References:

1   none

Purpose and agenda:

Statement of purpose: To review data collection process and identify any shortcomings or important issues

1   Review of data collection phase 4.
2   Other matters.

Participants:

1.   Dominican Republic: Fernando Casso (rapporteur)
2.   Mexico: Margarita Rangel (SENEAM), Oscar Vargas, Daniel Castañeda, Ricardo Sánchez (DGAC)
3.   Trinidad and Tobago: Ricky Bissessar
4.   COCESNA: Mayda Avila
5.   IATA: Marco Vidal

Discussions:

Review of data collection

1.   Mexico reminded that during the face to face meeting they agreed to send data after the collection period ends. They are verifying the data to be reported. They have a constant training program to mitigate errors.

2.   COCESNA is also verifying their data, and have found the same errors as before, not only duplicates, but also errors such as in field 10 and inconsistencies between field 10 and 18, but in less degree. COCESNA also commented on the FPL validation system to be implemented soon, which will generate rejection messages when any error is detected in incoming messages. The system will be in test phase for about a month, in parallel with the regular FPL processing system. Once the system is certified as operating correctly, airlines and ATS units will be informed of the cutover to production of the system, and they will offer support to minimize the delays that may result from the rejections of flight plans by the system.

3.   IATA commented regarding the error rejection system from COCESNA, expressing concern that in the case airlines submit a correct flight plan and the ATS unit transmit with errors, the airlines would assume the cost of delays because of errors generated by the ATS unit. COCESNA responded indicating that before bringing the system into production, they will work together with airlines and ANSPs, and communicate how they are going to work under this new system.

4.   A related issue is the fact that in some cases airlines send messages using an AFTN address that is not capable of receiving messages, and therefore the rejection message will not be seen. IATA commented that an alternate channel of communication with airlines can be e-mail, if the system is capable of also using e-mail for rejection messages. The rapporteur added that maybe an alternate AFTN address could be used for reporting errors, for example as a service message to the corresponding user. In any case, a list of addresses will be necessary for the inclusion of this data in the application. IATA asked if there are any LoAs signed up to now regarding the use of the system, and none are yet. But COCESNA, after the testing, will publish an AIC indicating how users and ANSPs will interact with the system. IATA requested a draft of the AIC, to begin working on awareness in this sense, to which COCESNA agreed. **(ACT 01/16)**

5.   The rapporteur mentioned that previously there was a list of PoC's for airlines that may need updating, but could be used for the purpose of indicating the AFTN/e-mail address for operators. In the case of ANSP's, the point of contact for the person responsible for following up on errors could be collected from the group.

6.   Trinidad and Tobago commented that in their experience the contact from the operator PoC list has not given results,

as they have used these e-mails but have not had responses. The representative from PIARCO was also of the opinion that there need to be a final decision on whether the airlines of the ANSP's should be responsible for sending flight plans. IATA also agreed to this, stating that there be a regional decision on the transmission of flight plans, and that the intervention of ICAO was important for defining this matter. The rapporteur reminded the task force that there was an action item of each State declaring delegation of flight plan origination, but in any case the experience is that operators have their systems defined in a way that does not easily allow defining delegation for some cases and not for others, so there has to be some level of agreement.

7. Also commented was the fact that, as AIDC is implemented throughout the region, air traffic services will depend more and more on the CPL and less on the FPL, so it will be possible for operators to only send FPL messages to the departure aerodrome, and from there the rest of the FIRs will receive flight plan information by means of CPLs. This is the case for Canada, which has AIDC interfaces with almost all adjacent FIRs. In this way, and in compliance with current documentation, the transmission of the FPL message to the departing ATS unit would be equivalent to submitting the flight plan, and the ATS unit would originate the necessary messages to the rest of the FIRs, mainly with CPL messages. This scheme could imply modifications of airlines systems, to be able to only send messages to the departure aerodrome. IATA insisted in that ICAO should give direction by means of a communication on how flight plan processing should be done in this aspect. The rapporteur indicated that there are two possible paths of action to be proposed: one is complying with the current documentation, carrying out the process as indicated in Document 4444 and related publications, or introducing a new procedure that will take into account any shortcuts allowed by technology. For the time being, it was considered safe to comply with current documentation.

8. The task force was interested in Canada's procedure for flight plans, as mentioned above, where airlines send flight plans only to the departure ATS unit, and CPLs are sent to subsequent FIRs by the ATS unit. IATA asked what would happen in case any FIR is not capable of processing CPLs (no AIDC implemented), as is the current case. In this case, FPLs would be sent instead of CPLs by the ATS unit. For this to happen, airline systems should be capable of sending the FPL only to the departure aerodrome, and ATS units must be capable of processing and distributing the FPLs/CPLs. In some cases staffing and training of the ATS units responsible would be necessary.

9. The task force was interested in a document that described Canada's processing of flight plans as described above. The rapporteur will ask the representative of Canada if this is available, and maybe provide more detail on this process. **(ACT 02/16)**.

10. COCESNA mentioned the intention of implementing a centralized flight plan processing system, which will receive and validate flight plan information, and distribute the data to the Central American States. The rapporteur mentioned that it could be useful to contact Trinidad and Tobago, who are in the final stages of implementation of a similar system, and can give good insight and lessons learned. The representative of Trinidad and Tobago offered some general information of the implementation of their flight plan processing system.

11. COCESNA also indicated that they can send the data for flight plan duplicates after the end of the collection period, which is acceptable.

Other Matters

12. The rapporteur mentioned that it is important for each FIR to have samples of flight plans that are generating duplicates, because with this information it is easier for the IATA representative to work with the airlines and prevent these errors from recurring. It is not necessary to have all the duplicate flight plans, but at least samples of the most frequent. This data can be then passed to IATA as needed.

Review of Previous Actions

ACT No.	Description	Status	Comments

Summary of Action Items from this Meeting

ACT No.	Description	Status	Comments
01/16	COCESNA to send IATA a draft of the AIC relative to the operation of the FPL validation system	Valid	
02/16	Rappoteur to ask Canada's representative for details on their flight plan processing procedure.	Valid	

Next meeting: TBD