



*International Civil Aviation Organization*

**ICAO New Flight Plan Format Study Group  
(INFPL STG)**

**Fifth Meeting  
(Cairo, Egypt, 03 - 05 September 2012)**

---

**Agenda Item 3:           Status of Implementation of INFPL in the MID Region**

**STATUS OF INFPL IMPLEMENTATION IN MID REGION AND  
STRATEGIC SUPPORT TEAM**

*(Presented by the Secretariat)*

**SUMMARY**

This paper provides the status of INFPL implementation in the MID Region, actions for the Strategic Support team and MID States contingency measures for the Implementation of ICAO New Flight Plan Format and Supporting ATS Messages.

Action by the meeting is at paragraph 3.

**REFERENCES**

- MIDANPIRG/13 Report

**1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1           The MIDANPIRG/13 meeting was held in Abu Dhabi, from 22 to 26 April 2012. The meeting was attended by a total of one hundred and two (102) participants, which included experts from ten (10) States (Bahrain, Egypt, Iran, Jordan, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, UAE and Yemen) and six (6) International Organizations/Agencies (ACAC, CANSO, IATA, IFALPA, Jeppesen and MIDRMA).

**2. DISCUSSION**

2.1           MIDANPIRG/13 meeting was apprised of the outcome of the joint ACAC/ICAO INFPL implementation workshop/seminar and agreed that MID States conduct internal awareness campaigns, share their experience, perform test according to the developed test schedule for the Region, also MID States that are unable to meet the target date of implementation to request support from other MID States to perform conversion from new to present in order that New FPL are not rejected by the automated systems. Furthermore, the meeting noted that even manual flight plan system requires an upgrade which may involve changes to the procedures, training and documents.

2.2           MIDANPIRG/13 meeting agreed that the conduct of internal awareness campaign on INFPL is important to all stake holders involved in the handling of flight plans. Furthermore the meeting agreed that these campaigns are good opportunity to address any FPL issue within the State. Therefore, the awareness package will differ from States to State. However, the material presented during the different INFPL SG meetings and seminar/workshop can be utilized for the awareness campaigns. Accordingly, the meeting agreed to the following Conclusion:

**CONCLUSION 13/36: ICAO NEW FLIGHT PLAN FORMAT AWARENESS CAMPAIGNS**

*a) That, States be urged to conduct internal awareness campaigns on INFPL and invite all stakeholders within their States*

2.3 The meeting may wish to recall, States concern on some erroneous flight plan filing on the current flight plan system, in this regard Bahrain indicated that 5% of the errors are emanating from operators filing wrongly some of the fields; also the other concern was that some flight plans were missing which require analysis. The meeting agreed that each State to conduct analysis and record the errors and discuss the issues during the awareness campaigns.

2.4 MIDANPIRG/13 meeting reviewed and updated the status of INFPL implementation as at **Appendix A** to this working paper. Furthermore, MIDANPIRG/13 was of the view that the risk of large scale cutover can be mitigated by performing proper testing in due time; in this respected it was highlighted that the regional transition strategy for implementation of INFPL defined three testing phases to ensure seamless transition. MIDANPIRG/13 agreed that neighboring States should not perform testing on the same day. Accordingly, MIDANPIRG/13 agreed to the following Conclusion:

**CONCLUSION 13/37: ICAO New FPL Format TESTING SCHEDULE**

*That, States be urged to follow the testing schedule as at **Appendix 4.5L** (**Appendix B** to this working paper) to the Report on Agenda Item 4.5.*

2.5 The meeting may wish to note that UAE offered to perform tests for all MID States requiring to conduct INFPL system tests, where a 48 hours prior notice is required by UAE to arrange for the necessary resources. Accordingly, MIDANPIRG/13 urged MID State to conduct INFPL testing with UAE. It was noted that Jordan and Lebanon had performed the necessary tests with UAE.

2.6 As a follow-up to MIDANPIRG/13 Conclusion 13/36 and 13/37 ICAO MID Regional Office issued State letter Ref.: AN 6/2B – 12/194 dated 1 July 2012 urging States to conduct internal INFPL awareness campaigns and invite all stakeholders involved in the handling of flight plans.

2.7 The meeting may wish to note that EUROCONTROL testing participation is open to all, EUR and non-EUR States. Details on EUR test plan and other documents concerning ICAO New Flight Plan in EUR are available at [http://www.cfm.eurocontrol.int/cfmu/public/subsite\\_homepage](http://www.cfm.eurocontrol.int/cfmu/public/subsite_homepage). EUROCONTROL will support mainly EUR States that require the conversion from New to Present until the end December 2013. Furthermore, EUROCONTROL developed new e-learning module ICAO 2012 Flight Planning Modifications available freely on the same website.

2.8 MIDANPIRG/13 meeting was apprised of the different INFPL activities and noted that Strategic Support Team(s) composed of regional expert members may be established as necessary to assist MID States with the implementation of INFPL and noted that Bahrain, Jordan, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia and UAE agreed to be members of SST. Accordingly, MIDANPIRG/13 agreed to the following Conclusion:

**CONCLUSION 13/38: INFPL STRATEGIC SUPPORT TEAM (SST)**

*That, in order to support INFPL implementation in the MID region, those States requiring support request the ICAO MID Regional Office to coordinate with the SST members the provision of the required support.*

2.9 The meeting may wish to note that a Special Implementation Project (SIP) has been approved by ICAO to support Libya, Syria and Yemen for the implementation of ICAO New flight plan. Accordingly, ICAO MID Regional Office coordinated special support meeting which was hosted by Jordan 19-21 March 2012. However, Libya was unable to attend. The special support meeting developed four parallel tracks solutions that will allow the two States to be on track, if followed properly.

2.10 The meeting may wish to recall that MIDANPIRG/12 did not support the development of regional contingency plan for INFPL implementation. However, MIDANPIRG/12 had decided that MID States should develop contingency measures. The contingency arrangement that could be applied for INFPL are highlighted in **Appendix C** to this working paper for reference.

2.11 The meeting may wish to note that States that are unable to accept the New FPL Format could request support from other States, to convert FPL and other ATS messages on behalf of the requesting State as contingency measure. This situation was not envisaged when Amendment 1 was proposed and the initial guidance material issued, although this circumstance is not ideal but possible.

2.12 MIDANPIRG/13 meeting agreed that appropriate testing between two States shall be conducted to ensure the conversion meets the operational needs of the requesting States, after which letter of agreement should be signed covering overall responsibilities. In this regard MIDANPIRG/13 meeting appreciated the offer from Bahrain and Saudi Arabia to provide support to States that need assistance in the conversion.

### **3. ACTION BY THE MEETING**

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) provide update to **Appendices A and B**; and
- b) encourage States to perform testing with UAE as soon as possible;
- c) provide update on the conduct of awareness campaigns;
- d) encourage States to request SST if necessary; and
- e) provide information on contingency measures in each State.

-----

APPENDIX A

STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF INFPL IN THE MID REGION

	Focal Point	Manf. Cont/Budget	Internal Testing	ANSP to ANSP Testing	Milestone	Date of Acceptance of both present and new format	Date of Submission of Implem. Plan	Contingency 1/2/3	User Testing	Vendors involved	Remarks
<b>Bahrain</b>	√	√/√	1 April 2012	1 March – 15 May	4	1 July 2012	1 Mar 2010	3	20-25 April - 2012	Avitech Thales	
<b>Egypt</b>	√	√/√	30 May 2012	10 – 30 June	3	1 July 2012	28 Feb 2012		August September	Comsoft Thales	Only converter will be installed
<b>Iran</b>	√	√/√			3					Avitech Thales	Letter sent to Thales Local converter
<b>Iraq</b>	√	√/√	15 April	20 June and October	2	September			August	Uptec Canadian	Contract
<b>Jordan</b>	√	√/√	1 January	June and October	4	1 June 2012		1, 2	June	Avitech	Converter will be used for the backup ATM system
<b>Kuwait</b>	√	√/√	15 April 2012	1 June 2012	3	August	28 Feb 2012		1 August 2012	Indra Comsoft	
<b>Lebanon</b>	√	√/√		June	3					Raytheon Thales Sofrevia	
<b>Libya</b>	√				3					INDRA	
<b>Oman</b>	√	√/√	25 May 2012	25 July 2012	4	1 September			15 July 2012	Comsoft Raytheon	
<b>Qatar</b>	√	√/√	31 March	23 Feb then April and June	5	1 July 2012	21 Mar 2010	1	15 April	Comsoft Selex	
<b>Saudi Arabia</b>	√	√/√	June	June July	4	1 August 2012		3	July	Thales Comsoft	Contract with Comsoft
<b>Sudan</b>	√	√/√			3					Thales Contract in process	Will use converter from other State

	<b>Focal Point</b>	<b>Manf. Cont/ Budget</b>	<b>Internal Testing</b>	<b>ANSP to ANSP Testing</b>	<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Date of Acceptance of both present and new format</b>	<b>Date of Submission of Implem. Plan</b>	<b>Contingency 1/2/3</b>	<b>User Testing</b>	<b>Vendors involved</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
<b>Syria</b>	√		√/√		3					Selex vitrociset	Contact initiated Contract was done via TCB 30424 (2004)
<b>UAE</b>	√	√/√	30 September 2010	23 Feb then March, April and July	6	1 July	28 Feb 2012	1	20 Feb and 02 – 29 March	Thales Comsoft	ACC Abu Dhabi waiting proposal
<b>Yemen</b>	√	√/√		September	3	26 September			October	ECIL ALES	

**Mile Stone:**

- 1- Empty
- 2- Analysis of the draft amendment
- 3- Evaluation of current system
- 4- Introduction of capability to pass new information
- 5- Check of AIDC / OLDI compatibility
- 6- Coordination with neighboring ANSP and airspace users
- 7- Implementation of new system

**Contingency**

- 1- No contingency all systems will be upgraded
- 2- Converter will be used
- 3- Ready to support neighbouring states for conversion

-----

## APPENDIX B

## MID REGION TESTING SCHEDULE

State	Software/ Hardware Delivery Before 31 March 2012	Internal Testing Before 31 March 2012	External Testing 1 April to 30 June 2012		Airspace Users Testing 1 July to 14 November 2012		Inter-Regional Testing		Type of Solution Converter or Upgrade	Date of Acceptanc of both Present and New Format	Remarks
			State	Date	User	Date	State	Date			
<b>Bahrain</b>	Done	1 April 2012	UAE Qatar Kuwait Iran Saudi Arabia	15 Apr 16 Apr 3 Jun  15 May	GF Bahrain Air	20 Apr 25 Apr	Singapore	1 June	both	1 July	
<b>Egypt</b>	1 - May	30 May	Saudi Arabia Sudan  Jordan  Libya	10 June  30 June  17 June  25 June	Egypt Air Sama Airlines Air Cairo Express	15 Aug  15 Sep  20 Sep	Athens  Israel  Cyprus	Sep  Sep  Sep	Converter	1 July	Only converter will be installed
<b>Iran</b>											
<b>Iraq</b>	1 April	15 April	Kuwait Jordan	20 June October	Iraqi airways	August			Upgrade	Sep	
<b>Jordan</b>	1 May	1 January	UAE Egypt Saudi Syria Iraq	March 17 June 20 June  October	RJA, SITA, Royal Falcon, Jordan	July July July  July	Eurocontrol Israel Cyprus	20 Feb July July	Both	July	Converter will be used for the backup ATM system

State	Software/ Hardware Delivery Before 31 March 2012	Internal Testing Before 31 March 2012	External Testing 1 April to 30 June 2012		Airspace Users Testing 1 July to 14 November 2012		Inter-Regional Testing		Type of Solution Converter or Upgrade	Date of Acceptanc of both Present and New Format	Remarks
			State	Date	User	Date	State	Date			
					Aviation						
<b>Kuwait</b>	31 March	15 April	Bahrain Iraq Qatar	Jun October 17 June	KUA Aljazeera	August August	Pakistan	Aug	Both		
<b>Lebanon</b>											
<b>Libya</b>											
<b>Oman</b>	19 - May	25 - May	UAE Bahrain Yemen Iran	25 July July Sept Sept	Oman Air	15 July	Mumbai Karachi	August August	Upgrade	Sep 2012	
<b>Qatar</b>	31 March	31 March	UAE Bahrain Kuwait	23 Feb 16 April 17 June	Qatar Airways Amiri	15 April 20 April			Both	1 July	
<b>Saudi Arabia</b>	31 March 2012	June	Jordan Egypt Bahrain  Yemen	20 Jun 27 Jun 25 Jun	SVA, Nas Aramco, Arabasc Jet Aviation Rabeg wings	July July July July  July Sep	Addis Abba	July		1 August	

State	Software/ Hardware Delivery Before 31 March 2012	Internal Testing Before 31 March 2012	External Testing 1 April to 30 June 2012		Airspace Users Testing 1 July to 14 November 2012		Inter-Regional Testing		Type of Solution Converter or Upgrade	Date of Acceptanc of both Present and New Format	Remarks
			State	Date	User	Date	State	Date			
			Sudan								
<b>Sudan</b>	May 2012										
<b>Syria</b>											
<b>UAE</b>	30 Septembe r 2010	30 September 2010	Qatar Bahrain Iran Oman Jordan	23 Feb 15 April  25 July March	Etihad Emirates	Feb Mar	Eurocontrol  Pakistan	20-24 Feb 12  22 Feb 12	Upgrade + Converter	01 July	
<b>Yemen</b>			Saudi Arabia Oman	Sept  Sept	AlYeme nia Alsaeeda	Oct					

-----

## APPENDIX C

FPL 2012 Contingency considerations

### **Contingency arrangements**

#### **1 General issues**

##### *1.1 Contingency always has a cost*

- (1) Staff resources
- (2) Additional finance
- (3) Delays to traffic

##### *1.2 Safety*

1.2.1 No increase in safety risks as generally throughput of traffic and therefore ATC workload is reduced.

1.2.2 All contingency arrangements must however be subject to the usual safety assessments as demanded by the Safety regulator

*1.3 It is unlikely that Airspace Users will be given the opportunity to utilise the PBN capabilities of the aircraft.*

#### **2 ANSP**

*2.1 A **Convertor system** will allow ANSPs to accept the NEW ICAO flightplan without rejection.*

2.1.1 Cost of convertor is a fraction of the cost of upgrading or replacing a Flight Data Processing system.

2.1.2 Convertors are automated such that there will be no perceived delay to traffic movements.

2.1.3 The disadvantage is that the enhanced information available in the NEW flight plan will not be readily available to the Air Traffic Controller.

2.1.4 Aircraft are unlikely to be offered the use of PBN routes more suited to the aircraft capabilities.

2.1.5 The ANSP is unlikely to be able to pass on the flightplan to the next ANSP in the NEW format.

2.1.6 Some Vendors are considering the leasing Converter systems as often these converters will be used as a short-term measure until the main Flight Data processing system is replaced.

## ***2.2 Manual intervention***

2.2.1 ANSPs will need to make available additional staff to receive the NEW flightplan without rejection and manually extract and produce the equivalent of a PRESENT flightplan which is acceptable to their current Flight Data Processing system.

2.2.2 Additional staff will be required to be rostered on duty to accept the NEW flight plan until such time as contingency is no longer required.

2.2.3 It is likely that additional staff will need to be trained to handle the increased flight plan intervention. These additional staff could be found from additional recruitment, ab-initio controllers or ATC students

## ***2.3 Neighbouring State conversion***

2.3.1 Some of the larger and more advanced States are likely to offer a downstream conversion of the NEW flightplan to the PRESENT flightplan to allow neighbouring States to continue to work in the present format.

2.3.2 The conversion capability is likely to be automated

2.3.3 Manual conversion to the PRESENT flightplan for downstream transmission will require additional staff for the ANSP providing this service

- END -