



**THE FORTY-THIRD MEETING OF THE
INFORMAL PACIFIC ATC CO-ORDINATING GROUP
(IPACG/43)**

(Tokyo, Japan 27 – 28 September 2017)

Agenda Item 6: ATM Issues

Monitoring Agency Activity in North Pacific Airspace

(Presented by Japan Airspace Safety Monitoring Agency (JASMA) and Pacific Approvals Registry and Monitoring Organization (PARMO))

SUMMARY

This information paper provides the meeting with a summary of relevant safety monitoring activities conducted for North Pacific Airspace by two ICAO-endorsed monitoring agencies. The Japan Airspace Safety Monitoring Agency (JASMA) and Pacific Approvals Registry and Monitoring Organization (PARMO) provide enroute monitoring agency (EMA) and regional monitoring agency (RMA) services for North Pacific Airspace. The purpose of this information paper is to increase awareness of the monitoring agency activities.

1. Introduction

1.1. The Japan Airspace Safety Monitoring Agency (JASMA) and the Pacific Approvals Registry and Monitoring Organization (PARMO) produce annual reports to the ICAO Regional Airspace Safety Monitoring Advisory Group (RASMAG). The 22nd meeting of this group, RASMAG/22, took place in July 2017. The RASMAG reports directly to the Asia Pacific Air Navigation Planning and Implementation Group (APANPIRG). The RASMAG meetings are open to all Asia Pacific States. All Asia Pacific EMAs and RMAs attend the annual RASMAG meeting and provide safety monitoring reports for operations observed during the previous calendar year.

1.2. The JASMA is operated by the Civil Aviation Bureau (CAB), Ministry of Land, Infrastructure Transport and Tourism-(MLIT)- Japan. The Air Traffic Control Association Japan (ATCA-J) has been supporting complementary parts of its operation in close coordination with JCAB on contract basis.

1.3. The PARMO is provided by the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) William J. Hughes Technical Center (WJHTC).

2. Discussion

2.1. The accompanying presentation in Attachment A contains a summary of the most recent reports delivered to RASMAG/22 by JASMA and PARMO relevant for the IPACG meeting.

2.2. The Asia Pacific RMAs use traffic sample data (TSD) to perform checks on the RVSM approval status for observed operations. Operations indicating “W” in Item 10 of the filed flight plan are cross-examined with the collective RVSM approvals database. Any of these operations for which an RVSM approval is not found are investigated. If an RVSM approval is not found with further investigation, the operation is noted and repeated occurrences are reported to RASMAG. The Asia Pacific RMAs reported an increase in the number of operations filing “W” in item 10 of the flight plan without a record of RVSM approval to RASMAG/22. The observed increase in the data from all the Asia Pacific RMAs was not from a single source, but from many places around the world. The main Asia Pacific States concerned are China, India, Indonesia, Philippines, Republic of Korea, and Viet Nam.

2.3. RASMAG/22 endorsed the following Draft Conclusion, for APANPIRG/28’s consideration:

Draft Conclusion RASMAG/22-10: Management of Non-RVSM Aircraft

That, due to the continuing problem of non-Reduced Vertical Separation Minimum (RVSM) aircraft operating inappropriately within the RVSM stratum on a long-term basis:

(a) Asia/Pacific States should respond in a timely manner to Regional Monitoring Agency (RMA) recommendations; and

(b) Asia/Pacific States and Administrations should enact policies, legislation (including appropriate enforcement actions), and procedures to ensure such non-approved aircraft are identified and refused entry into the RVSM stratum unless specifically exempted, or they have Air Traffic Control (ATC) approval, and

(c) ICAO should survey Asia/Pacific States and Administrations to determine whether such policies, legislation and procedures to exclude non-RVSM aircraft have been implemented; and

(d) RMAs should treat aircraft with an unverified RVSM approval status by its State of Approval for more than one month, starting from the first RMA notification, as a non-RVSM approved aircraft and that information provided to relevant State authorities for appropriate action; and

(e) RMAs should be empowered by APANPIRG to have direct communication with transport ministries if required in the event of inadequate response by the State.

2.4. The intention of the draft conclusion is to emphasize the role of States in the RVSM approval process. Ultimately, the goal is to ensure RVSM airspace remains safe for all operations.

2.5. One of the roles of an EMA and RMA is to receive reports of large height deviations (LHDs), large lateral deviations (LLDs) and large longitudinal errors (LLEs). Historically, separate forms requiring information applicable to the event type were completed for vertical and horizontal navigation errors.

2.6. In an effort to reduce the number varying forms to be completed by air navigation service providers (ANSPs), reduce the workload of the event reporter and data analysts, and acquire a more detailed description of the event being reported, PARMO developed a consolidated navigation error report form. The form includes fields applicable to LHDs, LLDs and LLEs. The format and fields included in the form are based on recommendations provided in ICAO Doc 9937, *Operating Procedures and Practices for Regional Monitoring Agencies in Relation to the Use of a 300 m (1 000 ft) Vertical Separation Minimum Between FL 290 and FL 410 Inclusive*, and ICAO Doc 10063, *Manual on Monitoring the Application of Performance-based Horizontal Separation Minima*, and are designed to capture details specific to the event that will support risk calculations.

2.7. The consolidated form is included as Attachment B. This form will be considered by all Asia Pacific EMAs and RMAs at the next RASMAG-Monitoring Agency Working Group (MAWG) in January 2018.

3. Conclusion

3.1 The meeting is invited to note the information provided.