

**Universal Weather and Aviation
Memorandum**

TO: Peter Ingleton
FROM: Steve Hull, Technical Manager Uvflightplanner.com
DATE: May 01 2006
SUBJECT: ICAO Meeting Montreal

I attended the last ICAO meeting concerning the changes of the actual flight plan ICAO. The group known as the Flight Plan Study Group (FPLSG) began working on changes to the ICAO format some time last year which Mike Schuler had been attending. This meeting was basically finalizing the requirements for those changes. I found myself to be the only Flight Planning specialist within the group. The rest were Air Traffic Control experts representing several regions of the world. The major players within the group were the FAA, Europe, Eurocontrol, Nav Canada, and Australia. Minor players (I think mainly because of the language barrier) were South America, Japan, and Singapore.

The meeting concentrated on new additional letters and tables that will be established to update new ATC surveillance radar technologies. The primary effort was to accomplish this without creating much work and programming with service providers. Service providers being ATC units, Flight planning computers, datalink services, and others of this nature.

Since the prime directive was to accomplish changes to reflect new technologies without causing much pain to service providers, the main thrust of the strategy was to include as many items as possible to Item 18 in the ICAO flight plan form. Many of these items are reflective of the new SSR (Radar surveillance) technologies.

All of the FPLSG findings and recommendations will be presented by Gunnar Emausson the group leader and a representative of ICAO under the title of "Technical Officer" within the "Air Traffic Management Section Air Navigation Bureau" to the ICAO commission panel. The recommendations can only be *approved* by this commission.

A real concern for adding each additional item or "other information" to Item 18 of the ICAO flight plan was the added characters to accommodate these new technologies and the possibility of going over a maximum character set through AFTN, which would cause a second message to be sent via AFTN to each ATC sector causing, most likely, rejects of the ICAO flight plan. A priority list was discussed, in earnest, of which I had several objections, that being the reclear flight plan (RIF) and EETs going below the priority list. However, we agreed that these would be moved up the list.

An additional entry for standardizing the input of overfly permits was discussed and Gunnar asked that I look into the feasibility of this working as *other information* for Item 18. I discussed my findings the next day with the group and it was concluded that it was not feasible at this time to standardize permit entries until there was some method to develop a standard permit code from each ICAO state.

The next meeting will take place sometime in either late October or early November. The group will focus on Future Air Navigation (FANS). However, it will be determined whether a study group will be effective in such a broad and quite technical spectrum.

Gunnar discussed the possibilities of how ICAO will look at getting the right people into the right type of forum. So there is the possibility that a group will either not be required or it will become organized into a panel type forum. I will have a better idea after the next FPLSG meeting.

Regards

Steve