

## **Eighth Meeting of the Pacific Project Team (PPT/08)**

(Paris, France, 16 December 2014)

### **TRASAS/4 Conclusion and Airspace Users' Work Program Suggestions**

(Presented by IATA)

#### SUMMARY

This working paper details a conclusion from the recent TRASAS/4 meeting and presents a number of work program suggestions for the meeting's consideration.

#### **1. Introduction**

1.1 The recent TRASAS/4 meeting held in Bangkok 29-31 October agreed to the following conclusion relating to the Pacific Project:

##### **TRASAS Conclusion 4/2 – Support for the Pacific Project**

That TRASAS:

reaffirms support for the Pacific Project as agreed in 2010 at TRASAS/3; and urges the United States, Canada, Japan and the Russian Federation to work cooperatively with airspace users to improve airspace efficiency between North America and Asia.

1.2 During the TRASAS meeting both Canada and the United States reaffirmed their support for the project. Outside the formal meeting the Pacific Project Team Co-Chairs, IATA and the United States, agreed to a renewed effort over the next 12 months to work collaboratively towards generating tangible outcomes.

#### **2. Discussion**

2.1 IATA welcomes the TRASAS/4 conclusion and the indications of support given by the ANSPs at the meeting. IATA and airspace users regard the Pacific Project Team as a vitally important group for two key, related reasons:

- Modeling and data analysis consistently indicates that realization of the Pacific Project goals has the potential to significantly improve operations between Asia and North America, and that the project has the potential to unlock the greatest environmental and efficiency gains on a per flight basis across any of the major traffic flows; and
- The Pacific Project is the only forum that brings together all relevant parties to consider this major traffic flow in end-to-end terms.

2.2 The ultimate aim of the Pacific Project remains to enable UPR as the primary means of navigation for flights operating between North America and Asia. Airspace users recognize that it may take some time to realize that aim and suggest that possible improvement initiatives are categorized and

evaluated using four time horizons:

*Immediate* – initiatives that can be considered and potentially implemented in the very near term (less than twelve months);

*Near term* – initiatives that can be considered and implemented in the short to medium term (twelve months to 3 years);

*Longer-term* – initiatives that can be considered and implemented in the medium term to long term (more than 3 years);

*Future state* – initiatives that maybe enabled by technological advances still under development or not fully deployed.

2.3 Utilizing these time horizons, airspace users request that this meeting discusses the following work program suggestions:

*Immediate* – **UPR expansion (FAA and State ATM)**

- Request that the FAA consider allowing UPRs westbound to Russian FIR boundary fixes on both the Magadan and Petropavlovsk boundaries. The relevant fixes are ERNIK, RUSOR, BESAT, BAMOK, KOKES, LUMES, and KUNAD. If possible the UPRs would not require using any ATS routes within ZAN airspace.
- Request that Russia consider an extension of the UPR expansion proposal above by allowing UPRs westbound from the Anchorage FIR boundary (LAT/LONs) to named waypoints along ATS routes within Russian Oceanic Airspace.

*Immediate-Near term* – **Traffic count data gathering (FAA and JCAB)**

- Request that the FAA provides and analyzes traffic count data along NOPAC ATS routes R220 and R580 by UTC time of day to evaluate the possibility of flex track (OTS), or possibly UPRs, to the Fukuoka boundary during low demand periods.
- Request that JCAB provides and analyzes traffic count data in order to evaluate allowing UPRs during low demand periods for traffic from North America to points west of the Anchorage/Fukuoka FIR boundary such as NOGAL and OPULO (approximately 153E), or possibly waypoints further west.
  - ❖ Note - it is acknowledged that gathering such traffic data is a time consuming process therefore future requests for traffic data in the PPT framework will only be made in order to aid the evaluation of a specific proposal. In terms of the specific requests above, it is suggested that the meeting discusses the data parameters that would best facilitate the evaluation of the proposals.

*Longer-term* – **replacing NOPAC with an OTS (all)**

- What needs to occur in order to evaluate replacing the NOPAC with an organized track system as an interim step on the path to enabling UPRs as the primary means of navigation for flights operating between North America and Asia?
- Will the member ANSPs support evaluating this as an option?

*Future-state* – **Space-based ADS-B (all)**

- Request that the PPT members discuss the pathway towards utilizing space-based ADS-B for surveillance in the PPT area of interest, including discussing whether this is potentially desirable or not. No commitment to utilizing the technology is being sought.

### 3. Action by the Meeting

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a. review and discuss the information contained in this Working Paper.