AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM Charting Group Meeting 17-02 – October 25 - 26, 2017

RECOMMENDATION DOCUMENT

FAA Control # ACF-CG RD 17-02-313

Subject: Publish Standard Proposed Flight Plan Deletion Times in the Chart Supplement

Background/Discussion:

In 2014, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) investigated a whistleblower disclosure regarding duplicate flight plans—a term commonly used for Multiple Flight Plans (MFPs). In response to the investigation, the Air Traffic Organization (ATO) formed a taskforce and convened a Safety Risk Management (SRM) panel in June 2014. From a general review of National Airspace System (NAS) data, taskforce members approximated that between 800 and 1,000 MFPs were in the NAS daily, but no data were provided to the panel to support this estimate. The panel identified one hazard, MFPs for the same Aircraft Identification (ACID) from the same departure airport within an established timeframe and arriving at the same destination (MFP-01), with a current risk of LOW (4C), based on ATO Safety Management System (SMS) Manual, Version 2.1. The current risk using the risk matrix in the ATO SMS Manual, September 2015, is now MEDIUM (4C).

Multiple Flight Plans (MFPs) are usually identified by an alert air traffic controller or a questioning pilot before safety has been seriously compromised, but controller and pilot intervention are the last lines of defense and they are not foolproof. Based on this conclusion and the considerations above, the July 2016 panel finalized several safety requirements to either reduce the frequency of MFPs in the NAS or mitigate their effects when they occur. These requirements (in no hierarchical order) are listed below and can be found in the Hazard Analysis Worksheet (see Appendix A).

- 1. Develop FAA publication changes that standardize the path of flight plan communication. The following changes will address the current lack of guidance for amending and canceling flight plans:
 - a. DCP to FAA Order JO 7210.3, *Facility Operation and Administration*, to add new Paragraph 8-1-4, FLIGHT PLAN DROP INTERVAL, to standardize flight plan drop times;

The panel reconvened in July 2016 to review the 2014 safety requirements and determine if they would address the concerns outlined in the FAA response to the 2014 whistleblower report that precipitated this issue as well as in the subsequent Air Traffic Safety Action Program (ATSAP) Corrective Action Request (CAR) 2016-020, *Duplicate Flight Plans*. (See Section 2 for more details on the decision to reconvene the SRM panel.) That follow-on panel concluded the following:

• Standard drop time(s) will be included in a publication available to operators (e.g., ChartSupplements) to enable them to determine when their flight plan will be dropped beforefiling another flight plan for the same flight.

Recommendations:

Add an additional page with content such as:

SITE	Prop	posed	Flight	Plan	Deletion	Time
ZAB	120	minut	ces			
ZAU	120	minut	ces			
ZBW	120	minut	ces			
ZDC	120	minut	ces			
ZDV	180	minut	ces			
ZFW	180	minut	ces			
ZHU	120	minut	ces			
ZID	240	minut	ces			
ZJX	120	minut	ces			
ZKC	120	minut	ces			
ZLA	120	minut	ces			
ZLC	120	minut	ces			
ZMA	120	minut	ces			
ZME	125	minut	ces			
ZMP	120	minut	ces			
ZNY	121	minut	ces			
ZOA	120	minut	ces			
ZOB	120	minut	ces			
ZSE	120	minut	ces			
ZTL	120	minut	ces			

Comments:

Submitted by: Lori Farrell
Organization: FAA/AJT-2410
Phone: (202) 267-0101

E-mail: Lori.Farrell@FAA.gov

Date: 03-27-2017

MEETING 17-02

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, briefed the issue. Valerie commented that she reached out to the proponent by email and shared with her that the Chart Supplement is not the appropriate place for the publication of flight plan deletion times. She explained that there is no flight plan guidance in the Supplements and there would thus be no expectation by pilots to find this narrow aspect of flight plan information in that publication. She suggested to the proponent that such information should appear in the AIM and possibly on the FAA Flight Planning Information website. The proponent was not in attendance. There was agreement to close this item.

STATUS: CLOSED