

To: Oceanic Work Group Members

From: Dennis Addison, Support Manager - Oceanic Airspace and Procedures

Subject: Synopsis, Oceanic Work Group (OWG) Meeting, June 18, 2014

Introduction

Dennis Addison, Support Manager, Oceanic Airspace and Procedures at Oakland Center welcomed the members of the Oceanic Work Group to the meeting.

Oakland ARTCC Update Dennis Addison

▪ **Oakland ARTCC Website:** The URL for the Oakland center web page has changed slightly and is displayed below. There is a new brief overview of Oakland Air Route Traffic Control Center ARTCC and 3 links: ZOA Domestic ATC Operations, KZAK Oceanic ATC Operations, NOTAMs TFRs SUAs. Select information from the pacific chart supplement has been added for user convenience and for those that might not subscribe to it. Some of the items from the pacific chart supplement added are the updated Track Advisory User's Guide (TAUG), and controlled airports. The Informal South Pacific Coordinating Group (ISPAG) website has changed to ISPAG.com and requires a logon and there is a new Informal Pacific Coordinating Group (IPAG) link. The Oceanic Work Group (OWG) meeting information is kept on the website from the previous 2 meetings.

http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/ato/service_units/air_traffic_services/artcc/oakland/

- **ADS-B In Trail Procedure (ITP):** Dennis briefly described what the ITP project was and how it was used climbing or descending aircraft through traffic using reduced separation standards. The FAA and United Airlines signed an agreement for the trail on April 2009. United Airlines retrofitted 12 B747-400 aircraft to be eligible for the procedure. On 100% of their pilots completed training on the equipment. Data collection started August 15, 2011 in the Southern Pacific SOPAC. The trial was expanded to include the entire Oakland Flight Information Region (FIR) on December 9, 2011. There was a 2 month lapse in the trial around September of 2013; however, the current trial is extended through September 29, 2014. Dennis presented data on the number of requests and the number of ITP maneuvers completed in the Oakland FIR. The number of requests during the month of May wasn't as high as the predicted.
- One of the reasons for the lower request volume is controllers are using a manual checklist that can be time consuming and they have to override a conflict probe. The FAA is working on automating the checklist/procedure but isn't expecting to deliver it until mid FY16
- The B747-400 aircraft that have ADS-B moved out of the SOPAC into the northern Pacific (NOPAC) and now the data includes the tracking of the entire Oakland FIR. International ITP expansion has been largely affected in the SOPAC by the vacancy of B747-400 aircraft. New Zealand and Fiji started trials however lack of traffic has put the trials on an indefinite hold. Oakland has talked with Japan about supporting the project and they haven't committed to anything yet.
- Dennis went over the difference between ADS-C CDP (Climb/Descend Procedure) and ADS-B. ADS-B ITP is a pilot initiated procedure where ADS-C CDP is a controller initiated procedure. ADS-C works by demanding both aircraft, then measuring the distance between them, and issuing climbs or descends through traffic based on a reduced separation minimum. Oakland center implemented a 2 year trial for ADS-C CDP which ended February 2013 and in that time frame there were 8 CDP clearances issued. Calculations done presented the fact that more ADS-C CPD clearances could've been issued. The main hurdles stemmed from a lengthy manual checklist which eventually had the controller overriding a conflict probe, and limited number of aircraft pairs with RNP-4 equipment. The FAA is working on automating the CDP checklist just like the ITP checklist it is projected to be delivered mid FY16.

- Gene Cameron inquired about the reliability of the new projected date (mid FY16) for the ADS-B ITP and ADS-C CDP automation software. He also asked the FAA or Oakland Center to provide more information to other providers like NAV Canada and JCAB. There was a brief discussion about an update from JCAB at IPACG and how reluctant JCAB is without a written rule from ICAO. Steve Pinkerton mentioned that the documentation was on track for an ICAO implementation and is projected to go to the AirNav council late 2014. Gene followed up with a question about ITP reduction in request frequency. Dennis stated that he hasn't done the analysis in a while but during the ADS-C CDP trial there were usually 65-70 events (in a 15 day period) that could've resulted in a climb or descent. The count included all the aircraft in the FIR not just United. Gene said that he would take the data from April-May back to his pilots and encourage them to utilize the procedure more. Someone on the phone asked Dennis if he had statistics for the number of requests. Dennis went over the current data from the slides and the statistics for ITPs. Gene said that the Pacific IATA caucus is in favor of ADS-C CDP when it comes back into operation. Dennis said his understanding once the FAA had the software the FAA would roll it out to all facilities. Right now as it stands 83-84% of pilot requests for different altitudes are granted. The request was made to present ADS-B ITP and ADS-C CDP to Nav Canada.

- **Dynamic Airborne Reroute Program (DARP):** Dennis reported that the number of DARP requests almost mirror the number of DARP clearances issued. Currently facilities that can receive DARP aircraft include, YBBN, NTTT, KZSE, KZOA, KZLA, HCF, and Guam CERAP. The facilities that can both receive DARP flights and allow aircraft to initiate DARP are RJTG, NZZO, NFFF, and KZAK. May data showed that there were 74 requests and 68 were issued. Operators must not request a DARP Reroute into FIRs that do not support the procedure. DARP procedures require AIDC between all facilities all the way to destination. Operational CPDLC is also required for aircraft requesting DARP reroutes. ATC is unable to issue DARP into FIRs where AIDC is not available. Based on actual DARP Trials from PACOTS aircraft utilizing the DARP prior to 180W savings were 6,900lbs or 24min. But when PACOTS aircraft can DARP earlier prior to 160E the potential savings are 10,400lbs or 36min. DARP will be a major topic of discussion at the upcoming IPACG meeting. Oakland center looked at the reason why DARP were being turned down and found the causal factors to be aircraft too close to an FIR boundary, traffic, military airspace, and controller work load.

- Fukuoka's (JCAB's) operational trial for DARP started 19 September 2013 0000 UTC. Current requirements for DARP usage between either Hawaii or North America to Japan include:

- DARP clearance is limited to aircraft bound for Hawaii at this time.
- Operational CPDLC is required for aircraft requesting a DARP
- DARP requests must be made:
 - At or east of 145E.
 - By the pilot at least 20 minutes before the divergence waypoint fix to allow processing time by ATC and pilot
 - At least 1 hour prior to crossing the Fukuoka/Oakland FIR boundary.
- ATMC will issue DARP clearances with the identical route to the requested route from aircraft, or uplink "UNABLE". (ATMC cannot issue a clearance with any modification to the requested route.)
- Operators wishing to employ DARP trial initiated in the Fukuoka FIR must pre-coordinate with ATMC office by email (atmc_ocean@cab.mlit.go.jp).
- For further questions
 - The Fukuoka Air Traffic Management Center (The Fukuoka AMTC)
 - Office TEL: +81-92-608-8869
 - Oceanic supervisor TEL: +81-92-608-8890

Note: Operational questions should be directed to the oceanic supervisor.

- All Nippon Airways (ANA) presented a paper at IPAG from their current DARP trials. DARP between Honolulu and Tokyo were ok for the entire route 12% of time, 58% of them had no merit and less than 1% of the time ATC denied it. The average fuel savings was 662lbs or 3 minutes. The reverse in flight

showed 550lbs average fuel savings. DARs that were ok for the entire route were only 3% and 76% showed no benefit, one time ATC denied a DAR and 18% of the time pilots denied it. ANA also started a trial from San Francisco to Tokyo (half of the data was paper trials) which resulted in 1100lbs average fuel savings. DARP tests from Tokyo to San Francisco and Los Angeles, starting in Oakland Center's FIR, tracked average fuel savings of 6900lbs and 24minutes. Total aircraft that used the DARP were 28 out of 85 or 33%. Looking at data if ANA aircraft started in Fukuoka's FIR project average fuel savings of 10000lb and 36min. The time it took flight crews to use the DARP on average took 20-25min total including 5-10min waiting for ATC to issue the clearance. Flight dispatcher time and workload has decreased significantly from initial trials of 20-25min to 10-15min for the preparation of DARs.

- Question about the DARs being rejected because of the proximity to the boundary and the ability to reduce the 60min limited time frame. Dennis said that the 60min is a procedure for the safety of information sharing between facilities.
- Greg Scott gave an update on DARPs Delta (DAL) did a DAR on DAL109 from Madrid Atlantic on the 1st of May and performed a DARP with Santa Maria and New York Oceanic. The result was 1200lbs of fuel savings and 6min.
- Gene Cameron added that dispatcher workload has always been a concern but United would become more active in the DARP as they look at fuel saving initiatives.
- There was a question if the DARP is ongoing in the Pacific. Dennis advised the group that DARPs are available throughout the Oakland FIR.

- **User Preferred Routes (UPRs):** Dennis touched on the potential UPR fuel savings throughout the entire Pacific could be over 32.8mil Kg annually but not all operators are using the procedure. On July 25, 2013, Fukuoka ATMC, Anchorage ARTCC and Oakland ARTCC began a trial to allow Track F UPRs filed with at least 50nm lateral distance south of PACOTS Tracks C and E. The idea is that UPRs have a huge impact on fuel savings. IATA presented a paper at IPACG requesting a phased implementation of unlimited PACOTS UPRs and is currently doing research on it. Oakland center is currently researching the use of unrestricted UPRs based on traffic and safety. PTRO UPRs started July 25 2013 one operators stated that they saved 67,000-68,000lbs of fuel. The Oakland Center Oceanic website gives UPR guidelines and more information.

- Gene Cameron advised the group that at the Cross Polar Work Group they discussed the possible trial of the B787-8 aircraft to UPR at higher altitudes because of their aircraft performance. Dennis said that he would look into the potential trial to see if it would be beneficial.

- **Merging PACOTS Tracks C and E:** March 13, 2013 began an operational trial of merging tracks C and E when it provided an advantage. Of the first 38 days of the operational trial Tracks C & E merged 14 days. The average fuel savings per flight was 1120 lbs. On April 26, 2013 Oakland suspended the operational trial to merge PACOTS tracks C and E due merging traffic. The merging traffic occurred mainly from time errors on operator's Track Advisory reservations and other facilities unable to accept aircraft at other than altitudes right for direction. Those two factors caused an increase in controller workload that jeopardized safety and the trial had to be discontinued. Extreme cases of missed reservations were from 12 to 303 minutes. Six different aircraft didn't have Track Advisory Gateway Reservations. On April 22nd only 9 of 38 aircraft met their crossing fix reservation window compared to 6 of 37 on April 23rd and 10 of 29 on April 25th.

- The errors in the Track Advisory reservations created numerous traffic conflicts that required Oakland to negotiate with Japan and Anchorage for the use of non-standard altitudes. On February 19, 2014 Anchorage and Oakland Center reached an agreement to use ADS-C distance based separation crossing the FIR. When the agreement for ADS-C cross boundary was reached the Cold bay radar site underwent maintenance and was unusable. Recently the radar site became operational and the new agreement can be realized. With the use of ADS-C distance based separation ATC is able to put more aircraft at a single altitude and help mitigate congestion for merging tracks.

- In the future when the Trial resumes Oakland will coordinate with the next facility for the use of non-standard altitudes. If prior approval for the use of the necessary non-standard altitudes can be obtained, the tracks will be published with a merge. If prior approval for the use of the necessary non-standard altitudes cannot be obtained, the tracks will be published without a merge in the Oakland FIR.

Oakland has purposed a new trial that does not merge tracks in Fukuoka's FIR sometime around November 2014.

- When the trial resumes, Operators must be better at meeting their Gateway Fix reservation times. Merging C/E will still require the use of some non-standard altitudes even with accurate TA reservations due to the mix of aircraft types.
- **Aircraft Equipage Trends:** Dennis went over data acquired on RNP and FANS equipped aircraft. The first graph displayed the comparison between RNP10 and RNP4 equipage based on aircraft type. Then Dennis showed data link utilization trends, the graph showed data link utilization up from 25% in 2004 to 60% in December 2013. Dennis also showed the percentage of data link operations by traffic flow with the ADS-C RNP4/10 trends from 2005 to present demonstrating a significant increase in equipage.
 - There was a big down turn in air traffic around 2008 and since then the traffic has rebounded and is higher than ever. The greatest amount of traffic in Oakland center use the Central Eastern Pacific routes (CEP) which is from California to Hawaii. Just under 40% of Oakland Oceanic air traffic use the CEP and of that number 35% of those aircraft are FANS equipped. The routes between Asia and Hawaii make up about 9% of traffic and are about 90% FANS equipped. The PACOTS traffic (US to Asia) is about 28% of Oakland Center's traffic with 90% FANS equipped aircraft. The south pacific traffic is 8% of the total air traffic which 88% of aircraft are FANS equipped. Nearly 100% of commercial flights or aircraft that operate in the upper altitude stratum are RNP10 equipped. As of last month there were 62% FANS and 52% RNP4 equipped aircraft operating in the Oakland FIR. When FANS aircraft make a request about 82% of the time the request is granted. HF aircraft are less likely to get requested altitudes due to large separation standards. Fukuoka is currently not applying ADS-C distance based separation between FANS over Iridium aircraft.
 - The cost of increased fuel burn due to lack of RNP4 and FANS equipage. Normal reporting rate or cost for ADS is around \$4.50 for an 8hr flight. The average extra fuel burn 1000ft below the requested altitude is 27000-29000kg based on information from air carriers. Oakland center started tracking the extra fuel burn 1000ft below requested altitude in September 2013 and found that non RNP4 aircraft had 21,310kg of extra fuel burn. The data also showed that RNP4 aircraft were affected by non RNP aircraft which resulted in an extra fuel burn of 13534kg. Additionally benefits are not tracked for 30nm lateral separation or two opposite direction aircraft have passed.
 - The current ATC application of ADS distance based separation is used in Anchorage, Fukuoka, Vancouver, ZSE/ZOA/ZLA/HCF/Guam, Auckland, Nadi, and Brisbane.
- **Flight Planned Mach Speeds:** Dennis started off by talking about the risk involved with aircrew not updating ATC on unannounced changes in speed, especially where distance-based separation is being applied. He went on to explain how the Ocean21 system uses the first speed in field 15 of the flight plan (FPL) for the entire route, unless the speed is updated by the controller. The ICAO Annex 2 paragraph 3.6.2.2 (effective November 15, 2012) requires aircrews to update ATC of estimate revisions in excess of 2 minutes. Dennis showed an example of speed change in a FPL where the aircraft had filed a speed difference of 0.13mach from 160E to 170E. The Ocean21 system would continue to show the filed speed of 0.71mach however the aircraft would be flying 0.84mach. This would cause the software to incorrectly project the time estimates and could affect safety.
 - ICAO requires pilots to notify ATC of a 5% or greater speed change from their filed flight plan speed. This means that an aircraft flight planed at 500kts can adjust their speed by 24kts above and below their FPL speed without advising ATC. Which means a speed change of 48kts without advising ATC is possible. If a controller is applying ADS-C 30nm longitudinal separation between two aircraft and the lead aircraft slows down because they hit turbulence, ATC could experience an 11nm separation reduction between the 14 minutes between ADS position reports.
 - Dennis advised the group of an ISPCG action item to develop a Pacific procedure for announcing speed changes. The proposed draft NOTAM for ANSPs is as follows:
- IN ORDER TO PREVENT UNANNOUNCED SPEED CHANGES AIRCREWS ARE REQUIRED TO USE THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURES IN THE KZAK FIR. UPON CROSSING THE KZAK FIR BOUNDARY, AIRCRAFT ARE REQUIRED TO REPORT THEIR SPEED IN THE FIR POSITION REPORT VIA CPDLC

OR HF VOICE. TURBOJET AIRCRAFT ARE TO REPORT THEIR MACH NUMBER AND NON-TURBOJET AIRCRAFT ARE TO REPORT A TRUE AIRSPEED. A PILOT MUST INFORM ATIS EACH TIME THE CRUISING SPEED, EITHER TAS OR MACH WHICHEVER IS APPLICABLE VARIES OR IS EXPECTED TO VARY BY A VALUE EQUAL TO OR GREATER THAN:

- A. 10 KNOTS TAS FROM THE PREVIOUSLY REPORTED SPEED - Non-Turbojet
- B. 0.02 MACH FROM THE PREVIOUSLY REPORTED SPEED - Turbojet.
- The group discussed part B of the NOTAM and it was mentioned that it might be confused with greater than 0.02mach and not its intended value of equal to or greater than. Scott Conde suggested adding +/- signs before the speed changes (10knots and 0.02mach).
- It was mentioned that in the North Atlantic there is no variation of assigned speed (unless assigned) and they are looking to do trials of no Mach trials with Santa Maria and New York Center. Iceland did a study of ADS-C reports in conjunction with the assigned speed and found that the ADS-C speed reports matched the assigned speeds within +/-0.02 Mach 99% of the time. So there is movement to do no Mach number trials within New York FIR in partnership with Santa Maria.
- The Technical Center is collecting data within Oakland airspace now to better inform the current distribution and will bring that back to the next SASP meeting in May. The ADS-C RNP4 reporting frequency might change based on the new data. Dennis added that the econ cruise isn't as much as a problem as sudden increases or decreases in speed due to turbulence etc.
- **Pacific Island Traffic:** Dennis discussed the major Pacific Island airports where Oakland Oceanic provides approach control services for. He went into detail and benefits for the potential of acquiring ADS-B equipment to increase both efficiency and safety at the busier island airports. A graph was used to show the number of actual departure and arrival delays which indicated that even with the limited tools available, controllers were providing exceptional service. Statistical data for the departure delays 2013 showed that only 0.007% of departures were delayed. When flights are delayed, the average delay is 9.76 minutes. The FAA is also investigating the feasibility of Space Based ADS-B Surveillance in conjunction with CPDLC to reduce separation standards. There was a brief discussion about the use of ADS-B and how beneficial it would be for all parties.
- Gene Cameron asked if the World Bank was involved in funding the islands, airports, facilities that have air traffic services for possible ADS-B support. Dennis said there hasn't been a lot of traction with getting funding for ADS-B and the benefits would outweigh the costs.
- **CEP Route Structure:** Dennis next presented a concept for increasing the available routes within the CEP by changing the lateral distance to 30NM. Dennis stated that the new route structure would further help aircraft achieve optimal fuel savings. He added that as aircraft are replaced after their lifespan FANS 1A equipage will increase. At some point it will make sense to consider 30nm spaced CEP routes. Gene Cameron added that there might not be the necessary increase in the equipage of FANS on the aircraft flying those routes. Jim commented that FANS equipage also helps with weather deviations. There was an ONER report of an aircraft that declared PAN, PAN, PAN and deviated 10nm off course because the controller couldn't issue a weather deviation based on separation standards. If the flight was able distance based separation 30nm the pilot wouldn't have had to declare a PAN, PAN, PAN. Jim Jansen explained that the NAT Tracks System routes are separated by a ½ degree and can get as close as 25nm.
- **Tailored Arrivals:** Dennis updated the group on the Oceanic Tailored Arrivals into San Francisco and Los Angeles. The graph of Tailored Arrivals (TA) issued into San Francisco fluctuated monthly from 50 to 100 TAs issued since its inception. The TAs into Los Angeles varied between 0 to 40. Dennis also mentioned the PIRAT1 STAR that was being developed which mirrors the Pacific 2 TA and has an OPD which can be used by non-FANS but RNAV equipped aircraft. When time based metering to SFO is in place aircraft are more frequently taken off the TA. Dennis explained that with the addition of a couple waypoints (UNO, DOS, TRES) the TA could be used to more effectively with Time Based Metering.
- A question was asked since the beginning of the TA has there been any changes to it. Dennis said the only changes to it have been the addition of waypoints PASIF and HUNTS. PASIF is published not mapped because of software issues.

- Someone added that there is new documentation that is trying to be added to the 7110.65 for tailored arrivals (descend/climb via) which might increase the availability to other airports. Scott Conde pointed out that part of the problem is ERAM requires a “TPRR” (spelling) or P altitude patch which requires 2000 lines of code. The expected rollout date is June FY16. If some of the arrivals for the climb/descend via language cross other arrival paths you end up with a hazard conflict alert. You may see some Metro Plex initiatives come forward with the arrival however, you won’t see the climb/descend language until that piece gets resolved.
- **ADS-C Climb/Descent Procedure (CDP):** Dennis presented a brief overview of ADS-C CDP. The manual trial provided eight clearances. The main issue was the controller manual checklist that it needed to be used in order to apply the procedure and the necessity to override Conflict Probe. The automation of the ADS-C CDP has been pushed back to early 2016 due to budget constraints. The operators expressed their displeasure with the delayed implementation.
- **Port Moresby 50nm RNP10 Lateral Separation:** Dennis advised the OWG of Port Moresby’s new 50nm distance based separation standards that began November 14, 2013. Dennis also talked about new routes that had been developed but not incorporated for the new separation standard. Oakland Center is currently working with Port Moresby and Brisbane to resolve any issues on the new routes. There is no projected implementation date.
- **Mazatlán AIDC:** Dennis reported that the FAA is working to establish an AIDC connection between Oakland and Mazatlán. The AIDC connection plan is in its infancy and Dennis will continue to update the group as it progresses. Dennis added that Mazatlán has announced that they are working to convert their class G (east of 120W) airspace into controlled airspace.
- **Impacts from Missile Defense Testing:** Dennis gave a speech on the topic of an airspace reservation from last year and how it affected air traffic. Through the slides Dennis provided data to show the large number of aircraft that have to be re-routed around such airspace. Routing around the reserved airspace would range from 20 to 300 extra miles to flown. Data indicated that during a 4 hour time span \$60,000 (at current fuel prices) would be lost due to re-routes and during a 6 hour time span the loss is increased to \$89,000. Trent Thomson from MDA advised the group that they do not take the data lightly and are working to minimize the impact. Trent also added that to test certain aspects of their system, it causes the tests to falls on unfavorable times. The MDA appreciates the analysis and collaboration with the FAA and hopes to continue to find the best solution. The operators thanked Oakland for working to mitigate the impacts of airspace reservation.
- **Volcanic Ash and PACOTS generation:** Dennis presented a piece on VOLKAM13 exercise and how it impacted the PACOTS. The findings were published under VOLKAM13 (IPACG39 Paper IP11). One of the findings Dennis touched on was the need for international dispatchers on a telecom to enhance communications. Dennis presented a chart of an actual volcanic eruption and how the PACOTS were affected. Dennis also included ICAO procedures and responsibilities for the presence of volcanic ash. To help mitigate risk Dennis summarized the following: In the event of an Ash Plume:
 - A teleconference with international dispatchers is recommended to reach an agreement on the affected airspace.
 - When there is no agreement on affected airspace but credible evidence exists that the PACOTS will be affected by the Ash Plume, the PACOTS will be moved so that they are clear of the Ash Plume. This is a more conservative approach that keeps aircraft clear of volcanic ash.
 - Operators that have completed their SMS analysis and determined that there is no risk could flight plan a UPR through the affected area. ATC would give advisories as required.
- The concern of immediate actions of communication, routing and the dissemination of information was discussed and everyone felt that VOLKAM13 was a good start but further planning and research needed to be done.
- Steve Pinkerton brought up that in December 2013 American airlines presented a paper related to the eruption of Kamchatka peninsula. American Airlines had one aircraft airborne from Dallas to Narita and was somewhere around Oklahoma. There were notable issues with the reroute, first was that the dispatcher sent out essentially a new flight plan. The new flight plan inputted by the dispatcher didn’t

get updated in the domestic centers and downstream facilities got duplicate flight plans. The other issue was the time required to update information and coordinate aircraft between Air Traffic facilities. Example: aircraft flying in anchorage now rerouted to Russia. Gene Cameron added that there was complexity getting an aircraft into Russian airspace that wasn't already filed through there. The update on volcanic ash was originally every 6 hours and it was moved up to every 3 hours. There was talk about the importance and benefits the south pacific could have by creating a similar simulation.

- **Oceanic Navigation Error Reporting ONERs:** Dennis informed the group that Oakland Center is tracking ONERs by airline and has automated Time Error tracking which has increased the numbers or time error reports dramatically. ONER or GNE (Gross Navigation Error) are considered when there are one or more of the following:
 - GNE (Gross Navigation Error) 25nm or more off route.
 - Intervention: Aircraft on different route than expected by ATC.
 - Height Error: 300 feet or more difference between assigned altitude and actual altitude.
 - Time Errors: Pacific = More than 3 minutes
- ONER reports are forwarded to Flight standards and the Technical Center and are used for airspace safety calculations. Oakland has recently experienced aircraft deviating off course without making a weather deviation requests or receiving clearances. It is important to make weather deviation requests prior to deviating off course. Dennis then showed a graph of de-identified operators with their individual number of ONERs. If individual air carriers would like to know their numbers they can contact Dennis. Flight Standards is working with the operators to reduce the number of ONER Time Errors. ARINC has started a read back program that requires the ARINC operator to read back position reports to the pilot.
- **Pacific Approvals Registry and Monitoring Organization PARMO:**
- **Oceanic and Offshore Operations AJV-824:** Steve Pinkerton presented an overview of the Cross Polar Work Group (CPWG) held in Ottawa, Canada on 3-6 December 2013. Steve began his talk on User Trajectory Planning and how certain enhancements and data, such as early intent information, from DOTS+ system were requested by airline operators. There was an explanation that the DOTS+ system is in maintenance mode and requested information by airline operators was not available at this time. The FAA is currently developing a new product (User Trajectory Planning for the pre Oceanic phase) that is part of NextGen and includes interactive flight plan collaboration, feedback about the likelihood of achieving a planned trajectory, recognition of acceptable variations, and support of increased User Preferred Trajectory (UPT). The operational trials and implementation are TBD.
- **Anchorage ARTCC update:** Steve Kessler started with the updates for Anchorage's sector 4s airspace. Anchorage is doing some developmental work for implementing Ocean21/ATOP in the Arctic FIR. As it stands FDP2000 doesn't support ADS-C reduced separation however, with the implementation of Ocean21 they would be able to use it. Implementing Ocean21 in the Arctic would require a re-sectorizing of the current sector 4 into 2 sectors. Steve showed the possible configurations for sector 64 and 4 boundary and added that ADS-C will be useable in the new sector. The impact to the users is they would potentially have to add an AFTN address when filing flight plans. Next he talked about the current NOTAMs and the current UPR restrictions. Current UPR restriction for flights joining the NOPAC route R580 is to join no further west than ONEIL. Effective 2/12/14, restriction will change to require joining R580 no further west than OPAKE. Steve mentioned the annual Red Flag military exercise that will be conducted Jun 13-27 Aug 8-22 Oct 3-17. The address for daily updates on special use airspace is <http://sua.faa.gov/sua>.
- Eddie Castillo asked Gene about icing for b787-8 flying above F380 and Gene said stay away from the equator. Gene stated that the NOTAM for contacting Anchorage and beacon code assignment had changed a couple times and caused quite a bit of confusion with pilots contacting Anchorage and obtaining a beacon code. Mark Torres explained the new NOTAM A0121/14 says that the air crews are supposed to contact ARINC prior to the ADIZ for a beacon code. HF contact is best made when crossing 150w but must be made before crossing the ADIZ. Mark went on to say that beacon codes are provided by Anchorage and given to ARINC and are assigned for aircraft on westbound PACOTS but not UPRs. Beacon codes are not assigned to UPRs because of their unpredictability. Gene agreed that UPRs might be the underlying issue.

- **Honolulu Control Facility (HCF) Update: SOME ONE** briefly commented on the upcoming Rim of the Pacific Exercise (RIMPAC). The opening ceremonies will be June 26 and wrap up will be August 1st 2014. Two new entrants this year are the Royal Norwegian Navy and the Chinese. The event is the biggest of its kind and will increase ATC work load. HCF will work hard to make the impact to the air carriers minimal.
- April 25, 2014 there was a TCAS event which was classified as a significant event on their foxtrot track. HCF has implemented and is in the process of implementing multiple mitigation strategies. One strategy that went active today is extending the Strategic Lateral Offset Procedure (SLOP) in Honolulu's airspace. The air craft can offset from the entry point for 70 miles or until it is vectored. For aircraft exiting or departing HCF they can begin to use SLOP when they are 70 miles from the Oakland HCF boundary and in level flight at altitude.
- **Cross Polar Work Group Update:** Steve Pinkerton wasn't able to attend because of custom and flight issues. He did go over User Trajectory Planning in the pre oceanic phase. It's a planning capability being developed to replace certain software like DOTS+. Questions were raised about the product and it has been developed by the Next Gen office and has been placed on hold until 2016 due to funding issues and other priorities. It is expected to get out to the field around 2018 and 2020. Gene added that the CPWG is held in places that are hard to get to and that it should be more accessible. IATA and the stake holders are very pleased with the FAA and the implementation of Ocean21 in Anchorage.
- **New York Center:** Shawn Knight started by going over various maps specific to New York Center's Oceanic airspace. The organized track system is built every day from collaboration with Santa Maria and Nav Canada. There can be up to ten different tracks at one time. Waters plus is the track system that runs north and south and was created in 2007 and joins routes south of New York's airspace. There is about 40% equipage rate of ADS-C and CPDLC in the Waters airspace and up to 80% equipage rate in the north Atlantic. Recently New York Center had a tri-lateral meeting with Santa Maria and Piarco. What came of that meeting was a great interest for no speed assignment outside the organized track system. The no Mach trial is projected to happen late 2014. Piarco ACC has a new operating platform that integrates radars on some of the islands. At the end of 2014 New York Center hopes to integrate 5 additional radars sites into Ocean21 and by the winter of this year they hope to have Ocean21 radar control. Reduced lateral separation down to 25nm and 5min longitudinal trials with NAT 2k and Nav Canada were scheduled for February 2015 and are now pushed back to November 2015. The UPRs outside the Organized Track System is ok with New York.
- There was a question about the reduced lateral separation and if there would be a need for a tighter RNP ie. 3 or 3.5. The answer is the RNP standard will still be RNP4.
- **Charter Update:** Dennis proposed an update to the OWG Charter and a vote was taken on the following:
 - Overall Roles and Responsibilities.** The Oceanic Work Group (OWG) has been in place since the early 1990's as a user/provider working group, partnering to provide for the continued development of effective, streamlined oceanic operations with the goal of increased capacity and the overall efficiency of service within the Pacific Region.
 - Responsibilities.** To support the activities of the Informal South Pacific Air Traffic Services Coordinating Group (ISPACG), Informal Pacific Air Traffic Services Coordinating Group (IPACG) and the Cross Polar Work Group (CPWG) and make recommendations when appropriate.

To serve as a user-provider forum working to improve the safety and efficiency of oceanic air traffic services in the Pacific Region.

Members. OWG membership is open to:

Airspace users in the Pacific Region. The International Air Transport Association (IATA). Interested air navigation service providers (ANSP). FAA Air Traffic Control System Command Center (ATCSCC). Ancillary Aviation Services providers (e.g., Rockwell Collins ARINC, Mitre Corporation, etc.). When necessary, an OWG sub-group (OWGSG) made up of representatives from the general membership may be formed to address major issues brought forward during a meeting. The OWGSG membership will be determined based on the specific issue(s) to be reviewed. The OWGSG is empowered by the OWG to establish Ad Hoc working groups, as necessary, to deal with issues requiring on-going detailed review and evaluation.

Meetings. Meetings will be held at least twice a year. An optional third meeting may be added midway between the two, if deemed necessary. Oakland Air Route Traffic Control Center (ARTCC) will chair OWG meetings. The agenda for each meeting will be developed through input from all members. The chair will distribute a call for agenda items followed by the distribution of the proposed agenda prior to the meetings. A tentative location for the meeting will be determined by the chair and agreed to by the members. In addition to the physical meeting, a virtual meeting will be broadcast with an associated telephone conference line for those wishing to participate, but unable to attend in person. The meeting URL and conference number and passcode will be included with the agenda.

OWGSG Meetings. The chairperson for the OWGSG will be selected from the sub-group membership at the time of formation. Meetings will be held either face-to-face or online, as agreed to by the sub-group membership. A quorum is required for OWGSG recommendations. As a minimum, a quorum consists of two representatives from the airspace users and two ANSP representatives. The sub-group will provide updates on their progress at subsequent OWG meetings.

Issues/Recommendations. Issues/recommendations may be provided to the OWG through any member. Members may bring subject matter experts as required by the issues. The OWG will prioritize issues and develop recommendations as a whole, or through sub-group activity, as necessary. Upon consensus of the group, recommendations for action or review will be forwarded to either the ANSP or ISPACG/IPACG.

Reports. The membership will receive the following: The PowerPoint presentation(s) developed for the OWG meeting. The synopsis from the OWG meeting. Reports and recommendations received from the OWGSG.

Charter Adoption. This Charter was reviewed and adopted at the regular meeting of the OWG held on June 18, 2014 and supersedes the OWG Charter dated May 13, 1997.

Dennis put the proposed charter to a vote and there were no objections.

- **Pacific Island Update:** Gene Cameron touched on the B767 aircraft that had to divert into PWAK and how important those airports are. There have been a couple of little glitches that have affected weather dissemination. The biggest concerns are the Hawaiian Islands from the RSA on Lihue, the eventual reconstruction at Kapolei with runways 2 and 20, and the Blue Angels at the end of September.
- **Next Meetings:**
 - IPACG 40 is September 8-12, 2014 Washington D.C.
 - ISPACG 29 Date TBD Santiago Chile
 - OWG: The next OWG meeting was agreed upon to be held **October 8, 2014**. The meeting will also be available on-line and via telecon.

June 18, 2014 OWG Attendance Sheet

Attended	Name	Organization	E-mail Address	Phone Number
√	Dennis Addison	FAA/ZOA	dennis.addison@faa.gov	510-745-3258
√	Raul Aguirre	AMX	aguirrehug@yahoo.com	
	Wayne Aleshire	Oceanic ATS Consult	aleshirew@aol.com	831-915-9631
	Dan Allen	FedEx	daniel.allen@fedex.com	901-224-5114
	Steve Altus	Jeppesen Tech Svc.	steve.altus@jeppesen.com	408-961-2260
	Mark Anderson	HAL	mark.anderson@hawaiianair.com	360-402-8960 (c) 360-456-3448
	Steve Baker	Alaska Airlines	Steve.Baker@AlaskaAir.com	206-392-6204
	Heather Bell	Vancouver ACC	bellh@navcanada.ca	604-868-4273
	Cynthia Berwyn	FedEx	chberwyn@fedex.com	310-780-7234
	Mike Birdsong	HQ AMC/A3V	michael.birdsong@scott.af.mil	618-229-3626
	Jonathan Bonds	UPS	jbonds@ups.com	
√	Jerry Bordeaux	FAA/HQ	Jerry.bordeaux@faa.gov	202-385-8329
√	James Brown	FAA	James.d.brown@faa.gov	916-715-7557
√	John Brown	Boeing Commercial	John.a.brown@boeing.com	425-266-0787
√	Dustin Byerly	FAA/Oakland ARTCC	Dustin.m.byerly@faa.gov	510-745-8891
√	Gene Cameron	UAL	gene.cameron@united.com	530-878-8791
√	Eddie Castillo	Pacific Aviation Corp.	ecastillo@pacificaviation.com	650-821-1190
	Jeff Cerasoli	SWA	jeffrey.cerasoli@wnco.com	480-652-1976
	Jorge Chades	FAA/HQ	Jorge.a.chades@faa.gov	202-385-8461
	Patricia Chavez	MITRE/CAASD	pchavez@mitre.org	703-983-5245
	Hill Chen	EVA Air	hillchen@evaair.com	
	Me Tin Cheung	FAA/ZOA	me.tin.cheung@faa.gov	510-745-3468
√	Karen Chiodini	FAA/AJE-32	karen.l.chiodini@faa.gov	202-493-5248
	Jerry Chou	EVA Airways	evajerry@hotmail.com	
√	Dave Cobb, Jr.	USAF 618 TACC/XOCZF	william.cobb@scott.af.mil	618-229-4977
√	Devin Corbett	FAA Oakland Center TMU/MOS	Devin.corbett@faa.gov	510-745-3332
√	Scott Conde	FAA/NATCA	zoanatca@pacbell.net	510-673-0237
	Tim Cornelison	Guam CERAP	tim.cornelison@faa.gov	
	Bradley Cornell	Boeing	bradley.d.cornell@boeing.com	425-280-5603

Attended √	Name	Organization	E-mail Address	Phone Number
	Paul Cousineau	AAL	Couse1@aol.com	714-381-3812
	John Crane	Virgin Australia	John.crane@virginaustralia.com	61-417695969
	Robert Cust	18th AF TACC/XOCZF	robert.cust@scott.af.mil	618-229-4977
	Greg Dale	UAL	greg.dale@united.com	812-825-5095
	Greg Dansereau	Nav Canada/Vancouver ACC	dansegr@navcanada.com	604-598-4850
√	Anderson Davie	FAA Flt Standards Western Pacific	Anderson.Davie@faa.gov	408-291-7681ext142
	Richard Davy	ACA Flight Dispatch	Richard.Davy@aircanada.ca	905-676-2948
	Sean Deaton	USAF 618 TACC/XOCM	sean.deaton@scott.af.mil	618-256-3705
	Dan Delane	FedEx	Daniel.delane@fedex.com	901-224-5543
	Owen Dell	Cathay Pacific Airways	owen_dell@cathaypacific.com	852-2747-8829
	Tony Diaz	ARINC - NYC	adiaz@arinc.com	631-244-2480
	Masakazu Douglas	JAL	masakazu.douglas@jal.com	310-606-6558
	Greg Down	NAV Canada/YVR ACC	Greg.down@navcanada.ca	604-586-4500
	Wayne Duren	FAA/ZOA	Wayne.duren@faa.gov	510-745-3860
	Keith Dutch	FAA/AJE-32	keith.dutch@faa.gov	202-385-8459
√	Dan Duva	Fedex Air Navigation	Daniel.duva@fedex.com	901-224-5153
	Esther Eivinsen	Air Canada	Esther.Eivinsen@aircanada.ca	905-676-2491
√	Don Elson	USAF 618 TACC/XOCM	Donald.elson@us.af.mil	618-229-0635
√	Christine Falk	FAA Tech Center	Christine.falk@faa.gov	609-485-6877
	Ronald Fischer	FAA/International Ops	Ronald.A.Fischer@faa.gov	540-422-4563
	Brian Flynn	FAA Tech Center	brian.e.flynn@faa.gov	609-485-7877
√	Dennis Fogarty	FAA NextGen Branch AWP-220	Dennis.Fogarty@faa.gov	310-725-7212
	Ken Foster	UPS/Flt Control Stds.	kffoster@ups.com	502-359-5155
√	Ted Fudge	NAV Canada	fudget@navcanada.ca	613-563-5651
	Frank Fujii	JAL	frank.fujii@jal.com	310-646-4640
	Julia Fuller	FAA/ZOA	Julia.fuller@faa.gov	510-745-3823
	Murray Giesbrecht	NAV Canada-YVR	giesbrm@navcanada.ca	604-908-6462
	Leo Gioia	FAA/ZOA	leo.gioia@faa.gov	
	Aaron Glorioso	Alaska Airlines	Aaron.glorioso@alaskaair.com	206-392-6340
	JP Gonzales	FACSFAC San Diego	Joseph.p.gonzales@navy.mil	619-545-1745

Attended √	Name	Organization	E-mail Address	Phone Number
	Tom Graff	FAA/L-3	tomjgraff@gmail.com	970-988-3633
	Masashi Hamada	ANA	m_hamada@fly-ana.com	650-821-0310
√	Lynne Hamrick	MITRE/CAASD	lhamrick@mitre.org	703-983-5441
	Steve Harris	USAF 618 TACC/XOCZF	steven.harris-02@scott.af.mil	618-229-4977
	Dustin Hegland	FAA/Oakland ARTCC	Dustin.hegland@faa.gov	510-745-3474
	Debra Hernke	FAA/ZLA TMO	Debra.Hernke@faa.gov	661-265-8250
	Byung Ho Ban	Korean Airlines	banbh@koreanair.com	310-417-5264
	Michael Hollman	USAF 618 TACC/XOCM	michael.hollman@scott.af.mil	618-256-3691
	Melissa Holmes	FAA/Oakland ARTCC	melissa.holmes@faa.gov	510-745-3545
	Robert Hong	FAA/HCF	robert.hong@faa.gov	808-840-6100
	Ray Howland	AAL	ray.howland@aa.com	817-967-8343
	Jay Hoyer	AAL	Jay.hoyer@aa.com	817-967-8416
	Fred Hsu	EVA Air	fredhsu@evaair.com	
	Jim Jansen	FAA/SJC FSDO	james.c.jansen@faa.gov	408-291-7681
√	Robert Jones	FAA/Oakland TMU/MOS	Robert.leo.jones@faa.gov	510-745-3332
	Elroy Kaneshiro	HAL	Elroy.kaneshiro@hawaiianair.com	808-838-5568
	Kathleen Kearns	SITA	Kathleen.kearns@sitaaero.com	
	Steve Kessler	FAA/ZAN/TMO	Steve.kessler@faa.gov	907-269-1220
	Gene Kim	TRS/SWA	Gene.kim@wnco.com	214-792-3242
	Kevin Kong	KAL	kjkong@koreanair.com	310-417-5261
√	Shawn Knight	New York ARTCC	Shawn.Knight@faa.gov	631-468-1026
	Tony Klancher	FAA/Anchorage ARTCC	antony.klancher@faa.gov	907-269-2730
	Tom Kraft	FAA	tom.kraft@faa.gov	202-369-2168
	Jim Krogh			
	Mike Lavery	NAV Canada-YVR	laverym@navcanada.ca	604-586-4550
	Grant LeClaire	SWA	Grant.leclaire@airtran.com	404-290-2724
	Joseph Lee	CAL		
	Jumper Leggio	ARINC	gleggio@arinc.com	925-294-8400
	JT Lenhart	FAA/Oakland Ocean		
√	Duane Lighty	ARINC – NYC	DWL@arinc.com	631-244-2480

Attended √	Name	Organization	E-mail Address	Phone Number
	Russell Lindsay	ARINC/SFO	rlindsay@arinc.com	925-294-8400
√	Scott Luka	Regulus Group	sluka@regulus-group.com	516-840-0187
	Vince Macdonald	NAV Canada – YVR	macdonv@navcanada.ca	604-787-8716
√	Mary Anne Mancillas	ARINC/HQ	mm@arinc.com	410-266-4242
√	Michael Martinez	FAA/Oakland ARTCC	Michael.martinez@faa.gov	510-745-3320
√	Belinda Maupin	ARINC/SFO	bmaupin@arinc.com	925-294-8400
	Leslie McCormick	CSSI	lmccormick@cssiinc.com	
	Ron McGowan	ARINC/HQ	rmcgowan@arinc.com	410-266-2376
√	James Meadows	FAA/Oakland ARTCC	Jim.meadows@faa.gov	510-745-3469
√	John Metzger	ARINC/HQ	jbm@arinc.com	410-266-4238
	John Moore	FAA	john.f.moore@faa.gov	202-385-8443
	Grant Morris	SWA	grant.morris2@wnco.com	
	Yasuo Nishiyama	NCA	yasuo.nishiyama@nca.aero	773-894-8250
√	AL Parris	ARINC/Rockwell Collins NYC	Aparris@arinc.com	571-246-4365
	Linda Pellegrini	FAA/HCF	Linda.Pellegrini@faa.gov	808-840-6111
	Robert Phillips	FedEx	robert.phillips@fedex.com	901-224-5150
√	Steve Pinkerton	FAA/AJE-32	Steven.Pinkerton@faa.gov	202-385-8384
	David Poe	JAL	David.poe.iii@jal.com	
	Alec Pook	Air Canada	Alec.pook@aircanada.ca	905-224-5150
	Dottie Poole	FAA/HNL Control Facility	Dottie.Poole@faa.gov	
	Leigh Prasse	ARINC - SFO	lprasse@arinc.com	925-294-8400
	Michael Rogerson	NAV Canada-YVR	rogersm@navcanada.ca	
	Tony Rushton	NAV Canada-YVR	rushtt@navcanada.ca	604-586-4510
	Mark Schell	CSSI	mschell@cssiinc.com	828-684-6217
	Chris Schmidt	SWA/US Navy	chris.schmidt@wnco.com	817-201-9443
√	Dave Schwartz	FAA/HCF	Dave.Schwartz@faa.gov	808-840-6253
√	Gregg Scott	DAL	gregg.scott@delta.com	678-823-2892
√	Vivek Sharma	The Boeing Company	vivek.sharma2@boeing.com	253-657-6339
√	Kent Sharrar	HAL	Kent.Sharrar@hawaiianair.com	808-783.3510
	Todd Shibata	FAA/HCF	todd.l.shibata@faa.gov	808-840-6201

Attended √	Name	Organization	E-mail Address	Phone Number
	Stephen Smith	FAA/PHX CMO		
	Mark Spence	HAL	mark.spence@hawaiianair.com	808-838-5519
√	Bill Sperandio	SWA	william.sperandio@wnco.com	214-792-7939
	Aubrey Stevens	Delta Air Lines	aubrey.l.stevens@delta.com	404-715-1712
√	Carol Stewart	NAV Canada		
√	Bob Swensson	MITRE	rswensso@mitre.org	703-801-6345
	John Taggart	FAA/ZOA	John.J.Taggart@faa.gov	510-745-3332
	ChengYeow Tan	Singapore Airlines	chengyeow_tan@singaporeair.com.sg	(65) 6540-2913
√	Chuck Taylor	Jeppesen	Chuck.taylor@jeppesen.com	408-961-3871
	Trent Thompson	MDA/DTRF	Trenton.thompson@mda.mil	256-450-4035
	Mike Tiongco	ARINC – SFO	mtiongco@arinc.com	925-294-8400
√	Mark Torres	AAL	Mark.torres@aa.com	817-967-5215
	Ben Treadaway	FAA/PHX CMO	Bennett.treadaway@faa.gov	602-393-4864x278
	Howard Tseng	EVA Air	howardseng@evaair.com	
	Dick Van Aernum	DAL	richard.vanaernum@delta.com	404-715-0019
	Peter Vogt	FAA/HQ	peter.vogt@faa.gov	202-385-8506
	Michael Ward	USAF AMC	michael.ward.51@us.af.mil	618-224-4977
√	Jim Webb	FAA/New York ARTCC	Jim.webb@faa.gov	631-468-5971
	Don Willems	USAF 12RS/Beale	Donald.willems@beale.af.mil	352-255-3116
	Wayne Winningham	FAA/Oakland Oceanic	wayne.winningham@faa.gov	510-745-3548
	Steve Wolford	AAL/Sys Ops Control	Steve.wolford@aa.com	817-967-8892
	Shumei Yamaguchi	NCA		
	Dan Yanagihara	JAL	dan.yanagihara@jal.com	310-606-6555
	Mitsuhiro Yoshizaki	NCA	mitsuhiro.yoshizaki@nca.aero	773-551-0803