



Agenda Item 6: Other business

INFORMATION IN THE AIP ON THE USE IN ATS ROUTE SEGMENTS OF FLIGHT LEVELS NOT APPEARING IN THE TABLE OF CRUISING LEVELS

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY	
<p>This working paper analyses the use of flight levels that are not in compliance with the Table of Cruising Levels as regards heading, as indicated in Appendix 3 to ICAO Annex 2, which are tactically applied by area control centres (ACCs) in some route segments of the SAM Region. It has been identified that the information contained in the AIP concerning the application of flight levels that are not in compliance with the Table in ICAO Annex 2 may lead to risky situations in case of communication failure.</p>	
REFERENCES:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ICAO Annex 2• Doc 4444 PANS ATM• ATSRO/08 meeting	
ICAO Strategic Objectives:	<i>A - Safety</i>

1. Introduction

1.1 The ATSRO/08 meeting analysed the information provided by *Aerolíneas Argentinas* and IATA on the use of flight levels other than those contained in the Table of Cruising levels as regards heading, as indicated in Appendix 3 to ICAO Annex 2, which are tactically applied by area control centres (ACCs) in some route segments to avoid aircraft climbs or descents in very short segments, or to avoid the convergence of traffic that will hinder aircraft separation.

1.2 In this respect, examples were presented on route UL216, between the San Gabriel VOR and point ZORRO (boundary between the Amazonica FIR and the Bogota FIR), and another case in route UL793, between points KUBIR and OROMU, which is a segment within the Asuncion FIR. These cases also occur in segments of other regional routes.

2. Discussion

2.1 It is recognised that these flight level assignment practices are included in Letters of Agreement (LOAs) between ACCs, which in the SAM Region are not always part of the information contained in the AIP.

2.2 Therefore, pilots, flight dispatchers and entities that develop navigation databases do not always have access to the LOAs that stipulate the application in a given route segment of flight levels that are not consistent with the heading.

2.3 There is a case between Ecuador and Peru in which, for regional route G675, Peru has published an observation to the user in its AIP, Section ENR 3, indicating the use of flight levels other than those specified in the Table of Annex 2 for the segment between PAGUR and URA VOR. This practice should be replicated in those States that face similar cases in route segments.

2.4 Consequently, the fragility of the information contained in the AIP, Section ENR 3, regarding the application of flight levels other than those specified in the Table of Annex 2 in some route segments might lead to risky situations in case of a communication failure.

3. **Conclusion**

3.1 Accordingly, for cases of route segments where, due to ATS agreements or other reasons, the flight levels listed in the Table of Cruising Levels of Annex 2 are not applied, and given the interest in safety, the ATM and/or airspace planning areas, together with the AIM units in their respective States, must take measures for defining the information that must be included in the AIP, Section ENR 3, Column 6 “Remarks” (AIP model in Doc 8126).

4. **Action suggested:**

4.1. States participating in the Meeting are invited to take under consideration the information presented in this working paper and define the corresponding course of action.