



International Civil Aviation Organization

**MIDANPIRG CNS/ATM/IC Sub-Group
(CNS/ATM/IC SG)**

**Sixth Meeting
(Cairo, Egypt, 31 January – 02 February 2012)**

Agenda Item 5: Regional Air Navigation Planning and Implementation Issues

INFPL IMPLEMENTATION IN THE MID REGION

(Presented by Secretariat)

SUMMARY

This paper provides update on the ICAO New FPL implementation in the MID Region showing the Status of MID States; it also provides the outcome of the INFPL SG/3 Meeting and the joint ACAC/ICAO Workshop/Seminar.

Action by the meeting is at paragraph 3.

REFERENCES

- INFPL SG/3 Report
- INFPL Seminar Report
- MIDANPIRG/12 Report

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 MIDANPIRG/12 meeting was held in Amman, Jordan 17-21 October 2010. The meeting adopted 80 Conclusions and Decisions of which five (5) Conclusions and one (1) Decision are considered directly relevant to the work of the INFPL Study Group.

1.2 The DGCA MID/1 was held in Abu-Dhabi, UAE, 22 – 24 March 2011. The meeting developed 13 Conclusions out of which one is related to INFPL, where the meeting noted that ICAO developed FPL Information Tracking System (FITS) website provides information regarding the implementation status of the new flight plan provisions in each State along with guidance and harmonized solutions to any difficulties encountered in the implementation process. It can be accessed at <http://www2.icao.int/en/FITS/Pages/home.aspx>.

1.3 The third meeting of the INFPL Study Group was held at the ICAO MID Regional office back to back with the INFPL Seminar Egypt, 19- 21 and 22-23 June 2011 respectively. The seminar was attended by a total of 57 participants from 8 States, 3 International Organizations and 3 systems suppliers. The meeting was attended by a total of Forty seven (47) participants from eleven (11) States (Bahrain, Egypt, Iran, Jordan, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, UAE and Yemen), one (1) International Organization (IATA) and one systems supplier (Comsoft).

1.4 The joint ACAC/ICAO workshop/seminar was held in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia 16-18 January 2012. The event was attended by ninety four (94) participants from eleven (11) States, and three (3) organizations.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 MIDANPIRG/12, reviewed the progress achieved and difficulties faced by other ICAO regions during the implementation of INFPL provisions, which were posted on the FITS. In this regard, the MIDANPIRG/12 meeting urged MID States to use FITS system and post any issue encountered in the implementation of INFPL in FITS. Accordingly, MIDANPIRG/12 agreed to the following Conclusion:

CONCLUSION 12/51: INFPL IMPLEMENTATION DIFFICULTIES

That, MID States be urged to complete the impact studies and file any difficulties arising in the implementation of INFPL to the ICAO MID Regional Office for posting on FITS.

2.2 MIDANPIRG/12 meeting recalled that a Questionnaire on the Status of INFPL Implementation was distributed during the first INFPL Workshop (Cairo, 4-6 July 2010). Accordingly, the MIDANPIRG/12 meeting urged MID States to reply to the questionnaire and tasked the INFPL SG to analyze the replies to the questionnaire and agreed to the following Conclusion:

CONCLUSION 12/53: QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE STATUS OF INFPL IMPLEMENTATION

That, MID States be urged to reply to the Questionnaire on the Status of Implementation of Amendment 1 to the Procedures for Air Navigation Services-Air Traffic Management, Fifteenth Edition (PANS-ATM, Doc 4444) as at Appendix 5.5J to the Report on Agenda Item 5.5, by 20 February 2011.

2.3 Based on the above, ICAO MID Regional Office sent a State letter AN 6/2B – 11/027 dated 16 February 2011, requesting MID States to provide update on the above two conclusions including, completed impact study, any difficulties being encountered or anticipated, provide National Performance Framework Form (PFF) and the reply to the questionnaire which is intended to obtain the necessary information in order to complete the survey on the status of implementation of Amendment 1 to the Procedures for Air Navigation Services-Air Traffic Management, Fifteenth Edition (PANS-ATM, Doc 4444) of INFPL in the MID Region.

2.4 The meeting may wish to note that Ten (10) States (Bahrain, Egypt, Iran, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and UAE) provided the replies to the questionnaires which were analyzed by the Regional Office and further updated by the ATM/SAR/AIS SG/12 meeting as at **Appendix A** to this working paper.

2.5 MIDANPIRG/12 recognized that the implementation of ICAO new FPL format is a substantial task and requires from States to secure a budget for the implementation of the new FPL Format Project. In addition States were urged to develop the technical requirements related to the upgrade of their ATC systems to comply with the new FPL format provisions and to initiate the necessary negotiations with vendors as soon as possible. Accordingly, MIDANPIRG/12 agreed to the following Conclusion:

CONCLUSION 12/52: ICAO NEW FLIGHT PLAN FORMAT IMPLEMENTATION

That, MID States be urged to:

- a) secure necessary budget for the implementation of the ICAO New FPL Format;*
- b) initiate necessary negotiation with their ATC systems manufacturers/ vendors for the implementation of necessary hardware/software changes, as soon as possible;*

- c) *develop National PFF related to the ICAO new FPL format project with clearly established milestones with timelines; and*
- d) *take all necessary measures to comply with the applicability date of 15 November 2012.*

2.6 Based on the above, and the information gained from the INFPL Implementation Seminar held in Cairo, 19-21 June 2011, it was highlighted that even manual flight plan system requires an upgrade even though it may only involve procedural changes training and documents. Accordingly, the INFPL SG/3 meeting updated the Regional Performance Framework Form (PFF) as at **Appendix B** to this working paper and urged MID States to develop and update their own National PFF.

2.7 The INFPL SG/3 meeting noted IATA views with regard to the significant changes to the ICAO Flight Plan (FPL) as at **Appendix C** to this working paper, since these changes are driven mainly in recognizing the service capabilities of modern aircraft and are expected to bring a marked improvement in delivering service and benefits.

2.8 The INFPL SG/3 meeting reiterated the requirement for the support of the testing phase which was agreed to be carried out along with IATA users. Furthermore, the meeting noted the States concern on some erroneous flight plan filing on the current flight plan, where the meeting requested Bahrain and UAE to provide information of any improvement in the flight plan filing (procedure, training, tracking etc..) that could be highlighted in the next meeting, taking the opportunity of the implementation of INFPL to fix any problems or issues in the current system.

2.9 Noting the requirement for harmonizing the implementation of Amendment No. 1 to the Fifteenth Edition of the Procedures for Air Navigation Services — Air Traffic Management (PANS-ATM, Doc 4444. MIDANPIRG/12 meeting agreed to the MID Region Strategy for Implementation of the ICAO New Flight Plan Format and associated ATS messages under conclusion 12/54. Accordingly INFPL SG/3 meeting had reviewed the MID Region Strategy for the implementation of the INFPL and developed revised version of the Strategy as at **Appendix D** to this working paper and agreed to the following Draft Conclusion:

*DRAFT CONCLUSION 3/2: REVISED STRATEGY FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF INFPL*

*That, the revised MID Region Strategy for the implementation of INFPL be adopted as at **Appendix 4A (Appendix D** to this working paper) to the Report on Agenda Item 4.*

2.10 The INFPL SG/3 meeting reiterated MIDANPIRG/12 views for not developing a Regional INFPL Contingency Plan. However, MIDANPIRG/12 agreed that each State to develop their own national contingency plan to be incorporated as part of their INFPL implementation plan as applicable, and to submit the plan to the ICAO MID Regional Office.

2.11 The INFPL SG/3 meeting noted the consequences of non-compliance with the implementation of INFPL on the target date 15 November 2012 where major impacts on the whole aviation community would be observed, examples are provided at **Appendix E** to this working paper. In this regard, the INFPL SG/3 meeting urged MID States to carefully look into the training needs of ATC, airline operators and end users for the successful implementation of the INFPL.

2.12 The INFPL SG/3 meeting noted that at the time of DGCA-MID/1 meeting (22-24 March 2011) 74% of MID States were in the evaluation or analysis of the current system phase. and the DGCA-MID/1 meeting agreed to the following Conclusion:

DGCA-MID/1 CONCLUSION 1/4 - IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ICAO NEW FPL FORMAT

That, considering the importance of timely implementation of the ICAO new Flight Plan Format, MID States are urged to provide necessary resources and support to expedite implementation of the ICAO New Flight Plan Format

2.13 Noting the above ICAO MID Regional Office organized INFPL Implementation Seminar on 19- 21 June 2011 in order to further assist States in the preparation for the implementation of the ICAO New Flight Plan format.

2.14 The INFPL SG/3 meeting noted that the implementation of the Amendment No. 1 to the Fifteenth Edition of the Procedures for Air Navigation Services — Air Traffic Management (PANS-ATM, Doc 4444), will require an update to the - MID Basic ANP and FASID (Doc 9708) and to ICAO Doc 7030 Regional Supplementary Procedures, to reflect the new requirements of the approved amendment for the flight plan format. Furthermore, the indicator STS/NONRNAV in item 18 of the ICAO Flight Plan as promulgated in Doc 7030 version 5 will no longer be supported by the implementation of the new provisions related to the flight plan established by Amendment 1 to PANS-ATM and will cause loss of functionality. The INFPL SG/3 meeting agreed to delete the indicator STS/NONRNAV from Doc 7030.

2.15 Based on the above, the INFPL SG/3 meeting developed a proposal for amendment (PFA) of the MID/ASIA to align the nomenclature used for the MID portion of the SUPPs with the new terminology and requirement as at **Appendix F** this working paper. Accordingly, the INFPL SG/3 meeting agreed to the following Draft Conclusion:

DRAFT CONCLUSION 3/3: PROPOSAL FOR AMENDMENT OF DOC 7030

*That, ICAO MID Regional Office develop and circulate the PFA as at **Appendix 4E** (**Appendix F** to this working paper) to the Report on Agenda Item 4 according to ICAO Procedures.*

2.16 The meeting may wish to note that on 27 September 2010 Memorandum of Cooperation (MOC) was signed between ICAO and ACAC. In the implementation plan for the MOC it has been agreed that ACAC and ICAO organize joint INFPL implementation workshop/seminar. Accordingly ACAC and ICAO MID Regional office held successful workshop which was generously hosted by the General Authority of Civil Aviation in Saudi Arabia from 16-18 January 2012, with ninety four (94) participants from eleven (11) States and three (3) organizations. The outcome is at **Appendix G** this working paper.

2.17 The meeting may recall that during the Y2K event an emergency support cell was formed in order to support the transition accordingly the meeting may wish to recommend the formation of such cell and task it to INFPL SG/4 which is planned to held at the ICAO MID Regional office from 27-29 February 2012. Furthermore, the meeting may wish to agree that the report of INFPL SG/4 be directly presented to MIDANPIRG/13 planned to be held in April 2012.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) review and endorse as appropriate INFPL SG/3 meeting conclusions;
- b) recommend action from **appendix G** review and update;
- c) agree on proposal in para. 2.17; and
- d) recommend appropriate actions for the timely implementation of the INFPL.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS

State	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8
Bahrain	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Egypt	No	Yes	Not yet	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not yet under development
Iran	Yes there are problems (120+training)	Yes as mentioned in Q1	No under development	Yes	Yes no doubts	Yes	Yes	Not yet under development
Iraq								
Jordan	No problems	Yes	Yes under development	Yes fully understand	Yes fully understand	Yes	Yes, and understand fully the impact	Defined action plan WP11
Kuwait								
Lebanon	No problem	Yes we will accept flight plan filing exceeding 120 hours	Planning to do so the issue under discussion	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	In progress we establish a committee and it is working on defining the action plan.
Libya	No problems	Yes	No under development	--	Yes	Yes	Yes	Under development
Oman	No	Yes	Yes under development	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Under development
Qatar	No Problem	Yes	Yes under development	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Under development
Saudi Arabia	No problems at this time	As it applies to ATM system	Yes will have Dual	Yes	Yes and will have dual functionality	Yes	Yes <i>expect additional automation and procedural impact</i>	Under development

State	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8
Sudan								
Syria								
UAE	No	Yes	Yes—ANSPs to include software in upgrades or new systems.	Yes	Yes	Yes—Most ANSPs including this upgrade with the automated system upgrades	Yes	Under development—National workshop Q1 2012.
Yemen								

Q1- *In your compliance to the changes in Amendment 1, is there any part of Amendment 1 in which your State identifies any major problem to comply?*

Q2- *Has your State considered the accommodation of the 120 hour filing provision outlined in Amendment 1?*

Q3- *Have you considered a strategy for transitioning NEW FPL and related messages to the PRESENT/EXISTING format?*

Q4- *Do you know about the regional actions defined in MID Regional Strategy for implementation of this amendment?*

Q5- *Do you understand the phased transition approach?*

Q6- *Do you intend to comply with the dates contained in Phase 2 (transition) of the approach (i.e., you plan to be ready to begin accepting NEW format FPLs and related messages between 1 April and 30 June 2012)?*

Q7- *Have you considered the automation and/or procedural impacts involved in the implementation of Amendment 1?*

Q8- *Has your State defined an action plan for carrying out the different aspects of this implementation?*

APPENDIX B

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW ICAO FPL FORM	
Benefits	
Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reductions in fuel consumption and CO₂ emission utilizing proper flight planning and aircraft capabilities are known in advance to ANSP
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ability of air navigation service providers to make maximum use of aircraft capabilities • ability of aircraft to conduct flights more closely to their preferred trajectories • facilitate utilization of advanced technologies thereby increasing efficiency • optimized demand and capacity balancing through the efficient exchange of information
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enhance safety by use of modern capabilities onboard aircraft
KPI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • status of implementation of ICAO new FPL provisions • status of updates in the FITS
Proposed Metrics:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • number of States meeting the deadline for implementation of the ICAO new FPL provisions • number of States providing the focal points and initiated impact studies

<i>Strategy</i> <i>Short term (2010-2012)</i> <i>Medium term (2013 - 2016)</i>				
ATM OC COMPONENTS	TASKS	TIMEFRAME START-END	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
SDM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning and implementation of transition elements 	2009-2012	INFPL SG	valid
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States to assign focal points and form and internal nucleus team 	2009 - 2010	States	valid
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure that enabling regulatory (regulations procedures, AIP etc..) provisions are developed 	2009- 2012	States	valid
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure that the automation and software requirements of local systems are fully adaptable to the changes envisaged in the new FPL form 	2009 - 2012	States	valid
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure that issues related to the ability of all system to pass information correctly and to correctly identify the order in which messages are received, to ensure that misinterpretation of data does not occur 	2009- 2012	States	valid
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • analyze each individual data item within the various fields of the new flight plan form, comparing the current values and the new values to verify any problems with regard to applicability of service provided by the facility itself or downstream units 	2009 – 2011	INFPL SG States	valid

<i>Strategy</i> <i>Short term (2010-2012)</i> <i>Medium term (2013 - 2016)</i>				
ATM OC COMPONENTS	TASKS	TIMEFRAME START-END	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensure that there are no individual State peculiarities or deviations from the flight plan provisions 	2009- 2012	States	valid
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensure that the accepting ATS Reporting Office accepts and disseminates all aircraft capabilities and flight intent to all the downstream ACCs as prescribed by the PANS-ATM provisions 	2009 – 2012	INFPL SG States	valid
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> plan the transition arrangements to ensure that the changes from the current to the new ICAO FPL form occur in a timely and seamless manner and with no loss of service 	2009-2012	States INFPL SG	valid
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> in order to reduce the chance of double indications it is important that any State having published a specific requirement(s) which are now addressed by the amendment should withdraw those requirements in sufficient time to ensure that aircraft operators and flight plan service providers, after 15 November 2012, use only the new flight plan indications. 	2009- 2012	States	valid
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> internal testing 	2009 – June 2012	States	valid
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> external testing and transition into operation 	1 April to 30 June 2012	States	valid
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> airspace users validation and filling of NEW FPLs if appropriate 	1 July to 14 November 2012	States and users	valid
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan and ensure the training of relevant stakeholders (air traffic controllers, etc) 	2009 - 2012	States	valid
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop and make available, guidance material for users, including but not limited to ANSP personnel 	2009 - 2011	INFPL SG	valid

<i>Strategy</i> <i>Short term (2010-2012)</i> <i>Medium term (2013 - 2016)</i>				
ATM OC COMPONENTS	TASKS	TIMEFRAME START-END	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> establish and enhance as appropriate a central depository (FITS) in order to track the implementation status 	Ongoing	ICAO	Completed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> inform the ICAO regional offices on an ongoing basis 	Ongoing- Dec 2012	States	Valid
linkage to GPIs	GPI/18 Aeronautical Information			

APPENDIX C

IATA Views on the changes requirement for the implementation of ICAO New flight plan format

- I. The changes will require major system adaptations and changes for both airlines and ANSP's, With the ultimate goal of fully realizing positive benefits from these changes, all airlines and ANSPs together must File, Accept and Transmit the NEW Format and contents of the FPL as to ensure a smooth transition.
- II. From airline perspective it is critical that all designated ATS offices currently accepting Filed Flight Plans from airlines and thereafter disseminating to down line ATS units, do so without cause for Rejection or Modifying critical flight data. The consequences can only delay flights on ground and/or longer routings and en-route delays – imposed on the airlines as the end-user.
- III. The airline systems that generate FPL's will need software changes to conform to the new data fields, sequence and alphanumeric coding. An accurate understanding, "mapping" and depiction of each aircraft capabilities and re-programming the FPL outputs to reflect this capability will be required. Dispatcher and Flight crew awareness will be performed by IATA for their member airlines and IATA expressed its agreement to invite none IATA members to their INFPL trainings and awareness campaigns.
- IV. IATA member airlines preparedness are taking necessary steps to ensure smooth transition through:
 - a) Ensuring that the Operational staff including flight crew are aware of the 2012 FPL changes and their implications.
 - b) That their FPL system has been upgraded to handle the 'NEW' FPL format and has been tested with ANSPs.
 - c) That the ANSP's in their areas of operations have deployed systems that are capable of handling 'NEW' FPL format.
 - d) That its Flight Crew and Flight Dispatchers are fully trained and understand the new requirements.
 - e) That the airline has good inventory of their aircraft on board equipments and their capabilities and the relevant Flight Planning databases have been updated to reflect this.
 - f) That the relevant Operational procedures and documentations have been reviewed to reflect the 2012 FPL format changes.
- V. States and ANSP provide the update to ICAO MID Regional Office in order to update the FITS to reflect the tests with users, which will be used by IATA to know which States already implemented.

APPENDIX D

**MID REGION
STRATEGY FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
ICAO NEW FLIGHT PLAN FORMAT AND SUPPORTING ATS MESSAGES**

Recognizing that:

- 1) Dynamic information management will assemble the best possible integrated picture of the historical, real-time and planned or foreseen future state of the ATM situation and provide the basis for improved decision making by all ATM community members, further more for the ATM system to operate at its full potential, pertinent information will be available when and where required;
- 2) The *Global Air Traffic Management Operational Concept* (Doc 9854) requires information management arrangements that provide accredited, quality-assured and timely information to be used to support ATM operations and will use globally harmonized information attributes;
- 3) ATM Requirement 87 in the *Manual of Air Traffic Management System Requirements* (Doc 9882) provides that 4-D trajectories be used for traffic synchronization applications to meet ATM system performance targets, explaining that automation in the air and on the ground will be used fully in order to create an efficient and safe flow of traffic for all phases of flight;
- 4) The amended ICAO Flight Plan and associated ATS Message formats contained in Amendment 1 to the Fifteenth Edition of the PANS ATM (Doc 4444, applicable 15 November 2012) have been formulated to meet the needs of aircraft with advanced capabilities and the evolving requirements of automated air traffic management systems, while taking into account compatibility with existing systems, human factors, training, and cost;
- 5) The ICAO new flight plan Format introduces considerable changes related, inter-alia, to Performance Based Navigation (PBN), Automatic Dependent Surveillance - Broadcast (ADS-B) and Global Navigation Satellite Systems (GNSS), while maintaining a high degree of commonality with the existing flight plan format;
- 6) The complexities inherent in automated computer systems preclude the adoption of a single regional transition date and transitions to the new flight plan provisions will therefore occur throughout the declared transition period;
- 7) The risk of not updating all MID States automated systems as planned and before the implementation date of 15 November 2012; and
- 8) The risk of all users simultaneously commencing “NEW” on the common implementation date without proper testing with the States.

The MID Region implementation of Amendment 1 to the PANS-ATM shall:

- 1) Ensure that all States and airspace users implement the full provisions of Amendment 1 to PANS-ATM 15th Edition with applicability date of 15 November 2012, not just selected aspects of the provisions;
- 2) Acknowledge that States not implementing the full provisions of Amendment 1 are obligated to publish the non compliance in State AIP as a ‘significant difference’ well in advance of the 15 November 2012 applicability date and will be included on the MIDANPIRG List of Deficiencies in the CNS/ATM Fields; and

- 3) Ensure that, from 15 November 2012, all States and airspace users accept and disseminate 'NEW' flight plan and associated ATS message formats only and capabilities for 'PRESENT' flight plan provisions are discontinued.

The MID Regional transition to the PANS-ATM Amendment 1 provisions shall:

- 1) Comply with the guidance provided by ICAO as described in the ICAO guidance material in State Letter AN 13/2.1-09/9, dated 6 February 2009; titled "Guidance for implementation of flight plan information to support Amendment 1 of the Procedures for Air Navigation Services — Air Traffic Management, Fifteenth Edition (PANS-ATM, DOC 4444)";
- 2) States must ensure coordination with adjacent States for testing and transition and inform other interested stakeholders as appropriate;
- 3) Ensure that the INFPL SG undertakes coordination to facilitate harmonization with implementations in neighboring regions;
- 4) Eliminate or minimize State specific constraints and, if constraints continued to be ~~are~~ identified as necessary, implementation of such constraints should be agreed on a regional basis or sub regional basis in preference to an individual State basis;
- 5) Declare a preparation transition period from 1 January 2012 until 14 November 2012, comprising;
 - Before 31 March 2012 - ANSPs software delivery and internal testing,
 - 1 April to 30 June 2012 – ANSPs external testing and
 - 1 July to 14 November 2012 – airspace users testing;
- 6) Encourage ANSPs and airspace users to coordinate appropriate implementation methodologies in order to ensure that migration to 'NEW' could be done without problems on the agreed and declared implementation date;
- 7) Encourage States and users to immediately commence preparations to implement Amendment 1 provisions preferably not later than declared preparation period and report progress to the INFPL SG periodic meetings;
- 8) States Implementing NEW Format should have the capability to process both PRESENT and NEW formats;
- 9) MID States shall not support PRESENT format after 15 November 2012;
- 10) Strategic Support Teams (SST) to be identified and resourced to support those States who are behind the regional Implementation Plan, and;
- 11) Establish State and Regional coordination cells. Guidelines will be provided to align with the joint ICAO and IATA management center in ICAO HQ Montreal planned around the applicability date.

APPENDIX E

ICAO Flight Plan changes by 15 November 2012

The consequences of States not meeting the deadline

There will be confusion in the aviation sector in those States which are not ready to accept the NEW Flight Plan format on 15 November 2012.

1 To FPL filers and Agencies

- 1.1 Aircraft will miss slot times
- 1.2 Airspace User dispatch staff or agencies will be overwhelmed with rejected flight plans
- 1.3 Airspace User dispatch staff or agencies will be overwhelmed with re-submitting acceptably modified flight plans

2 To Airspace Users

- 2.1 Airspace users may choose to take an alternate route via an ANSP which can make use of their aircraft capabilities and so deliver efficiencies expected by that Airspace User
- 2.2 Aircraft will be denied the most efficient flight profiles associated with their performance based navigation.

3 To Air Traffic Controllers

- 3.1 Controllers may be presented with a flight at a boundary for which there is no flight plan
- 3.2 Controllers may feel pressured to manually submit a limited flight plan online in order to accept a flight
- 3.3 Increased coordination of aircraft from one FIR to another
- 3.4 Controllers may have to maintain control of an aircraft in their airspace if an adjacent FIR refuses to accept a flight.
- 3.5 Increased workload due to communications and excessive coordination requirements

4 To Aircrew

- 4.1 Aircrew may be overloaded by having to file Flight Plan modifications en route.
- 4.2 Aircraft will be delayed
- 4.3 Aircraft likely to be subject to holding if airport gates have not been vacated due to departing aircraft missing their slots

5 To ANSPs

5.1 ANSP staff may be overloaded by having to manually enter flight Plans which have been rejected by the automated system.

5.2 ANSPs may lose revenue from aircraft not using their FIR facilities.

6 Safety

6.1 Manual modifications to flight plan data either by filers, ATC staff or aircrew could lead to incorrect data being transmitted or detail lost altogether.

6.2 Credible corruption of flight plan data could occur due to a mix of NEW and Present flight plan content after the 15th November deadline.

6.3 Pilots may have to enter flight Plan data manually into the FMS if Flight Plan is rejected by ATC thus introducing a greater risk of error.

Chapter 2. FLIGHT PLANS

2.1 CONTENT – GENERAL

(A2 – Chapter 3; P-ATM – Chapter 4 and Appendix 2)

2.1.1 Date of flight

Nil.

2.1.2 Area navigation (RNAV) specifications

2.1.2.1 State aircraft operating in the ICAO MID Region

2.1.2.1.1 Operators of State aircraft not equipped with RNAV equipment meeting RNP 5 shall not insert the designator “S” or “R” in Item 10 of the flight plan.

2.1.2.1.2 Since such flights require special handling by air traffic control, “STS/NONRNAV” shall be inserted in Item 18 of the flight plan.

2.1.3 Required navigation performance (RNP) specifications

2.1.3.1 The letter R shall be inserted in Item 10 (Equipment) of the flight plan to indicate the aircraft meets the RNP type prescribed, has been appropriately approved and can comply with all conditions of that approval.

2.1.3.2 Operators of aircraft fitted with RNAV having a navigation accuracy meeting RNP 5 shall insert the designator “R” in Item 10 of the flight plan for operation in the ICAO MID Region, as specified in 4.1.1.5.3.

2.1.4 Minimum navigation performance specifications (MNPS)

Nil.

2.1.5 Reduced vertical separation minimum (RVSM) approved aircraft

2.1.5.1 The letter W shall be inserted in Item 10 (Equipment) of the flight plan if the aircraft and operator have received RVSM State approval, regardless of the requested flight level. The aircraft registration shall be inserted in Item 18 of the flight plan.

2.1.6 Non-RVSM-approved aircraft

Nil.

Chapter 2. FLIGHT PLANS

2.1 CONTENT – GENERAL

(A2 – Chapter 3; P-ATM – Chapter 11)

2.1.1 Date of flight

Note.— The PANS-ATM, 11.4.2.2.2.5, states that “if a flight plan is filed more than 24 hours in advance of the estimated off-block time of the flight to which it refers, that flight plan shall be held in abeyance until at most 24 hours before the flight begins so as to avoid the need for the insertion of a date group into that flight plan”. The following specifies details regarding the insertion of a date group into the flight plan.

2.1.1.1 If a flight plan for a flight conducted wholly in the EUR Region is filed more than 24 hours in advance of the estimated off-block time (EOBT), it is mandatory to provide the date of the flight (DOF). If the flight plan is filed less than 24 hours in advance of the EOBT, the date of the flight may be optionally indicated. This information will be inserted in Item 18 of the flight plan as a 3-letter indicator (DOF) followed by an oblique stroke and date of flight in a 6-figure group format:

DOF/YMMDD (YY = year; MM = month; DD = day)

2.1.2 Area navigation (RNAV) specifications

2.1.2.1 Operators of aircraft approved for basic area navigation (B-RNAV) operations, as set out in 4.1.1.5.2, shall insert the designator “R” in Item 10 of the flight plan.

2.1.2.2 Operators of aircraft approved for precision area navigation (P-RNAV) operations, as set out in 4.1.1.5.2, shall, in addition to the designator “R”, also insert the designator “P” in Item 10 of the flight plan.

2.1.2.3 Operators of State aircraft not equipped with RNAV shall not insert the designators “S” or “R” or “P” in Item 10 of the flight plan. Instead, STS/NONRNAV shall be inserted in Item 18 of the flight plan.

2.1.2.4 Where a failure or degradation results in the aircraft being unable to meet the P-RNAV functionality and accuracy requirements of 4.1.1.5.2.4 before departure, the operator of the aircraft shall not insert the designator “P” in Item 10 of the flight plan. Subsequently, for a flight for which a flight plan has been submitted, an appropriate new flight plan shall be submitted and the old flight plan cancelled. For a flight operating based on a repetitive flight plan (RPL), the RPL shall be cancelled and an appropriate new flight plan shall be submitted.

2.1.2.5 In addition, where a failure or degradation results in the aircraft being unable to meet the B-RNAV functionality and accuracy requirements of 4.1.1.5.2.6 before departure, the operator of the aircraft shall not insert the designators “S” or “R” or “P” in Item 10 of the flight plan. Since such flights require special handling by ATC, Item 18 of the flight plan shall contain STS/RNAVINOP. Subsequently, for a flight for which a flight plan has been submitted, an appropriate new flight plan shall be submitted and the old flight plan cancelled. For a flight operating based on an RPL, the RPL shall be cancelled and an appropriate new flight plan shall be submitted.

APPENDIX G

Outcome of Joint ACAC – ICAO INFPL Implementation Seminar

- States who have not done so to allocate the necessary resources to implement the provisions of amendment 1.
- Launch of training campaigns within States with specified time lines
(Engineers, Ops , ATC, Military , Airlines, maintenance etc..)
- Consider Regional Testing Schedule
- Following were identified as members of Regional Support Team (Bahrain, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, UAE and IATA)
- Interregional issues to be handled through concerned ICAO Regional office
- Make use of ICAO support through SST/Interested states should file a request by INFPL SG/4
- Encourage States to Share their experience (testing doc, training, etc.)
- States to consider collective negotiations with vendors and should seeks assistance from representative organization (CANSO, IATA, IFATCA, etc.) to conclude agreement with vendors
- INFPL SG/4 to prepare standard briefing to be distributed to all MID States for distribution to all airlines registered in their States.
- Development of standard regional rejection procedures (Jordan by INFPL SG/4)
- Development of common test plan to ensure that states will conduct (carry out) all necessary tests to validate INFPL SG/4
- States unable to accept INFPL are encourage to request support from other States willing to provide the to conversion AND TO CONCLUDE THE NECESSARY LOA.

- END -