International Civil Aviation Organization

AIDC Review Task Force Meeting

Brisbane, Australia, 27-28 March 2003

Agenda Item 3:   **Develop an updated version of the Asia/Pacific ICD for AIDC**

Coordination of amended destinations

SUMMARY

There is currently no method for coordinating an amended destination via AIDC. Discussion is sought on this deficiency.

(Presented by Australia)

1.   Background

1.1   There is no provision in the Asia Pacific AIDC ICD for the notification or coordination of an amended destination via AIDC messaging.

1.2   The notification messages (ABI), certain coordination messages (PAC and CPL) and the negotiation message (CDN) allow the transmission of amended data (Field 22). Whilst amended data allowable includes route information, Field 16 information (Destination) is not a permitted field in Field 22 of any AIDC messages.

2.   Discussion

2.1   In the event of a change of destination for flights that have not yet departed, the FPL may be cancelled, and a new flight plan issued. Alternatively a CHG message could be transmitted.

2.2   This process should not occur for an airborne flight – there is a fundamental problem with an AOC transmitting a CHG message that amends an aircraft's route and/or destination after the aircraft has been cleared via "flight planned route".

2.3   If an aircraft requests a re-route to a new destination, the ABI can contain the amended route, but not the amended destination. Similarly for re-routes after coordination has occurred, the CDN can be used to coordinate the new route, but not the new destination.

2.4   In theory, these changes <u>should</u> be able to be coordinated between ATSUs via ground to ground coordination links. However, no provision currently exists for this to occur in the Asia Pacific AIDC ICD.

2.5   No actual amendment proposal is made within this paper. Rather, discussion is sought as to a possible solution to this problem.

2.6   The following paragraphs describe possible options as well as problems that may be associated with these options...

- Field 16 of the mandatory section of the AIDC message *could* simply be replaced with the <u>new</u> destination. This would, however, cause problems with ATS Units that use uniqueness checks (identification, departure point, destination) to match an AIDC message with a flight plans. In this case, any AIDC message that simply replaced the original destination with an amended destination would be rejected, as there would be no matching flight plan.

- Field 22 of the message *could* be amended to include Field 16 as an allowable field. If this was done, consider the following:

  - Would only the <u>first</u> AIDC message need to indicate that the destination has been amended? (ie would subsequent AIDC messages contain the amended destination or the original destination in the mandatory section of the message). If only the initial message contained the new destination in the amendment field, what happens when ATSU2 coordinates with ATSU3?

    It is possible that their first AIDC message to ATSU3 would show Field 16 of the mandatory data as the amended destination, which would not match the destination held by ATSU3's flight data processor.

  - Alternatively, should the mandatory field of the AIDC message *always* contain the originally flight planned destination with the amended destination in Field 22? If so, consider the following:

    - What destination is included in Field 16 of the coordination message (eg EST or CPL)? Should it contain the original or amended destination?
    - What destination should be sent if a CHG message had been previously received amending the destination?

  - If Field 22 was amended to permit Field 16, what messages should this apply to? Possible options include the notification message (ABI), coordination messages (PAC), or negotiation messages (CDN).

    Note that there may be other scenarios to consider as well.

2.7   It should be noted that the North Atlantic Common Coordination ICD does contain provision for amending the destination when transmitting a CDN message.

3.   Recommendation

3.1   Task force members are requested to:

- Note that it is not currently possible to coordinate an amended destination via AIDC; and
- Discuss this issue in an attempt to identify a possible solution to this deficiency, with a view to creating appropriate amendments for the AIDC ICD.

* * *