INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION
ASIA AND PACIFIC OFFICE

REPORT OF THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE ASIA/PACIFIC ICAO FLIGHT PLAN & ATS MESSAGES IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE AND SEMINAR (FPL&AM/TF/5 & SEMINAR)

MANILA, PHILIPPINES, 7 – 9 NOVEMBER 2011

Approved by the Meeting
and published by the ICAO Asia and Pacific Office, Bangkok

Page

…………………...

1.1   Introduction

1.1.1   The Fifth Meeting of the Asia/Pacific ICAO Flight Plan & ATS Messages Implementation Task Force and Seminar (FPL&AM/TF/5& Seminar) was held at the Heritage Hotel in Manila, Philippines from 7 to 9 November 2011.

1.2   Officers, Secretariat and Participants

1.2.1   Mr. Len Wicks, Regional Officer ATM (Air Traffic Management), acted as the Seminar Moderator and Secretary for the Task Force meeting. Mr. Warren Beeston, ATM Systems Manager, Airservices Australia, presided as the Chairman of the Task Force and assisted with the Seminar. Mr. Tom Brady from ICAO HQ (Montreal) served as the main Seminar Presenter.

1.2.2   The Task Force Chairman Mr. Stu Douglas, Senior ATS Systems Specialist, Airways Corporation of New Zealand Ltd. sent his apologies for the meeting.

1.2.3   Seventy-six (76) participants from Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, DPR Korea, French Polynesia, India, Indonesia, Japan, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nepal, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, United States, Viet Nam, IATA, Comsoft, Frequentis and Thales attended the meeting. A list of participants is in **Appendix A**.

1.3   Opening of the Meeting

1.3.1   Mr. Charlemagne P. Gilo, Assistant Chief Airways Communicator, CAAP, on behalf of Hon. Ramon S. Gutierrez, Director General, Civil Aviation Authority of the Philippines, extended a warm welcome to the participants. He added that Civil Aviation Authority of the Philippines was happy to host FPL&AM/TF/5 and Seminar at the request of the ICAO Regional office, and expressed hope that the meeting would be fruitful for all participants.

1.3.2   Mr. Len Wicks, on behalf of Mr. Mokhtar A. Awan, Regional Director, ICAO Asia and Pacific Regional Office, opened the meeting and welcomed participants to Manila.

1.4   Documentation and Working Language

1.4.1   The meeting was conducted in English. All meeting documentation was in English.

1.4.2   Thirteen (13) working papers, nine (9) information papers and one (1) flimsy were presented to the meeting. A list of the papers is at **Appendix B**.

……………………….

Agenda Item 1:   Adoption of Agenda

1.1   The meeting adopted the following agenda:

Agenda Item 1:   Adoption of Agenda

Agenda Item 2:   Review outcomes of related meetings

Agenda Item 3:   Review available documentation and guidance materials
                         o Amendment 1, 15th Edition PANS-ATM (Doc 4444)
                         o ICAO Guidance for Implementation of Flight Plan amendment
                         o Strategy for the implementation of new ICAO flight plan and
                           supporting ATS messages

Agenda Item 4:   Regional strategies for implementation and aspects

Agenda Item 5:   Review and update FPL&AM/TF Task List

Agenda Item 6:   Any other business

Agenda Item 7:   Date and venue of the next FPL&AM/TF meeting

Agenda Item 2:   Review outcomes of related meetings

Review Report of APANPIRG/22 (WP/04)

2.1   The meeting reviewed material from the 22nd Meeting of the Asia/Pacific Air
Navigation Planning and Implementation Regional Group (APANPIRG/22, 5-9 September 2011) that
was relevant to the FPL&AM/TF.

2.2   The outcomes from the Asia/Pacific ICAO Flight Plan & ATS Messages Task Force
(FPL&AM/TF/3, 23–24 August 2010, and FPL&AM/TF/4 and Seminar 01–03 June 2011),
responsible for overseeing implementation of Amendment 1 to the *Procedures for Air Navigation
Services — Air Traffic Management, Fifteenth Edition* (PANS-ATM, Doc 4444) were presented to
APANPIRG/22 (APANPIRG report excerpts as follows).

> *3.2.1   The ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/21 meeting was asked if there was a go/no-go date for
> FPL 2012 implementation. The Secretariat advised there was no 'Plan B', as this
> may cause some administrations to be less motivated. IATA stated that the airlines
> were ready and expected the same from ANSPs. Moreover, IATA stated that if one
> State did not comply then it could potentially affect a lot of other States, so this is the
> reason why the question of contingency had not been formally discussed.*

> *3.2.2   At the ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/21 the United States observed (as a member of
> multiple groups dealing with the changes from Amendment 1) that there was a lot of
> diverse discussion and different interpretations; thus they proposed the creation of a
> multi-regional flight plan coordination group to facilitate harmonized implementation
> and coordinate a globally harmonized approach to filing flight planning information
> which may not be explicitly covered by Amendment 1.*

3.2.3   The ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/21 meeting noted that there was an ICAOHQ resource coordinating FPL 2012 regional implementation efforts, and that Regional Officers were informally coordinating as required. Notwithstanding this, and the short time before the testing regime was due to start on 1 January 2012, it was considered necessary to highlight the importance of formal coordination at this critical juncture. IFATCA supported the need for such coordination.

3.2.4   The ATM/AIS/SAR SG 21 meeting noted that there were significant differences in interpretation. Hong Kong, China noted that States may be reluctant to invest in changes if there were inconsistencies that had not been identified to date.

3.2.5   The meeting noted that the intention of the Sub-Group was to focus the attention of APANPIRG on this important issue. ICAOHQ was concerned about the lack of clarity of the words 'key personnel' and organisations' and suggested that this coordination was already on-going. The meeting agreed to the following Conclusion:

Conclusion 22/1 – FPL 2012 Implementation Co-ordination

That, ICAO be urged to emphasise inter-regional coordination by ensuring regular dialogue, information-sharing and meetings between key personnel and organisations managing the FPL 2012 implementation process.

2.3   ICAO HQ advised that the forthcoming vendor's meeting was part of the coordination required to meet the intent of APANPIRG Conclusion 22/1.

Agenda Item 3:   Review available documentation and guidance materials

FPL 2012 Quarterly Questionnaire (WP/03)

3.1   The Secretariat presented the latest results from the quarterly questionnaire, which was intended to keep the Flight Plan Implementation Tracking System (FITS, located at http://www2.icao.int/en/FITS/Pages/home.aspx) website information up-to-date.   The FITS information would also raise awareness of potential implementation issues associated with the testing transition phases as early as possible.

3.2   During the FPL & AM TF/4 and Seminar, it become apparent that there was a need to supplement the information available on the FITS, and also to provide support to enhanced FITS functionality through regular, updated information. It was therefore recommended that a questionnaire be completed by the FPL 2012 Points of Contact every quarter, by:

- 1 July 2011;
- 1 October 2011;
- 1 January 2012;
- 1 April 2012; and if required,
- 1 July 2012.

3.3   The ICAO HQ representative informed the meeting that the FITS database was being upgraded to include additional columns for the questionnaire responses and that other ICAO regions were conducting similar questionnaires to the Asia/Pacific region.

3.4   The latest results from the Questionnaire are appended as **Appendix C**. A State Letter T3/10.1.20 – AP077/11 (ATM) dated 7 June 2011 regarding the questionnaire was sent to all Asia/Pacific administrations, and a reminder message AP-ATM0243 dated 25 July 2011 was sent to administrations with a Flight Information Region (FIR). At the time of the FPL & AM TF/5, eighteen (18) administrations had not provided a response to the July or October 2011 questionnaires:

- Afghanistan;
- Bangladesh;
- Bhutan (no FIR);
- China;
- Cook Islands (no FIR);
- Kiribati (no FIR);
- Marshall Islands (no FIR);
- Micronesia (no FIR);
- Myanmar;
- Nauru;
- Niue (no FIR);
- Palau (no FIR);
- Papua New Guinea;
- Samoa (no FIR);
- Solomon Islands;
- Timor Leste (no FIR);
- Tonga (no FIR); and
- Vanuatu (no FIR).

3.5   The focus of the FITS website was naturally on administrations that were responsible for FIRs. In this case, there were seven (7) such administrations that did not respond.

3.6   Indonesia advised that they had been having issues with the tendering approval process and that they expected to have approval in late 2012 (more information - IP/07).

<u>'W' in Item 10a and 'NONRVSM' in Item 18 (WP/10)</u>

3.7   Australia discussed the issue of flight planning mutually exclusive RVSM entries and highlighted the possible need for software code management of contradictory entries. It was possible to software code a simple check to ensure that the flight planning of RVSM capability was consistent within a flight plan. Australia had elected to provide this check in their 2012 flight plan specification and to reject flight plans to the queue for manual processing when 'W' and 'NONRVSM' are simultaneously filed. Australia realised as a consequence of the meeting that the check between field 10 and 18 should only be a one-way check. This proposal was endorsed by the meeting and captured as part of the WP/05 work.

3.8   Australia sought to add the following paragraph to Section 5 (Software Coding Considerations) of the Asia/Pacific Guidance Material:

Consistency between Item 10a and STS/ in Item 18

If W is filed in Item 10a then STS/NONRVSM must not exist in Item 18 and if STS/NONRVSM is filed in Item 18 then W must not exist in Item 10a.

<u>2012 Post Implementation Review Proposal (WP/11)</u>

3.9   Australia proposed a Post Implementation Review of the 2012 Flight Plan implementation to gather and highlight identified flight plan discrepancies or omissions from Amendment 1, and a forum to clarify issues or propose additional changes to be incorporated into PANS/OPS ATM Doc. 4444.

<u>Filing of ORGN in Item 18 (WP/12)</u>

3.10   This discussion paper was presented by Australia to promote a consolidated understanding and use of the ORGN indicator in Item 18 of the flight plan.

3.11   Amendment 1 stated that ORGN may be the originator's 8 letter Aeronautical Fixed Telecommunication Network (AFTN) address or other appropriate contact details, in cases where the originator of the flight plan may not be readily identified. The paper recommended that the ORGN indicator be limited to eight alphanumeric characters, or other characters considering limits already imposed by other service providers, otherwise it would be open to other means of communication such as email.

3.12   The United States noted that ORGN was used today in places such as Europe. The USA felt that if the field was limited to an AFTN address, then automated responses may be possible when errors were detected. India suggested that the ability to use other appropriate means was useful and would prefer not to restrict this to AFTN addresses. Australia asked if guidance could be provided as to what was appropriate. French Polynesia emphasised the need for a standard procedure.

3.13   It was recognised that having access to telephone number contacts may be advantageous, especially for general aviation in regard to possible search and research follow-up. Japan was thinking of using the field for telephone numbers and would prefer not to restrict to only eight characters. The vendors[1] commented that they did not interpret information in this field and the only limitation was the length of field 18.

3.14   In Europe the Central Flow Management Unit (CFMU) restricted the length to 30 alphanumeric characters. The meeting concurred with the European position, and further discussed this as part of the Regional Guidance Material update (WP/05).

<u>Regional Guidance Material Update (WP/05)</u>

3.15   Version 3 of the Asia/Pacific Guidance Material for the Implementation of Amendment 1 to the 15th Edition of the *Procedures for Air Navigation Services – Air Traffic Management* (PANS-ATM, Doc 4444) was dated 3 June 2011. An update was required to the Regional Guidance Material which would incorporate all the agreed interpretations and lessons learnt from the implementation of software, in preparation for internal testing. Many of these interpretation issues were discussed in other FPL & AM TF/5 Working Papers.

---

[1] The term 'vendors' refers to commercial companies providing services supporting the implementation of Amendment 1 such as Thales, Consoft and Frequentis, and does not imply a lesser role than other stakeholders.

3.16   Regarding the exact timing of the changeover to NEW format only, it was recognised that Air Navigation Service Providers (ANSPs) would have to determine their required changeover process when PRESENT plans would not be accepted after coordination with neighbouring affected States. This information was expected to be provided during the July 2012 questionnaire and placed on the FITS web site.

3.17   The European position on the changeover was as follows:

- IFPS (Integrated FPL System) would not accept FPLs with EOBT (Estimated Off-Block Time) more than 24 hours in advance during the period 12-15 November 2012;

- FPLs with EOBT on 15 November 2012 should be filed in NEW format even if submitted prior to midnight. If necessary to AO should await until after midnight to submit the FPL; and

- RPLs (Repetitive Flight Plans) for the Winter 2012/13 season should be filed in NEW format.

3.18   The Task Force reviewed the draft Regional Guidance Material and an extensive discussion resulted in an updated document, which is appended as **Appendix D**.

Agenda Item 4:   Regional strategies for implementation and aspects

Conversion into DAT (WP/06)

4.1   Australia proposed an order for conversion of the NEW Flight Plan DAT indicator in Field 18, for PRESENT flight plans. Table 6-1 (Conversion of Field 10a) of the Asia/Pacific Guidance Material included several entries where Field 10a conversions result in DAT/ and COM/ elements in Field 18 of the converted flight plan.

4.2   Australia had interpreted this to mean that flight plan conversion of DAT/ occurred as follows:

- any existing DAT/ entries in the NEW format flight plan (submitted for conversion) are transferred to the COM/ indicator in Field 18 of the converted PRESENT flight plan (or message) - prior to conversion of the 10a equipment qualifiers; and

- any equipment qualifiers in Field 10a requiring conversion to DAT/ in accordance with the conversion table 6.1 (i.e. J1-J7) are to be entered into the DAT/ indicator of the converted PRESENT flight plan (or message) in accordance with table 6.1.

4.3   Japan intended to check with their vendors as to the impact of this interpretation. The meeting discussed the issue and believes that the suggested processing was not inconsistent with the existing ASIAPAC conversion tables.

4.4   Comsoft noted that this interpretation would mean a difference with the CFMU. Frequentis noted that they used two different conversion tables, for European systems and for others. The Eurocontrol CFMU conversion table for NEW to PRESENT translated content of DAT/ to COM/, consistent with the Asia/Pacific table, except for one case. If the content of DAT/ was S, H, V, and/or M then it was left in DAT/ and not moved to COM/. The meeting was not sure why this

exception was made. However, DAT/ was not expected to contain S, H, V, or M in the NEW format flight plan. Therefore, considering that the DAT/ content would be regenerated to be consistent with what was filed in Field 10, the meeting did not recommend changing the Asia/Pacific conversion table to match the European table.

Implied DOF upon receipt of DLA message for EOBT across 0000 UTC (WP/07)

4.5   This paper presented the Australian interpretation and software coding requirements for receipt of DLA messages that change the EOBT across midnight UTC. The Asia/Pacific Guidance Material (Version 3) stated that the preferred option for delaying a flight over midnight UTC was to use a CHG message; however the option to use a DLA message was available. Currently the Asia/Pacific Guidance Material gives the option to use either a CHG of a DLA message to provide advice of delays across midnight UTC, so States would need to software code their systems to cater for the receipt of both messages types.

4.6   French Polynesia agreed with only using the CHG message. India noted the same solution in IP/06 and thus agreed with the Australian proposition. A post-implementation review may result in a request for change to the PANS ATM to strengthen its provisions in this regard.

CHG message processing during transition (WP/08)

4.7   States using NEW format were expected to software code their systems to down convert NEW format messages for ANSPs that are still only using PRESENT format. Australia had identified an issue relating to the submission of CHG messages (with changes to Field 18) that required conversion.   Any change messages generated from a NEW format that would be down converted containing changes to either field 10 or 18 in the amendment field 22 needed to be constructed from the NEW format, considering the dependent relationships of these two fields. This would ensure no data was lost after any down conversion.

4.8   Comsoft noted that if field 10 changes had consequences to field 18, then this message would be queued and was not convertible.

4.9   Thales and the USA stated that if they received a change message to a flight plan for a PRESENT-capable FIR, the entire flight plan would be considered in the construction of the CHG message. Comsoft stated that because their conversion was located at the switch their processing was handled differently. The meeting agreed that there were possible issues when down-converting the content of a CHG message.

Removal of DOF Provision (WP/09)

4.10   This paper was presented by Australia, which aimed to communicate to States and other stakeholders regarding the issue with DOF removal from item 18 of the flight plan when the EOBT was within 24 hours. Australia believed that implementation of this provision by removal of a filed DOF would create issues in automated systems where routine messages were exchanged for flights that crossed FIR boundaries as DOF is now a message key and used to associate to the original flight plan. Removal of the DOF could lead to rejections and thus the Regional Guidance Material as copied below needed to be amended to reflect this.

> *At a defined time before Estimated Off Blocks Time (EOBT), normally within 24 hours, DOF/ can be removed from stored FPLs. In any case, DOF/ is not necessary in AIDC messages since flight data is generally first coordinated after departure. The inclusion of DOF/ in AIDC messages is subject to bilateral agreement between States.*

4.11   New Zealand clarified that the original intent of this procedure was to support ATS Inter-facility Datalink Communications (AIDC) messages. New Zealand suggested removal of the first sentence in the Guidance Material. The meeting agreed with the Working Paper proposal.

Transition to New Flight Plan & ATS Messaging (WP/13)

4.12   IATA presented a paper that highlighted some of the issues to be taken into account during transition/cut over phase to NEW. In particular, the paper discussed a cut-over using a converter, whether they were vendor supplied or developed 'in house'.

4.13   IATA did not support transition with converter systems if it could be avoided. IATA's position was that converter systems should not be viewed as a long-term solution, and States with such systems should be encouraged to do so with a clear plan to implement capabilities to process NEW format as soon as practicable.

4.14   IATA was further concerned about the filing of long-haul FPL when the plan itself was complex and large. Generally this required a significant amount of information to be included and transmitted, so for certain states such lengthy Flight Plans must be filed in two sections (two plans). IATA suggested that NEW FPL format should support such long-haul plans. The USA legacy system only supported 48 elements in the route field at present, but the new system would allow 1,000 characters. The United States may continue to file long-haul flight plans that required splitting into two flight plans in their legacy systems.

4.15   IATA also espoused that transition plans must take into account aircraft that were airborne in the system at cut-over, together with their associated FPL information. Systems needed to ensure these flights and associated FPL information could be appropriately processed during the transition/cut-over phase.

4.16   ICAO, IATA, CANSO and other stakeholders were considering Strategic Support Teams (SST), led by ICAO. These would be available to States to provide more targeted support to address implementation issues.

4.17   ICAO HQ further explained to the meeting that the proposed SSTs would attend a State with three to four experts for up to five days, and be hosted at an Area Control Centre (ACC). The State would be expected to bear the travel costs. The SST would depend on unlimited access to relevant staff, and would be tailored to assist the State in regards of the particular area of concern, such as finance and training. Hazard identification would also be expected to be a part of an SST process.

French Polynesian ICAO New FPL and ATS Messages Implementation Plan (IP/02)

4.18   French Polynesia presented a progress report on the implementation plan for the ICAO Flight Plan New Format and ATS Messages that would be adopted by Tahiti. The paper noted some of the main operational issues during the transitional period. There were two sub-systems affected by the changes, Eurocat X (Thales, ATM system) and ATALIS (EGIS AVIA, Aeronautical Information System).

4.19   French Polynesia described an issue with DOF regarding AIDC messages being received when Field 18 was filed with '0', then FPL Field 18 could be overwritten. Australia had elected not to translate any AIDC messages during the transition, as the only fields applicable to Amendment 1 changes were 10 and 18, which were optional in AIDC messages. Australia was prepared to differentiate the various neighboring FIRs as to the type of data that should be sent and did not recommend over-writing field 18 data.

Advance Submission of FPL (IP/03)

4.20   This paper outlined the New Zealand position regarding the advance submission of a flight plan as detailed in Amendment 1 to the 15th Edition of PANS-ATM Doc4444. After consultation with stakeholders, New Zealand had decided not to accommodate the capability to receive flight plan data with an EOBT greater than 24 hours.

FPL Item 10a Character Order (IP/04)

4.21   Australia presented an information paper intended to provide advice to other States regarding the allowable order of designators for implementation of Amendment 1 in Item 10a. Whilst Doc 4444 did not definitively mandate the order of designators, it was apparent that States and vendors had interpreted this to define the order in cases where standard equipment and other equipment were carried as 'S' first, followed by one or more equipment designator letters.

4.22   Australia only accepted 'S' first. Some vendors accepted this data in any order. Thales was specific that they expect the 'S' as the first character. The USA did not have a defined order of reception for their domestic system. Japan did not have a defined order of preference and would send the message in the order it was received.

Notes on FAA Implementation of Amendment 1 to DOC 4444, 15th Edition (IP/05)

4.23   The United States Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) presented the current status of U.S. implementation efforts. The United States noted that training for Amendment 1 was an issue because of recency, so the timing of the training needed to be well planned.

4.24   The meeting noted that relevant Asia/Pacific States were requested to report their readiness in order to test automated interfaces. IATA reiterated that it was a very good initiative to have monthly communications between relevant users, and encouraged other States to make this approach.

4.25   The Chairman asked about the difference between international and domestic operations in respect of filing NEW format plans. The United States explained that certain data such as items E1- E3 in Field 10a were not relevant for domestic-only operations.

Status of implementation in India (IP/06)

4.26   India presented an update on their plans to implement the NEW ICAO flight plan and associated messages. The Airports Authority of India had developed in-house suitable software patches to existing AFTN systems to cater to the input processing, distribution and presentation of FPL messages. The software had already been installed and successfully tested at Delhi, Varanasi, Mumbai, Nagpur, Chennai, Trivandrum and Madurai, and was being installed at other airports in India.

4.27   Madurai was connected to Chennai AMSS via TCP/IP protocol through extended LAN technology; the successful working of this circuit had proved that the amended Automatic Message Switching System (AMSS) software was able to handle the amendment effectively for different type protocols.

4.28   The Indra automation system was compliant with the NEW FPL system and successful tests had been conducted at Nagpur ACC in October 2011. The Chairman commented that the management of DOF on long haul flights required calculation of the FIR boundary timing.

<u>Indonesia New Flight Plan Format Implementation Progress (IP/07)</u>

4.29   Indonesia presented information on their implementation progress. They advised there were some issues related to the procurement process and some portions of Indonesian FIRs were likely to delay the implementation of the New FPL Format by 2013; however after 15 November 2012, FPLs would be processed via converters until the upgrade of ATM Systems was completed.

4.30   Indonesia would upgrade the ATM Systems used in Makassar ATS Center (MATSC) and ATC systems supporting some approach control units, to be ready for handling NEW FPL format by September 2012. However, there would be a delay in the implementation plan for Ujung Pandang ACC, Surabaya Approach and Bali Approach until June 2013.

4.31   Airlines would be able to file NEW format after 15 November 2012, which would be transformed using a converter in the Jakarta FIR. However between September 2012 and June 2013 all messages sent to Ujung Pandang FIR would be converted to PRESENT format by the Flight Data Management Centre located in MATSC except for Balikpapan Approach, which was expected to be ready for NEW FPL Format and AIDC by September 2012. The meeting noted that notwithstanding this, all adjacent FIRs would need to receive flight plans in NEW format from Indonesia.

4.32   IATA expressed concern regarding the use of manual handling for Ujung Pandang due to the workload. Philippine Airlines also expressed concern about the transfer of information from the Manila FIR to the Australian FIRs. In this case, Indonesia intended to forward the full original flight plan details to Australia.

<u>Cambodian New FPL format and ATS Messages Implementation Plan (IP/08)</u>

4.33   Cambodia described their progress in completing a contract signed with Thales in February 2011. Software and hardware delivery had been completed on 01 October 2011. Initial training for technical staff and familiarization of the systems had also been completed on 31 October 2011. Cambodia was well progressed towards implementation and requested the meeting to consider harmonisation of implementation with neighbouring States.

4.34   The Chairman congratulated Cambodia on their excellent progress, and the fact that they were ready for testing was admirable (India and Singapore were early candidates for testing).

4.35   India noted that there was a need for training at the earliest opportunity, which would depend on the stability (completeness) of regional guidance material and the readiness of system components in each State. The Chairman stated that the update of the Guidance Material was just necessary fine tuning, and should not involve fundamental changes to the application of Amendment 1 itself.

4.36   Japan had already fixed its specification for the FPL system changes and wanted to ensure that an amendment to the Guidance Material would not be adversely affected. The Chairman noted that this would be taken this into consideration when WP/05 was reviewed.

Agenda Item 5:   Review and update FPL&AM/TF Task List

5.1   The meeting reviewed the Task List as presented by WP/02, and agreed that the Task List shown as **Appendix E** appropriately represented the current work programme of the Task Force.

Agenda Item 6:   Any other business

<u>European FPL Technical Matters (IP/09)</u>

An Information Paper was presented that clarified European FPL technical matters.

6.1   A seminar programme is appended at **Appendix F.**

<u>Session 1: Update of Implementation Issues</u>

Global update, inter-regional issues

6.2   ICAO HQ reminded the participants of the universal nature and importance of this project. It was emphasised that the key of NEW flight plan was the ability to convey extra information to the ATM system from the enhanced features of the format. The NEW plan would benefit airlines in terms of recognizing advanced capabilities, but would entail significant cost to airlines and ground services.

6.3   It was stressed that all staff involved in the implementation of Amendment 1 must be adequately trained, not just some controllers. It was imperative that everyone spread the word about the Amendment 1 changes to improve awareness and capability.

6.4   There would be some aviation disruption in November 2012 in some sectors, and what was being attempted was to minimise the impact. The flight plan changes had the potential to be even more problematic than the Y2K change.

6.5   It was stressed that administrations must continue to communicate with their Regional Office to ensure a harmonised application of changes. Moreover, the implementation date of 15 November 2012 was not expected to slip. In that regard, participants were reminded of the importance of compliance with the implementation timeline. It was stressed that everyone should be ready to accept the NEW plan format by July, to allow airlines the opportunity to test before November 2012.

6.6   All ICAO Regions have confirmed readiness to comply with the timeline. Most States had reviewed the impact of the changes and are already testing their capability. It was stressed that all stakeholders, including State agencies and the military, need to be involved and informed.

6.7   It was noted that some ICAO States were behind the schedule. Some States did not understand the importance of the project, and while some States were meeting the requirements of the amendment, their implementation was not the 'spirit' of the change. Many States were still not providing progress information to the FITS website. The key was to try and implement the application in a harmonised manner. IATA were advising their members to switchover to NEW format around 15 November 2012, but this needed to be well planned.

Vendor Presentation I: Thales

6.8   Thales (based in France) provided ATM system solutions within more than a dozen Asia/Pacific FIRs. Mexico testing had been conducted with the new Thales software, and Thales had started testing some months ago. They noted that their FPL 2012 solution was ICAO compliant, and that there were many systems other than FDPS that would be affected by the changes:

- military and airport systems;

- Aeronautical Information Systems and associated Internet modules;

- AFTN terminals / AMHS terminal;

- simulator and training systems; and

- traffic charging systems.

6.9   Thales stated that their FPL 2012 solution was capable of translating from NEW back to PRESENT format using conversion tables. If the status of the FIR was unknown, or if the FPL was ambiguous, Eurocat looked for clues as to the type of FPL it was.

Vendor Presentation II: Comsoft

6.10   Comsoft (based in Germany) noted that air navigation service providers and military organisations will benefit from the NEW FPL format improvements. However, coordinating the transition from present to new format posed a tremendous challenge as the simultaneous transition of all flight plan processing systems worldwide was very difficult. Comsoft stated that even after 15 November 2012, a number of flight plan processing systems would not be using the NEW format.

6.11   Comsoft described their converter solution, which was stated as being compliant with Amendment 1 and capable of translating from PRESENT to NEW and vice-versa. However the latter case depended on PRESENT format plans including aircraft capability codes in Field 18. They noted that some agencies conducting FDPS implementations did not understand the DOF feature, and thus there was a risk of misinterpretation of the flight date.

6.12   Comsoft agreed that a convertor was not in the spirit of the amendment but met the requirement, and made a good contingency solution. They believed that PRESENT could be up-converted to NEW however this would require additional training for dispatchers. Australia and ICAO HQ stated that up-conversion was only possible for a previously down-converted NEW FPL.

Vendor Presentation III: Frequentis

6.13   Frequentis (based in Austria) presented information on their 'Smart 2012 Converter', specifically noting the main changes that their system took into account:

- Field 10: Equipment and Capacity - the equipment field was being changed and it could be significantly longer than it was now;

- Field 13 - the EOBT had been added to field 13 for ATS messages arrival (ARR), change (CHG) and cancel (CNL);

- Field 15 - the bearing and distance from a navigation aid could now be applied to any significant point, such as a waypoint (this had typically already been in use so no conversion was done for field 15); and

- Field 18 – this was required in all flight plans and ATS messages (except ARR) whose EOBT was more than 24 hours from the current time.

6.14   In regard to FPL with EOBT more than 24 hours from current time, Frequentis noted that their systems could hold FPLs for up to 120 hours.

6.15   Frequentis stated that the conversion between NEW and PRESENT required equipment codes utilising a table that provided information about the value to insert into item 10a and the item 18 value to be inserted.

Session 2: Transition

Discussion on Amendment 1 interpretations, vendors

6.16   The FPL Study Group spent four years determining the changes required for Amendment 1. However it was very apparent that there were various interpretations of several FPL components. It was also very important for vendors that there were not different interpretations, so the software acted consistently. Asia/Pacific could create agreed interpretations that other regions could use, which was preferable to regional variations.

6.17   ICAO HQ noted a number of areas that needed clarification:

- Use of P1-9;
- Use of DLE (Field 15);
- Conversion of NEW to PRESENT;
- Differentiating NEW and PRESENT;
- Use of DOF/ in ATS Messages;
- Interpretation of STS/; and
- Interpretation of Field 10b – impacts on filing instructions.

6.18   The Chairman and a small working group reviewed the issues and provided those in Flimsy format so the interpretations could be discussed by the Task Force and where possible, agreed as part of the Regional Guidance Material.

6.19   The Seminar was informed about the planned vendor's conference at Prestwick, Scotland, from 7 to 8 December 2011. Participants were reminded that they needed to do hazard identification and analysis for any ATM system change.

Testing methods, manual flight plan integration

6.20   ICAO HQ provided an overview of the testing methods that were expected to be used in a generic sense. In addition, the general assessment processes for manual flight plan systems were presented for States that did not utilise an automated flight plan process system.

Session 3: Training

Training issues and guidelines, templates

6.21   Airservices Australia presented a map of their training plan that was expected to be delivered in early 2012 for their staff. Each State was unique, so training requirements would need to be tailored. Nevertheless, the map would provide a guide as to the possible requirements and delivery processes.

6.22   The material highlighted the need for people to be aware that there were three crucial elements regarding aircraft capabilities:

- equipment was serviceable;
- the flight crew were trained; and
- the aircraft was authorised by the state of registry.

6.23   One issue that was highlighted were the actions required if an aircraft which had indicated advanced COM/SUR and NAV capabilities had a degraded performance during flight. In this case, it was not clear if controllers should be modifying the flight plan details and whether there needed to be phraseologies and standard procedures to deal with this. Current guidance is lacking in this area and this may be a subject for any PIR discussion.

Promulgation: AIP, SUP, manuals, Internet, etc.

6.24   Australia already would promulgate an Aeronautical Information Circular (AIC) in November 2011 to advertise the change and intended to update that with further details in early 2012. In addition, there would be an AIP Supplement issued with the actual requirements.   The communications strategies included a web site to convey information on the changes.   French Polynesia planned to issue an AIC in January 2012 (IP/02). New Zealand issued an AIC (5/11) effective 7 April 2011. However, there did not appear to be any other States that had issued an AIC at the time of the Task Force meeting.

Agenda Item 7:   Date and venue for the next FPL&AM/TF meeting

        Next Meeting

7.1   If required, a further meeting of the FPL & AM/TF may be scheduled for 28-29 May 2012, location to be advised, dependent on State implementation progress and advice from ICAO HQ. Australia presented WP11 that proposed a Post Implementation Review, which would be considered by ICAO HQ.

        Closing of the Meeting

7.2   Mr. Beeston thanked all the participants for the success of the meeting. He especially thanked the Civil Aviation Authority of Philippines, who had supported the FPL&AM/TF/5 and Seminar.

7.3   Mr. Len Wicks thanked delegates for the excellent progress achieved and wished them a safe journey home.

……………………………

List of Participants

		Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
1.		**AUSTRALIA (4)**		
	1.	Mr. Warren Beeston	ATM Operational Systems Manager Airservices Australia Locked Bag 747 Eagle Farm Qld 4009 Australia	Tel: +61-7-3866 3720 Fax: +61-7-3866-3833 E-mail: warren.beeston@airservicesaustralia.com
	2.	Mr. Mark Boys	Communications Navigation Surveillance ATM Specialist Airservices Australia Locked Bag 747 Eagle Farm Qld 4009 Australia	Tel: +61-7-3866 3691 Fax: +61-7-3866-3385 E-mail: mark.boys@airservicesaustralia.com
	3.	Mr. Shane Sumner	Systems Specialist Airservices Australia Locked Bag 747 Eagle Farm Qld 4009 Australia	Tel: +61-7-3866 3376 Fax: +61-7-3866-3257 E-mail: shane.sumner@airservicesaustralia.com
	4.	Sqd.Ldr. Rob Pedder	Staff Officer Operations Support Royal Australian Air Force Headquarters, No. 44 Wing RAAF Base Williamtown New South Wales Australia	Tel: +61-2-4034 7099 Fax: +61-2-4034 7002 E-mail: robert.pedder@defence.gov.au Robin31@aapt.net.au

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
2.	**BRUNEI DARUSSALAM (3)**		
5.	Mr. Yasin Apong	Briefing Officer Department of Civil Aviation Brunei International Airport Jln. Berakas BB2513 Bandarseri Begawan Brunei Darussalam	Tel: +673-2330142 Fax: +673-2331157 E-mail: yasin.apong@civil-aviation.gov.bn
6.	Ms. Anna Ang Soh Hon	Air Traffic Control Officer Department of Civil Aviation Brunei International Airport Brunei Darussalam	Tel: +673-2330142 ext 1850 Fax: +673-2331157 E-mail: sohhoncarvalho@hotmail.com
7.	Ms. Dk. Norhoneytawati Pg Tejudin	Aeronautical Telecommunication Engineer Department of Civil Aviation Brunei International Airport Brunei Darussalam	Fax: +673-2333666 E-mail: wati.tejudin@civil-aviation.gov.bn
3.	**CAMBODIA (3)**		
8.	Mr. Chhun Sivorn	Deputy Director State Secretariat of Civil Aviation #62 Preah Norodom Blvd Phnom Penh Cambodia	Tel: +855 23 224258 Fax: +855 23 22 4259 E-mail: ans.ssca@gmail.com
9.	Mr. Saichon Pingsakul	Director, ATS Planning & Training Department Cambodia Air Traffic Services Co., Ltd. CATS Building Opposite Phnom Penh International Airport Russian Federation Blvd Sangkat Kakab, Khan Dang Kor Phnom Penh Cambodia	Tel: +855 16 771135 Fax: +855 23 890214 E-mail: saichonp@cats.com.kh

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
10.	Mr. Sivarak Chutipong	Technical Engineer Cambodia Air Traffic Services Co., Ltd. CATS Bldg. Opposite Phnom Penh Int'l Airport Russian Federation Blv'd Phnom Penh Cambodia	Tel: +855-16-771138 Fax: +855-23-890214 E-mail: sivarakc@cats.com.kh
4.	**DPR KOREA (3)**		
11.	Mr. Kim Chang Il	Chief of Air Traffic Control Division, ATMD General Administration of Civil Aviation Sunan District, Pyongyang City DPR Korea	Tel: +850-2-18111 ext 8108 Fax: +850-2-3814410 E-mail: gaca@silibank.net.kp
12.	Mr. Mun Yong Su	Technical Assistant of Air Traffic Management Department General Administration of Civil Aviation Sunan District, Pyongyang City DPR Korea	Tel: +850-2-18111 ext 8108 Fax: +850-2-3814410 E-mail: gaca@silibank.net.kp
13.	Mr. Yun Chol	Assistant of Air Traffic Control Division, ATMD General Administration of Civil Aviation Sunan District, Pyongyang City DPR Korea	Tel: +850-2-18111 ext 8108 Fax: +850-2-3814410 E-mail: gaca@silibank.net.kp
5.	**FRENCH POLYNESIA (1)**		
14.	Mr. Didier Garbies	Head of Engineering Department French Polynesia Air Navigation Service P.O. Box 6011 98702 Faaa – Tahiti French Polynesia	Tel: +689-86 12 95 Fax: +689-86 10 49 E-mail: garbies.didier@seac.pf

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
6.	**INDIA (2)**		
15.	Mr. Satyajit Dutta	Jt. General Manager (ATM) Airports Authority of India Rajiv Gandhi Bhavan Safdarjung Airport New Delhi 110003 India	Tel: +91 11 2465 8450 Fax: +91 11 2464 5606 E-mail: satyajitdutta1@rediffmail.com sdutta@aai.aero
16.	Mr. R. Raja	Manager (COM) Airports Authority of India Chennai Airport Chennai India	Tel: +91-44-2256 0122 Fax: +91-44-2256 1535 E-mail: rraja@aai.aero raja_aai@hotmail.com
7.	**INDONESIA (7)**		
17.	Mrs. Endah Purnamasari	Chief of Aeronautical Information Publication Directorate of Air Navigation DGCA, Ministry of Transportation Jl. Medan Merdeka Barat 8 Jakarta 10110 Indonesia	Tel: +(62) 21 3507603, 3516961 Fax: +(62) 21 3507603 E-mail : ais_indonesia@indo.net.id
18.	Mr. Zainal Arifin Harahap	ATM Officer Directorate of Air Navigation DGCA, Ministry of Transportation Jl. Medan Merdeka Barat 8, Gd. Karya Lt.23 Jakarta 10110 Indonesia	Tel: +62 (21) 3506451/3506554 Fax: +62 (21) 3507569 E-mail: cokycok@gmail.com zainal.arifin@dephub.go.id
19.	Mr. Teguh Harnomo	DGCA, Ministry of Transportation Jl. Medan Merdeka Barat 8 Jakarta 10110 Indonesia	Tel: +62 (21) 3507672, 3505137 Fax: +62 (21) 3505139

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
20.	Mr. Winarso	DGCA, Ministry of Transportation Jl. Medan Merdeka Barat 8 Jakarta 10110 Indonesia	Tel: +62 (21) 3507672, 3505137 Fax: +62 (21) 3505139
21.	Mr. Wiwik Nurwiyoso Adi	DGCA, Ministry of Transportation Jl. Medan Merdeka Barat 8 Jakarta 10110 Indonesia	Tel: +62 (21) 3507672, 3505137 Fax: +62 (21) 3503519
22.	Mr. Riza Fahmi	Assistant Deputy for ATS Quality Assurance PT. Angkasa Pura I (Persero) Kota Baru Bandar Kemayoran Block B-12 Kav No.2 Jakarta 10610 Indonesia	Tel: +62-21-654 1961 ext 2312 Mobile: +62-811 411 071 Fax: +62-21-658 66838 E-mail: r_fahmi@yahoo.com
23.	Mr. Sofyan Harahap	PT. Angkasa Pura I (Persero) Makkasar Air Traffic Service Centre (MATSC) Jl. Bandara Baru Makassar 90242 Indonesia	Tel: +62 (411) 4813210 ext 2060 Fax: +62 (411) 4813222
8.	**JAPAN (1)**		
24.	Mr. Masamichi Mizutamari	Special Assistant to the Director Operation and Flight Inspection Division Japan Civil Aviation Bureau Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism 2-1-3, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku Tokyo 100-8918 Japan	Tel: +81-3-5253 8751 Fax: +81-3-5253 1664 E-mail: mizutamari-m22h@mlit.go.jp

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
9.	**LAO PDR (4)**		
25.	Mr. Khine Simvongsa	Deputy Director Air Navigation Division Department of Civil Aviation Ministry of Public Work and Transport P.O. Box 119 Wattay International Airport Vientiane Lao PDR	Tel: +856-21-512163 Fax: +856-21-520237 E-mail: ksimvongsa@yahoo.com laodca@laotel.com
26.	Mr. Keoviengxay Khampaseut	Engineer Department of Civil Aviation Wattay International Airport P.O. Box 119 Vientiane Lao PDR	Tel: +856-21-512163 Fax: +856-21-520237 E-mail: keo_2662@yahoo.com laodca@laotel.com
27.	Mr. Douangboupha Samay	Deputy Director of Air Traffic Technical Service Center Lao Air Traffic Management Air Navigation Div. P.O. Box 2985 Wattay International Airport Vientiane Lao PDR	Tel: +856-21-512006 Fax: +856-21-512216 E-mail: ksimvongsa@yahoo.com
28.	Mr. Manasavanh Kounlath	Deputy Director of ATS Center Lao Air Traffic Management P.O. Box 2985 Vientiane Lao PDR	Tel: +856-20-22202598 Fax: +856-21-512216 E-mail: manas998@yahoo.com

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
10.	**MALAYSIA (5)**		
29.	Mr. Tan Kim Sin	Assistant Director Air Traffic Management Sector Department of Civil Aviation No. 27, Persiaran Perdana, Level 4, Podium Block B, Precinct 4 62618 Putrajaya Malaysia	Tel: +603- 88714284 Fax: +603-88810530 E-mail: tanks@dca.gov.my
30.	Mr. Shahiran Jaafar	AIS Maintenance Manager Department of Civil Aviation Block B, Kompleks Kawalan Trafik Udara Lapangan Terbang Sultan Abdul Aziz Shah 47200 Subang, Selangor Malaysia	Tel: +603 8737 0585 Fax: +603-8734 0585 E-mail: shahiran@microtel.my
31.	Mr. Mohd Razmin Sham Mazlan	AIS Maintenance Engineer Department of Civil Aviation Block B, Kompleks Kawalan Trafik Udara Lapangan Terbang Sultan Abdul Aziz Shah 47200 Subang, Selangor Malaysia	Tel: +603 8737 0585 Fax: +603-8734 0585 E-mail: mrazmins@microtel.my
32.	Mr. Richard Lawrence *(Seminar)*	ATM Executive Malaysia Airlines East Wing 2nd Fl, Flight Management Building KLIA, 6400 Sepang, Selangor Malaysia	Tel: +0387775678 +0138907622 E-mail: raz@malaysiaairlines.com

A – 7

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
33.	Capt. Yau Wing Lim *(Seminar)*	Flight Ops Manager (Tech Ops/ATM) Malaysia Airlines East Wing 2nd Fl, Flight Management Building KLIA, 6400 Sepang, Selangor Malaysia	Tel: +0387775564 E-mail: ywlim@malaysiaairlines.com
11.	**MONGOLIA (3)**		
34.	Mr. Yondon Erdenebat	Specialist of ANS Administration Secretary and Member of Implementation of FPL2012 Team Civil Aviation Authority of Mongolia Buyant-Ukhaa Ulaanbaatar 17120 Mongolia	Tel: +976-99903040 Fax: +976-11-379981 E-mail: yo_erdenebat@mcaa.gov.mn yoerka@yahoo.com
35.	Mr. Syesyer Yerkhanat	Air Traffic Controller Member of Implementation of FPL2012 Team Civil Aviation Authority of Mongolia Chinggis Khaan Int'l Airport Ulaanbaatar 17120 Mongolia	Tel: +976-88098188 Fax: +976-11-379981 E-mail: erkhanat@mcaa.gov.mn erganat@yahoo.com
36.	Mrs. Nyamdort Chintsetseg	Aircraft Dispatcher "MIAT" Mongolian Airlines	Tel: +976-9999 0026 Fax: +976-11-379952 E-mail: chintsetseg@miat.com
12.	**NEPAL (3)**		
37.	Mr. Surya Bahadur Thapa	Deputy Director Civil Aviation Authority of Nepal Tribhuvan International Airport Kathmandu Nepal	Tel: +977-1-411 3261 Fax: +977-1-411 3180 E-mail: sbthapa2@hotmail.com

		Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
	38.	Mr. Bharat Prasad Sharma	Manager Civil Aviation Authority of Nepal Tribhuvan International Airport Kathmandu Nepal	Tel: +977-1-411 3261 Fax: +977-1-411 3180 E-mail: sharmabp@wlink.com.np
	39.	Mr. Gyanman Bajracharya	Manager Civil Aviation Authority of Nepal Tribhuvan International Airport Kathmandu Nepal	Tel: +977-1-411 3261 Fax: +977-1-411 3180 E-mail: gmbajra_09@yahoo.com
13.		**PHILIPPINES (4)**		
	40.	Mr. Charlemagne P. Gilo	Assistant Chief Airways Communicator Civil Aviation Authority of the Philippines 4th Floor, CAAP Building Air Traffic Service MIA Road, Pasay City Philippines	Tel: +632-879-9159 Fax: +632-879-9259 E-mail: Charlemagne.gilo@gmail.com
	41.	Mr. Arnold A. Santamaria	Supervising Airways Communicator Civil Aviation Authority of the Philippines 4th Floor, CAAP Building Air Traffic Service MIA Road, Pasay City Philippines	Tel: +632-879-9291 Fax: +632-879-9259 E-mail: arnoldsaint102@yahoo.com
	42.	Mr. Tomas C. Sotto	Manager – Central Flight Dispatch Philippine Airlines PAL FOD BLDG GATE 1 MBC NICOLS Andrew Ave Pasay City 1300 Philippines	Tel: +632-879-5874, 9175095046 Fax: +632-879-5809 E-mail: tomas_sotto@pal.com.ph

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
43.	Mr. Roehl A. Brillantes	Manager –Flight Dispatch Cebu Pacific Air AOC, DOM. RD. Pasay City Philippines	Tel: +632-290-5280 Mobile: +0922 861 6294 Fax: +632-851-9183 E-mail: roehl.brillantes@cebupacificair.com
14.	**REPUBLIC OF KOREA (3)**		
44.	Mr. Hong Sungmin	Assistant Director ATM Division Office of Civil Aviation Ministry of Land, Transport and Maritime Affairs 1-8, Byeoryang-dong Gwacheon-si, Gyeonggi-do 427-040 Republic of Korea	Tel: +82-2-2669-6434 Fax: +82-2-6342-7289 E-mail: smhong01@korea.kr
45.	Mr. Jung Hyunghoon	ATC Education Manager Incheon ACC P.O. Box 26 Incheon Airport Joong-gu, Incheon 400-340 Republic of Korea	Tel: +82-32-880 0235 Fax: +82-32-889 2381 E-mail: wolfholic@korea.kr
46.	Mr. Byun Hyug Cheol	Assistant Director AIS Division, Incheon ACC P.O. Box 26 Incheon Airport Joong-gu, Incheon 400-340 Republic of Korea	Tel: +82-32-746 0553 Fax: +82-32-889 5905 E-mail: bravohotel@korea.kr

		Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
15.		**SINGAPORE (3)**		
	47.	Ms. Wong Liang Fen	Chief, Aeronautical Information Services Aeronautical Information Services Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore Singapore Changi Airport P.O. Box 1 Singapore 918141	Tel: +65-6595 6051 Fax: +65-6543 1826 E-mail: wong_liang_fen@caas.gov.sg
	48.	Mr. Rengaraju Sundraraj	Chief Flight Services (CFS) Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore 60 Biggin Hill Singapore 509950	Tel: +65-65412433 Fax: +65-65456252 E-mail: r_sundraraj@caas.gov.sg
	49.	Mr. Lim Hong Heng	Executive Engineer (Air Traffic Management Systems) Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore Singapore Changi Airport P.O. Box 1 Singapore 918141	Tel: +65-6595 6696 Fax: +65-6542 2447 E-mail: lim_hong_heng@caas.gov.sg
16.		**SRI LANKA (1)**		
	50.	Mr. R.W.M.F. Rohan Perera	Senior AIS Officer Airports and Aviation Services (Sri Lanka) Ltd. Sri Lanka	E-mail: ais@airport.lk felixrohanperera@gmail.com
17.		**THAILAND (1)**		
	51.	Mr. Bunpot Kujaphun	General Administrative Manager Aeronautical Radio of Thailand Ltd 102 Ngamduplee Thungmahamek, Sathorn Bangkok 10120, Thailand	Tel: +66-2-285 9847 Tel: +66-2-287 8538 E-mail: bunpot.ku@aerothai.co.th

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
18.	**UNITED STATES (3)**		
52.	Mr. Ray Ahlberg	En Route and Oceanic Services Technical Performance Support Group Flight Planning Lead Federal Aviation Administration 600 Independence Avenue, SW Washington, D.C. U.S.A.	Tel: +1-202-385 8290 E-mail: ray.ahlberg@faa.gov
53.	Mr. John Evans	Air Traffic Organization En Route & Oceanic Program Operations, System Engineering Sub Team OFDPS Software Lead Atlantic City, NJ U.S.A.	Tel: +1-609-485 8471 E-mail: john.evans@faa.gov
54.	Mr. Brian Bagstad	Senior ATO Representative, Asia Pacific Region Air Traffic Organization System Operations, International Office Asia Pacific Group FAA c/o US Embassy Singapore 27 Napier Road Singapore 258508	Tel: +65-6476 9462 E-mail: brian.bagstad@faa.gov
19.	**VIET NAM (9)**		
55.	Mrs. Ho Thi Doan Trang	ATS Officer Air Navigation Department Civil Aviation Authority of Viet Nam 119 Nguyen Son Street Long Bien District Ha Noi Viet Nam	Tel: +84-4-38723 600 Fax: +84-4-38274 194 E-mail: hodoantrang@caa.gov.vn

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
56.	Mr. Doan Tri Dung	Director of Technical Department Vietnam Air Traffic Management (VATM) Ha Noi Viet Nam	Tel: +84–4-38726839 E-mail: doantridung2008@gmail.com
57.	Mr. Nguyen Hung Son	Manager, Training Plan Division Training Department Vietnam Air Traffic Management (VATM) Ha Noi Viet Nam	Tel: +84–913005868 Fax: +84-4-38728250 E-mail: atchungson@yahoo.com
58.	Mr. Dang Dang Van	Deputy Manager ATS/Southern Region Air Traffic Services Viet Nam Air Traffic Management Ha Noi Viet Nam	Tel: +84-4-38728521 Fax : +84-4-38725687
59.	Mr. Cao Quoc Phong	Deputy Manager, ARO Unit Southern Airport Cooperation Viet Nam	Tel: +84-8-38485383-3368 Fax : +84-8-38422143 E-mail : caoquoc_phong@yahoo.com
60.	Mr. Doan Van Duong	Deputy Manager, Ground Control Unit Southern Airport Cooperation Viet Nam	Tel: +84-8-38485383-3227
61.	Mr. Dang Phi Son	Manager, GCU Unit Middle Airport Cooperation Danang International Airport Danang City Viet Nam	Tel: +84-988444135 Fax : +84-511-3614341/3614670 E-mail: phison80@yahoo.com
62.	Mrs. Tran Thi Hoa	Deputy Manager ARO/AIS Northern Airport Cooperation Noi Bai International Airport Ha Noi Viet Nam	Tel: +84-35844121 / +8498821299 Fax: +84-4-35844306 E-mail: tranhoa_glb@yahoo.com

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
63.	Mr. Phan Huu Son	Flight Dispatch Supervisor Operation Control Centre Vietnam Airlines Ha Noi Viet Nam	Tel: +84–4-38720884 Fax: +84–4-38272916 E-mail: sonphanhuu@vietnamairlines.com
20.	**IATA (3)**		
64.	Mr. David Rollo	Assistant Director Safety, Operations & Infrastructure International Air Transport Association 111 Somerset Road #14-05 Somerset Wing Singapore Power Building Singapore 238164	Tel: +65-6499 2251 Fax: +65-6233 9286 E-mail: rollod@iata.org
65.	Mr. Owen Dell	Manager International Operations Cathay Pacific Airways Ltd. International Operations 9/F Central Tower, Cathay Pacific City 8 Scenic Road Hong Kong International Airport Hong Kong, China	Tel: +852-2747 8829 Fax: +852-2141 3818 E-mail: owen_dell@cathaypacific.com
66.	Mr. Giram Singh	Senior Manager SIA Flight Operation Control Centre Flight Ops Technical (SIN-STC 04-C) 720 Upper Changi Road East Singapore 486852	Tel: +65-6541 1452 E-mail: s_giram@singaporeair.com.sg

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
21.	**COMSOFT (1)**		
67.	Mr. Aurelien Lourot	FPL 2012 Coordinator COMSOFT GmbH. Wachhausstrasse 5a 76227 Karlsruhe Germany	Tel: +49 721 9497 2555 Fax: +49 721 9497 129 E-mail: Aurelien.Lourot@comsoft.aero
22.	**THALES (4)**		
68.	Ms. Marquis Geneviéve	Flight Plan Data Processing Expert Thales Air Systems Parc Tertiaire silic-3, Avenue Charles Lindbergh-BP20351-94628 Rungis Cedex France	Tel: +33-1-79 61 58 79 Fax: +33-1-79 61 17 41 E-mail: genevieve.marquis@thalesgroup.com
69.	Mr. Bruno Marion	Air Traffic Management Bid Manager Thales Australia WTC North Bank Atrium Lobby level Siddeley Street Melbourne VIC 3005 Australia	Tel: +61 3 8630 4303 E-mail: bruno.marion@thalesgroup.com.au
70.	Mr. Raymond Lions	New CNS/ATM Systems Project Resident Manager Thales Australia, Philippine Brance 4F, APMC Building 136 Amorsolo Street, Legaspi Village Makati 1229 Philippines	Tel: +632-478 2110 E-mail: raymond.lions@thalesgroup.com.au

		Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
	71.	Mr. Andrew Nabarro	ATM Operational Consultant Thales Australia WTC North Bank Atrium Lobby level Siddeley Street Melbourne VIC 3005 Australia	Tel: +61-401 696 343 Fax: +61-3-8630 4675 E-mail: andrew.nabarro@thalesgroup.com.au
23.		**FREQUENTIS (2)**		
	72.	Mr. Christian Troemer, MBA	Chief Regional Officer FREQUENTIS ROHQ U1211 Herrera Tower V.A.Ruffino cor. Valero Street Salcedo Village Makati City Philippines	Tel: +63 2 894 3097 Mobile: +63 917 790 8194 Fax: +63 2 817 3219 E-mail: Christian.Troemer@frequentis.com.ph
	73.	Mr. Engelbert Liebhard	FREQUENTIS ROHQ U1211 Herrera Tower V.A.Ruffino cor. Valero Street Salcedo Village Makati City Philippines	E-mail: Engelbert.Liebhard@frequentis.com.ph
24.		**ICAO (3)**		
	74.	Mr. Tom Brady	Consultant Air Traffic Management Section ICAO Headquarters Montreal, Canada	E-mail: tbrady@icao.int

	Name	Title/Organization	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL
75.	Mr. Len Wicks	Regional Officer, ATM ICAO Asia & Pacific Office 252/1 Vibhavadi Rangsit Road Ladyao, Chatuchak Bangkok 10900 Thailand	Tel: 66-2-5378189 ext 152 Fax: 66-2-5378199 E-mail: lwicks@bangkok.icao.int
76.	Ms. Sunisa Charoenmin	Technical Assistant, ATM ICAO Asia & Pacific Office 252/1 Vibhavadi Rangsit Rd Ladyao, Chatuchak Bangkok 10900, Thailand	Tel: +66-2-5378189 ext 50 Fax: +66-2-5378199 E-mail: scharoenmin@bangkok.icao.int

....

LIST OF WORKING PAPERS (WPs) AND INFORMATION PAPERS (IPs)

WORKING PAPERS

NUMBER	AGENDA	TITLE	PRESENTED BY
WP/1	1	Provisional Agenda	Secretariat
WP/2	5	Task List for the FPL&AM Task Force	Secretariat
WP/3	4	FPL 2012 Quarterly Questionnaire	Secretariat
WP/4	2	Review Report APANPIRG/22	Secretariat
WP/5	3	Regional Guidance Material Update	Secretariat
WP/6	4	Conversion into DAT	Australia
WP/7	4	Implied DOF upon receipt of DLA message for EOBT change across 0000 UTC	Australia
WP/8	4	CHG message processing during transition	Australia
WP/9	4	Removal of DOF Provision	Australia
WP/10	3	'W' in Item 10a and 'NONRVSM' in Item 18	Australia
WP/11	3	2012 Post Implementation Review Proposal	Australia
WP/12	3	Filing of ORGN in Item 18	Australia
WP/13	4	Transition to New Flight Plan & ATS Messaging	IATA

INFORMATION PAPERS

NUMBER	AGENDA	TITLE	PRESENTED BY
IP/1	-	List of Working Papers (WPs) and Information Papers (IPs)	Secretariat
IP/2	4	Implementation Plan of ICAO NEW Flight Plan Format and ATS Messages in French Polynesia	French Polynesia
IP/3	4	Advance Submission of a Flight Plan	New Zealand
IP/4	6	FPL Item 10a Character Order	Australia
IP/5	4	Notes on Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Implementation of Amendment 1 to Doc 4444, 15th Edition	United States
IP/6	4	Status of Implementation in India	India
IP/7	4	Indonesia New Flight Plan Format Implementation Progress	Indonesia
IP/8	4	Implementation of ICAO New Flight Plan Format and ATS Messages in Cambodia	Cambodia
IP/9	4	European Region Post 2012 Flight Planning Technical Matters	Secretariat

……………………

Appendix A: APAC FPL 2012 Software Questionnaire

Flight Information region (s)

1. Has a FPL 2012 cost and resource capability assessment been conducted?

2. Has the FPL 2012 Safety Assessment commenced?   a) If yes, what Safety Assessment step has been reached?

3. What other major changes to the ATM system are also being made?

4. Which agency is developing the FPL 2012 software?

5. What stage is the software development?

6. If a software vendor is contracted, advise which vendor?

7. Is your State using a front end converter?   a) If yes, when is the converter going to be replaced by a FPL 2012 compliant FDPS?

8. When will the internal testing commence and when is it expected to be completed?

9. When will testing be able to be conducted with other ANSPs?

10. When will testing start with airlines/operators?

Updated 01 November 2011

	Q1 Cost & Resource	Q2 Safety Assessment	Q2a Step	Q3 Major Changes	Q4 Software Agency	Q5 Software Stage	Q6 Software Vendor	Q7 Frontend Converter	Q7a Converter Time	Q8 Internal Testing	Q9 ANSP External Test	Q10 External User Test	Comments
Afghanistan • Kabul FIR													
Australia • YBBB Brisbane • YMMM Melbourne	Yes Business case has been agreed and Project work has commenced.	Yes A determination from the Regulator (CASA) has been made that a Safety Case is required	Work on a Safety Plan has commenced	Several systems require change and some will be decommissioned prior to the planned cutover	Airservices Australia (Australia's ANSP) and the Department of Defence are overseeing development of software by contractors.	Initial discussions and development of scope prior to contract finalisation.	Thales, Sensis/Nav Canada, Comsoft and Raytheon will be.	We are considering a converter to handle FPLs and associated messages into some systems.	Our FDPS will be compliant from July 2012. Internal FDPS not affecting other FIRs will continue as today and utilise the converter until replacement. This converter will be disabled after transition and once legacy systems are incorporated into our next generation Flight Plan management systems.	Internal testing is likely to commence in the 3rd quarter 2011 with our CADAS system and in 1st quarter 2012 for the balance of our ATM systems. It will be complete just prior to the commencement of transition in July 2012.	We are likely to be able to test some components late 2011 and most components in early 2012.	Testing planned to start in 1st Quarter of 2012.	Australia
Bangladesh													
Bhutan													
Brunei Darussalam													
Cambodia • Phnom Penh FIR	Yes	Yes	Will be started in Oct 2011	Expand RDP and FDP	Thales	Done by supplier	Thales	No	-	Oct 2011 – Jan 2012	Jan 2012	Jan 2012	Cambodia
China													
Hong Kong, China • Hong Kong FIR	Yes	Yes	Safety implications were identified, mitigated and documented	Front End Processors (FEP) system is developed to handle PRESENT/NEW FPL&AM message format conversion for existing ATM systems	In-house	System testing/ acceptance in progress	In-house	Yes	End of 2013	Q3/2011 – commence testing Q4/2011 – complete testing. FEP system will be ready by 1 Jan 2012 in compliance with Phase 1 of APAC 3-phase transition strategy.	1 Apr 2012 In compliance with Phase 2 of APAC transition strategy	1 Jul 2012 In compliance with Phase 3 of APAC transition strategy	Hong Kong, China

Macao, China	Yes	Yes	Analysis have been performed to trigger a software upgrade which has been completed in Dec 2010	The internal ATC (RDP/FDP) system needs to be upgraded regarding the FPL 2012. The ATC system is under quotation stage with the ATC system supplier.	ComSoft	Completed	ComSoft	No The supplier ComSoft can provide such converter but not purchased. If situation evolves as necessary, it can trigger the purchasing process	N/A	System module upgrade completed and successfully tested in Dec 2010	Subject to readiness of other ANSPs and further coordination for arrangement of Tests	N/A Airlines/ Operators are using the same system	Macao, China
Cook Islands													
DPR Korea • Pyongyang FIR	Yes FPL 2012 cost and resource capability assessment has been conduct	Yes	The safety assessment for Present and Now mixed environment operations is undergoing.	No other major changes to the ATM system.	Aviation Technology Development Institution of GACA	The task force team has been organized and is developing the software.	No contract Collaboration with China ATMB	No		The internal testing will commence from 3 January 2012 and it is expected to be completed on 31 March 2012.	From 1 April 2012 testing will be available to be conducted with other ANSPs.	From 1 April 2012 testing will start with airlines/ operators.	General Administration of Civil Aviation
Fiji	In Progress A Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) is currently being carried out	Yes	Initial stage Identification of Risks involved with the two options available	To be determined This will be determined after the Safety Assessment has been completed	To be determined Dependent on the Safety Assessment and CBA outcome	To be advised Vendors approached have already begun development of the software	To be advised	To be advised	To be advised	01 Jan – 31 Mar 2012 Fiji will endeavor to meet the Asia/Pacific FPL2012	01 Apr – 30 Jun 2012 Fiji will endeavor to meet the Asia/Pacific FPL2012	01 Jul – 15 Nov 2012 Fiji will endeavor to meet the Asia/Pacific FPL2012	Civil Aviation Authority of Fiji
France (French Polynesia) • NTTT	No	Not commenced We plan to conduct a safety assessment during the transition period	N/A	Briefing Office system We got a system named "ATALIS" dedicated to our briefing office to fulfil FPL. The system interface will be impacted to authorize legacy and new FPL	THALES Thales is provided DTI the same release than Mexico	Needs and Specifications state Thales and Egis Avia	Yes Thales and Agis Avia	No Our system will be upgraded according the ICAO 4444 specifications	N/A	March 2012 Tahiti is going to receive the ICAO 4444 release in march to begin internal testing and training	May 2012	May 2012	France
India • Delhi FIR • Mumbai FIR • Kolkata FIR • Chennai FIR	Yes	No		Delhi & Mumbai is switching over to Raytheon automation system - Auto Track –III; Chennai is switching over to new ATS automation system sourced from Raytheon	It is being developed in-house for AFTN message switch.	Software changes have been completed in the frontend as well as backend system of AMSS to accept and process new ICAO FPL and ATS Messages The application will be deployed at message switches at other airports in India shortly.	Raytheon, Selex, Indra, for ATM Automation system and Comsoft for AMHS.	No	N/A	Internal testing of AFTN (AMSS) system has been conducted between Delhi and Varanasi successfully.	TBN	TBN	
Indonesia • Jakarta FIR	Cost has been finished and capability assessment is still on-going	On-going	On-going	Upgrading ADPS and ATC System using converter (short term)	Local vendor converter (short term)	On-going (tender) converter (short-term)	ELSA Comfort converter (short-term)	Yes (short-term)	Des 2013 new JATMS long-term	Jan to March 2012	April to June 2012	On Jul to Sep 2012	Indonesia
• Ujung Pandang FIR	No, it hasn't It will be conducted by the end of this year (2011)	No, it hasn't. It will be commence on 1st quarter 2012		Upgrade on ATC and AIS System	•For converter by in-house developer •For System by vendor	Technical trial (for converter)	•Thales •Atalis •Nova ATM System	Yes, it is	Temporary, during transition until end 2012	commence on 1st quarter 2012	Will be conducted on 2nd quarter 2012	On 1st July 2012 (pub. by AIC)	Indonesia

Japan • Fukuoka FIR	Yes	Yes	On-going	None	JCAB	On-going	NEC	Converter function is going to be installed to the front end system	On 15th November 2012	On 1st January 2012. To be completed on 31st March	On 1st April 2012	On 1st July 2012	Japan Civil Aviation Bureau (JCAB)
Kiribati													
Lao PDR • VLVT-Vientiane	On-going	Plan in October 2011		Not yet	Looking	Looking	Looking	On-going study		April 2012	May-Jun 2012	July 2012	Lao PDR
Malaysia • Kuala Lumpur FIR • Kota Kinabalu FIR	Yes	No Expect to be completed by Dec 2011	N/A	FDPS upgrade To make it compliant	TBN	N/A	N/A	No	N/A FDPS Upgrade	Jan-31Mar2012	1Apr-30Jun2012	1Jul-15Nov2012	Department of Civil Aviation, Malaysia
Maldives • Malé	On-going	No	N/A	FDPS upgrade to make it compliant	Looking	N/A	No	No	N/A	Mid 2012	Third Quarter 2012	TBN	Maldives
Marshall Islands													
Micronesia													
Mongolia • ZMUB ARO of ZMUB AD	Mongolia is planning to increase route charge due to difficulties in finding financial resources	No	-	None	Avitech – AG of Germany	Will be finished by October 2011	Avitech - AG	Yes	Sept 2012	The internal testing will commence on 01 January 2012 and expected to be completed on 31 March 2012	Testing will be conducted from 01 April 2012	Testing with airlines/ operators will be conducted from 01 July 2012 to September 2012	CAA of Mongolia
• ZMUB ATM of Ulaanbaatar ACC	Mongolia is planning to increase route charge due to difficulties in finding financial resources	No	-	None	Indra of Spain	Has received commercial proposal from India	Indra	Not determined	-	Indra is able to provide the software 6 months after signing the contract. Therefore, the internal testing and testing with other ANSPs will commence in May or June 2012 simultaneously.	Indra is able to provide the software 6 months after signing the contract. Therefore, the internal testing and testing with other ANSPs will commence in May or June 2012 simultaneously	Testing with airlines/operators will be conducted from 01 July 2012 to September 2012	
Myanmar													
Nauru													
Nepal	Yes	None Not required due to non automated system		Yes	No	AMHS solution provider selection in progress	None Nepal does not have FDP, AIDB system	N/A		March 2012	May 2012	May 2012 In coordination with Indian FIR	Civil Aviation Authority of Nepal
New Zealand • NZZC • NZZO	No	No	N/A	N/A	Airways NZ In-house	NZZC Requirements have been written and software task being sized. NZZO Requirements completed and software design and coding commenced.	N/A	No	N/A	NZZC Internal testing to commence 1APR2012 and expected to be completed by 30JUN2012 NZZO Internal testing to 31MAR2012	NZZC-N/A NZZO-1APR2012	NZZC 1JUL2012 NZZO 1JUL2012	New Zealand
Niue (NZ)													

Pakistan • Karachi FIR • Lahore FIR	Yes	No Expected in October 2011			M/s COM soft & M/s Indra M/s COM soft has upgraded the system software for AMHS M/S Indra is being coordinated for the upgrade of ATM.	AMHS was updated in March, 2011	M/s Indra For software upgrade of ATM	No	-	Sept 2011-Dec 2011 For testing of AMHS software	- As per ICAO regional testing plan, which is awaited.	- 1. Airline / Operators using PCAA software of AMHS are already compliant. 2. Airlines using any other country / Company software /equipment are to be coordinated for upgrade. 3. Testing may be started in Oct. 2011.	Pakistan Civil Aviation Authority
Palau													
Papua New Guinea													
Philippines • Manila	No	No	N/A	None yet Once the Czech system for the New Manila ACC is commissioned, its FDPS will be upgraded.	None yet	No Information CS-Soft of the Czech Republic claims to have a converter	No	No	No	No date yet	As soon as any State requests it Declare if on-line or off-line testing	No date yet	Civil Aviation Authority of the Philippines
Republic of Korea • Incheon FIR	Cost and resource capability assessment has been conducted by maintenance or management services agencies	Not yet. Safety assessment is going to be commenced right after finishing the system development.	-	There is no major changes to the ATM system in Incheon FIR except for expending FDPS, which needs to be upgraded or equipped with converters.	KOCA decided to use a convertor for Incheon ACC system and a local company is developing related system. And, one of the ATM systems (Incheon ARTS) was being provided by Thales and discussions for an upgrade is in progress.	KOCA began developing the Converter from April 29, 2011 and it will be finished by December 20, 2012,	1.Local IT company with Incheon ACC 2.Thales with Incheon APP ATM system	Yes. In Incheon ACC FDPS use converter.	Current ATS system will be equipped with converters at the front and back of the Flight Data Processor and the converters will be installed by Dec 22, 2012.	KOCA planning to begin internal testing from April 1, 2012 and hope to be completed by June 30, 2012.	The test with other ANSPs will be commenced from July 1, 2012.	The test with airlines/operators will be also commenced from July 1, 2012	Office of Civil Aviation, MLTM Republic of Korea
Samoa													
Singapore • Singapore FIR	Yes	No	N/A	New ATM System which can accept and process NEW FPL will be installed Our new AIM System can receive and transmit both PRESENT and NEW FPL	Thales	In development for the new ATM system	N/A	Yes For the existing ATM system	By end of Year 2014	Between January and March 2012	Between April and June 2012	Between July and November 2012	
Solomon Islands													

Sri Lanka • VCCC	Yes	No New Flight Plan format Flight Plans filed at AIS/BIA shall be checked whether they are accepted without any cause of reject or denial of service. This checking has to be done with the countries who has already adapted to new flight plan format.	-	1) Existing ATM System (ACC) will be replaced with a new ATM system fully compatible with new FPL by April 2012. 2) ATM system (Approach Control) will be upgraded to be compatible with new FPL, AIDC and with independent Servers for Recording by the end of July 2012. New AMHS/AFTN system compliant with FPL 2012 will be commissioned in Jan 2012.	Selex Sistemi Integrati of Italy	Proposal expected by Dec 2011	N/A	No	-	Feb – Aug 2012	Aug 2012	July 2012	VCCC
Thailand • Bangkok FIR	Yes We have already conducted both cost and capability assessment on the front-end system. Consequently, assessment on end-user systems (ATM Systems) has been planned.	In progress Partial assessment has been conducted on the front-end system. Consequently, assessment on end-user systems (ATM Systems has been planned)		Major changes have been made to the Flight Data Management System (Front-end system) and the Bay of Bengal Cooperative ATM System (BOBCAT). In addition technical refreshed on ATM systems within AEROTHAI has been planned for.	1.Front end- internally developed. 2.ATM System – to be determined.	Completed	1.Front end- internally development. 2.ATM System – to be determined.	Yes	The FPL 2012 compliant Front-end system is planned to be implemented by Q1 2012. Replacement/upgrades of other end-user systems are to be determined.	Planning in progress	Planning in progress	Planning in progress	DCA Thailand
Timor Leste													
Tonga													
Vanuatu													
Viet Nam • Hanoi FIR • HoChiMinh FIR	This assessment has started and will be completed in November 2011	This assessment has commenced. The step will be updated in the next quarter.	Major changes are as ATM Euro-cat-X at Southern ATS Company, Automated AIS System (Gia Lam, Hanoi), Flight Data Management System at ATC Coordination Centre (Gia Lam, Ha Noi); FDP System at Northern ATS Company is being changed by new system.	ATM Eurocat-X at Southern ATS Company: Thales. Automated AIS System (Gia Lam, Ha Noi): Comsoft. Flight Data Management System at ATC Coordination Centre (Gia Lam, Ha Noi): Hoang Thanh Company (Vietnam). RDP/FDP System at Northern ATS Company: Selex	At present, VATM is on-going in negotiation with the companies providing equipment. The stage will be defined in the next Quarter.	It is expected the following vendors: Thales, Consoft, Selex and Hoang Thanh	Yes, the systems will use converter. This will be replaced by 2013 subject to the Post-implementation assessment.	The internal testing would be planned in a period from 01 January till 31 March 2012. The detailed timing will be subject to the working results with the companies providing equipment.	The testing conducting with other ANSPs would be planned in a period from 01 April till 30 June 2012. The detailed timing will be subject o the working results with the companies providing equipment.	The testing with airlines/operators will start conducting with other ANSPs would be planned in a period from 01 July till 15 November 2012 in accordance with ICAO schedule.			

USA[1] • Oakland Oceanic (KZAK), New York Oceanic (KZWY) and Anchorage Oceanic (PAZN)	Yes	Yes (preliminary) All APAC region interfaces are with the Ocean 21 system used for these FIRs			FAA (via contractor)	Development is compete	Lockheed Martin	Not for this system		It is complete.	April 2012 Some early test opportunities might be available	Early to mid 2012	USA
• 20 Domestic U.S. FIRs (KZAB, KZAU, KZBW, KZDC, KZDV, KZFW, KZHU, KZID, KZJX, KZKC, KZLA, KZLC, KZMA, ZKME, ZKMP, KZNY, KZOA, KZOB, KZSE, KZTL)	Yes	No. Planning to start soon. Attempting to coordinate Safety Assessment across all affected systems.		Replacement of entire ATM System. Current Host and URET systems and new ERAM system will both have to be modified.	FAA (via contractor)	Preliminary Engineering complete S/W development starting July 2011	Lockheed Martin	Not for these systems, although see Remarks. Host and URET systems will accept and pass NEW content flight plans but controllers will view PRESENT content.	When ERAM deployment is complete, Host and URET systems will be gone. Currently projected for 2014 time frame.	Host- Feb 2012 thru April 2012 ERAM- June 201 thru Aug 2012	Host- April 2012, ERAM- August 2012 Note: These systems do not interface to any systems in the APAC region.	Host- July 2012, ERAM- Sept. 2012	USA
• Anchorage domestic ARTCC (PAZA) Uses FDP-2000 Flight Data Processing system	Yes	No		None	FAA	Currently in Engineering Expect S/W start in August 2011		No		Early 2012	Early to Mid 2012 Note: PAZA does not interface to any APAC FIRs	Mid 2012	USA
• Oakland Oceanic FIR (Honolulu Control Facility and Guam CERAP) Uses Offshore Flight Data Processing System (OFDPS)	Yes	No		None	FAA	Engineering to start in October 2011 Expect S/W start in January 2012		No		May 2012	N/A (no external interfaces)	August 2012	
France[2]													

---

[1] Includes American Samoa, Guam, Johnston, Kingman, Midway, Mariana, Palmyra, Wake

[2] Includes French Polynesia, New Caledonia, Wallis and Futuna Islands

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

ASIA AND PACIFIC OFFICE

Asia/Pacific Guidance Material for the

Implementation of Amendment 1 to the 15th Edition of the

Procedures for Air Navigation Services – Air Traffic Management

(PANS-ATM, Doc 4444)

Version 4, 9 November 2011

ISSUED BY THE ICAO ASIA/PACIFIC REGIONAL OFFICE, BANGKOK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix

ASIA/PACIFIC GUIDANCE MATERIAL FOR THE

IMPLEMENTATION OF AMENDMENT 1 TO THE 15th EDITION OF

PROCEDURES FOR AIR NAVIGATION SERVICES – AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

(**PANS-ATM, Doc 4444**)

1.   Background

1.1   In order to ensure a harmonised implementation of the provisions contained in Amendment 1 to the 15th Edition of PANS-ATM relating to comprehensive changes to the ICAO Flight Plan and associated ATS Messages formats, this Asia/Pacific regional guidance material has been developed by APANPIRG's Asia/Pacific ICAO Flight Plan and ATS Messages Task Force (FPL&AM/TF). ~~The material will be further developed during 2010 and presented to APANPIRG/21 in September 2010 for formal adoption.~~

1.2   Asia/Pacific (APAC) States and Air Navigation Service Providers (ANSPs) are encouraged to use this material as general implementation guidance for the new flight plan and ATS messages formats required by Amendment 1 to PANS-ATM for applicability date 15th November 2012. The material is expected to be of specific assistance when coding software changes in automation systems needed to support the changes to flight plan and ATS message formats

1.3   The FPL&AM/TF considers that it is of critical importance to conduct validity checking of Filed Flight Plans (FPL) and Air Traffic Service (ATS) Messages filed with and between all Asia/Pacific States and ANSPs, and to ensure that Current Flight Plans (CPL) and other messages exchanged between States and ANSPs are likewise formatted and handled in a similar fashion. In this manner, users/filers are assured that FPLs and associated messages are checked with the same level of scrutiny independent of where the flight originates. Additionally, they are assured that critical flight data information is passed intact by each Asia/Pacific State and ANSP along the route of flight.

2.   Terminology

2.1   In accordance with International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) transition guidance documents, the following terminology is used throughout this guidance material:

- **PRESENT** format is defined as ICAO flight planning and ATS message formats currently in use as specified in DOC 4444, 15th Edition.

- **NEW** format is defined as ICAO flight planning and ATS message formats specified in Amendment 1 to DOC 4444, 15th Edition.

- **Applicability Date** is the 15 November 2012 effective date of Amendment 1 to PANS-ATM (Doc 4444).

3.   Transition Period & Phased Implementation

3.1   The FPL&AM/TF considers that applying an implementation strategy whereby all user switchovers to NEW format occur on the same day (i.e. on Applicability Date) would result on an unmanageable impact on ANSPs systems with a very real risk of automation system crashes. As such, the pre-implementation ANSP safety case analyses are expected to identify this implementation scenario as a safety hazard that requires effective mitigation.

3.2   Under the phased arrangements agreed by the FPL&AM/TF for application in the Asia/Pacific Region, ANSP implementation of NEW format (whilst simultaneously retaining PRESENT capability) would take place first, followed by a staggered user switchover to NEW capability.

3.3 The transition period is defined as the declared Asia/Pacific transition period from 1 January 2012 until 15 November 2012, as outlined in the updated Asia/Pacific Region *Strategy for the Implementation of NEW ICAO Flight Plan Format and Supporting ATS Messages* proposed by FPL&AM/TF/2 (November 2009), comprising the following phases:

- **Phase 1** - ANSPs software delivery and internal testing
  - o 1 January to 31 March 2012,
- **Phase 2**– ANSPs external testing and implementation
  - o 1 April to 30 June 2012, and
- **Phase 3** – Airspace users testing and implementation.
  - o 1 July to 15 November 2012

3.4 Under the phased approach, States will not implement NEW capability before the commencement of the ANSPs external testing and implementation period on 1 April 2012 and, insofar as possible, would complete implementation of NEW capability by the end of the ANSPs external testing and implementation period on 30 June 2012. Following this, airspace users would be invited by AIC, AIP supplementand/or NOTAM to commence testing with ANSPs from 1 July 2012. Importantly, ANSPs and users would be encouraged to coordinate appropriate implementation methodologies in order to ensure a staggered migration of airspace users to NEW during the airspace users testing and implementation period (i.e. 1 July – 15 November 2012).

4.   DOF/ - Five Day (120 hour) Advance FPL Lodgement

4.1 The Amendment 1 provisions enable flight plans to be lodged up to 5 days (120 hours) prior to the Estimated Off Blocks Time (EOBT) for the flight, a significant change from the 24 hour requirement in the existing provisions.

4.2 Present experience in the Asia/Pacific region with FPLs submitted well in advance of EOBT (within the present 24 hour window) is that this practice precipitates a large number of CHG messages as operators change aircraft type, or tail number on a same type but with different equipage, or vary the ETD, or a variety of other modifications to what has originally been filed. As meteorological conditions change after the FPL has been filed, route changes and altitude changes also manifest, requiring modification messages as well. Overall, the existing 24 hour window generates a significant amount of message traffic that does not add apparent value to the aircraft operator and increases complexity for the many ATS units along the path of flight that have to process the extra modification messages. To address this existing problem, in one instance an Asia/Pacific State has already published a constraint in AIP under which flight plans are not accepted more than 8 hours prior to EOBT.

4.3 The extension of the filing period from 24 hours to 120 hours is expected to compound these effects, particularly in respect to meteorology factors as changes to the flight plan become necessary on the basis of updated weather reports received within the 5 day period before departure.

4.4 Investigations by the FPL&AM/TF have been unable to identify required operational circumstances in the Asia/Pacific Region where FPL lodgement earlier than 24 hours was necessary to meet the medium term needs of States. A similar situation is reported by IATA in respect to Asia/Pacific operators.

4.5   Discussions during the FPL&AM/TF/2 meeting highlighted the difficulties being experienced by many States in terms of civil aviation funding. In the case of the 120 hour lodgement provision, it was difficult for States to justify a business case for changes to what was often a number of legacy systems within a State when there was no clear operational requirement driving the change. Such changes would, of course, be included by States in the specification for new system procurement but, in the absence of a clear operational need, the business case for retrofit by Asia/Pacific States does not appear sound.

4.6   Notwithstanding, some States already have some capacity for DOF, albeit disabled in their systems at the moment. In these cases, where financial impacts were much less, it was logical for such ANSPs to proceed with 120 hour lodgement capability. It is also possible that some States will prefer to proceed with a DOF retrofit to legacy systems in time for the November 2012 implementation. However, the potential impacts of the implementation of an 'island' airspace which was accepting 120 hour lodgement should be considered in terms of the impact of neighbouring airspaces not accepting 120 hour lodgements, particularly in relation to AIDC configuration.

4.7   In light of the issues presently associated with the 5 day (120 hour) lodgement provision, including business case difficulties, the FPL&AM/TF does not support a compulsion on all Asia/Pacific States to meet the 120 hour lodgement provision by 15 November 2012. Accordingly the position adopted in the Asia/Pacific interim regional implementation strategy was proposed to APANPIRG for strengthening from the current *"... consider a constraint..."* to *"...adopt a regional approach that does not require processing of flight plans more the 24 hours prior to EOBT during the declared transition period..."*.

4.8   This is expected to mitigate the transition issues associated with DOF/ matters and reduce transmission of superfluous modification messages and the associated loading on messaging systems. DOF/ complexities will be further considered by States after the November 2012 implementation and, in any case, would be incorporated into new systems as they were specified, procured and commissioned.

5.   Software Coding Considerations

Date of Flight (DOF) and Early Filing

5.1   In Amendment 1, use of a DOF/ indicator in Item 18 is accompanied by the ability to file NEW format up to 120 hours in advance. As it is likely that not all ANSPs will implement the 120 hour requirement by the Applicability Date, the following guidelines regard use of DOF/:

   a)   An ANSP that does not implement the 120 hour requirement should handle such messages in accordance with normal ANSP error message handling procedures if that message has a DOF/ that is beyond their implemented time frame (i.e. more than *nnn* hours in advance, often limited to 24 hours). This ensures such messages are processed for the intended day of flight.

   b)   ~~At a defined time before Estimated Off Blocks Time (EOBT), normally within 24 hours, DOF/ can be removed from stored FPLs. In any case,~~ DOF/ is not necessary in AIDC messages since flight data is generally first coordinated after departure. The inclusion of DOF/ in AIDC messages is subject to bilateral agreement between States.

Use of P1-P9 in Field 10a

5.2   In relation to the use of P1-P9 in Field 10a (Radio communication, navigation and approach aid equipment and capabilities), Amendment 1 identifies alphanumeric entries P1-P9 in Field 10a as "Reserved for RCP." The following guidelines regard filing and processing P1-P9 in Item 18:

a) Even though there is no need for this information now, ANSPs should accept P1-P9 if filed in an FPL and pass the information in AIDC messages, but with no interpretation or processing required. This will avoid transition issues and minimize necessary coordination when these items begin to be used in the future.

Changed definition of "S" in Field 10a

5.3　　　　Amendment 1 changes the definition of standard equipment in Field 10a ("S") so that it no longer includes ADF. An FPL may have elements that uniquely identify it as being in either PRESENT or NEW format. However, it is also possible for an FPL to have no unique elements, and thus be valid as both PRESENT and NEW format. In such an FPL, use of "S" in Field 10a is ambiguous.

5.4　　　　Therefore, it is essential to know whether an FPL is in NEW or PRESENT format before interpreting an "S" filed in Field 10a. The following guidelines regard filing and processing of "S" during Phases 2 and 3 of the transition period, respectively (i.e. 1 April to 30 June & 1 July to 15 November 2012).

a) In conjunction with the beginning of Phase 2 of the transition period (i.e. 1 April 2012), ANSPs should not assume ADF capability when an "S" is filed, regardless of the perceived format of the filed FPL (NEW or PRESENT format). All FPLs received on or after 1 April 2012 with an "S" filed in Field 10a will be processed and/or interpreted as if "V O L" (VHF RTF, VOR and ILS) were filed;and

b) States and ANSPs must provide instructions to their users to file an "F" for ADF in PRESENT format FPLs, beginning 1 April 2012.

Consistency between Field 10a and PBN/ in Item 18

5.5　　　　The PBN/ indicator introduced by Amendment 1 conveys not only navigational capability with respect to accuracy, but also information regarding what type of navigational equipment is used to achieve it. This introduces a relationship between PBN/ in Item 18 and Field 10a, and it is possible to file inconsistent data (i.e., capabilities in PBN/ that are not supported by data in Field 10a). Consequently, a consistency check should be coded to evaluate NEW FPLs per the following guidelines:

- If B1, B2, C1, C2, D1, D2, O1 or O2 are filed, then a "G" must be included in Field 10a;

- If B1, B3, C1, C3, D1, D3, O1 or O3 are filed, then a "D" must be included in Field 10a;

- If B1 or B4 is filed, then an "O" or "S" and a "D" must be included in Field 10a (i.e., "OD" or "SD" must appear in 10a);

- If B1, B5, or C1 are filed, then an "I" must be included in Field 10a; and

- If C1, C4, D1, D4, O1 or O4 are filed, then a "D" and an "I" must be included in Field 10a (i.e., "D I" must appear in 10a).

Consistency between Item 10a and STS/ in Item 18

5.6　　　　Amendment 1 formalised flight plan filing of the mutually exclusive entries 'W' (in Item 10a) and "NONRVSM" (in Item 18 STS/). The use of NONRVSM in STS is to signify intent to operate as a Non-RVSM flight in RVSM airspace. To avoid contradictory RVSM indications and possible incorrect application of separation standards based on this, a consistency check should be coded to evaluate NEW FPL related messages per the following:

- If STS/NONRVSM is filed in Item 18 then 'W' should not exist in Item 10a.

Item 10b omission in Amendment 1

5.7   Amendment 1 omitted the Item 10b 'N' designator (i.e. no surveillance equipment for the route to be flown) in Appendix 3 whilst in Appendix 2 this was retained as a valid designator. This was clarified as being an inadvertent omission and consequently 'N' remains a valid character for use in Item 10b.

Item 10b advice to filers

5.8   In relation to the use of surveillance equipment and capabilities, Amendment 1 identifies alphanumeric entries in Item 10b. States should consider including in their flight planning manuals and/or the flight planning section of their AIP, the following guidelines:

a) 'N' or

b) SSR Modes A and C and S
- Maximum of one entry is expected from either 'A' or 'C' or 'E' or 'H' or 'I' or 'L' or 'P' or 'S' or 'X' and/or

c) ADS-B
- Maximum of one entry is expected from either B1 or B2 and/or
- Maximum of one entry is expected from either U1 or U2 and/or
- Maximum of one entry is expected from either V1 or V2 and/or

d) ADS-C
- One or both of the entries 'D1' 'G1'

Validity Checking & Processing of Item 18 Indicators

5.9   Amendment 1 indicates that only the specified indicators should be included in Item 18. Furthermore, it makes the order of the indicators mandatory as opposed to preferred. Finally, the rules for some items are quite explicit and could readily be subject to validity checking by automation systems. The following guidelines regard use of Item 18:

a) Systems should not accept indicators in Item 18 which are not defined in the PANS-ATM. If internal requirements create the need to use a 'local' non-standard indicator, measures must be taken to ensure that airspace users filing with multiple FIRs are not impacted.

b) Airspace users should file indicators in the required order to ensure that systems applying truncation do not eliminate more important data. ANSPs should either enforce the required order, or ensure that AIDC messages contain the items in the required order regardless of the order filed.

c) Airspace users should only file a single instance of each indicator. If duplicate indicators are detected, their contents will be concatenated within a single occurrence of the indicator but with a space inserted between the two data streams.

5.10   ANSPs should, at a minimum, perform a validity check of Item 18 indicator contents that are used for processing, and they are encouraged to check all items not listed as "free text field" in the Table 5-1, Item 18 Indicator Validity Check, below.

Indicator	Contents
STS/	One or more of the approved specified entries, separated by spaces
PBN/	A single string containing up to 8 of the approved alphanumeric descriptors No embedded spaces
NAV/	Free text field
COM/	Free text field
DAT/	Free text field
SUR/	Free text field
DEP/	Free text field
DEST/	Free text field
DOF/	A single string in the specified date format (YYMMDD). No embedded spaces
REG/	A single string. No embedded spaces

EET/	One or more strings. Each string is:
	    2-5 alphanumeric characters; or
	    a LAT/LONG followed by a 4-digit elapsed time, from 0000 to 9959 (i.e., 0-99 hours followed by 0-59 minutes)

SEL/	A single string of four letters
TYP/	Free text *Note: Although the entry is structured when used for formation flights, it is also used when no designator is assigned and, therefore, may be any text description.*
CODE/	A single string of 6 hexadecimal characters
DLE/	One or more strings Each string consists of a valid Significant Point followed by a 4-digit elapsed time
OPR/	Free text field
ORGN/	Free text field

PER/	A single letter
	The letter must be one of those specified in PANS-OPS (Doc 8168), as below:
	  • *Category A:* less than 169 km/h (91 kt) indicated airspeed (IAS)
	  • *Category B:* 169 km/h (91 kt) or more but less than 224 km/h (121 kt) IAS
	  • *Category C:* 224 km/h (121 kt) or more but less than 261 km/h (141 kt) IAS
	  • *Category D:* 261 km/h (141 kt) or more but less than 307 km/h (166 kt) IAS
	  • *Category E:* 307 km/h (166 kt) or more but less than 391 km/h (211 kt) IAS
	  • *Category H:* Specific procedures for helicopters.

Indicator	Contents
ALTN/	Free text field
RALT/	Free text field
TALT/	Free text field
RIF/	Route information consistent with the format of a valid Field 15c
RMK/	Free text field

Table 5-1: Item 18 Indicator Validity Check

Allowable Indicators and Mandated Order in Item 18

5.11   Systems should accept indicators in Item 18 which are defined in the PANS-ATM. Consideration should also be given to system acceptance/handling of legacy indicators, not included in PANS-ATM, but approved by ICAO for continued use. It is recommended that APAC states either automatically:

> a) remove on reception any non-standard indicators not approved for use in Asia/Pacific without rejecting the original message; or
>
> b) automatically re-order these non-standard indicators on reception without rejecting the original message by inserting the non standard indicator and associated text as RMK/ and with the "/" removed between the non standard indicator and associated text.

Processing location information in the DEP/, DEST/, ALTN/, RALT/ and TALT/ indicators in Item 18.

5.12   Amendment 1 specifies that Item 18 entries for DEP/, DEST/, ALTN/, RALT/ and TALT/should contain the name and location of the aerodrome. It also requires that *"...For aerodromes not listed in the relevant Aeronautical Information Publication [AIP], indicate location as follows ..."*. The following guidelines will promote common interpretation and filing practices:

> c) If the aerodrome identifier is not in ICAO DOC 7910, *Location Identifiers*, but is an approved identifier per the AIP for the State where the aerodrome is located, the name of the aerodrome should be the identifier and no additional location information is needed.
>
> d) If the aerodrome is neither in DOC 7910 nor in a relevant AIP, the name of the airport should be included followed by a location as specified in the amendment. ANSPs should expect to be able to process the last text string provided as a location (Lat/Long, or bearing and distance from significant point, or fix name) to be usable in their flight plan route calculations.

Use of the DLE/ indicator in Item 18.

5.13   Amendment 1 defines a new DLE/ indicator for Item 18, after which a significant point and delay time at the significant point can be filed. The following guidelines regard filing and processing of this indicator:

> a) The significant point in the DLE/ indicator should be required to match a significant point in Field 15c (i.e. not an implied point along an ATS route). An FPL designating an unknown point in a DLE/ indicator should be handled in accordance with normal ANSP error message handling procedures.

7

5.14   MARSA - It is recommended that state guidance be provided to filers (AIP) to ensure consistent application of MARSA as follows:

- MARSA when submitted in the flight plan is an indication of an intention to declare MARSA, either:

    o   for the flight duration (requires more than one aircraft in Item 9 of the flight plan); or

    o   from a nominated point in the flight plan, to be stated in Item 18 RMK/ along with identification(s) of aircraft planned to participate in MARSA operations (e.g. RMK/MARSA COLT WIZZA240036.

5.15   ATFMX – States should consider including in their flight planning manuals and/or AIP flight planning section instructions to filers to, when intending to file ATFMX in STS/ for flights which cross more than one FIR, include in RMK/ the FIR (s) for which this exemption applies (e.g. RMK/ATFMX NZZO).

Use of ORGN

5.16   ORGN – It is recommended that ANSPs published specific guidance to filers for this Indicator. Other parts of the world have set character limits for this Indicator.

6.   Conversion from NEW format to PRESENT format

6.1   As described in the ICAO material in the attachment to State letter AN 13/2/1-09/9, conversion from NEW to PRESENT format will be required during the transition period and will affect Field 10a, Field 10b, and Field 18. It is extremely important that such conversions from NEW format to PRESENT format are consistently applied by Asia/Pacific ANSPs and, preferably, throughout all ICAO regions.

6.2   Several ANSPs have indicated an intention to maintain their systems in PRESENT format post November 15th 2012 and to utilise retrofitted flight plan converters to accept NEW and convert NEW flight plans for their systems. Whilst not desirable, it is appreciated that for states using legacy systems with short term plans for replacement, this represents a viable option, however it must be understood this does not constitute compliance with the spirit of Amendment 1.

6.3   Amendment 1 mandates the order of Item 18 indicators (see 5.9 above). In order to reduce the degree of software development required it is acceptable for the order of both PRESENT and NEW format flight plan messages to be as per that defined in Amendment 1 for NEW format messages.

6.4   The guidelines contained in the Conversion Tables for respective fields included below record regionally agreed conversions from NEW to PRESENT format for consistent application by ANSPs. During the conversion process, duplication of entries should be avoided at all times. For example, if NEW flight plan contains PBN/B2B3 then the desired resulting Field 18 entry in the corresponding PRESENT plan should be NAV/RNAV5 B2 B3 and not NAV/RNAV5 B2 RNAV5 B3 as might be interpreted from the translation table. Conversion from PRESENT to NEW was never intended, nor recommended by ICAO. Up converting is considered high risk and should not be used in 'live' system operations.

6.5   Table 6-1: *Conversion of Field 10a,* as shown below, is to be used for conversion of NEW Field 10a to PRESENT Field 10a. In using the Table, ensure a check is made for the presence of the information in both the "Field 10a" and "Item 18" NEW columns and convert it to the information in both the "Field 10a" and "Item 18" in PRESENT columns. If, when per the table text is to be inserted inField 10 or Field 18, the text is already present, then it should not be inserted again. When inserting text in Field 18, if any information is already present due to having been filed or having been inserted by an earlier translation insertion, the text should be appended to the end of the existing text preceded by a space. For example, if PBN/B2 NAV/TCAS is filed in a NEW flight plan, then the resulting NAV/ entry in the corresponding PRESENT flight plan will be NAV/TCAS RNAV5 B2.

'NEW' Data Content		Conversion to 'PRESENT' Data Content	
Field 10a	**Item 18**	**Field 10a**	**Item 18**
N		N	
S		S	(refer para 5.4)
S F		SF	(refer para 5.4)
A		Z	NAV/GBAS
B		Z	NAV/LPV
C		C	
D		D	
E1		Z	COM/FMC WPR ACARS E1
E2		Z	COM/DFIS ACARS E2
E3		Z	COM/PDC ACARS E3
F		F	
G		G	
H		H	
I		I	
J1		J	DAT/V COM/J1
J2		J	DAT/H COM/J2
J3		J	DAT/V COM/J3
J4		J	DAT/V COM/J4
J5		J	DAT/S COM/J5

'NEW' Data Content		Conversion to 'PRESENT' Data Content	
Field 10a	**Item 18**	**Field 10a**	**Item 18**
J6		J	DAT/S COM/J6
J7		J	DAT/S COM/J7
K		K	
L		L	
M1		Z	COM/INMARSAT M1
M2		Z	COM/MTSAT M2
M3		Z	COM/IRIDIUM M3
O		O	
P1-P9		*Reserved- should not be present.* **Remove** *items if present (i.e. do not make information part of the PRESENT format plan).*	
R	PBN/A1	RZ	NAV/RNAV10 RNP10 A1
R	PBN/B1	RZ	NAV/RNAV5 B1
R	PBN/B2	RZ	NAV/RNAV5 B2
R	PBN/B3	RZ	NAV/RNAV5 B3
R	PBN/B4	RZ	NAV/RNAV5 B4
R	PBN/B5	RZ	NAV/RNAV5 B5
R	PBN/B6	RZ	NAV/RNAV5 B6
R	PBN/C1	RZ	NAV/RNAV2 C1
R	PBN/C2	RZ	NAV/RNAV2 C2
R	PBN/C3	RZ	NAV/RNAV2 C3
R	PBN/C4	RZ	NAV/RNAV2 C4
R	PBN/D1	PRZ	NAV/RNAV1 D1
R	PBN/D2	PRZ	NAV/RNAV1 D2
R	PBN/D3	PRZ	NAV/RNAV1 D3
R	PBN/D4	PRZ	NAV/RNAV1 D4

'NEW' Data Content		Conversion to 'PRESENT' Data Content	
Field 10a	**Item 18**	**Field 10a**	**Item 18**
R	PBN/L1	RZ	NAV/RNP4 L1
R	PBN/O1	PRZ	NAV/RNP1O1
R	PBN/O2	PRZ	NAV/RNP1 O2
R	PBN/O3	PRZ	NAV/RNP1 O3
R	PBN/O4	PRZ	NAV/RNP1 O4
R	PBN/S1	RZ	NAV/RNP APCH S1
R	PBN/S2	RZ	NAV/RNP APCH BARO VNAV S2
R	PBN/T1	RZ	NAV/RNP AR APCH RF T1
R	PBN/T2	RZ	NAV/RNP AR APCH T2
T		T	
U		U	
V		V	
W		W	
X		X	
Y		Y	
Z	COM/nnnn	Z	COM/nnnn
Z	NAV/nnnn	Z	NAV/nnnn
Z	DAT/nnnn	Z	COM/nnnn

Table 6-1: Conversion of Field 10a

Conversion of Field 10b

6.6   Table 6-2: *Conversion of Field 10b,* as shown below, is to be used for conversion of NEW Field 10b to PRESENT Field 10b. Ensure a check is made for the presence of the information in both the "Field 10b" and "Item 18" NEW columns and convert it to the information in both the "Field 10b" and "Item 18" in PRESENT columns.

'NEW' Data Content		Conversion to 'PRESENT' Data Content	
Field 10b	**Item 18**	**Field 10b**	**Item 18**
N		N	

'NEW' Data Content		Conversion to 'PRESENT' Data Content	
Field 10b	Item 18	Field 10b	Item 18
A		A	
C		C	
E		SD	COM/E
H		S	COM/H
I		I	
L		S D	COM/L
P		P	
S		S	
X		X	
B1		D	COM/B1
B2		D	COM/B2
U1		D	COM/U1
U2		D	COM/U2
V1		D	COM/V1
V2		D	COM/V2
D1		D	COM/D1
G1		D	COM/G1

Table 6-2: Conversion of Field 10b

Conversion of Item 18

6.7   Table 6-3: *Conversion of Item 18,* as shown below, is to be used for Conversion of NEW Item 18 to PRESENT Item 18.

'NEW' Data Content	Conversion to 'PRESENT' Data Content
Item 18	Item 18
STS/	STS/ copy text over • Except change "ATFMX" to "ATFMEXEMPTAPPROVED"
SUR/	RMK/ SUR <textafter SUR/>

'NEW' Data Content	Conversion to 'PRESENT' Data Content
Item 18	**Item 18**
DOF/	Maintain data in DOF/ if possible, otherwise remove. While not a documented PRESENT indicator, it is currently in wide use.
DAT/	COM/
DLE/	RMK/ DLE <text after DLE/>
ORGN/	RMK/ORGN <text after ORGN/>
TALT/	RMK/ TALT <text after TALT/>
PBN/	*See Table 5-1 above*
All other indicators copy over directly, with additions to NAV/, COM/, and DAT/ as specified in Tables 6-1 and 6-2 above. *DAT conversion should therefore occur in two steps:* 1. *Any existing DAT/ entries in the NEW format flight plan (submitted for conversion) are transferred to the COM/ indicator in Field 18 of the converted PRESENT flight plan (or message) - prior to conversion of the 10a equipment qualifiers; then* 2. *Any equipment qualifiers in Field 10a requiring conversion to DAT/ in accordance with the conversion table 6.1 (i.e. J1-J7) are to be entered into the DAT/ indicator of the converted PRESENT flight plan (or message) in accordance with table 6.1.* *Note; After conversion is possible that there will be duplicate entries in DAT/ and COM/.*	

Table 6-3: Conversion of Item 18

7.   Differentiating between NEW format and PRESENT format

7.1   Although in most cases it will be evident when a FPL is in either the PRESENT or NEW format, situations can arise whereby the presentation of a particular FPL fully meets the parameters of both the PRESENT and NEW formats i.e. the same FPL is able to be interpreted using either of the PRESENT or NEW parameters. However, decoding the FPL using the PRESENT parameters could reach a different outcome than decoding the same FPL using the NEW format. For example, the letter "S" is used for standard equipment in Item 10 of both FPL formats, meaning V, F,O & L (i.e. VHF RTF, ADF, VOR and ILS) in PRESENT format but only V, O & L in NEW format (i.e. no ADF).

7.2   Accordingly, from the commencement of Phase 3 (1 July to 15 November 2012 - Airspace users testing and implementation) of the phased implementation strategy the following criteria should be used to determine if the filed FPL is in PRESENT or NEW format:

       a)   If the FPL is filed prior to an ANSP accepting NEW, assume the Flight Plan is PRESENT.

7.3   Once an ANSP has announced it can accept NEW format, if any of the following is filed assume the filed Flight Plan is in PRESENT format:

a) In Field 10a if the Qualifier E, J, M or P is filed without an associated numeric;

b) In Field 10b if the Qualifier D is filed without an associated numeric;

c) In Item 18 an entry used for STS/ is not in the allowed list for NEW; and

d) In Item 18 an entry used for PER/ is more than a single letter in the allowed list.

7.4   Once an ANSP has announced it can accept NEW format, if any of the following is filed assume the filed Flight Plan is in NEW format:

a) In Field 10a if any of the following qualifiers are filed: A, B, E1, E2 , E3 , J1, J2 , J3 , J4 , J5, J6, J7 , M1 , M2 , M3, P1, P2 , P3 , P4 , P5 , P6 , P7, P8, P9.

b) In Field 10b if any of the following qualifiers are filed: E , H , L , B1 , B2 , U1 , U2 ,V1 , V2 , D1 or G1.

c) In Item 18 if PBN/ is filed.

d) In Item 18 if SUR/ is filed.

e) In Item 18 if DLE/ is filed.

f) In Item 18 if TALT/ is filed.

7.5   If there isa unique qualifier from the PRESENT list and another unique qualifier from the NEW list co-existing in the same FPL, this indicates that the FPL is inconsistent and therefore should be rejected by automation (e.g. to an 'error queue'). After November 15, 2012 all FPLs will be assumed to be in NEW format.

8.   ATS Messages

Item 18 DOF

8.1   The FPL&AM/TF considers that ambiguity exists in relation to Field Type 18 and DOF which has implications on the composition of ATS messages as published in Amendment 1. The clarification provided for the requirement to include Field Type 18 in CHG, CNL, DLA, DEP and RQS messages states *"Field Type 18 with DOF specified is meant to uniquely identify the flight when the FPL is presented more than 24 hours in advance and there is no need to include all other Item 18 information"*. Consequently, states should be sending only the DOF element from field 18 or '0' (when no DOF is contained within the flight plan) in these message types. It is important to note that when the DOF/ element is modified by Field Type 22 in a CHG message, the complete Item 18 data must always be provided. If it is not, any elements omitted will be considered as modifications and they will be removed from the Item 18 content

8.2   The clarification also offers an interpretation of the Field Type 16 Previous Field/Next Field Table. This clearly states that only the DOF indicator is included in these messages and only if filed with the original message. If DOF is not filed in the original message then Field Type 18 is omitted. However, this interpretation contradicts the composition and examples for the CHG, CNL, DLA, DEP, RQP and RQS messages detailed in the Amendment which refer to Item 18 *"Other information (using more than one line if necessary)"*.

8.3   Accordingly, the following interpretation is applicable as an Asia/Pacific regional approach:

a) Insert the last notified DOF/YYMMDD in Field Type 18 if that indicator has been previously specified; and

b) If the DOF/ indicator has not been previously specified insert zero (0) in Field Type 18.

8.4　　　　To avoid possible confusion of DOF caused by subsequent DLA messages, a CHG message (instead of a DLA message) should always be used if a flight is delayed over 0000 UTC, indicating in Field 22 the amendments to both Field 13b and Field 18 i.e. both the EOBT and DOF; regardless of the existence of DOF in Field 18 of previously transmitted ATS messages. Similarly, a CHG message with a new EOBT in Field 13b and new DOF in Field 18 should always be used if the flight EOBT is advanced over 0000 UTC.

8.5　　　　If states do elect to use a DLA message for this purpose (per 8.7 example 2 below), their automated systems should have the capacity to add a DOF in cases where one did not previously exist, or to add a day to the DOF where one did exist within Item 18 of the flight plan. Likewise, recipients of DLA messages across 0000 UTC should modify DOF in their systems in the same manner.

8.6　　　　Example ATS messages based on these interpretations are shown below:

Reference FPL Messages

(FPL-ABC123-IS
-B77W/H-SDE1GIRWZ/SB1D1
-NZAA2300
-M083F360 DCT PAPTI A464 TN J251 DN B583 BRU M768 TSN R468
GOMES DCT DANNY1B
-VTBS1130
-PBN/A1B1C1D1L1 DOF/091120)

(FPL-ABC456-IS
-B77W/H-SDE1GIRWZ/SB1D1
-NZAA2300
-M083F360 DCT PAPTI A464 TN J251 DN B583 BRU M768 TSN R468
GOMES DCT DANNY1B
-VTBS1130
-PBN/A1B1C1D1L1)

Modification (CHG) Messages

- (CHG-ABC123-NZAA2300-VTBS-DOF/091120-16/VTBS1130 VTBD)

- (CHG-ABC456-NZAA2300-VTBS-0-16/VTBS1130 VTBD)

- Delaying the flight until the next day

  (CHG-ABC123-NZAA2300-VTBS-DOF/091120-13/NZAA0045-
  18/PBN/A1B1C1D1L1 DOF/091121)

  (CHG-ABC456-NZAA2300-VTBS-0-13/NZAA0045-18/PBN/A1B1C1D1L1
  DOF/091121)

Note:
1. When changing DOF insert the complete content of Item 18 in Field 22
2. CHG message (instead of DLA message) including the new EOBT and the new date of flight should be used if a flight is delayed over 0000 UTC.

Flight Plan Cancellation (CNL) Messages

- o (CNL-ABC123-NZAA2300-VTBS-DOF/091120)

- o (CNL-ABC456-NZAA2300-VTBS-0)

Delay (DLA) Messages

- o (DLA-ABC123-NZAA2345-VTBS-DOF/091120)

- o (DLA-ABC456-NZAA2345-VTBS-0)

Departure (DEP) Messages

- o (DEP-ABC123/A0254-NZAA2347-VTBS-DOF/091120)

- o (DEP-ABC456/A0254-NZAA2347-VTBS-0)

Request Flight Plan (RQP) Messages

- o (RQP-ABC123-NZAA2345-VTBS-DOF/091120)

- o (RQP-ABC456-NZAA2345-VTBS-0)

- o (RQP-ABC123-NZAA-VTBS-DOF/091120)

- o (RQP-ABC456-NZAA-VTBS-0)

Request Supplementary Flight Plan (RQS) Messages

- o (RQS-ABC123/A0254-NZAA2345-VTBS-DOF/091120)

- o (RQS-ABC456/A0254-NZAA2345-VTBS-0)

Arrival (ARR) Messages

- o (ARR-ABC123-NZAA-VTBS1115)

- o (ARR-ABC456-NZAA2345-VTBS1115)

8.6   It is now mandatory to insert in FPL Item 18 the date of flight departure if the flight plan is filed more than 24 hours in advance of the estimated off-block time of the flight. This also impacts on associated flight plan update messages (ARR, CHG, CNL, DLA, DEP).

8.7   The DOF provided in Field 18 of the update messages must always refer to the last notified Off Block Date (EOBD). This is very important and proper application of the rule may appear to result in information being presented in a counter-intuitive way as shown in the following examples:

➢ Field 18 in the original Flight Plan: STS/HOSP PBN/B3 DOF/100304

➢ Field 13b in the original Flight Plan: 2230

Example 1: CHG message – Preferred Method

It is recommended to use a CHG message if a flight is delayed over 0000 UTC, indicating in Field 22 the amendments to both Field 13b and 18, the EOBT and the DOF.

(CHG-ABC123-NZAA2230-VTBS-DOF/100304-13/NZAA0200-18/STS/HOSP PBN/B3 DOF/100305)

Note that the first DOF reference in the CHG message is 04 March, which was the previous notified date; however the modification in Field 22 shows the correct, new Date of Flight which is 05 March.

If the flight is further delayed until 0400 on 05 March, the corresponding DLA message will look like this:

(DLA-ABC123-NZAA0400-VTBS-DOF/100305)

The DLA message refers to the DOF as 05 March since this is the EOBD last communicated by the previous CHG message.

Example 2: DLA message

A DLA message could also be used to communicate a delay over 0000 UTC but is ambiguous and subject to confusion. It is therefore strongly recommended that a CHG message is used to communicate a delay over 0000 UTC as per Example 1.

The new EOBT/EOBD advised in a DLA message must always be understood as a date/time that is later than previously notified.

(DLA-ABC123-NZAA0200-VTBS-DOF/100304)

Note that the DOF reference in the DLA message is 04 March which was the previous notified date; however it is implicit that the new EOBD is 05 March.

Ifthe flight is further delayed to 0400 on 05 March; the corresponding DLA message will look like this:

(DLA-ABC123-NZAA0400-VTBS-DOF/100305)

The DLAmessage refers to the DOFas 05 March since this is the EOBD last communicated by the previous DLA message.

8.8   The use of the DLA message to communicate a delay over 0000 UTC (Example 2) is deceptive in that the new EOBD is not explicitly stated and the DOF in Field Type 18 does not correlate with the new EOBT.

8.9   Where multiple flight plans have been filed (same Aircraft Identification, Departure, Destination but different DOF) it is recommended that CHG messages, including DOF, are used to advise delays. This will enable automated systems to clearly identify which flight is being referenced.

9.   Cutover to NEW format

9.1   States will be asked by ICAO to provide their exact cutover timing for promulgation on the FITS website. States should consider planning this timing in conjunction with neighbouring states.

Appendix

ASIA/PACIFIC REGION

STRATEGY FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF

NEW ICAO FLIGHT PLAN FORMAT AND SUPPORTING ATS MESSAGES

Recognizing that:

1) The *Global Air Traffic Management Operational Concept* (Doc 9854) requires information management arrangements that provide accredited, quality-assured and timely information to be used to support ATM operations;

2) ATM Requirement 87 in the *Manual of Air Traffic Management System Requirements* (Doc 9882) provides that 4-D trajectories be used for traffic synchronization applications to meet ATM system performance targets, explaining that automation in the air and on the ground will be used fully in order to create an efficient and safe flow of traffic for all phases of flight;

3) The amended ICAO Flight Plan and associated ATS Message formats contained inAmendment 1 to the Fifteenth Edition of the PANS ATM (Doc 4444, applicable 15 November 2012) have been formulated to meet the needs of aircraft with advanced capabilities and the evolving requirements of automated air traffic management systems;

4) The implementation of the amended ICAO Flight Plan and ATS Message formats has been adopted by APANPIRG/20 as Regional Performance Objective 5, and

5) The complexities inherent in automated computer systems preclude the adoption of a single regional implementation date and transitions to the new flight plan provisions will therefore occur in accordance with the declared transition period described in this document.

The Asia/Pacific implementation of Amendment 1 to the PANS-ATM shall:

1) Ensure that all States and airspace users implement the provisions of Amendment 1 from 15 November 2012, not just selected aspects of the Amendment;

2) Acknowledge that States not implementing Amendment 1 from 15 November 2012 are obligated by ICAO provisions to publish, preferably by 12 January 2012, the non compliance in State AIP as a 'significant difference' and will be included on the APANPIRG List of Deficiencies in the ATM/AIS/SAR Fields; and

3) Ensure that, from 15 November 2012, all States and airspace users accept and disseminate 'NEW' flight plan and associated ATS message formats only and capabilities for 'PRESENT' flight plan provisions are discontinued.

*(**Note:** In the context of the implementation, 'PRESENT' refers to the existing flight planning and ATS message formats as defined in the current version of the PANS-ATM and 'NEW' refers to the amended provisions as contained in Amendment 1 to the PANS-ATM.)*

The Asia/Pacific transition to the PANS-ATM Amendment 1 provisions shall:

1) Comply with the regional guidance provided by APANPIRG's Asia/Pacific Flight Plan and ATS Messages Task Force (FPL&AM/TF);

2) Preserve global consistency in implementation by basing implementation activities, to the extent possible, on Guidelines 1 to 6 described in the ICAO guidance material in State Letter AN 13/2.1-09/9, dated 6 February 2009;

3) Ensure that the FPL&AM/TF undertakes coordination to facilitate harmonization with implementations in neighbouring regions;

4) Minimize State specific constraints and, if constraints are identified as necessary, implement such constraints on a regional or sub regional basis in preference to an individual State basis;

5) Declare a transition period from 1 January 2012 until 15 November 2012,comprising;

   - 1 January to 31 March 2012 - ANSPs software delivery and internal testing,
   - 1 April to 30 June 2012 – ANSPs external testing and implementation, and
   - 1 July to 15 November 2012 – airspace users testing and implementation.

6) Not implement 'NEW' capability by States before the commencement of the ANSPs external testing and implementation period (i.e. no ANSP 'NEW' before 1 April 2012) and, insofar as possible, complete ANSP implementation of 'NEW' capability by the end of the ANSPs external testing and implementation period (i.e. complete ANSP 'NEW' before 30 June 2012);

7) Recognizing the risk to automated systems of having all users simultaneously commencing 'NEW' on the common implementation date (15 November 2012), encourage users to take full advantage of the airspace users testing and implementation period to ensure operational readiness of flight planning systems;

8) Encourage ANSPs and airspace users to coordinate appropriate implementation methodologies in order to ensure a staggered migration of airspace users to 'NEW' during the airspace users testing and implementation period (i.e. 1 July – 15 November 2012);

9) Encourage States and users to immediately commence preparations to implement Amendment 1 provisions in accordance with the declared transition period and report progress to the FPL&AM/TF periodic meetings;

10) Require States to inform the Regional Office of scheduled transition date by 1 July 2010 in accordance with APANPIRG Conclusion 20/8, for relay to the FPL&AM/TF;

11) To mitigate Date Of Flight (DOF) complexities, adopt a regional approach that does not require processing of flight plans more than 24 hours prior to Estimated Off Blocks Time (EOBT) during the declared transition period;

12) Require that States retain capability to simultaneously support 'PRESENT' and 'NEW' provisions (flight plan and ATS message format) from the activation of their 'NEW' capabilities until the end of the transition period (i.e. until 15 November 2012), at which point 'PRESENT' capability shall be discontinued;

(last amended FPL&AM/TF/2, November 2009, adopted by APANPIRG/20, September 2010)

FPL&AM TF - TASK LIST

(last amended FPL&AM/TF/5, November 2011)

ID	Task Name	Start Date	Finish Date	Completion Date	Resource Names/Remarks
1.0	**PANS-ATM**				
1.1	Review of Amendment 1 to PANS-ATM	17 Mar 09	17 Mar 09	**20 Mar 09**	
1.2	Clarification request to ICAO headquarters			20 NOV 09	
1.3	IATA to study the eligibility in the equipment listing of Item 10 – only file parameters that relate to flight to destination and alternate destination			2 JUN 11	IATA
1.4	Study the sequencing in the Item 10			2 JUN 11	FITS Issue A5
1.5	IATA to study whether the 16 character limitation in PBN/ in Item 18 is sufficient			2 JUN 11	FITS Issue A2
1.6	Study on the suitability of deriving regional character limitations in other fields and sub-fields			9 NOV 11	EUR Regional designators discussed (IP/9 and Regional Guidance V4 para 5.11
1.7	State survey of local peculiarities including the DOF use			2 JUN 11	
1.8	RPL management – include equipment field			2 JUN 11	FITS Issue A8
2.0	**Regional Transition Strategies**				
2.1	Review of the "guidance for implementation of flight plan information to support Amendment 1"	17 Mar 09	NOV 11	9 NOV 11	
2.2	Preparation of coordinated Asia/Pacific transition strategies and plans	17 Mar 09	MAY 12		FITS to be updated to allow transition details for each State
2.3	Adoption of the Strategy by APANPIRG	11 Sep 09	11 Sep 09	2 JUN 11	
2.4	IATA to inform TF/2 about details of transition arrangements			20 NOV 09	
2.5	Regional Office to relay details of IATA transition arrangements			20 NOV 09	
3.0	**AIDC**				
3.1	Identification of impact on AIDC operations			2 JUN 11	
3.2	Update of AIDC ICD			2 JUN 11	IMG progressing these changes

ID	Task Name	Start Date	Finish Date	Completion Date	Resource Names/Remarks
4.0	**Contingency Planning**				
4.1	Preparation of contingency strategies	Q1 2012	MAY 2012		
5.0	**Website**				
5.1	Update information on State capability PRESENT/NEW status in the ICAO website	1 Jul 11	Ongoing		Quarterly Review questionnaire will be expected to update FITS website
6.0	**AIS**				
6.1	Publication of AIC			2 JUN 11	WP07 discussed TF4, State responsibility
6.2	Amendment of AIP, if necessary			2 JUN 11	State responsibility
6.3	Trigger NOTAM			2 JUN 11	State responsibility
7.0	**Studies of Operational Impact**				
7.1	Study on implications for presentation formats including the electronic flight progress strip.			20 MAY 11	State Letter T3/10.1.20-AP039/11 (ATM) surveyed States on impact on affected systems
7.2	Study on impacts to users (flight planning systems, etc)			20 MAY 11	State Letter T3/10.1.20-AP039/11 (ATM) surveyed States on impact on affected systems
7.3	Issues regarding ETD and EOBT		09 NOV 11		Investigation of effects by IATA
8.0	**Regional Supplementary Procedures**				
8.1	Amendment of SUPPS			2 JUN 11	WP02 TF4
9.0	**Performance Framework Form (PFF)**				
9.1	Review and update of the PFF	17 Mar 09	Ongoing	09 NOV 11	Not a specific task for the TF, this is part of a paper presented to APANPIRG
10.0	**Perform System Verifications**				
10.2	Conduct of the flight plan trial, support from IATA		Ongoing		Phase 3 Implementation Plan. Further discussion to develop generic test plan.
10.3	Identify problems and solutions		Ongoing		Possible agenda item for May 2012 meeting
10.4	Follow-up actions		Ongoing		
11.0	**Rulemaking (if necessary)**				
11.1	Review of State regulatory documentation			2 JUN 11	TF4 Seminar reminder
11.2	Review of letters of agreement			2 JUN 11	TF4 Seminar reminder
12.0	**Training/Education**				
12.1	Regional Seminar			2 JUN 11	TF4 Seminar
12.2	Promulgate information to controllers and AIS			2 JUN 11	TF4 Seminar

ID	Task Name	Start Date	Finish Date	Completion Date	Resource Names/Remarks
12.3	Training for dispatchers/pilots/controllers			2 JUN 11	TF4 Seminar
12.4	FPL 2012 Training Template		31 DEC 11	09 NOV 11	Australia, review by NZ, US, Japan, China
13.0	**Implementation**				
13.1	Adaptation of automation and software to NEW		Ongoing		Reviewing progress on FITS
13.2	Post-adaptation verification		Ongoing		
13.3	Ensure no local peculiarities or deviations in the Regions		Ongoing	09 NOV 11	
13.4	State to notify ICAO of the implementation of NEW		Ongoing		
13.5	Keeping PRESENT until 15 November 2012		15 NOV 12		
14.0	**Post-implementation**				
14.1	Ceasing PRESENT		16 Nov 12		
14.2	Review of the post-implementation status			2 JUN 11	Planned by ICAO HQ, not a TF function
15.0	**Coordination**				
15.1	Election of the Chairperson			2 JUN 11	TF3
15.2	Coordinate with ATN ICG			2 JUN 11	
15.3	Liaison by ANSPs with defence authorities			2 JUN 11	State responsibility
15.4	Report to ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/19			2 JUN 11	
15.5	Report to CNS/MET/SG/13			2 JUN 11	
15.6	Report to APANPIRG/20			2 JUN 11	
15.7	Task Force/1	17 Mar 09	20 Mar 09	20 MAR 09	
15.8	Seminar and Task Force/2	10 Nov 09		20 NOV 09	
15.9	Task Force/3			24 AUG 10	
15.10	Task Force/4			2 JUN 11	
15.11	Task Force/5			9 NOV 11	
15.12	APAC Flight Plan Ad hoc Working Group		Ongoing		Interpretation Coordination Group
15.13	Strategic Support Team assistance		Ongoing		Team structure and process proposed
15.14	Clarification of terms/application of Amendment 1		31 DEC 11	9 NOV 11	ICAO HQ, contact group

ICAO New FPL Format Seminar

(*Manila, Philippines, 7 November 2011*)

SEMINAR PROGRAMME

Monday, 7 November 2011		
TIME	**SUBJECT**	**PRESENTER**
09:00-09:30	**Registration**	
09:30-10:00	**Opening of the Seminar /Workshop**	Mr. Len Wicks, ICAO APAC
10:00-10:30	*Break*	
SESSION 1	**Update of Implementation Issues**	
10:30-11:00	Global update, inter-regional issues	Mr. Tom Brady, ICAO HQ
11:00-11:20	Vendor Presentation I	Thales
11:20-11:40	Vendor Presentation II	Comsoft
11:40-12:00	Vendor Presentation III	Frequentis
12:00-13:00	*Lunch*	
SESSION 2	**Transition**	
13:00-14:00	Discussion on Amendment 1 interpretations	Mr. Tom Brady, ICAO HQ
14:00-14:30	Testing methods, manual flight plan integration	Mr. Tom Brady, ICAO HQ
14:30-15:00	*Break*	
SESSION 3	**Training**	
15:00-16:00	Training issues and guidelines, templates	Mr. Warren Beeston, ASA
16:00-16:30	Promulgation: AIP, SUP, manuals, Internet, etc	Mr. Warren Beeston, ASA

....