



FPL Monitoring Group
Minutes of Teleconference/12
(September 2, 2015 1800 UTC)

Purpose and agenda:

Statement of purpose:

1. Review of mitigation actions
2. Planning of duplicate and multiple flight plan data collection
3. Other Matters

Participants:

1. Curaçao: Natasha Leonora-Belafonte, Joseph Nicolas
2. Dominican Republic: Fernando Cassó (Rapporteur)
3. Jamaica: Maxine Allen
4. Mexico: Sandra Carrera, Román Ramírez, Manuel Rodríguez, Angel Bautista, Edgar González, Oscar Vargas, Daniel Castañeda
5. PIARCO: Ricky Bissessar
6. United States: Dan Eaves
7. IATA: Marco Vidal
8. ICAO: Julio Siu

Discussions:

Review of mitigation actions

1. IATA referred to a situation presented by COCESNA a few months ago regarding errors in flight plans, in which they collaborated to identify errors in flight plans for Avianca from El Salvador. The errors were differences in the routes. One case was a change done by the dispatcher, who is now in training. The rest were generated from El Salvador ANSP, that was changing SIDs in the routes originally presented by the airline. COCESNA will work with El Salvador to correct the problem. There are regulations and approvals required for flight plans in El Salvador that prevent a straightforward solution. Up to now, the only report from COCESNA has been for El Salvador, so it does not seem to be a general problem in Central America, as ICAO asked.
2. ICAO asked about problems regarding the filing of flight plans by means of an online service (flightplan.com), that was mentioned in a previous teleconference (Curaçao). Curaçao mentioned that was a suggestion as a possible means, that airlines do not normally use these means. United States mentioned that they have contact with personnel from flightplan.com, and offered that Curaçao inform them of a point of contact, so that they can put both parties (Curaçao and flightplan.doc) in contact, and any issue with the online service can reach the personnel at flightplan.com. United States also mentioned that there was a flight plan filers teleconference the next day, that any issue with the filers could be directly presented there.
3. Curaçao mentioned that duplicates have been reduced, most of the time the issue being the operators resending flight plans without cancelling the previous one.
4. ICAO mentioned the contact list dissemination, for which there are two action items from the previous teleconference (**ACT 01/11**, Rapporteur to coordinate with ICAO the publication of the contact list on the AIDC TF web page, and **ACT 02/11**, Rapporteur to agree with ICAO procedure for updating the contact list on the web site). ICAO asked for the latest version of the contact list, and if it can be provided this week. United States proposed checking first for any updates in order to send the latest information, and resulted in **ACT 01/12** for the United States to send the updated contact list to the rapporteur. The rapporteur will wait for this updated list before sending to ICAO for uploading to the Task Force web site.
5. IATA also mentioned having a list indicating which FIRs permit airlines to file the flight plan directly, and which require



**FPL Monitoring Group
Minutes of Teleconference/12
(September 2, 2015 1800 UTC)**

to have the alternate aerodrome as a mandatory field. There are FIRs that did not respond to the survey of the alternate aerodrome that was administered by the Task Force, and IATA was asking if it was possible to complete this survey. The rapporteur considered that the purpose of the survey relating to the alternate aerodrome was for the creation of the regional agreement, and since that goal was met, continuing the survey would not be necessary. IATA mentioned the objection from Cuba, which was discussed in a previous teleconference. The case of Mexico was also mentioned, as they require the alternate aerodrome be specified. Mexico indicated that this requirement does not apply to overflights. IATA asked if a flight departing from Mexico to the United States could have a flight plan omitting the alternate aerodrome, and Mexico responded that this was possible. The rapporteur asked Mexico if they could accept ZZZZ for the alternate aerodrome, and ALTN/NONE in field 18. Mexico responded that this was not possible. Mexico's system does permit a flight plan to be filed without the alternate aerodrome, thus it would not pose a problem rejecting a flight plan in this condition.

Planning of duplicate and multiple flight plan data collection

6. The form to use for the collection of data was considered. The original data collection form was modified, resulting in the form indicated in Appendix A. This form allows registering the multiple addresses originating the messages, as well as limiting the information to only those of relevance for duplicates. For each occurrence, the user will register the date, callsign, and will indicate each originating address on it's own line, starting from the line with the date and callsign, as can be seen in the example.
7. The methodology used will be similar to the previous rounds. The data collection will start on September 14th, and will end on October 4th. A follow up teleconference will be conducted on the 22nd, for the purpose of reviewing the data collection process during the first week and addressing any possible shortcomings. Analysis will take place from October 5th to the 16th. The results will be presented from October 19th to the 23rd. A teleconference will be held to see the results, and decide what the next steps will be.
8. United States mentioned that it is very important to identify the cancel messages that correspond to flight plan messages, as the latter should not be counted as duplicates in those cases. The rapporteur suggested that the ATC systems may allow identification of duplicates if there is a terminal where you can see the erroneous messages detected. It would be easier than looking for them in the flight data processing system, if it is available.
9. Jamaica mentioned that they will be acquiring a new AIM system that will correct some shortcomings of their current systems, regarding duplication of flight plans.
10. ICAO indicated that it would be important that the State Letter for the data collection be sent early on, no later than the 7th, to give States a chance to prepare. Also, it will be necessary to update the FPL Mon Group web page with the latest information, so ICAO suggested that United States, IATA and the rapporteur can review the information on the site and make sure all information is up to date.
11. The rapporteur mentioned that it would be useful to have a document instructing how to fill the duplicates collection form, and publish it on the web site. This instruction document will be sent along with the minutes as well as being published on the website.
12. ICAO asked if and how the Best Practices document from CANSO is being used for the recommended actions for mitigation of duplication, to align the work between CANSO and this FPL MON Group. The rapporteur indicated that, although the document was not directly referenced for the mitigation actions suggested, these actions are mostly aligned with what is recommended in the CANSO document, as is the use of cancelling and resubmitting, and the time limit before departure for submitting changes. United States indicated that it is important that each group interchange information, compare activities and share learning experience.

Other Matters



**FPL Monitoring Group
Minutes of Teleconference/12
(September 2, 2015 1800 UTC)**

13. The rapporteur mentioned that there was no survey done for the direct filing of flight plans, but it was mentioned in the last teleconference that during this one the list could be started with the participating FIRs. The list resulted as follows:

- United States: delegates to the airlines or their designated flight plan filing service for flights originating and departing from within the United States.
- Canada: up to the knowledge of the United States, Canada similarly delegates, although Nav Canada provides a national filing system (a web site for flight plans to be filed).
- Jamaica also has a mix of delegation and non-delegation, as there are facilities from the ANSPs that can be optionally used by the airlines for the submission of flight plans.
- Curaçao does not delegate with the exception of a list of airlines, who submit the flight plans themselves.
- Mexico also has a mix of delegation and non-delegation, although most of the flight plans that are submitted via the ANSP are general aviation.
- Dominican Republic does not delegate.

14. The rest of the FIRs should respond to the question of “Does your FIR delegate the origination of flight plan messages to operators?” and send the results to the rapporteur. ICAO offered to help with distributing the question to the rest of the FIRs.

Review of Previous Action Items

ACT No.	Description	Status	Comments
01/11	Rapporteur to coordinate with ICAO the publication of the contact list on the AIDC TF web page	Complete	
02/11	Rapporteur to agree with ICAO procedure for updating the contact list on the web site	Valid	Due 14/08/2015

Summary of Action Items from this Meeting

ACT No.	Description	Status	Comments
01/12	United States to send the updated contact list to the rapporteur for publication in ICAO web site	Valid	Due September 7 th .
02/12	United States, IATA, Dominican Republic to review the task force website and make sure information is updated	Valid	Due September 7 th .

Next meeting: To be determined.