



ICAO

International Civil Aviation Organization
North American, Central American and Caribbean Office

WORKING PAPER

FPL/AD/MON — WP/07
18/02/15

FPL Ad hoc Group Missing/duplicated/erroneous Filed flight plan /Flight plan (FPL) evaluation meeting (FPL/AD/MON)

Mexico City, Mexico, 24-26 February 2015

Agenda Item 3: Review of the measures adopted during December – January 2014 period for mitigation of errors (recommended actions)

REPORT OF THE PIARCO FIR AD HOC GROUP

(Presented by Ad Hoc Group Rapporteur – PIARCO FIR)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
This paper reports on the activities within the Piarco FIR as they relate to errors and problems associated with Flight Plan data collection, processing and distribution.	
Action:	Suggested actions are presented in Section 4.
<i>Strategic Objectives:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Safety• Air Navigation Capacity and Efficiency• Environmental Protection
<i>References:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The collection of FPL data from 21st July to 28th August 2014• Minutes of 1st FPL Monitoring Group Teleconference - 09 July, 2014• Minutes of 2nd FPL Monitoring Group Teleconference 29 July, 2014• Minutes of 3rd FPL Monitoring Group Teleconference 05 September 2014• Minutes of 4th FPL Monitoring Group Teleconference 20 October, 2014• Minutes of 5th FPL Monitoring Group Teleconference 05 November, 2014• ICAO recommended actions to mitigate FPL errors

1. Introduction

1.1 The Piarco FIR Ad Hoc group consisted of Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, Grenada, Guadeloupe, Martinique, Montserrat, Nevis, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Trinidad and Tobago.

1.2 Based on the action plan the following tasks were accomplished:

- A template was distributed within the Piarco FIR.
- Data was collected and submitted to the Rapporteur FPL Monitoring Group for analysis.
- The results were received and distributed to the States within the Piarco FIR.
- Recommendations were made for immediate implementation.
- Feedback was received from each individual State within the FIR.

2. Discussion

2.1 There were delays in the data collection as not all States had put the necessary mechanisms in place for the project. With some effort, the data was eventually collected; however, some States were not able to fulfil the required mandate of collecting data for the specified period. The delays were due to states not adhering to the date specified for the commencement of the data collect. Because of this, they had missed the days that would have passed and only submitted data from when they actually started.

2.2 States did not meet the submission deadline for the delivery of data to the Rapporteur.

2.3 Based on analysis of the data collected, the following observations were made:

- There were several reports of missing and duplicated flight plans. Some States routinely duplicated the FPLs without checking to see if the receiving State actually had the FPL. Some States reported missing FPLs without properly checking for the required FPL. The Piarco AIM office is in the process of implementing a Centralized Fight Planning Unit with the objective of significantly reducing missing and duplicated FPL errors. The system is being tested and should be fully functional by the end of the first quarter 2015.
- There were errors related to the proper completion of FPL data with respect to field 10 (a) and (b) and the corresponding field 18. Some of these errors were a result of the following:
 - Inadequate training of the AIS/AIM personnel. It is the intention of Piarco to perform a Knowledge Verification Test (KVT) with the operations staff and recommend refresher training where necessary
 - Little or no training of some of the aircraft/airline handling agencies who produce and/or promulgate FPLs.
 - Inadequate training or lack of proper knowledge of equipment on-board the aircraft by pilots.
- There is the possibility of having the IDS Spatia software used within the FIR updated to perform more stringent checking for such errors.
- Incorrect ATS route errors. This is again because of inadequate training. Again, a KVT test would be performed and the inadequacies would be addressed.
- Direct contact with originators of FPLs would be very useful in reducing several errors.

2.4 ICAO distributed a list of suggested actions to be taken immediately. Unfortunately, this list was not received by the end users in a timely manner.

- Items immediately implemented
 - Avoiding the use of RPLs. This feature was disabled on the IDS Spatia system
 - Some states were able to identify personnel for monitoring FPLs.
- Items that are not possible to be implement immediately :
 - Personnel for monitoring FPLs for some states due lack of available staff. Training.
 - AIS/AIM personnel training would have to be scheduled and the resources be allocated.
 - AIS operators to address FPL issues directly with the originators. Contact information would be made available as agreed.

3. **Proposed Initiatives.**

3.1 The following initiatives are being proposed:

- The E/CAR States should ensure their systems and resources are available and ready for the next data collection exercise.
- A more detailed list of error categories reflected on the template can be discussed to identify errors that are classified as “others”
- Proper training of operators where possible. Training of E/CAR AIS/AIM staff can be arranged within the specified units. The meeting is invited to suggest training for the other operators outside of the AIS/AIM offices who promulgate FPLs directly.

4. **Suggested Action**

4.1 The meeting is invited to take note of:

- a) the contents of this working paper;
- b) take any other action as deemed necessary