**09-075 (October 6, 2009) Central Database for Fixes.** ISSUE: Not all Instrument procedure service providers have access to a complete central database of aeronautical and procedural information. Of particular importance is a complete fix/waypoint database that captures all fix use. All instrument procedures (including STARs and SIDs and airways) use fixes/waypoints in support of the NAS. A recent incident in Alaska supports the need for an accessible central fix database that includes all procedural use of the fix/waypoint with the capability to enter new and revised data. A NFPO procedure specialist developed a SID from Klawok, AK that terminated at UDENE (a fix on an airway).  The SID was named the UDENE ONE DEPARTURE as specified in Order 8260.46. Unbeknownst to the procedure designer, there already was a UDENE ONE DEPARTURE in existence, a Special SID for Ketchikan, AK. The end result was that the SID serving Klawok had to be cancelled on August 27, the day it was effective. Had the all the fix use for UDENE been in an accessible central database, the procedure specialist would have known of the Special SID at Ketchikan and assigned another name for the SID at Klawok. The US has the largest, most complex national airspace structure in the world. Allowing the continuation of multiple databases that are not freely accessible to all parties that produce instrument procedures is unacceptable. Recommend that NFDC and AeroNav Services resolve this issue as soon as possible.

Status 10-06-09: New issue submitted by Charlie Rose, AFS-460. AFS-460 believes there should be a single database source for fix use as opposed to the current AeroNav Services (IFP-FIX) and NFDC (NASR) databases. Charlie briefed that there are currently approximately 500 Special procedures in use. Special and 3rd party procedure developers mainly draw their information from NASR, not IFP-FIX. Tom Schneider stated that he was under the impression that IFP-FIX was to be a web-based information program that would be available to all. Brad Rush briefed that all procedure development should have been coordinated through the RAPT. Brad noted there have been cases where AFS had approved Specials, but the fixes had not been processed through NFDC. Tom stated that ATC initiates -2s for non-procedural ATC use. Why doesn’t ATC have access to IFP-FIX? Charlie noted that 3rd party Part 97 procedure developers send fix data to NFDC and asked whether these fixes were updated in IFP-FIX. Brad responded that he didn’t know. He added that IFP-FIX access is currently limited because anyone with access has the capability to make changes to a fix. Curtis Davis stated that if every fix were processed through the NFPO, as specified in Order 8260.19, paragraph 263a, which says in part “.…Form 8260-2 is the vehicle used to transmit requests for the establishment, revision or cancellation of navigational fixes, holding patterns, and/or reporting points. All fix requests must be processed through the NFPO”, then the NFDC problems would be solved. Curtis added that Form 8260-2s processed through the NFPO are correctly filled out and both databases are connected. Curtis further recommended Order 8260.19 be changed to require all over-CONUS fixes be processed through the NFPO. Brad immediately stated that AeroNav Services would not be tasked to accomplish work they are not required to do. He added that IFP-FIX does not include all fixes; however, it can accommodate 3rd party procedure fixes if properly funded. Scott Jerdan recommended that, since both databases are under the purview of the ATO, a process be started to reconcile the differences between NASR and IFP-FIX. He also recommended NFPO assess the IFP-FIX rules for shared usage of fixes. After much further discussion, Bill Hammett stated that this issue had too many tentacles to be resolved through the full AISWG. He recommended that an ad-hoc sub group similar to the IFP ad hoc group chaired by Brad from Sept 2004 to Oct 2006 be formed to address all the problems. Bill recommended Brad also chair this group as it relates closely to the sub group he chaired previously. Participation should include NFDC, NFPO, NACO, AFS-460, AFS-420, and DoD. **OPEN.**

IOU: Brad Rush to form and chair a sub group to address this issue.

Status 01-05-10: Brad Rush reported that the ad hoc group has not been formed and there was nothing to report. As an example of why AeroNav Services does not want to share IFP-FIX, Brad stated that an ARTCC made uncoordinated changes to an AeroNav Services fix (VEDAS) and the changes were processed by NFDC. This prompted Wayne Fetty to ask whether other offices could make changes to USAF fixes. Curtis Davis responded no. **OPEN.**

IOU: Brad Rush to resolve this issue through the ad hoc group.

Status 03-30-10: Tom Schneider briefed that Brad Rush, who had to temporarily leave the meeting, had an IOU to lead an ad-hoc work group to address this issue; however, he was unable to schedule a meeting due to other commitments. Brad added that a meeting has been scheduled for April 5. **OPEN.**

IOU: Brad Rush to resolve this issue through the ad hoc group.

Status: 06-29-10: Brad Rush briefed that the Database and Coding Team of the Navigation (NAV) Procedures Project (NAV Lean) is taking on this issue and should have recommendations toward the end of summer. Eric Secretan and Scott Jerdan are the AeroNav services representatives on the team. Scott briefed that the team is addressing key issues regarding releasing data to the public and third-party (OTA) procedure developers, especially IFP-FIX. He added that stewardship is also a big issue. Brad stated that he will keep the ad hoc group alive; however, it will not meet again until the NAV Lean recommendations are complete. **OPEN.**

IOU: Brad Rush to address the NAV Lean recommendations through the Central Database for Fixes ad hoc working group.

Status 10-05-10: Brad Rush stated that the NAV-Lean project made some recommendations that are being considered. He also stated that the AeroNav Services/NFDC re-organization under Mission Support Services will produce changes to improve the issue. Tom Schneider stated that several individuals have been appointed under AFS-400 to track the process and implementation of NAV-Lean recommendations. There was a suggestion the issue could be closed since it would be addressed through the NAV-Lean process. Bill Hammett stated that the issue shouldn't be closed because nothing has been done and the problem still exists and will continue to do so until, 1) There is a public accessible centralized data base that lists the fix use documented in the remarks section of the 8260-2, and 2) The capability is developed that will allow NFDC to NFDD the remarks section of the -2. Brad stated that he has previously recommended that the entire -2 be promulgated via the NFDD. Bill, responded this had previously been looked into and NFDC responded that publishing the entire -2 in the NFDD is currently not feasible. Brad then stated that the current 8260.19 policy is contradictory in that it requires all -2s to be processed through the NFPO (now Mission Support Services). Problems arise when other agencies; e.g., third-party developers, ATC facilities, DOD, etc. initiate new fixes or change the use of an existing fix without MSS knowing about it. Charlie Rose re-affirmed the root cause of the problem is that no one is tracking fix use. Brad again emphasized the need for policy first. After additional discussion, Tom agreed the issue should remain open and stated the ad hoc working group that was recommended at meeting 09-04 re-form and seriously address the problem considering the NAV-Lean recommendations. Brad agreed and said he would try to schedule a meeting next month. **OPEN.**

IOU: Brad Rush to address the NAV Lean recommendations through the AISWG Central Database for Fixes Working Group. A meeting has been tentatively scheduled for November 15.

Status 01-11-11: Brad Rush briefed that the ad hoc fix working group met on November 15 and on December 16 - copies of the minutes are attached. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for the end of January or first part of February. Additionally, Brad stated that he had forwarded recommended changes to AFS-420 for inclusion in Change 1 to Order 8260.19. In response to training issues for AT fixes, Brad noted that the former FPOs are now under the Service Area's Operations Support Group (OSG) and should be able to provide quality training on Form 8260-2 preparation to AT personnel. Valerie Watson asked who is the focal point for coordinating additional usage of a currently charted fix. Brad responded that NFDC needs to be the coordination point, especially for third party fix use. Bill Hammett stated that it appeared we were moving toward a "fix ownership" position; every fix would have an "authorized source" and that source would be the only office that could make changes to the -2 supporting a particular fix. Brad added that the DOD has not been brought into the discussions yet, but that will occur soon. Charlie Rose briefed that Danny Hamilton, Manager AFS-460 has been detailed as a Nav-Lean team lead to address this issue. He recommended that Danny, or his designee, be a participant of the fix working group. **OPEN.**

IOU: Brad Rush to continue to keep the group apprised of actions of the AISWG Central Database for Fixes Working Group.

Status 04-05-11: Brad Rush briefed that the ad hoc group had not met since the last AISWG meeting; however, he is attempting to schedule a meeting the first week in May. He added that in working with AFS-460 and NFDC, agreements from previous meetings of the ad hoc group as to whom is allowed to initiate -2s are working well. Those agencies are AJV-3, Air Traffic (through the applicable Service Center), DOD, and third party (OTA). Bill Hammett responded that this was a good first step, but it doesn't answer the question of who is ensuring that the originator ("owner") of a fix is informed when another agency needs to use that fix. Val Watson asked how would NFDC know, even when receiving a -2 from a sanctioned submitter, whether the changes reflected on the -2 would affect other users of the fix and whether those changes had been coordinated with the other users. Brad responded that the "fix use" portion of the -2 would reflect military, OTA or other users of the fix and that it would be NFDC's role as the "gate-keeper" to insure that the necessary coordination takes place. Val replied this is a tall order for NFDC and the reason why the issue is on the agenda in the first place. Bill stated that these issues need to be addressed at the next ad hoc working group. **OPEN.**

IOU: Brad Rush to continue to keep the group apprised of actions of the AISWG Central Database for Fixes Working Group.

Status 07-12-11: Brad Rush briefed that the AISWG Central Database for Fixes Working Group did not meet since the last AISWG meeting. He did note that Change 1 to Order 8260.19, which was effective June 21, included recommended changes from the previous meetings. Eric Secretan briefed that he has spoken to the Directors of AJV-2 and AJV-3 regarding creating a new centralized database for fixes. He said the process will take approximately 3-years. He stated that in the interim, NASR will be the repository for fix data for the foreseeable future and NFDC will have to continually manage and coordinate changes. Bill Hammett asked why another new database had to be created and why NASR couldn't be used as the comprehensive database. Eric responded that the reasons AeroNav Products cannot use NASR directly are: 1) the lack of ability to create, delete and change fix data in NASR beyond the next charting date (i.e., lack of "temporality" and "pending data"); 2) there are no automated system ties to the procedure development tools (IPDS and IAPA) from NASR; and, 3) IFP-Fix generates an 8260-2 whereas NASR does not. IFP-Fix was built to create and document fixes, and to tie to IAPA and IPDS production tools; NASR stores fixes. Bill questioned if it wouldn't be easier to modify NASR to store current and future data via a flagging system as opposed to developing a totally new system. Eric responded that databases like IFP-Fix and AIRNAV will continue to be necessary for procedure development because of how they need to handle pending data. Tom Schneider stated that Form 8260-2 needs to be revised to indicate an owner/data steward for fixes. This will provide NFDC a POC for changes requested by other agencies. Brad added that he will attempt to schedule a working group meeting the third week of August. Jeff Waterman asked whether NGA is represented on the working group. Brad responded yes. **OPEN.**

IOU: Brad Rush to continue to keep the group apprised of actions of the AISWG Central Database for Fixes Working Group.

Status 09-27-11: Brad Rush was not in attendance. In his absence, Don Harmer briefed that a meeting of the AISWG Central Database for Fixes Working Group was held on August 31 and minutes distributed on September 6. Several comments were received that indicate the minutes require revision. It is anticipated that Brad will re-send minutes upon completion of travel (in approximately 2-weeks). Tom Schneider briefed that changes recommended by the Fix Use Group have been included in Change 2 to Order 8260.19E, which should be out for formal coordination in November. The change includes expanded guidance in Chapter 2 and the addition of an office of primary responsibility (OPR) for each fix on Form 8260-2. **OPEN**.

IOU: Brad Rush to continue to keep the group apprised of actions of the AISWG Central Database for Fixes Working Group.

Status 01-10-12: Brad Rush confirmed that all changes recommended by the Fix Use Group have been included in Change 2 to Order 8260.19E, which is out for formal coordination and is targeted for publication on February 9. Brad mentioned one example of the recommended changes, that computer navigation fixes (CNF) would now follow the naming convention “CFXXX.” Tom Schneider stated that the Service Center Operations Support Groups (OSG) have expressed concern over not having enough time to train personnel on the changes. Curtis Davis stated that the NFDC is still experiencing ATO Service Area difficulties in preparing Air Traffic stand alone 8260-2s. The OSG-FPTs apparently do not have access to the IFP-FIX 6 Tool. Tom Schneider asked whether the old FPOs had capability to access IFP FIX? Tom added that he is trying to delegate this responsibility to the FPT, but is receiving pushback. Charlie Rose then asked if there was any update on a central fix database. Barb Cordell commented that one of the key recommendations of the Master Data Management Matrix (MDMM) initiative (see Issue 12-084, for more background) was to develop a consolidated “points” database, which would include fixes. Barb stated that if this recommendation is approved, then the database could be developed in 18 months. Chris Criswell summarized that Brad’s working group is developing the short term solutions and that the MDMM recommendation represents the long term solution. **OPEN.**

IOU: Brad Rush to continue to keep the group apprised of actions of the AISWG Central Database for Fixes Working Group.

Status 04-03-12: Brad Rush reported that there were no updates since the last AISWG meeting. Tom Schneider added that Order 8260.19E Change 2, which includes changes recommended by the Fix Use Group, was signed and is effective as of mid-March (Effective Date: March 21, 2012). Wayne Fetty noted that there have been instances of DoD fixes being modified by the FAA without informing the services of the changes (in particular, an Air Force restriction was removed from the fix SEATO). Tom responded that the OPR’s for fixes are identified in Change 2, and Brad added that additional guidance and updated processes have been included in Change 2. Brad mentioned this issue now falls under the scope of the “Points” database being planned and developed as part of the MDMM initiative, and recommended this issue be closed with further updates reported under that issue. The group agreed.

**Issue Closed (See Issue 12-084 for further updates).**