



International Civil Aviation Organization

The Fifth Meeting of the Asia/Pacific ICAO Flight Plan and ATS Messages Implementation Task Force (FPL&AM/TF/5)

Manila, Philippines, 8 – 9 November 2011

Agenda Item 2: Review outcomes of related meetings

REVIEW REPORT APANPIRG/22

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY

This paper presents an overview of the outcomes of the 22nd meeting of APANPIRG that related to the FPL & AM TF.

This paper relates to –

Strategic Objectives:

A: Safety – Enhance global civil aviation safety

C: Environmental Protection and Sustainable Development of Air Transport – Foster harmonized and economically viable development of international civil aviation that does not unduly harm the environment

Global Plan Initiatives:

GPI-12 Functional integration of ground systems with airborne systems

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The 22nd meeting of the Asia/Pacific Air Navigation Planning and Implementation Regional Group (APANPIRG/22) was held at Bangkok from 5 to 9 September 2011. A full copy of the APANPIRG/21 meeting report is available on the website of Asia and Pacific Office at <http://www.bangkok.icao.int/> under the ‘Meetings’ menu.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 Excerpts from the APANPIRG/22 report highlighting key discussions relating to the FPL&AM/TF are as follows.

ICAO Flight Plan & ATS Messages Implementation Task Forces and Seminar (FPL & AM/TF/3, FPL & AM/TF/4 and Seminar)

3.2.1 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.

3.2.2 APANPIRG Conclusion 21/13 emphasised the need for urgent and appropriate coordination with neighbouring States and FIRs. Most States that responded to the State Letter indicated compliance with the transition dates. Almost all airlines surveyed confirmed their readiness.

3.2.3 Many States had not completed the safety assessment for the change and had also not developed their system requirements. States needed to assess the safety risks of the transition as part of their Safety Case under Annex 11. Some administrations were yet to engage vendors, or commence in-house software development. Singapore advised that some vendors were ready with converter solutions, although vendors varied as to their preparedness. It was noted that sharing of information was required between ANSPs regarding vendors and their testing programmes.

3.2.4 The Task Force considered that a transitional switchover to NEW format plan was preferable to a simultaneous ‘big bang’, implementation. Also of concern were converters, which may affect forwarded downstream data, and may not support the advanced PBN features.

3.2.5 A review of the flight plan related material in the Regional Supplementary Procedures (SUPPs, Doc 7030) compared to Amendment 1 of PANS-ATM (Doc 4444) was completed. Australia agreed to develop a FPL 2012 Training Template for Amendment 1 training. An inter-regional contact group headed by ICAOHQ would discuss areas of inconsistency of interpretation in the application of the changes and clarify these for FPL & AM TF/5.

3.2.6 Almost all APAC States had now submitted information for the Flight Plan Implementation Tracking System (FITS) website. There were 12 administrations that had not completed the 1 July FPL 2012 questionnaire responses, which were used to track implementation progress and update the FITS website (refer **Appendix A** to the Report on Agenda Item 3.2).

3.2.7 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.

3.2.8 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.

3.2.9 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.

3.2.10 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.

3.2.11 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.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to

- a) note the information contained in this paper; and
- b) discuss any relevant matters as appropriate.

.....