



FPL Monitoring Group
Minutes of Teleconference/24
(May 2, 2019 1800UTC)

References:

- 1 None

Purpose and agenda:

Statement of purpose:

- 1 Review the March 2019 data collection results
- 2 Other matters.

Participants:

1. Belize: Gilberto Torres
2. Curaçao: Jozef Nicolaas
3. Dominican Republic: Fernando Cassó R. (Rapporteur)
4. Mexico: Margarita Rangel (SENEAM), Daniel Castañeda (DGAC)
5. Trinidad and Tobago: Ricky Bissessar
6. United States: Dan Eaves
7. IATA: Marco Vidal
8. ICAO: Mayda Avila **Discussions:**

Review the March 2019 data collection results

1. The rapporteur informed the meeting that the results of the latest data collection done in March of this year was presented in the past AIDC meeting, where there was a topic regarding flight plan errors. The rapporteur presented several graphs from the data collected, where the overall error and correct fpl percentage could be seen.
2. The rapporteur explained that, to take into account the differences in volume of the data sent by each State, that percentages were used to normalize the data and give each State equal weight in the final result.
3. In this analysis, it was viewed that 84% of the total processed flight plans were correct, leaving 16% with errors. This is still a considerable number of errors.
4. Looking at the type of error, the percentages for the most frequent type of error are summarized below:

Error	Percentage
Duplicated FPL	25%
Inconsistent ATS Route	13%
Invalid EET Data	11%
SPL Information Included	9%
Invalid Item 18 Data	7%
Missing FPL	6%
No Alternate Aerodrome	6%



FPL Monitoring Group
Minutes of Teleconference/24
(May 2, 2019 1800UTC)

ICAO Doc 4444 Format Incorrect	6%
-----------------------------------	----

5. IATA commented that the error of inconsistent type of aircraft could be mitigated establishing a common BADA for all States. The rapporteur indicated that in the past AIDC meeting this issue was addressed and that a working paper will be presented to ICAO headquarters describing the problema and possible solution.
6. Mexico had done an analysis of their own data and determined that they had basically the same average good/bad flight plans as the global level, 84%/16%, which represented a reduction of 2% regarding the previous collection. More than 50% of those errors were duplicate flight plans. The data corresponded to the Mérida and Monterrey FIRs. The graphs using only Mexico data were viewed by the meeting, corresponding to the analysis done by Mexico. Invalid Item 18 errors were also frequent according to the graph. Mexico DGAC will have meetings with SENEAM and airspace users.
7. IATA asked for specific examples of flight plans with errors, in order to help with Mexico, which was agreed to by the latter. **(ACT 01/22)**
8. In the case of Trinidad and Tobago, the most frequent errors were ATS FDP problem, wrong ICAO 4444 format, Inconsistent ATS route and inconsistent SID/STAR. In the case of inconsistent ATS routes, IATA commented that the definition of waypoints beyond the boundary point may be a factor.
9. United States added to this comment referring to the case explained during the AIDC meeting, in which the impossibility of inserting a STAR because of system capacity caused an operational safety issue. This STAR corresponded to an airport in the US, and so the comment was regarding how far from the border does the area of interest of an FIR extend. Caution must be practiced in this sense, as a recommendation.
10. The ICAO CNS Regional Officer summarized the important points from the AIDC meeting:
 1. Databases could have information that is no longer needed, thus occupying capacity that could be used otherwise.
 2. SID and STAR issues, mostly because of the difference in naming (6 characters vs 7 characters). This case will be forwarded to the PBN task force. IATA mentioned that airlines can mostly manage the 6/7 character issue, but where there is a transition then there are more than 7 characters specified in the AIPs, and that causes problems.
 3. Different interpretations of Document 4444 can lead to differences in flight plan processing. These cases shall be forwarded to the AIM Task Force. IATA commented that maybe it would be wise to send these cases to ICAO headquarters, the ICAO CNS RO indicated that the AIM RO will reach out to headquarters as needed.
11. Belize commented that sometimes US carriers indicate the alternate aerodrome in their flight plans, and sometimes they don't. United States clarified that US carriers that are certified can file form outside the US with or without the alternate aerodrome, depending on the circumstance. IATA offered to send background information on this to them. **(ACT 02/22)**
12. The rapporteur indicated that the changed due to the Metroplex implementation could have been a factor that introduced errors in this collection. Therefore a second collection for the year was proposed. The date is to be agreed on.
13. United States recommended the strategy of addressing first the major offenders in the analysis of flight plan errors and see what is happening. This will allow States to make good progress while keeping the effort simple.



FPL Monitoring Group
Minutes of Teleconference/24
(May 2, 2019 1800UTC)

Other Matters

14. The rapporteur indicated that the group must update the work programme tasks. As there are tasks pertaining to the implementation of the regional procedure for flight planning, the rapporteur will send a questionnaire or survey asking the status of implementation, any obstacles to the implementation encountered, lessons learned and other important data that may help in the completion of the tasks.
(ACT 03/22)

Review of Previous Action Items

ACT No.	Description	Status	Comments

Summary of Action Items from this Meeting

ACT No.	Description	Status	Comments
01/22	Mexico to provide IATA with specific examples of flight plan errors	Valid	
02/22	IATA to provide background information to Belize regarding the use of alternate aerodrome in flight plans	Valid	
03/22	Rapporteur to send questionnaire to the group members to update the work programme and provide additional information on mitigation measures	Valid	

Next meeting: To be determined.