



International Civil Aviation Organization

South American Regional Office

Second Meeting of Air Navigation and Safety Directors of the SAM Region

(Lima, Peru, 14 to 16 September 2015)

AN & FS/2-WP/03

10/08/15

Agenda Item 1: Declaration of Bogota: Follow-up to the implementation of air navigation priorities

ATFM Project (ASBU: B0-SEQ, B0-FRTO, B0-NOPS and B0-ACDM)

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY	
<p>This working paper presents to the Meeting the status of implementation of ATFM in the Region, training investments made by Project RLA/06/901, and the difficulties encountered during implementation. It also describes the impact that the implementation of ATFM measures by States that lack ATFM units or positions has on efficiency and safety, and the recommendations formulated in this regard by the Third Meeting of the GREPECAS Programmes and Projects Review Committee (PPRC/3).</p>	
References:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Doc 9750, Global Air Navigation Plan• SAM/IG/12, 13, 14 and 15 meeting reports• GREPECAS/17 meeting report• Report of the Third Meeting of the Programmes and Projects Review Committee (PPRC/3)	
ICAO strategic objectives:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>A - Safety</i><i>D - Economic development of air transport</i><i>E - Environmental protection</i>

1. Background

1.1 In the SAM Region, issues related to ATFM implementation in the South American Region and all of its associated activities are reviewed at the meetings of the SAM Implementation Group (SAM/IG), where it has been noted that the States are already capable of meeting the goal of the Bogota Declaration of implementing at least one flow management position (FMP) or one flow control unit (FMU) at each area control centre (ACC).

1.2 The SAM/IG/12 and subsequent meetings of the SAM/IG (SAM/IG/12-15) continued to monitor the status of implementation of the ATFM Project, its Action Plan and its relationship with Project B1 on the improvement of demand-capacity balancing (DCB).

1.3 Since 2009 through 29 May 2015, under the ATFM training programme and the auspices of Project RLA/06/901 and the support of the Air Navigation Management Centre (CGNA) of Brazil, 6 courses on runway and ATC sector capacity calculation were conducted, in addition to ATFM and CDM theoretical-practical courses, providing training to a total of 130 experts of the South American Region.

2. Discussion

2.1 Implementation has not yet produced the expected results despite efforts made by both Project RLA/06/901, through the drafting and development of guidance material and facilitation of ATFM training courses, and the States themselves, through the use of such material for ATFM implementation and the training received.

2.2 It has also been noted that, in most States, the experts who received ATFM training have not replicated the courses. Training must be disseminated within the respective Administrations in order to increase the number of staff with ATFM training.

2.3 Upon analysing the reasons for delayed effective implementation of air traffic flow management units/positions (FMUs/FMPs), it has been noted that some States believe that they have not yet reached traffic levels at their airports and ATC sectors that warrant the implementation of elements and functions of an air traffic flow management system. Other States recognise that they have reached full capacity but, due to budgetary, staffing, organisational, and other reasons, they have not been able to start or proceed with their ATFM system.

2.4 Some States that have not yet implemented a minimum ATFM service issue a large amount of messages and NOTAMs, establishing entry and exit restrictions at different points of FIR boundaries for flow control.

2.5 Several of the NOTAMs issued refer to time restrictions at FIR entry or exit points, regardless of flight level, causing a severe impact on traffic in neighbouring FIRs and even FIRs in other regions because of the domino effect.

2.6 Actions thus taken, without any strategic planning, not only impact capacity but also generate a safety risk, especially for transcontinental flows affected by the measures, and affect flight and fuel planning. In some cases, the measures adopted have been disproportionate to the situation at hand.

2.7 The solution to avoid these situations is to implement at least one flow control position or one flow control unit, depending on the level of complexity, at each Area Control Centre (ACC). These positions or units could initially provide services during a selective schedule, based on peak hours. Likewise, a supervisor could cover a flow management position during low traffic hours.

2.8 This implementation is urgently required in order to establish a strategic ATFM plan that provides operational predictability and timely connectivity to users, since the absence of ATFM units affects all hubs in the Region, causing unnecessary congestion in the parking apron and huge losses to the industry.

2.9 Regarding safety, some inter-regional operations with long-haul flights carrying strict amounts of fuel may have to divert to alternate aerodromes in other States, destabilising normal air traffic flow and congesting airports, thus increasing operational expenditure by users.

2.10 In order to assess the attainment of ATFM goals, the following indicators have been established:

- Percentage of States that have conducted runway and ATC sector capacity calculations.
- Percentage of States that have implemented ATFM in flow management units/positions (FMUs/FMPs).

2.11 To date, 85% of the States in the Region have conducted runway and ATC sector capacity calculations in preparation to implementation, as shown in the following table:

Percentage of States that have conducted runway and ATC sector calculations

September 2015 85%	ARG	BOL	BRA	CHI	COL	ECU	FGY	GUY	PAN	PAR	PER	SUR	URU	VEN
	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES

2.12 To date, only 35% of the States in the Region have implemented ATFM, as shown in the following table:

Percentage of States that have implemented ATFM in flow management units (FMUs) or flow management positions (FMPs)

September 2015 35%	ARG	BOL	BRA	CHI	COL	FGY	ECU	GUY	PAN	PAR	PER	SUR	URU	VEN
	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	N/A	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES

2.13 It has also been noted that some States have not sent their experts to SAM/IG meetings on a consistent basis, which delays the execution of the task approved by the States themselves within the context of GREPECAS and, accordingly, under the ATFM Project designed for that purpose.

2.14 At its third meeting, the GREPECAS Programmes and Projects Review Committee approved Conclusion PPRC/3-5: “*Actions for ATFM implementation in the SAM Region*”, encouraging SAM States to:

- Locally replicate ATFM training received by their experts at the courses sponsored by Project RLA/06/901, in order to improve ATFM knowledge of their specialised personnel;
- Avoid implementing ATFM measures that affect users and that impact safety, especially those Administrations that have not created units responsible for strategic management of flow control measures;
- Introduce in their bilateral letters of agreement the appropriate procedures to regulate the strategic application of such measures, avoiding their impact on efficiency and safety;
- Implement flow control positions or units (FMPs/FMUs) as soon as possible in order to avoid capacity/demand imbalances caused by scheduled or unforeseen events; and
- Report to the PPRC/4 meeting the action taken pursuant to the previous paragraphs.

2.15 In order to follow up on Conclusion PPRC/3-5, a Strategic Planning Table has been developed, as shown in **Appendix A** to this working paper, for States to report to the Secretariat their plans concerning this conclusion.

3. **Suggested action:**

3.1 The Meeting is invited to:

- a) review this working paper and make comments or propose actions as it may deem advisable to expedite ATFM implementation; and
- b) complete the Strategic Planning Table shown in Appendix A to this working paper.

APPENDIX A

STRATEGIC PLANNING TABLE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ATFM														
CONC. PPRC/3-5 action of compliance	ARG	BOL	BRA	CHI	COL	ECU	FGY	GUY	PAN	PAR	PER	SUR	URU	VEN
	Month/ Year	Month/ Year	Month/ Year	Month/ Year	Month/ Year	Month/ Year	Month/ Year	Month/ Year	Month/ Year	Month/ Year	Month/ Year	Month/ Year	Month/ Year	Month/ Year
1- Replica of ATFM courses to speccialized personnel														
2- Bilateral Letters of Agreement with appropriate ATFM procedures without impacting on safety														
3- Implementation of Flow Control Positions or Units (FMPs/FMUs)														

Note: If your State has already implemented ATFM, place only the date foreseen for compliance 2.