

AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM
Instrument Procedures Group
Meeting 15-01 – April 28, 2015

RECOMMENDATION DOCUMENT

FAA Control # 15-01-322

Subject: Charts for SID, STAR, and ODPs do not provide accurate information for filing a flight plan in many cases.

Background/Discussion: When SID, STAR, or named ODP are filed in a flight plan, sometimes the FAA ERAM computer is not adapted to permit including these procedures in the flight plan. When this occurs, a flight plan that includes an affected procedure will be rejected by ERAM. This may occur well after the flight plan has been accepted by the filing agency. The result is the pilot gets to the airport, calls for their clearance, and ATC does not have a flight plan on file. If the flight plan is filed and has a departure time within a few hour window of the filing, the flight plan is routed directly to ERAM and the pilot may get an error indication that the route has an error in it. In many cases, the pilot ends up using trial and error to determine what in the route is causing the error by refiling the flight plan multiple times until they determine a route that is accepted.

Some cases involve vector SID's where ERAM doesn't accept them because a route can't be adapted for the SID. Some have specific requirements that are not stated on the chart, such as Turbojet only. Some have instructions on the Chart to file the transition waypoint and not the SID. Others still have local requirements that the SID or STAR or a specific transition are only assignable by ATC and may not be filed.

The instructions for using the computer code need updating to reflect how to file a SID, ODP or STAR with and without a transition. For example, the code for KCLT Hugo Two SID is HUG2.HUG, but filing this will be rejected by ERAM.

Recommendations: When a SID, STAR, or ODP is not adapted to be used by ERAM, consider not provide the computer filing code and indicate on the chart that the procedure may not be filed by the pilot, but it may be assigned by ATC. Include any equipment or aircraft requirements on the chart notes. Coordinate with the ERAM adaption team and the responsible ATC Facility to confirm that the published database data and charts reflect all dependencies and that the ERAM will accept the computer codes and transitions. Clarify the instructions in the Frontmatter (Legend data) in the TPP publication that describes how to use the computer code and filing flight plans.

Comments:

Submitted by: John Collins

Organization: ForeFlight LLC

Phone: 704 576-3561

FAX:

E-mail: john@foreflight.com

Date: April 6, 2015

INITIAL DISCUSSION – MEETING 15-01: John Collins, GA pilot, briefed  the issue as outlined on the Requirements Document (RD) and showed examples of routes. If you file these routes as written, they are rejected. He recommended that if the pilot cannot file a code (associated with a route), that code should not be provided to the pilot. The problem is not the information but the usage. Gary Fiske, AJV-82, pointed out vector SIDs are not adapted in ERAM and cannot be filed, and John agreed and restated that is the point; do not provide a code if it cannot be filed in a Flight Plan (FP). A group discussion followed on filing, notifications, rejections, etc. Gary added that he had specifically requested no computer coding be allowed by facilities on radar vector SIDs in Order 8260.46, which would fix this problem. Tom stated that the ATO had instructed him to retain computer codes for Vector SIDs for those Air Route Traffic Control Center (ARTCC) locations that desire to use them. Gary added there are many routes in the ATC system that have codes but will never be adapted into ERAM (system cannot handle all of them). Language was put in Order 8260.46 stating that before the computer identification code could be added or deleted on radar vector SIDs, the ARTCC facility had to be contacted for desired action. Rich Boll, NBAA, said NBAA knows there are some SIDs that cannot be filed and that is covered in the AIM. NBAA's issue is if computer codes are removed from some of the non-adapted SIDs. The RUUDY RNAV SID off Teterboro (KTEB) is not adapted, so if it's filed, the FP will be rejected; however, all the data driven maps today use that computer code to extract route information from the database. Removing the codes could have some serious unintended consequences. Rich suggested not removing the code but rather publish a chart note to not file the computer code in the FP and believes there is precedent on existing SIDs and STARs. Lev Prichard, Allied Pilots Association, stated he uses Foreflight and has encountered the same problem John Collins outlines. A group discussion on timing of FP submissions by user, database supplier, service provider, and Lockheed Martin's 3 hour filing window are causing the subsequent FP rejection after initial acceptance. Lev asked about expanded ERAM storage capabilities to allow longer lead times on FP filings. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, expanded on Rich's previous comments that the computer code on these procedures is essential. It is used by Jeppesen for the chart image and coding for the procedure; not only the retrieval in the navigation database, but the overlay on data driven en route operations. On procedures not given a computer code by the FAA, Jeppesen has an internal specification for making one and adding it to make possible retrieval of images and overlays in a consistent way, so the absence of the codes is a problem. Rich Boll inquired how we inform pilots not to file certain routes. Tom said it is up to the ATC facility when developing the procedure (some already have the caveat). Gary acknowledged the issue but added this not easily fixed since different facilities want different things. Tom asked if the issue can be taken to ERAM automation staff at the ATO so they can be made aware and respond to it. Rich inquired if there could be an Order 8260.46 and Order 8260.19 forms requirement (charting specification) to have a check box indicating if computer code can/cannot be filed. Gary said the ATO needs to indicate which ones can/cannot be filed for whatever reason, i.e. "...assigned by ATC only..." Tom posed to the group the question if a chart note is needed. John Moore, Jeppesen, cautioned against chart notes in this case and Lev responded everything in Dallas has a chart note and that is good. Suggestion was made that new filing guidance requiring ATC to pre-screen clearances farther in advance. It was acknowledged this would be a good idea, but not likely to happen. Tom said guidance can be added in Order 8260.46 to remind the ATC facilities that if they are not going to allow the SID to be filed (for whatever reason); it must be indicated on the chart. Gary did not see any problem with STARs since all have computer codes.

Status: Tom will investigate what guidance can be added in Order 8260.46F. **Item open:** AFS-420

MEETING 15-02: Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed guidance has been placed in FAA Order 8260.19G (STARs) and FAA Order 8260.46F (SIDs). The statements will allow the ATC facility to request a chart note be placed on the procedure saying "Do not file - to be assigned by ATC". John Collins, GA pilot, said this is good going forward, but inquired about existing procedures. Tom said this would be addressed during periodic reviews and procedures will be up numbered. A discussion followed on HOST computer filing, codes utilized, and how some filed procedures are being "kicked-out". Gary Fiske, AJV-82, added some procedures are coded using a three letter identifier that does not exist. Tom said the policy for those computer codes has been in existence for years and policy may not have been followed. This cannot be fixed here at the ACF and specific instances may need to go back to the applicable facility. Gary took an IOU to work with John to fix identified locations (about 20-30). Brad Rush, AJV-54, said AIS is also working an initiative now to clean up computer codes on SIDs and STARs and requested John supply him with the same list. The ACF issue will be closed.

Status: Item Closed.