

#### References:

1 AIM/FPL/AIDC/1 meeting report

#### Purpose and agenda:

### Statement of purpose:

- 1 Review and approval of agenda.
- 2 Updates on the ANSP contact list for airlines to get feedback on FPL issues
- 3 Discussion of guidance document for what requires a rejection of a flight plan and what doesn't
- 4 Discussion of FPL systems capabilites survey results.
- 5 Plan user teleconference
- 6 Plan next data collection
- 7 Discuss AIDC/FPL meeting in Lima, Peru, in April
- 8 Other matters.

#### Participants:

- 1. Cuba: Carmen Dearmas, Jorge Centella
- 2. Curação: Natasha Leonora-Belefanti, Jacques Lasten, Jozef Nicolaas
- 3. Dominican Republic: Fernando Casso (rapporteur)
- 4. Haiti: Ernso Edmond
- 5. Jamaica: Jeffery Gallows
- 6. Mexico: Margarita Rangel (SENEAM), Daniel Castañeda (DGAC)
- 7. United States: Dan Eaves
- 8. IATA: Marco Vidal
- 9. ICAO: Mayda Avila

#### **Discussions:**

Review and approval of agenda

1. The agenda was approved without modification.

Updates on the ANSP contact list for airlines to get feedback on FPL issues

- 2. The meeting decided that the contacts for the ANSPs be included in the document that currently collects the contact information for the airlines and is published in the ICAO AIDC/FPL Task Force webpage. As the original document is a spreadsheet, a new tab will be created for this information to be presented.
- 3. States will send their contact information to Marco Vidal as PoC for this task (ACT 01/21).
- 4. The due date for this action would be Jan 30<sup>th</sup>, and ICAO would publish this information the first week of February (ACT 02/21). The link for this updated document will be then distributed to the group by the rapporteur (ACT 03/21).

Discussion of guidance document for what requires a rejection of a flight plan and what doesn't

- 5. The rapporteur reminded the group of the discussion from the face to face meeting with the airlines that there are errors that can be corrected locally by the ANSP with coordination from the airline, or can be changed by these, without having the need to reject the flight plan.
- 6. United States indicated that the criteria for rejecting or not a flight plan could depend on the discretion of the FIR of origin.



- 7. Cuba has a position where minor errors are corrected. There is a policy according to which a flight plan is rejected when violating Document 4444. Any other errors go to the aforementioned position. Only route errors within Havana FIR are corrected in the system, but operator data is not changed.
- It was agreed that changes route information pertaining to a given FIR does not impact any downstream FIRs.
- 9. IATA pointed out the importance of feedback to the airlines in any case, as this will allow the error to be avoided in the future, and so the meeting agreed that any local correction be subject to feedback to the originating airspace user.
- 10. The rapporteur proposed agreeing on a common baseline for changes to be done locally, so that all FIRs have the same criteria. The example of Cuba is a good starting point, considering only route data in the corresponding FIR as subject to local correction.
- 11. The meeting agreed to have a teleconference on February 20<sup>th</sup> with the participation of airlines to propose and agree on a regional criteria for rejecting or not flight plans (ACT 04/21).

#### Discussion of FPL systems capabilities survey results

- 12. The results of the survey was displayed and commented. There were 7 responses in total.
- 13. According to the results all responding FIRs are capable of accepting ATS messages that modifyh FPLs. The need for conducting a similar survey for the airlines was questioned, and although not considered necessary, because the ANSPs have shown to be able to accept any ATS related to flight plan modification, the information could be of good reference.
- 14. ANSPs are capable of generating most messages that modify FPLs. This is useful for ANSP to ANSP management of flight plans.
- 15. One of the issues discussed in the face to face meeting in Honduras was that some systems would produce a loss of the assigned slot to flights that cancelled their flight plan, thus making the practice of cancel and refiling a flight plan not recommendable. This case in particular has been observed in Colombia, and IATA indicated that this issue has been being treated and a solution has been reached. Mexico has a similar situation, and the effort is ongoing.
- 16. Rejection messages are generated by 4 of the 7 responding FIRs, with three of them using a similar format. The remaining FIR uses AMHS NDR messages, which would not be received by any AFTN user.
- 17. Considering the cases where there are no REJ messages generated or being generated in a different format, a manual process should be in place to offer feedback for any flight plan errors detected.
- 18. Mexico expressed that they have cases when the flight plan is issued by a third party provider, as flightplan.com, in which any feedback will not get to the originator of the message but to the third party provider. IATA referred to a test done with Colombia where a reply address was specified, and the feedback could get to the user. Mexico will discuss with IATA to this respect and consider a solution to this issue.

#### Plan user teleconference

19. This topic was deferred to a later date, due to time constraints.

#### Plan next data collection

- 20. The meeting agreed to do a data collection for the duration of one week, from March 5<sup>th</sup> to March 11<sup>th</sup>. This will allow having enough time to analyse and extract conclusion in time for the AIDC/FPL meeting in April (ACT 05/21).
- 21. The rapporteur stressed the importance of recording the total number of flight plans processed, along with the errors



detected. This will allow the comparison with the previous collection, independently of the time span collected.

Discuss AIDC/FPL meeting in Lima, Peru, in April.

- 22. The rapporteur mentioned that there is a meeting in the SAM region to review the progress of AIDC implementation and FPL issues in their region, and that our region was invited to attend. The meeting discussed the topics that could be treated in this meeting.
- 23. The homogenous procedure that was discussed would be presented, and serve as a basis to compare approaches in each region for working on this task.
- 24. Also, the discussion of flight plan exchange between the regions. There are some NAM/CAR FIRs that border SAM states, and this would be a good opportunity for both parties to get together and discuss common issues.
- 25. The latest data collection analysis could be presented, to show how errors have evolved.
- 26. The meeting was invited to comment or suggest any other topics of interest, and Jan 31<sup>st</sup> would be the due date for this. The agenda would then be sent to the group. A draft of the agenda till now for the meeting, including topics for AIDC also, are in APPENDIX A of these minutes (ACT 06/21).

#### Other Matters

27. No other matters were discussed.

#### **Review of Previous Action Items**

ACT No.	Description	Status	Comments
01/20	Rapporteur to distribute the tentative dates and agendas of the face to face meeting	Completed	
02/20	IATA, United States and Dominican Republic to draft a homogeneous procedure for flight plan processing for comment by July 28 <sup>th</sup>	Superseded	Presented at the ANI/WG
03/20	Curaçao to provide a time frame for the working methods described in the group's terms of reference	Valid	
04/20	Rapporteur to send IATA the list of callsigns and dates as a reference for correction by the airlines	Valid	

## **Summary of Action Items from this Meeting**

ACT No.	Description	Status	Comments
01/21	States to send to IATA representative the contacts for FPL issues feedback	Valid	Due Jan 30 <sup>th</sup>
02/21	ICAO to publish the updated contact list in the Task Force webpage	Valid	Due first week of February
03/21	Rapporteur to distribute the link for the updated contact list to the group members	Valid	Due first week of February
04/21	States to conduct a teleconference with the participation of airlines to agree on a common criteria for rejecting or accepting flight plans with minor errors.	Valid	Due Feb 20 <sup>th</sup>
05/21	States to conduct a data collection for the week of March 5 <sup>th</sup> to March 11 <sup>th</sup>	Valid	



ACT No.	Description	Status	Comments
06/21	States to comment on the tentative agenda for the joint NAM/CAR/SAM AIDC/FPL meeting	Valid	Due Jan 31 <sup>st</sup>

Next meeting: Feb  $20^{\text{th}}$ . Time to be determined.



#### **APPENDIX A**

## Reunión AIDC/FPL SAM/NAM/CAR Meeting Agenda

- 10. Present the Regional Plan, to show the level of implementation in the region / Presentar el Plan Regional, para mostrar el grado de implementación en la región.
- 11. Discuss the pending interfaces between the NAM/CAR and SAM States / Discutir sobre los enlaces pendientes entre los estados NAM/CAR y SAM.
- 12. Present what was discussed regarding the proposed AIDC performance metrics, and introduce the subject of separations. The issue of separation changes due to AIDC implementation was brought up in a survey sent by ICAO / Presentar lo discutido sobre las métricas propuestas del desempeño del AIDC, e introducir el tema de las separaciones. Ya vi que se menciona el tema de los cambios en las separaciones por la implementación de AIDC en una encuesta que se envió de OACI.
- 13. Present the homogeneous procedure discussed in the meeting in Honduras, and if posible the experience to date of any trial or steps that have been taken / Presentar el procedimiento homogéneo discutido en la reunión en Honduras, y si es posible la experiencia hasta el momento de cualquier ensayo o pasos que se hayan dado.
- 14. Results of the last data collection done to date. We could do one before the meeting and present the evolution / Resultados de la última colección de data que se haya realizado. Pudiéramos hacer una antes de la reunión y presentar la evolución.