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

WORKING PAPER

GTE/18 — WP/11
13/09/18

CAR/SAM Planning and Implementation Regional Group (GREPECAS) Eighteenth Scrutiny Working Group Meeting (GTE/18)

Mexico City, Mexico, 22 – 26 October 2018

Agenda Item 3: Large Height Deviation (LHD) analysis

TRENDS IDENTIFICATION

(Presented by CARSAMMA)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Working Paper present a summary of the trends of Large Height Deviations (LHD) received by CARSAMMA, when the aircraft is still in climb or descent, when the aircraft calls at a different point from the coordinated, when the Accepting unit does not check the level, the transfer point or time correctly and the Transferring unit does not perceive the error; lack of re-coordination due to aircraft entering the FIR ahead of the coordinated estimate and also on transfer failures caused by technical issues of the equipment.

Action:	The suggested actions are in Section 3.
Strategic Objectives:	• Safety
References:	• GTE Methodology • 2017 and 2018 (first semester) Large Height Deviations (LHD) reports

1. Introduction

1.1 The CAR/SAM Planning and Implementation Regional Group (GREPECAS) delegated to the CAR/SAM Monitoring Agency (CARSAMMA) the function of receiving, analysing and codifying the LHDs, and present them to the GTE Meeting and in the teleconferences for its validation, since information for the risk calculations, qualitative (Safety Management System Methodology (SGSO)/Safety Management System (SMS)) and quantitative (CRM) methodologies will be taken from them.

1.2 The objective of this work is to give more information to the experts so that the 2017 and 2018 (first semester – until June 2018) LHD reports CARSAMMA received are observed and analysed, one more time, so similar failures do not repeat, mainly in the specified points, and that the experts of the involved FIRs take the relevant mitigating actions.

2. Analysis

2.1 Some 2017 LHD reports, first and second semester (underlined) and of the 2018 first semester (**bold**), had as coordination failure the final parameter, the aircraft crossed the TCP an intermediate level to the coordinated one, so that the traffic was still climbing or descending when it called.

2.2 Table 1 (available only in Spanish) shows all the LHD reports that are framed in this type of situation, the traffic is coordinated in a level and calls during climb or descent.

Reportes 2017	**FIR que reporta**	**FIR que comete la falla**	**Posición**
36	**Bogotá**	**Guayaquil**	**BOKAN**
40	San Juan	Maiquetía	MILOK
122	Comodoro Rivadavia	Mount Pleasant	**DIGIS**
207	Comodoro Rivadavia	Mount Pleasant	**DIGIS**
230	Kingston	Barranquilla	EDROD
268	**Lima**	**Guayaquil**	VAKUD
282	Recife	Brasilia	UGULO
316	Córdoba	La Paz	PUBUM
321	**Lima**	La Paz	ELAKO
322	Santiago	Mendoza	MIBAS
334	La Paz	Córdoba	GESPA
366	**Lima**	Antofagasta	SORTA
465	Recife	Curitiba	IRUXI
476	**Bogotá**	**Guayaquil**	**BOKAN**
489	**Bogotá**	**Guayaquil**	**ENSOL**
490	**Bogotá**	Panamá	BUSMO
492	Mendoza	Córdoba	PAMAL
527	Córdoba	Mendoza	SOLER
544	Maiquetía	Barranquilla	SIDOS
686	Antofagasta	Lima	IREMI
766	Mendoza	Santiago	ALBAL
768	La Paz	Amazónica	RCO
1064	Santo Domingo	Port Au Prince	ETBOD
Reportes 2018	**FIR que reporta**	**FIR que comete la falla**	**Posición**
29	**Bogotá**	**Guayaquil**	**BOKAN**
41	Panamá	Bogotá	**DAKMO**
114	Recife	Curitiba	IRUXI
122	Santo Domingo	Miami	SEKAR
191	Guayaquil	Central América	UGADI
307	Curitiba	Montevideo	AKPOD
355	**Bogotá**	**Guayaquil**	**ENSOL**
379	**Bogotá**	Panamá	**DAKMO**
405	**Bogotá**	**Guayaquil**	**ENSOL**

Tabla 1 *- Reportes de LHD cuyas transferencias son hechas con un nivel y llama en ascenso o descenso.*

2.3 As we can see in Table 1, the FIRs that report the most failures in 2017 are Bogotá (4 times) and then Lima (3 times). The most reported FIR is Guayaquil (4 times). The point with most occurrences was BOKAN. So far in 2018, **first semester**, the points DAKMO and ENSOL were the most reported (2 times each), but BOKAN, ENSOL and IRUXI deserve special attention because they are presented as points already reported in 2017. It can also be observed that the FIR Bogota points out coordination failures of the FIR Guayaquil, in 2017 (3 times) and in the first semester 2018 (3 times), and that more attention should be taken from the FIR Guayaquil with traffic passing through ENSOL and through BOKAN.

Note: Mount Pleasant (EGYP) APP has failed many times for no coordinating or passing traffic flight plans data for the FIR Comodoro Rivadavia.

2.4 Some LHD reports of 2017 first semester and second semester (underlined) and of the first semester of 2018 (**bold**), had as a coordination failure the final parameter, a point different from the coordinated, that is, the aircraft comes in an airway, changes airway or deviates from route and this is not coordinated with the adjacent FIR.

2.5 Table 2 (available only in Spanish) shows all the LHD reports that are framed in this type of situation, the traffic is coordinated in a point and calls in a different one.

Reportes 2017	**FIR que reporta**	**FIR que comete la falla**	**Posición coordinada**	**Posición que la aeronave llama**
24	Santo Domingo	Curazao	VESKA	**PALAS**
26	Bogotá	Amazónica	ARUXA	50 NM “S” ARUXA (LET)
31	Montevideo	Curitiba	MLO	BGE
53	San Juan	Piarco	LAMKN	MODUX
60	Lima	La Paz	* NO HUBO *	30 NM al “W” PDO
80	Lima	Amazónica	LIMPO	40 NM “W” LIMPO (POSKA)
149	Curitiba	La Paz	* SOLO RUTA *	CUB
198	Ezeiza	Montevideo	UBLAM	RODOV
223	Montevideo	Ezeiza	* NO HUBO *	ABEAM STO
270	Lima	La Paz	* NO HUBO *	“W” OBLIR
339	Córdoba	La Paz	MARIA	50 NM “E” MARIA
352	Kingston	Curazao	DIBOK	ALBIN
390	Santo Domingo	Curazao	PALAS	VESKA
421	Guayaquil	Central América	LIXAS	130 NM “W” LIXAS
477	Guayaquil	Bogotá	ENSOL	BOKAN
560	Amazónica	Bogotá	ABIDE	45 NM “SW” ABIDE
568	Córdoba	Ezeiza	SINUT	VUDSI
655	Bogotá	Panamá	IVROS	ILTUR
663	Amazónica	Bogotá	ABIDE	ASAPA
666	Curazao	Port Au Prince	LENOM	MAXIN
729	Guayaquil	Bogotá	PULTU	40 NM “E” PULTU
733	Central América	Kingston	ATUVI	DELVI
765	Bogotá	Panamá	TOKUT	BUXOS
800	Lima	Bogotá	PLG	56 NM “W” PLG (**PULTU**)

Reportes 2017	FIR que reporta	FIR que comete la falla	Posición coordinada	Posición que la aeronave llama
802	Lima	Bogotá	PLG	40 NM "W" PLG (**PULTU**)
856	La Paz	Amazónica	ARMUK	UDIDI
861	Lima	Bogotá	PLG	35 NM "W" PLG (**PULTU**)
876	La Paz	Curitiba	SIDAK (UM402)	CUB
921	Santo Domingo	Curazao	PALAS	KISAS
948	Santo Domingo	Port Au Prince	PIGBI	ETBOD
953	La Paz	Lima	OBLIR	RAXUN
955	Santo Domingo	Port Au Prince	PIGBI	DCR
1015	Santo Domingo	Curazao	VESKA	29 NM "SE" **PALAS**
1103	Curazao	Santo Domingo	VESKA	**IRGUT**
-	-	-	-	-
Reportes 2018	**FIR que reporta**	**FIR que comete la falla**	**Posición coordinada**	**Posición que la aeronave llama**
03	San Juan	Piarco	ELOPO	"NE" ELOPO
13	Lima	Antofagasta	SORTA	IREMI
28	Bogotá	Panamá	TOKUT	BUXOS
31	Santo Domingo	Port Au Prince	ETBOD	OSIDU
205	San Juan	Piarco	MODUX	ILURI
213	Santo Domingo	Curazao	PALAS	VESKA
228	Amazónica	Lima	POSKA	OSORA
286	Lima	Guayaquil	ARNEL	VAKUD
325	Asunción	La Paz	SIDAK	"W" SIDAK
347	Curazao	Santo Domingo	PALAS	BEROX
358	Bogotá	Lima	PLG	ROLUS
368	Santo Domingo	Curazao	VESKA	KISAS
388	Curitiba	Resistencia	ARULA	118 NM "NE" ARULA (ILPEP)

Tabla 2 *-Reportes de LHD cuyas transferencias son hechas en un punto y llaman en otro.*

2.6 As we can see in Table 2, FIRs that report the most in 2017 are: Santo Domingo and Lima (6 times each), followed by FIRs Bogotá, Guayaquil and La Paz (3 times each). The most reported are: Bogotá (7 times), Curacao (5 times), La Paz (4 times), Amazon and Port Au Prince (3 times each). The most reported points are PLG (3 times) changed for PULTU and VESKA (3 times), changed for PALAS (2 times) and IRGUT (1 time). Now in 2018, first semester, the FIR that reported the most this case was Santo Domingo (3 times), followed by Bogotá, Lima and San Juan (2 times each). The FIRs most reported with this failure were Curacao, Piarco and Lima (2 times each). There are points like BUXOS and KISAS that were already reported in 2017.

Observation 1: The aircraft calls far away from the waypoint, at a considerable distance due to weather deviation probably not informed by the pilots or unnoticed by the ATCO.

Observation 2: On FIR La Paz, the failures should be attributed to the pilots because it relies on their information to make the necessary changes and/or re-coordination of the waypoint in function of the meteorological deviations, but even knowing that a failure occurred in the coordination, reported by the adjacent FIR, La Paz does not report the pilot's error.

2.7. Some LHD reports had as coordination failure the parameter flight level understanding, flight number, fixed or hour; that is, the coordination is still made the verification is wrongly done and the Transferring unit does not notice the failure. In 2017 in the first semester and in the second semester (underlined) we had this type of failure. In the first semester of 2018 (in bold) those failures are listed in the table below.

2.8. Table 3 (*available only in Spanish*)shows all the LHD reports that are framed in this type of situation, the traffic is coordinated at a flight level and is wrongly scored by the adjacent FIR. The number of the flight, the waypoint or the hour, can also have errors in their notes, and thus the reason for LHD report.

Reportes 2017	**FIR que reporta**	**FIR que comete la falla**	**Hora, fijo o Nivel coordinado**	**Hora, fijo o Nivel anotado**
17	Guayaquil	Lima	20:45	21:45
74	New York	Piarco	22:33	22:23
219	Kingston	Habana	FL 370	FL 390
329	Antofagasta	Lima	LPE2429	LPE2369
472	Central América	Kingston	FL 370	FL 390
515	Kingston	Panamá	FL 320	FL 340
885	Guayaquil	Bogotá	FL 330	FL 370
1010	Antofagasta	Lima	SORTA	IREMI
Reporte 2018	**FIR que reporta**	**FIR que comete la falla**	**Hora, fijo o Nivel coordinado**	**Hora, fijo o Nivel anotado**
392	Panamá	Central América	FL 370	FL 350

Tabla 3 - *Reportes de LHD cuyas transferencias fueron hechas, pero con errores de entendimiento.*

2.9 As we can see in Table 3, in 2017 there are FIRs that still do not ensure that the ATCO of the adjacent FIR reads back correctly. The FIR Lima gives the correct transfer 3 times, but does not understand what the ATCO of the accepting FIR reads back. The ones with most errors are Guayaquil, Kingston and Antofagasta (2 times each). Now in 2018, first semester, there is only one FIR that made the report.

2.10. Some 2017 LHD reports, first semester and second semester (underlined) and the first semester of 2018 (**bold**), had as coordination failure the parameter related to technical issues of the equipment used for the transfer, (Aeronautical Message Handling System (AMHS) or Air Traffic Services Inter-facility Data Communication (AIDC)) that is, the traffic calls at a different flight level than the coordinated one.

2.11. Table 4 (*available only in Spanish*) shows all the LHD reports that are framed in this type of situation, the traffic is coordinated in one level and calls in another.

Reportes 2017	FIR que reporta	FIR que comete la falla	Posición
278	Recife	Curitiba	VRI
286	Recife	Brasilia	VUTNO
289	Córdoba	Ezeiza	DOPRI
465	Recife	Curitiba	IRUXI
524	Recife	Brasilia	IMBES
530	Curitiba	Brasilia	ENACT
556	Recife	Brasilia	RUBIC
567	Córdoba	Ezeiza	PAR
636	Córdoba	Ezeiza	SINUT
639	Recife	Brasilia	POSMU
801	Córdoba	Ezeiza	ROKER
1123	Recife	Brasilia	BETAR
Reportes 2018	**FIR que reporta**	**FIR que comete la falla**	**Posición**
198	Habana	Central América	FUNKO
303	Guayaquil	Lima	**VAKUD**
304	Lima	Guayaquil	ARNEL
305	Lima	Guayaquil	**VAKUD**
320	Lima	Guayaquil	**VAKUD**
338	Lima	Guayaquil	**VAKUD**
339	Lima	Guayaquil	**VAKUD**

Tabla 4 *- Reportes de LHD cuyas transferencias son hechas con un nivel y llama en otro debido falla de los equipos.*

2.12 As we can see in Table 4, FIRs that report the most in 2017 are: Recife (7 times) followed by Córdoba (4 times). The most reported are: Brasilia (6 times) followed by Ezeiza (4 times). It should be noted that the points do not repeat. Now in 2018, first semester, the FIR that reported this fact the most was Lima (5 times). The FIR most reported with this failure was Guayaquil (5 times).

Note: The message exchange system deserves more attention when it involves the VAKUD position since until now there are a lot of reports with that failure.

2.13. Some LHD reports of 2017, first semester and second semester (underlined) and of the first semester of 2018 (in bold), had as a coordination failure the parameter related to re-coordination, since the traffic is coordinated, but crosses significantly ahead of the coordinated time.

2.14. Table 5 (*available only in Spanish*) shows all the LHD reports that are framed in this type of situation, the traffic is coordinated in one hour and calls in another, anticipated.

Reportes 2017	FIR que reporta	FIR que comete la falla	Posición	Hora Coordinada	Hora que llama	Anticipó __ minutos
5	Santo Domingo	Port Au Prince	DCR	20:10	20:01	9
14	Amazónica	Maiquetía	POVLA	08:06	08:16	10
24	Santo Domingo	Curazao	PALAS	14:22	14:07	15
29	Santo Domingo	Port Au Prince	PIGBI	20:56	20:42	14
30	Santo Domingo	Curazao	VESKA	20:53	20:44	9
48	Santo Domingo	Curazao	VESKA	19:09	19:01	8
50	Curazao	Barranquilla	OROSA	03:55	03:48	7
78	Curazao	Kingston	DIBOK	18:48	18:37	11
85	Lima	Bogotá	PLG	22:44	22:04	40
96	Guayaquil	Central América	LIXAS	02:38	02:29	9
104	Antofagasta	Lima	IREMI	08:26	07:36	50
111	Santo Domingo	Port Au Prince	PIGBI	15:17	15:08	9
112	Antofagasta	Lima	IREMI	08:34	07:35	59
114	Santo Domingo	San Juan	MELLA	15:00	14:53	7
116	Santo Domingo	Curazao	VESKA	16:14	16:01	13
130	Guayaquil	Lima	ANPAL	14:46	14:31	15
131	Guayaquil	Bogotá	UGUPI	01:20	01:11	9
153	Guayaquil	Lima	PABOB	07:39	07:32	7
154	Santo Domingo	Curazao	VESKA	21:28	21:17	11
167	Antofagasta	Lima	IREMI	09:45	08:47	58
196	Resistencia	Ezeiza	OPNIN	16:14	16:05	9
221	Amazónica	Bogotá	ABIDE	22:33	22:24	9
249	Santo Domingo	Curazao	VESKA	21:28	21:20	8
251	Guayaquil	Bogotá	PULTU	23:30	23:22	8
256	Santo Domingo	Port Au Prince	ETBOD	00:19	00:12	7
264	Santo Domingo	Port Au Prince	PIGBI	12:21	12:13	8
269	New York	Piarco	DRDGE	23:55	23:33	22
273	Resistencia	Ezeiza	KORTA	13:13	13:04	9
274	Resistencia	Ezeiza	TODES	16:54	16:45	9

Reportes 2017	FIR que reporta	FIR que comete la falla	Posición	Hora Coordinada	Hora que llama	Anticipó __ minutos
275	Santo Domingo	Curazao	KARUM	17:47	17:39	8
287	Santo Domingo	Port Au Prince	ETBOD	06:53	06:44	9
291	Santo Domingo	Port Au Prince	PIGBI	03:21	03:11	10
306	Curazao	Santo Domingo	IRGUT	12:12	12:12	7
348	Guayaquil	Bogotá	ENSOL	15:29	15:22	7
349	Guayaquil	Bogotá	UGUPI	17:53	17:43	10
382	Córdoba	Mendoza	ESKOP	12:08	11:58	10
420	Amazónica	Bogotá	ABIDE	01:35	01:27	8
433	Guayaquil	Bogotá	BOKAN	01:50	01:40	10
449	Curazao	Santo Domingo	IRGUT	05:29	05:21	8
450	Curazao	Santo Domingo	TEKOL	05:35	05:28	7
479	Guayaquil	Bogotá	ANGEL	23:10	22:55	15
507	Córdoba	Resistencia	SIKOB	02:01	01:07	54
508	Lima	La Paz	ELAKO	12:47	12:36	11
534	Curazao	Kingston	TARBA	22:55	22:25	30
542	Guayaquil	Central América	LIXAS	23:56	23:39	17
546	Antofagasta	Lima	IREMI	09:56	08:56	60
553	Amazónica	Maiquetía	PAKON	23:28	23:17	11
562	Mendoza	Córdoba	ISIPO	15:25	15:17	8
570	Mendoza	Córdoba	ISIPO	15:21	15:13	8
602	Guayaquil	Bogotá	UGUPI	18:13	18:01	12
609	Antofagasta	Lima	IREMI	01:45	01:23	22
628	Bogotá	Panamá	BUXOS	21:29	21:20	9
643	Kingston	Habana	GELOG	18:49	18:18	31
669	Lima	Antofagasta	IREMI	04:52	04:44	8
700	Curazao	Barranquilla	OROSA	22:07	21:57	10
737	Lima	La Paz	DOBNI	12:44	12:35	9
777	Bogotá	Central América	BOLDO	19:13	18:13	60
821	Santo Domingo	Curazao	IRGUT	23:20	23:12	8
826	Ezeiza	Resistencia	TODES	06:32	06:23	9
868	Guayaquil	Bogotá	BOKAN	12:36	12:28	8
890	Córdoba	Mendoza	ISIPO	00:11	23:58	13
900	Santo Domingo	Port Au Prince	RETAK	20:10	19:59	11

Reportes 2017	FIR que reporta	FIR que comete la falla	Posición	Hora Coordinada	Hora que llama	Anticipó __ minutos
910	Port Au Prince	Santo Domingo	PIGBI	19:27	18:27	60
948	Santo Domingo	Port Au Prince	ETBOD	16:20	16:08	12
968	La Paz	Córdoba	GAXOK	23:44	22:48	56
969	Resistencia	Ezeiza	KORTA	02:33	02:23	10
970	Resistencia	Ezeiza	OPNIN	03:23	03:13	10
972	Curazao	Barranquilla	OROSA	18:46	17:45	61
977	Resistencia	Córdoba	SIKOB	18:20	18:08	12
981	Antofagasta	Lima	ALDAX	06:17	05:17	60
986	Guayaquil	Bogotá	PULTU	20:52	20:35	17
1029	La Paz	Resistencia	PILCO	16:24	16:17	7
1068	Curazao	Barranquilla	SELAN	18:53	18:46	7
1074	Santo Domingo	Port Au Prince	PIGBI	19:16	19:07	9
1087	Curazao	Barranquilla	SELAN	01:30	01:23	7
1088	Santo Domingo	Port Au Prince	PIGBI	13:44	13:35	9
1095	Santo Domingo	Curazao	KISAS	13:06	12:59	7
1097	Lima	La Paz	ELAKO	13:07	12:06	61
1114	Santo Domingo	Curazao	POKAK	15:58	15:46	12

Reportes 2018	FIR que reporta	FIR que comete la falla	Posición	Hora Coordinada	Hora que llama	Anticipó __ minutos
7	San Juan	Piarco	LAMKN	23:16	22:36	40
34	Antofagasta	Lima	IREMI	19:09	19:00	9
43	Antofagasta	Lima	IREMI	15:25	15:15	10
85	Curazao	Barranquilla	OROSA	18:54	17:52	62
87	Curazao	Barranquilla	OROSA	18:27	18:17	10
120	Port Au Prince	Kingston	BENET	05:52	04:52	60
137	Bogotá	Guayaquil	ANGEL	21:15	20:49	26
147	Curazao	Santo Domingo	IRGUT	15:01	14:51	10
162	Lima	Guayaquil	EVLIM	23:13	23:13	60
164	Curazao	Barranquilla	OROSA	18:28	18:19	9
220	Curazao	Barranquilla	OROSA	18:17	18:04	13
263	Santo Domingo	Port Au Prince	OSIDU	01:33	01:23	10
311	Resistencia	Córdoba	SIKOB	20:25	19:08	77

Reportes 2018	FIR que reporta	FIR que comete la falla	Posición	Hora Coordinada	Hora que llama	Anticipó __ minutos
312	Resistencia	Córdoba	TIKLA	20:07	19:10	57
318	Guayaquil	Bogotá	BOKAN	14:31	14:20	11
356	Curazao	Port Au Prince	LENOM	07:42	06:41	61
375	Bogotá	Guayaquil	UGUPI	16:40	15:37	63
414	Santo Domingo	Curazao	VESKA	03:43	02:42	61
417	Curazao	Barranquilla	OROSA	16:08	15:57	11
418	Guayaquil	Bogotá	BOKAN	06:17	06:01	16

Tabla 5 *- Reportes de LHD cuyas transferencias son hechas en una hora y llama en otra (anticipación).*

2.15 As we can see in Table 5, the FIRs that reported the most this type of failure in 2017 were: Santo Domingo (22 times), Guayaquil (13 times), Curacao (10 times), Antofagasta and Resistencia (6 times each) and Lima (5 times). The most reported FIRs are: Bogotá (12 times), Port Au Prince (11 times), Curacao (10 times), Lima (8 times), Ezeiza and Barranquilla (5 times each). The positions/points where most re-estimation failures occurred were: PIGBI (7 times), IREMI (6 times), VESKA (5 times), ETBOD, ISIPO, OROSA and UGUPI (3 times each). Now in 2018, first semester, the FIR that reported the most this fact was Curacao (7 times). The FIR most reported with this failure was Barranquilla (5 times) followed by Guayaquil (3 times). Regarding the minutes of anticipation, during the year of 2017, it must be highlighted that in that analysis we only consider anticipations greater than 6 minutes. There are reports whose aircraft passed a coordination point in more than 30 minutes in advance and that is already happening in 2018.

2.16 An evaluation of the data is made below in Table 5, where we can see where the re-coordination has more failures (data for 2017 and 2018), Table 6 (*available only in Spanish*).

FIR que reporta	FIR que falla	Punto 1	Punto 2	Punto 3	Punto 4	Punto 5	Punto 6
Santo Domingo	Curazao	VESKA	IRGUT	KARUN	KISAS	PALAS	POKAK
	Port Au Prince	PIGBI	ETBOD	DCR	OSIDU	RETAK	
	San Juan	MELLA					
Curazao	Barranquilla	OROSA	SELAN				
	Kingston	DIBOK	TARBA				
	Port Au Prince	LENOM					
	Santo Domingo	IRGUT	TEKOL				
FIR que reporta	**FIR que falla**	**Punto 1**	**Punto 2**	**Punto 3**	**Punto 4**	**Punto 5**	**Punto 6**
Guayaquil	Bogotá	UGUPI	BOKAN	PULTU	ANGEL	ENSOL	
	Central América	LIXAS					
	Lima	ANPAL	PABOB				

FIR que reporta	FIR que falla	Punto 1	Punto 2	Punto 3	Punto 4	Punto 5	Punto 6
Antofagasta	Lima	IREMI	ALDAX				
Resistencia	Córdoba	SIKOB	TIKLA				
	Ezeiza	KORTA	OPNIN				
Lima	Antofagasta	IREMI					
	Bogotá	PLG					
	Guayaquil	EVLIM					
	La Paz	ELAKO	DOBNI				
Amazónica	Bogotá	ABIDE					
	Maiquetía	PAKON	POVLA				
Bogotá	Central América	BOLDO					
	Gayaquil	ANGEL	UGUPI				
	Panamá	BUXOS					
Córdoba	Mendoza	ERKOP	ISIPO				
	Ezeiza	SIKOB					
Port Au Prince	Kingston	BENET					
	Santo Domingo	PIGBI					
Mendoza	Córdoba	ISIPO					
La Paz	Córdoba	GAXOK					
	Resistencia	PILCO					
Ezeiza	Resistencia	TODES					
Kingston	Habana	GELOG					

Tabla 6 *– Evaluación de los datos sacados de los reportes de LHD cuyas transferencias son hechas en una hora y llama en otra con anticipación*

3. Suggested Actions

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

a) Accept the information presented on this Working Paper and States use this information as a reference for the mitigation of their LHD reports; and

b) present such decision to the GTE members for their information and approval.

— END —