed in coordination with some states and airlines, the following causes, were detected as start of the FPL missing, duplicated or with errors:

- **Human factor**
 - When “retyping” into the AFTN/AMHS/FDP, the FPL filled format (paper) given to the AIM officer. Several errors were found on the route, especially when going to a far FIR from the Departure; also were found errors on, FL, aircraft type, NAV/COM/SUR equipment and STAR.
 - When 2 or more FPLs are sent by the operator (sender) to update a previous one.
 - When the AIM officer is using a pre-programmed addresses list to transmit FPLs, with edition mistakes on the destinations addresses (some FIR/ATS units are not on the on the list).

- Under a similar condition some local procedures uses a pre-programmed FPL (with routes, FL, etc. for certain flights) and the operator fails to update some fields to the AFTN/AMHS/FDP.

1.3 The chances to fail under the same conditions are increased when the departing aerodrome is a regional hub, a high movement aerodrome or when by local procedures, the ground staffs on these same aerodromes have to constantly amend the FPL for last moment changes (change of route due to weather, fleet changes, slots, etc.).

1.4 To reduce these and other possible subsequent events, IATA is encouraging the airlines and the States, to use the current technology available on both sides, to delegate to the airlines that meet the requirements, the transmission of the FPL and when applicable, the actualization messages to report delays, (DLA), Changes (CHG) and cancel (CNL), directly from the airline's operations control centre or dispatch, reducing the possibilities of errors for human factor.

1.5 These messages would be transmitted by the airlines up to a given time previous the pushback or EOBT, to ensure that the ATC have the latest correct information before the flight.

The Doc4444 chapter 11, states:

11.2.1.1.1 Messages for ATS purposes shall be originated by the appropriate ATS units or by aircraft as specified in Section 11.3, except that, through special local arrangements, ATS units may delegate the responsibility for originating movement messages to the pilot, the operator, or its designated representative.

If properly applied, this proposal will give the following safety and efficiency benefits to the CAR/SAM states and users:

- Reduce the FPL errors/ rejections.
- Reduce ATC delays when they don't have the FPLs on time.
- Reduce the LHD errors, between the ATS units when transferring flights using the wrong information.
- Reduce the workload of the ARO/AIM (especially in hubs) and ATC officers.
- AIRPROX that happened by having different information on-board and on the ATM systems

Given the problems discussed, IATA presented this proposal to the SAMIG13 meeting and to the NACCWP04 meeting, to be reviewed by the states as a regional mitigation strategy getting the following results:

SAMIG13

5.12 *The Meeting took note of the IATA proposal to use a methodology for the submittance of flight plan information directly by the airlines through the AFTN/AMHS, with the aim of reducing human factor-related errors, which are around 90% of the errors in the flight plans. In this sense, taking into account that some States have started initiatives for the remittance of flight plans through the Internet or other means, it was decided that this proposal be sent to States for analysis by and applicability in each State and in the Region. In addition, the Meeting deemed convenient that the States of the Region inform of the actions being undertaken to mitigate the errors presented in the flight plans. In this respect, the Secretariat will send a letter requesting the afore indicated information.*

NACCWG04

3.3.22 *To carry on the analysis of the missing/duplication of FPLs, the Meeting agreed on the creation of a FPL Ad hoc Group to report on error situations and follow up on action items in each State regarding the mitigation of flight plan errors. This Ad hoc Group will report to the AIDC Task Force.*

2. Special Local arrangement/procedures publication

2.1 As a result of the efforts performed by the Peruvian ANSP- CORPAC and DGAC, an AIC sample is provided as appendix A to this working paper, with general references and operational conditions to apply this procedure.

2.2 It's important to mention that, some states are not fully compliant with the principles governing the identification of SID/STAR mentioned at the annex 11, publishing names with more than 7 characters (transitions). In order to be accepted by the air traffic control system databases (compliant with the annex 11), these "plain language designators" are coded differently at the air traffic control systems databases; nevertheless these coded procedures are not published by the states. These differences creates an environment where neither the airlines nor the FPL services providers, are aware of what the automated ATM systems are requiring on this specific item/field, to allow a FPL be sent without errors.

3. Suggested actions:

3.1. The Meeting is invited to:

- a) Review the feasibility and implementation of this proposal in order to get the best of the current technological installed capabilities.