



*5th FPL Monitoring Group Teleconference  
(November 5, 2014 at 15 UTC)*

- Reference:**
1. FPL data collected- 1<sup>st</sup> Round
  2. Minutes of 4th FPL Monitoring Group Teleconference (October 30th, 2014)

**Purpose:** To draft an action plan for mitigation of flight plan errors.

**Participants:**

- Dominican Republic: Fernando Casso (Rapporteur)
- Haiti: Erns Edmond
- Mexico: Daniel Castañeda, Edgar González, Margarita Rangel, Oscar Vargas, Román Ramírez, Sandra Carreras
- United States: Dan Eaves
- IATA: Marco Vidal
- ICAO: Julio Siu

**Discussion**

1. The FPL Mon Rapporteur consolidated several of the corrective actions for mitigating the FPL errors under the common template prepared with ICAO as to start the drafting of an action plan from the results obtained from this first round of data collection, implement these actions and conduct the second round of data collection to evaluate the improvements achieved.
2. ICAO asked the Rapporteur to identify the FIRs that have not sent information to the 1<sup>st</sup> round of FPL data collection, so they can be included in the State Letter with the request to collect and send data for the next round. **ACT 05/01:** FPL Mon Rapporteur to include in the template which FIRs provided their data to the first FPL Data collection process.

**Actions suggested from the States**

***Missing FPLs***

3. The suggestions sent by the States were discussed, beginning with Haiti. Regarding missing flight plans, Haiti explained that for the three cases of missing flight plans identified, the originator was contacted by AFTN message or directly. In two cases (Insel Air and Aerocaribbean) the response was immediate. AirTransat had not responded till that moment.
4. In this process of contacting the airlines, Haiti mentioned that several local AFTN addresses were indicated. Haiti has published an AIC but didn't specify the official AFTN address to file FPLs. ICAO highlighted that the official FPL filing AFTN address should be available in ENR xxx of each State AIP. In this regard an action that ANSPs verify the address where flight plans should be sent was agreed with a due date of November 30<sup>th</sup>.
5. For the purpose of feedback, it was agreed that the airlines provide a preferred means of communication so that it is possible for them to be contacted should there be any problems with a flight plan. **ACT 05/02:** United States offered to provide by November 21<sup>st</sup> an initial list of contacts to be updated.
6. The repetitive flight plan was discussed, and the conclusion was that the effort necessary to keep them up to date did not justify its usefulness, so its use is discouraged for the time being.
7. ICAO commented that all users shall comply with the ICAO and State regulations for filing FPLs as indicated in the NACC/WG/03/xx Conclusion. Actions will be included in the suggested actions.

***Duplication FPLs***

8. For the case of duplication, Haiti explained that airlines sent the flight plan to some of the involved FIRs, but not to all. Because of this, Haiti as service provider sends the FPL to all FIRs, causing FPL to be duplicated.

United States mentioned that sometimes the agreements between service providers and airlines are not followed, the flight plan sometimes is sent from the airlines and sometimes by the service provider. IATA agreed that there should be a uniform way to work, and recalled the fact that the airlines be the originators of flight plans and that some practical guideline of best practices tailored for the region should be developed following ICAO SARPs.

9. IATA proposed that there be examples of each type of error presented to the airlines for the purpose of assisting the training and guidance to the operators. By means of the data collected, it is possible to consult the call signs reported, and obtain from this reference the flight plans in error for that purpose.
10. Due to the above: It was agreed **ACT 05/03** IATA, United States and ICAO to draft guidelines for filling of FPLs due by November 28<sup>th</sup>.
11. The Eastern Caribbean Central FPL planning system initiative to solve the FPL errors was discussed. IATA pointed out that it was not clear for them the manner in which the central FPL processing system would prevent the duplication of flight plans, and the member of Trinidad and Tobago was not available in the meeting, so the explanation is pending. **ACT 05/04:** Trinidad and Tobago to brief the FPL Mon TF Members of their CFP initiative by next teleconference.

#### ***Rejected/Erroneous FPLs***

12. United States pointed out that there are differences between system regarding the processing of flight plans, especially in fields 10 and 18. Some FIRs may reject a flight plan whereas others would not. There was a stated need of uniformity for the filing of flight plans, so this situation can be reduced to the minimum. Looking at the particular error messages with respect of the “Inconsistent item in field 10 and 18 PBN” error, there were some doubts on exactly what was wrong. For instance, there were error messages as “NO PBN” and “PBN ERROR” that was not clear on exactly where the inconsistency lied in the flight plan. There will be a need to consult the flight plan to see what the exact error was.
13. ICAO pointed out that there should be consistency between the information of different entities managing the flight plans for example, the ATS routes recognized by the FDP and the ones in the ARO office. There should be no inconsistencies in the case of automated systems if these systems validate correctly. In general, as mentioned by United States, most systems would reply to the originator indicating the error if a flight plan is rejected. This brought up the issue of the feedback to the originator in the case of an error, in case it is not automatically provided by the system.
14. ICAO indicated that in many cases there is a position within the system where erroneous flight plans are displayed for correction, and a designated operator to work with these flight plans. ICAO proposed that ANSPs should provide feedback to the originator for FPLs errors and for its improvements. The Rapporteur also mentioned the different level of validation between systems: flight plans may be rejected by one system based on parameters not taken into account by another system.
15. **ACT 05/05:** The Action Plan template will include actions from the previously commented situations and will then be sent for more comments from the FPL Mon Members by 14 Nov 2014. The actions for the States/ANSPS/Users are intended to carry out before the end of the year. Examples will be provided for ease of comprehension where needed.

#### ***Next Steps***

16. United States suggested that eventually the members of the group have a face to face meeting to discuss the more complex topics. Following this suggestion, it was agreed for ICAO to host a face to face meeting for the FPL monitoring group for next year, before the ANI/WG meeting. In this regard, it was proposed to have the meeting in February 2015, so there could be an evaluation of the action plan results, program the second round of data collection and have results to present to the ANI/WG meeting. This Meeting of the FPL Mon Group could be held together in the same week with an AIDC TF Meeting. The proposed venue for the meeting is the ICAO regional office in Mexico City. **ACT 05/06:** ICAO and the AIDCTF Rapporteur to coordinate the FPL Mon and AIDC TF Meeting for February 2015.

**Next meeting:** December 8<sup>th</sup> at 1500 UTC.