International Civil Aviation Organization
Western and Central African Office

AFI PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION REGIONAL GROUP (APIRG)

Fourteenth Meeting of the Air Traffic Management/Aeronautical Information Management/Search and Rescue Sub-Group (ATM/AIM/SAR SG/14)
(Dakar, Senegal, 11 to 14 May 2015)

Agenda Item 3: Status of Implementation of the Sub-Group Work Programme and related Task Forces/Working Groups as assigned by APIRG

3.1 Air Traffic Management

2014 RVSM OPERATIONS APPROVALS SURVEY

(Presented by ARMA)

SUMMARY

This paper presents the statistics of the Global RVSM Approvals Survey conducted in Africa for period December 2014. ATM Coordination procedures are proposed for Non RVSM approved aircraft.

Action by the meeting is at **paragraph 3.**

This information paper is related to ICAO Strategic Objectives: **A** & **B**

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The ARMA completed the RVSM Operations approval survey for December 2014 as per ICAO Regional Monitoring Agency Coordination Group (RMACG) tasking. The results are presented to the meeting to support the efforts towards achieving full RVSM Operations compliance by all operators.

1.2 The AFI contribution will be incorporated into the consolidated Global document for use by the Secretary of the ICAO RMACG.

1.3 Non RVSM approved aircraft, State or Civilian, present a safety risk when flight plans are incorrectly submitted resulting in flight within the RVSM stratum. State aircraft, with prior coordination, could be accommodated in RVSM airspace with 2000FT separation traffic permitting in AFI.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 Below are four explanatory notes to clarify the process that provides the information in the table 1:

2.1.1 The ARMA is unable to conduct a survey by flight plan due to the many FIRs being surveyed and the limited access to all FIR's flight plans.

2.1.2 The surveys are conducted by scrutinizing RVSM safety assessment traffic flow data per FIR and establishing RVSM status per aircraft with reference to the AFI RVSM Approvals database and those of other regions. (This is possibly the most effective method producing a realistic result) In most cases flight plans are requested from ACC's to support the UCR.

2.1.3 30 AFI FIR's are monitored however only 20 FIR's were assessed. This is 4 less FIR's than the 2013 assessment. The emphasis is placed on the fact that all FIR's must submit traffic data.

2.1.4 The result is considered to be a true reflection of the non RVSM approved aircraft as most aircraft pass through more than one FIR.

2.2 The following FIR/ACC's have been assessed by FIR/ACC name in Table 1 below:

FIR/ACC	**% Non RVSM**	**FIR/ACC**	**% Non RVSM**
Algiers	0.12%	Luanda	0.00%
Antananarivo	0.43%	Lusaka	0.00%
Beira	0.00%	Mauritius	0.00%
Brazzaville	0.00%	Mogadishu	0.00%
Cape Town	0.03%	Nairobi	0.0%
Dakar	0.00%	N'djamena	0.00%
Entebbe	0.00%	Niamey	0.00%
Gaborone	0.00%	Roberts	0.00%
Harare	0.00%	Seychelles	0.00%
Johannesburg	0.01%	Windhoek	0.00%
Kano	0.14%		
Khartoum	0.02%		

Table 1

2.3 A total of 64367 flights were assessed and within this traffic data 10 aircraft were found to be non RVSM approved which is a reduction from 204 aircraft in 2013 that were found to be non RVSM approved.

2.4 These ten aircraft conducted multiple flights in the AFI RVSM airspace during December 2014 and operated without a State RVSM Approval. This covers both Regional and International Operators.

2.5 The ARMA has followed up on all the Non RVSM approved aircraft, via UCR, so as to ensure that the relevant CAA's are made aware and can commence with remedial actions and report back to TAG and ultimately ARMA.

2.6 The ARMA has processed similar queries from other RMA's that have encountered and recorded African registered aircraft operating in the non-compliant category so that they can receive the required attention. It should be recalled that all RMA's coordinate on a continuous basis.

2.7 In some instances ARMA has been made aware that ATM coordination might have contributed to the incursion into RVSM airspace however it is not always possible for ATC to provide the alert to the receiving ACC. The following examples:

a) Non RVSM approved State aircraft correctly flight planned receiving 2000FT separation should be coordinated with this information so as to enhance safety if possible.

b) Non RVSM approved aircraft correctly flight planned at FL280 or below requesting clearance into RVSM airspace shall not be cleared. Where possible the receiving ACC should be informed that the same request might be received and should be denied due to the non RVSM approval status.

2.8 States/ACC's would be wise to immediately inform ARMA of any suspected aircraft operating in RVSM airspace without RVSM approval so that ARMA can investigate and substantiate the event before taking up with the State of registry for remedial action.

CONCLUSION

2.9 In conclusion it should be noted that there has been a big improvement in kerbing the operation of non-RVSM approved aircraft in AFI RVSM airspace. This has been achieved with the cooperation of the many Civil Aviation Authorities. Although the number has decreased, it should be noted that the survey was conducted only for the month of December 2014 and that the ten aircraft undertook multiple flights. The continued monitoring and follow up remedial action by ARMA and AFI CAA's will be continued in an effort to eliminate such occurrences.

3.0 ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

a) take note of the information provided in this information paper; and

b) continue to support ARMA and follow-up on remedial actions necessary.

--- *END* ---