

The International Federation of Air Line Pilots' Associations



Reference: ATS 2016

17ATS069
18 November 2016

To: Executive Board
ATS Committee Members
Member Associations

Ladies and Gentlemen,

**IFALPA AIR TRAFFIC SERVICES (ATS) COMMITTEE MEETING
FRANKFURT, GERMANY, 14-16 NOVEMBER 2016**

Please find attached the report of the ATS Committee meeting. It contains a summarised account of the discussions and recommendations made.

- Attachment 1 – Attendance List
- Attachment 2 – Agenda
- Attachment 3 – Minutes of Meeting
- Attachment 4 – Checklist of Actions

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, which appears to read 'Carole Couchman'.

Carole Couchman MBE
Senior Technical Officer

cc: Observers

ATTENDANCE LIST

Name of delegate	Association	Email address
Juan Pablo Mazzieri	Argentina	juanpimaz@icloud.com
Jussi Kauppi	Finland	jkauppi73@gmail.com
Ryad Bounoua	France	r.bounoua@gmail.com
Henri Bouyer	France	henri.bouyer.ck@gmail.com
Wolfgang Starke	Germany	wolfgang.starke@vcockpit.de
Hendrik Wille	Germany	hendrik.wille@vcockpit.de
Sebastian Goetz	Germany	sebastian.goetz@vcockpit.de
Christian Denke	Germany	airtraffic@cdenke.de
Dieter Oakley	Hong Kong	dieter.oakley@hkalpa.org
Paul Vissers	Italy	paul.vissers@aliceposta.it
Yuri Yomel Estrada	Mexico	yomo.737@gmail.com
Mohamed Anas El Karnighi	Morocco	elkarnighi@gmail.com
Jan Willem Heerink	Netherlands	jheerink@gmail.com
Agustin Guzman	Spain	agusguz@hotmail.com
Pirasuth Sasunee	Thailand	pirasuths@yahoo.com
Deniz Akinci	Turkey	denizakinci@talpa.org
Richard Toomer	UK	richardtoomer@balpa.org
IFALPA		
Patrick Magisson	EVP TSS	patrickmagisson@ifalpa.org
Amornvaj (Ben) Mansumitchai	EVP Asia/Pacific	amornvaj@gmail.com
Rip Torn	ATS Chairman	rip.torn@alpa.org
Carole Couchman	Senior Technical Officer	carolecouchman@ifalpa.org

Observers

Nic Cojocariu	Eurocontrol	neculai.cojocariu@eurocontrol.int
Philippe Domogala	IFATCA	philippe.domogala@ifatca.org
Kimmo Koivula	IFATCA	kskifatca@gmail.com

Apologies

Stefan Fiedler – VC	James Gaskell - BALPA
Felix Gottwald - VC	Masaki Maruyama - Japan
Markus Wahl - VC	Mike Hynes – RVP NAT
Mike Davidson – Aus ALPA	Loic Michel - ECA
Singapore	South Africa

AGENDA

- 1. ADMINISTRATION (ADM)**
- 2. PROJECT REVIEWS**
- 3. AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (ATM)**
- 4. COMMUNICATION (COM)**
- 5. NAVIGATION (NAV)**
- 6. SURVEILLANCE (SUR)**
- 7. SUPPORTING LOGISTICS:**
 - AERONAUTICAL INFORMATION SERVICES (AIS)
 - METEOROLOGY (MET)
 - SEARCH AND RESCUE (SAR)
- 8. MISC.**

MINUTES

OPENING REMARKS

1.0.1 The ATS Committee meeting was held at the VC Headquarters in Frankfurt, Germany. Eckhard König welcomed everyone to Germany on behalf of VC and provided information concerning social arrangements that had been made for the Committee. The Chairman welcomed everyone to Frankfurt, especially members of the IFALPA Executive Board, Observers from IFATCA and those attending for the first time; this was followed by the usual tour de table.

1.0.2 SCHEDULE

The Chairman set out the order of business and working hours. He advised that the meeting would follow the agenda with a couple of exceptions to ensure those who could only attend for part of the meeting had the opportunity to present their papers.

1.0.3 Approval of Agenda / Meeting Objectives

1.0.3.1 It was agreed that the meeting would follow the schedule as discussed and ensure the reviews and development of any new policies/ positions would take precedence.

1.0.3.2 Minutes of Previous Meeting

The Senior Technical Officer presented the minutes and action items from the previous meeting. It was noted that there were very few outstanding actions that needed to be completed.

17ATS023

1.0.4 IFALPA Electronic Communications

The Senior Technical Officer reminded the ATS Committee of their Committee page on the IFALPA website and requested the ATS Committee to continue to review this page and assist in the updating of the information listed. The meeting papers were also available on the FTP site. Members are reminded that the remote online meeting capability is available for use between the scheduled face to face meetings.

IFALPA Updates

The Senior Technical Officer informed the meeting that IFALPA now had a full complement of staff, all of which had received training in their respective positions. It was recognised that there are still issues with the IFALPA websites but that there would be a meeting in the near future to address inaccuracies and the Committee were requested to inform the Senior Technical Officer of any updates or changes that needed to be made.

**ATS
COMMITTEE**

1.0.5 REVIEW OF ICAO DOCUMENTATION

1.0.5.1 ICAO State Letters

There were no outstanding State Letters to be reviewed. The Senior Technical Officer reminded the Committee to send in comments when State Letters were sent out; even if the comments were just to agree with the proposed amendments.

1.0.6 REVIEW OF IFALPA DOCUMENTATION

The following papers concerned the review to the IFALPA documentation:

17ATS038

Draft Introductory papers (IPs) for Conference 2017

There were two draft IPs presented, these had been developed during the Working Group Meeting. The first concerned Radiotelephony call signs for aircraft, the suggested policies were recommended for approval and to progress to Conference. The IP can be found in Appendix 1.

APPENDIX 1

The second IP concerned the updating of Policy in PANS-ATM. The Committee made some adjustments to suggested policies including deleting existing policy in reference to information required prior to take-off. The rationale was explained, as the ICAO policy was sufficient. The IP can be found in Appendix 2

APPENDIX 2

Expiring Resolution for Conference 2017

17ATS039

The draft IP for the expiring resolution calling for IFALPA and the Member Associations to ensure that there should be no reduction or erosion of standard separation minima as a result of the operational availability of an airborne collision avoidance function and that this function remains independent and is used for collision avoidance only was reviewed. The Committee recommended that the expiring resolution is reaffirmed at the 2017 Conference. The IP can be found in Appendix 3.

APPENDIX 3

IFALPA Position for Trial and Demonstration Flights for New Technologies

17ATS040

The Committee discussed a proposed position paper dealing with trials and demonstration flights used to validate and test new technology in actual, real-time conditions. The importance of the trials in advancing the safety and efficiency of aviation was recognised and supported. However, there were concerns regarding the implementation of these trials, which needed to include all stakeholders, including the pilots that will actually be doing the trial. There were discussions as to whether a special license would be necessary, the licence would cover somewhere between a test pilot and a line pilot. It was agreed that the position paper should be sent to the AAP, ADO and HUPER Committees for review and comment before proceeding any further.

AAP/ADO/HUPER
COMMITTEES

2. HOT TOPICS/PROJECT REVIEWS

2.1. Approved Projects

2.1.1 Performance Based Navigation (PBN)

Discussions were covered under agenda item 5.1.

2.1.2 Communications Systems – Datalink

There were no discussions for this agenda item

2.1.3 Aviation System Block Upgrades (ASBUs)

There were brief updates on the SESAR and NextGen programmes. SESAR 1 has been completed and the Joint Undertaking will continue until 2024. SESAR 2020 will commence in 2017 where ECA hope to be involved. Areas to be monitored include Trajectory Based Operations (TBO). Improvements for meteorology and ATSC Remote Towers.

NextGen is being deployed on schedule, the ADS-B set up is ongoing but is expected nationwide in the near future with the aircraft mandate set for 2020. In addition, there were several SWIM developments ongoing.

It was noted that there are other programmes in China, India and Japan that should be included under this hot topic.

2.1.4 Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems.

This is covered under agenda item 3.2.2.

UAS

This is covered under agenda item 3.2.2.

- 2.1.5 It was suggested that the Reduced Separation in the Monitored Ongoing Projects should be added to this section and that RVP NAT, Mike Hynes should lead it. **MIKE HYNES**

2.2 Monitored Ongoing Projects

2.2.1 IFALPA Vision Statement – The Future of Air Navigation **11POS03**

It was agreed that it this remained a useful document and was used in several different meetings. It was recognised that it should be reviewed at least yearly for any updates to be made and that this should be done for the next meeting.

2.2.2 Volcanic Ash

This will be covered under agenda item 7.1.4.

2.2.3 Reduced Separation (Vertical, Lateral)

This has been move to Hot Topics.

2.2.4 Internal Committee Work Methods

There were no discussions under this agenda item.

2.3 Regional Issues/Association Update

2.3.1 Asia/Pacific

Report from APAC MET SG20. EVP Asia/Pacific presented this report explaining that within the Regions the RVPs covered these type of meetings and very much appreciated the assistance of SMEs from the Committees. This report concentrated on the Volcanic Ash Exercise that had taken place in the Region and the lessons learnt. The next exercise would concentrate on Indonesia. **17REG004**

- Report from APAC ATMSG 4.** EVP Asia/Pacific presented this report highlighting the ongoing issues related to Afghanistan airspace and the need for contingency plans. There were discussions related to applying longitudinal separation and that often both pilots and controllers were not aware of what should be applied. IFATCA explained that the controllers would need to be aware of the letters of agreement between the FIRs to apply the separation and this was not always possible. **17REG007**
- 2.3.2 NAT**
- Report from NAT POG2** **17ATS033**
Report from NAT SG15 **17ATS035**
Report from NAT IMG/49 **17ATS067**
- Captain Mike Hynes provided a summary of all the NAT meetings. He had participated in five NAT WG meetings during 2016. IFALPA participation has been welcomed, and oftentimes provides the only flight crew perspective. The increased use of data link within oceanic airspace requires all flight crews to review flight manual guidance material to ensure appropriate responses to ATC CPDLC messages. The number (count) of reported NAT operational errors has remained relatively constant with the increased traffic. No NAT single operator or ANSP can be highlighted as incurring the majority of errors. However, in reviewing the preventions and actual errors, flight crew action remains a leading casual factor. The primary error is flight crews remaining on their “original” flight plan route rather than properly executing amended re-route clearances.
- 2.3.3 EUROPE**
- NETOPS/16** – This report was reviewed, the history of the formation of NETOPS was given and it was noted that the Flight Level adherence had again been raised during this meeting. It was also noted that there would be a PBN symposium in early 2017, 31. Jan to 2. Feb. 2017 dealing with FINAL APPROACH OPERATIONS at Eurocontrol HQ. **17ATS053**
- Report from BALPA** – The report was reviewed and there were several questions relating to how aviation matters would be handled with the BREXIT. It was noted that it was too early to comment but that it was unlikely that CAP 371 would return. **17ATS062**
- Report from Italy** – The report was reviewed and an update given on Free routing which would be effective from 8 December 2016. It was noted that for further benefits from this would only be achieved once implemented across Europe. There had also been a trial for Remote ATS concerning Linate with the initial results showing that low volume traffic could be handled from a remote ATS but high traffic volume needed a manned ATS. This was still in its infancy and there were no indications that remote ATS would be implemented yet. There were discussions relating to improving the awareness of both controllers and pilots to their respective roles and several suggestions were made including the production of short films giving the impression of a virtual jumpseat as well as where possible, inviting controllers to be part of the simulator trainings. **17ATS064**

- Report on VC Activities** – The report was reviewed and the involvement of VC in national, regional and international meetings was noted and commended. **17ATS065**
- Report from France** – The report was reviewed and the issues at several French airports relating to flight paths and RECAT were noted along with the Critical Deficiency Status of Nice airport. **17ATS068**
- 2.3.4 AFI/MID**
There were no papers from the Region, however, it was noted that the Target Level of Safety in RVSM airspace continued to be exceeded and further measures needed to be employed to reduce the number of Airprox and related deficiencies.
- 2.3.5 CAR/SAM**
There were no papers from the Region
- 2.3.6 NAM**
- Report from NAT Ops Forum** **17ATS045**
The report was reviewed with no further comment.
- Report from ALPA ATS meeting August 2016** **17ATS051**
The report was reviewed with no further comment.
- 3. AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (ATM)**
- 3.1 External Representation**
- 3.1.1 ICAO Air Traffic Management Requirements and Performance Panel (ATMRPP)**
It was noted the ATMRPP meeting was being held at the same time of the ATS meeting and therefore there was no update.
- 3.1.2 ICAO Air Traffic Management Operations Panel (ATMOPSP)** **17ATS054**
The report from Paul Vissers was reviewed; there were several issues relevant to the ATS Committee. The recent changes to the SID/STAR phraseology were discussed and the Committee registered its disappointment that, despite all the work in the previous 10 years to produce a harmonised procedure and phraseology, the United States were not going to use the recommended phraseology. IFATCA warned that this might lead to several European States not implementing as well. It was recognised that some States had implemented immediately, and others would take the next 12 months to achieve implementation. It was also noted that some controllers were avoiding the issue by giving radar vectors.
- There were discussions related to the application of cold temperature corrections and joint sub group had been formed comprising of the Flight Operations Panel (FLTOPSP), ATM Operations Panel (ATMOPSP) and eventually, the Instrument Flight Procedures Panel (IFPP) to assess if provisions and guidance material was required. It was noted that pilot participation from each of the Panels had been achieved. There was discussion relating to Reduced Runway Separation Minima (RRSM) but it was recognised that this is not a global requirement at present but that a safety case would need to be done prior to any implementation. The other issues involved phraseology that was being developed in various areas.

- 3.1.3 ICAO North Atlantic System Planning Group (NAT SPG)**
There was no update from this meeting as the RVP NAT had been unable to attend.
- 3.1.4 ICAO European Air Navigation Planning Group- Coordinating Group (EANPG-COG)**
The meeting noted that representatives were needed for both the COG and EANPG. Paul Vissers volunteered to be the representative for the EANPG. **PAUL VISSERS**
- 3.1.5 Informal Pacific Air Traffic Coordinating Group (IPACG)** **17REG034**
The report from the meeting was reviewed and it was noted that IFALPA had issued a safety bulletin relating to reporting of speed changes in the Oakland FIR. The importance of complying with the NOTAM that had been issued over a year ago was emphasised as failure to comply could result in violations being issued. Safety Bulletin 16SAB07 refers.
- 3.1.6 Informal South Pacific Air Traffic Coordinating Group (ISPACG)**
The meeting noted that a representative was needed for this meeting.
- 3.1.7 IFATCA Technical and Operations Committee (TOC)** **17REG030**
IFATCA presented the report from the meeting and it was noted that IFATCA present their policy in a slightly different format to IFALPA but the relevance remained the same. IFATCA was thanked for funding Felix Gottwald at the last meeting and it was recognised that there is mutual respect for participation in each other's meetings.
- 3.1.8 ICAO Aviation Systems Block Upgrades (ASBUs)**
There were no reports or discussions under this agenda item.
- 3.1.9 IFALPA Remote Piloted Aircraft Systems Advisory Group (RPAS AG)**
There were no reports for this agenda item but discussed under 3.2.2.
- 3.2. Policy/Position Papers**
- 3.2.1. Revision of Policy on Remote Aerodrome Control** **17ATS036**
The paper was reviewed and the Committee reminded that although IFALPA had policy on Remote Aerodrome Control it needed updating and adding to. After considerable discussion relating to the use of simultaneous and multiple virtual operations, the Committee revised some of the proposed text. The IP can be found in Appendix 4. **APPENDIX 4**
- 3.2.2 Update of Position Paper on UAS** **17ATS037**
The Committee reviewed the update of the IFALPA Position Paper. Several editorial changes were made. In returning the Position Paper to the author, the Committee requested that the definition of UAS should be clearly indicated and how RPAS fitted into the definition. In addition, a request was made that a full grammar and spelling check is made once all the changes have been agreed to and that emotive language is removed. The paper will be sent back to ADO. **ADO COMMITTEE**

3.2.3 Additional items from the NAT for ATS consideration

FLIMSY 1

As a result of recent NAT WG meetings four issues had come to light that required additional consideration by IFALPA – NAT southeast corner DLM issue, definition of loss of separation, PBCS/PBN monitoring and free route airspace.

With the advent of the DataLink Mandate (DLM) within the North Atlantic High Level Airspace (NAT HLA) all aircraft operating on the Oceanic Track System (OTS) between FL350-390 are required to be ADS and CPDLC equipped and operative. There had been a request for some operators to receive an exemption for equipment. The ATS Committee were not in favour of any exemptions for equipment.

MIKE HYNES

Loss of Separation (LOS). Currently no ICAO definition or IFALPA policy exists concerning the definition of LOS. For the purposes of safety analysis, a LOS event involves an aircraft which is operating with less than the required separation minima (traditionally a Gross Navigational Error (GNE) event or incorrect altitude). A LOS event does not require an actual loss of separation between two aircraft. If a single aircraft experiences a deviation of a sufficient value that less than the allowable separation would have existed – then it is considered an LOS. Advances in PBCS and PBN procedures and systems will allow reduction in separation minima and are dependent upon datalink connectivity and navigation performance. However, to date no LOS criteria have been established for safety analysis purposes when datalink connectivity and navigation performance become degraded. The ATS Committee suggested that the development of Criteria should be sent to the Separation and Airspace Safety Panel (SASP) and may be the definition should reflect a loss of capability. In addition, it may also be helpful to look at the criteria for the loss of the C2 link for RPAS.

MIKE HYNES

PBCS/PBN monitoring. The mechanism for monitoring PBCS compliance appears unclear. Comments from certain regulators indicated they do not intend to play an active role in monitoring operator PBCS compliance. Various ANSP comments indicate that they will assume a “denial” of service role based on PBCS compliance monitoring. Would this type of “non-regulatory” but mandatory compliance monitoring be acceptable to IFALPA? The ATS Committee considers this as not acceptable.

MIKE HYNES

Free Route Airspace - There has been an increased use of high altitude direct routings without the use of “fixed” airways to improve the efficiency of airspace. NAT ANSPs as part of their involvement in this project were made aware of some technical and EC Network Manager constraints, such as a limit of DCT to 250 NM and/or the need to establish new cross-border transfer points. With the expanded use of Free Route airspace unnecessary limitations such as those found in the EU limitations could cause undo constraints. This information was noted by the Committee

- 3.2.4 Classification of airspace** **FLIMSY 2**
- The paper was presented to update existing policy in Annex 11 relating to the classification of airspace. The proposal included a new definition to differentiate the different classes of commercial operations. Despite considerable discussion, the proposal for the definition was not accepted at this time. However, the changes for including Class D airspace as an acceptable environment for commercial air transport operations, where local procedures are established to effectively segregate IFR and VFR traffic flows, for example geographically within control zones was recommended for approval.
- There were discussions as to whether this would affect helicopter operations. There was no consensus so the paper would be sent to the Helicopter Committee for review. The IP can be found in Appendix 5. **HELICOPTER COMMITTEE APPENDIX 5**
- 3.3 Information Papers**
- 3.3.1 Report from IFATCA Asia/Pacific Regional Meeting** **17ATS029**
- The report from the IFATCA Asia/Pacific Regional was presented and the Committee noted the development being made in Singapore with a trial for traffic sequencing in the TMA using speed control limits.
- 3.3.2 Traffic Alert & Collision Avoidance System (TCAS) RTCA SC-147 & EUROCAE WG-75 |Meetings Summaries** **17ATS044**
- The report was presented and noted.
- 3.3.3 Paired Approach and Delegated Separation** **17ATS046**
- The report was presented and noted.
- 4 COMMUNICATION (COM)**
- 4.1 External Representation**
- 4.1.1 ICAO Communications Panel (CP)**
- With the ICAO reorganisation of Panels it was recognised that the Operational Data Link Panel had been absorbed into the Communications Panel and was now classified as a Specific Working Group. It was decided that this agenda item and 4.1.2 could now become one agenda item entitled Communications Panel – Operational Data Link Working Group.
- 4.1.2 ICAO Operational Data Link Working Group (OPDLWG)** **17ATS042**
- The Chairman presented a consolidated report from the Operational Data Link Working Group meeting, highlighting that the CPDLC message set was again being updated and the provided the rationale as to why some message elements are removed from CPDLC message. Much of the work is centred on updating the GOLD Manual which has been upgraded from a Regional document to an ICAO Manual. There were discussions relating to the Tracking of the SATVOICE Implementation. It was recognised that there is an issue of accuracy and updating the map when situations change. There was a proposal for the ICAO Regional Offices to initiate the task of validating the short term assignments for short codes. Then the Regional Offices share the responsibility to continually maintain it.

- 4.1.3 ICAO Communications Failure Coordination Group (CFCG)**
 There had still been no further progress on the proposed provisions for the revision of the Communications Failure procedures. The Senior Technical Officer was asked to raise this issue at ICAO. **SENIOR OFFICER** **TECH**
- 4.1.4 RTCA SC214/Eurocae WG78 Data Link Standards**
 There were no reports or discussions under this agenda item and it was suggested that this could be removed from the ATS Agenda and work programme. **SENIOR OFFICER** **TECH**
- 4.1.5 ICAO North Atlantic Communications and Navigation Sub Group**
 There were no reports or discussions under this agenda item.
- 4.2 Policy/Position Papers**
- 4.2.1 Discussion Paper on Phraseology for Safety Nets** **17ATS058**
 The paper on development of phraseology for Safety Nets was presented. It was noted that the ICAO ATMOPS Panel had also been tasked with developing this. It was suggested in the paper that the following Safety nets needed appropriate phraseology:
- APM – Approach Path Monitor:**
 APM is a safety net that is intended to warn ATCOs if aircraft are descending too low during approach and get in unsafe situation. Warning time for APM alerts is typically less than two minutes, there might be only one alert for unsafe situation or two (or more) alerts giving cautions and alerts depending on risk of the situation.
- MSAW – Minimum Safe Altitude Warning**
 Normally MSAW covers busy TMAs and Approach sectors (including the departure end), sometimes also en-route sectors, mainly where high terrain is present. The principle of MSAW is similar to APM: It compares the Mode-C replies of aircraft transponders with terrain and obstacle data and generates alerts or warnings if needed.
- RIMCAS – Runway Incursion Monitoring and Collision Avoidance System**
 Although RIMCAS is currently not a SNET accepted by ICAO, the author believes that there are procedures and phraseology required. Further, the author believes that RIMCAS should be accepted by ICAO as a SNET and be included into the respective ICAO documents.
 RIMCAS is a Ground-Based Safety Net that is warning Aerodrome (or Tower) controllers of an incursion of traffic (including transponder equipped vehicles) on a designed protected zone around active runways.
- E-GPWS – Enhanced Ground Proximity Warning System**
 Once a corrective alert from this SNET is received, pilots will immediately climb the aircraft with maximum climb angle possible to avoid collision with terrain. This manoeuvre is likely to deviate from ATC-clearance or previously given instruction.

There was considerable discussion as to the need for phraseology but it was agreed to develop this further. It was suggested that the warnings should remain as consistent as possible to avoid any confusion either for pilots or for controllers. Wolfgang Starke was asked to provide a paper for the next meeting and it was envisaged that the paper would also be sent to the ATMOPSP to assist them in their development of phraseology.

**WOLFGANG
STARKE**

4.2.2 SEPLA's Position on the use of English in Air-Ground Radiotelephony Communications 17ATS061

Agus Guzman presented the paper on behalf of SEPLA and made a short presentation to explain their position and the rationale for wanting to change the IFALPA policy in Annex 10 Volume II.

It was recognised during an emotive discussion that the use of non-standard phraseology and the lack of English proficiency should be addressed in the analysis of previous accidents and incidents in respect to how the issues related to those specific events. Additionally, it was noted that further information on how not using a common language affected those operations and if such events would have been prevented by the sole use of the English language in the radiotelephony communications.

SEPLA called for IFALPA's position on this issue to be reviewed in order to promote a new policy that would require a risk assessment to be performed before implementing any given measure related to radiotelephony communications or any other aviation safety related issue.

Further discussion suggested that the data presented was not conclusive and reminded SEPLA that phraseology is really a code that had been developed based on the English Language. There was also the issue of situational awareness for those on the frequency that do not have the local language.

In addition, it was noted that the Committee were sceptical that all States would be able to perform the necessary risk assessment suggested.

It was recommended that this is referred to the HUPER Committee for consideration and also the AAP Committee. SEPLA will organise a workshop to be held in March 2017, open to all, to discuss this further.

**HUPER/AAP
COMMITTEES**

SEPLA

4.3 Information Papers

There were no papers for this agenda item

5. NAVIGATION (NAV)

5.1 External Representation

5.1.1 ICAO Performance Based Navigation Study Group (PBNSG)

17ATS027

17ATS066

The reports from the two meetings were reviewed, the main issues for this Study group continues to involve training for pilots, controllers and regulators. The Study Group has made some progress in the Charting issue with the ATM WG focusing on the best way to smooth the transition which includes no transition provisions, just the transition timeline (by 2022). In other words – going directly from what is being used now in a region to the final 2022 provisions in a coordinated way. The PBN Manual update is also progressing with various additions to the Attachments to all the Volumes. The IFALPA paper on the concept of providing some clarification as to what the aircraft displays for RNP vs. the actual requirements of the airspace (whether there are any or not) was well received. The manufacturers have volunteered to work on the wording for the next PBNSG meeting.

5.1.2 ICAO Instrument Flight Procedures Panel (IFPP)

17ATS055

The report from the IFPP was reviewed. The Plenary of the IFPP Working Groups meeting reviewed the status reports from the nine working groups which cover a range of disciplines such as Air Traffic Management (ATM), Flight Operations, Helicopters, Performance Based Navigation (PBN), Collision Risk Modelling (CRM), Implementation, Integration, Quality Assurance and the joint task force with the Aerodrome Panel on Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS). The work being looked at in all these working groups requires close coordination with the other Panels and Study Groups within ICAO.

5.1.3 Asia/Pacific PBN Seminar and PBN Implementation Coordination Group

There were no reports for this agenda item but it was recognised that the Asia/Pacific Region is working to implement PBN in as many States as possible in a short period of time.

5.2 Policy/Position Papers

5.2.1 Discussion Paper FMS RNP Display.

17ATS048

The paper was presented identifying that the RNP value displayed in the FMS is not necessarily the RNP value required for the airspace one is flying in, but a default one. This can lead to wrong assumptions for pilots. The question was asked if the displayed RNP value was necessary.

During the discussions that followed the Committee considered whether policy should be developed requiring a current standard default RNP values of FMS be adjusted to;

- RNP 4 for Oceanic Areas
- RNP 1 for Continental En-Route Airspace

Or for the Navigation Database suppliers to code the appropriate RNP value for all defined ATS routes.

It was agreed that the paper should be referred to the ADO Committee for further comment and review.

**ADO
COMMITTEE**

5.3 Information Papers

5.3.1 Decommissioning of NAT NDBs

17ATS063

RVP NAT sent in an information paper that had been presented at the NAT IMG concerning the suggested decommissioning of NAT NDBs. The paper had been present by IATA who would like to "decommission" the NDBs utilized for the Blue Spruce routes. The IMG meeting conclusion was to only study the issue, not establish a decommissioning plan, and to allow the states involved to evaluate who uses the NDBs. The Committee noted the information.

6. SURVEILLANCE (SUR)

6.1 External Representation

6.1.1 ICAO Separation & Airspace Safety (SASP)

17ATS031

The report was presented and it was noted that Felix Gottwald was currently in the SASP meeting in Montreal. It was also noted that there might be possible new separation standards to be developed using the Advanced Surveillance Enhanced Procedural Separation (ASEPS) specifications.

There is a circular currently under development, which contains all the mathematical calculations to be achieved, and outlining the requirements for this to be implemented. The Mathematics Sub Group have presented their findings for the circular explaining how they had reached their conclusions and which assumptions had been used. The results from two Human in the Loop simulator trials conducted in Canada and the US had been presented, it was interesting to note that both had very different results. This made it very difficult for the Panel to form any conclusions and they requested other areas to conduct similar trials to obtain further data. This is likely to come from Australia and Europe. It was however, noted that the actual parameters for these trials may need to be better defined. It was also recognised that there will need to be considerable training required for the ANSPs and controllers and possibly a revised look at the communications and surveillance standards to ensure safety is maintained.

Special Procedures for In-Flight Contingencies in Oceanic Airspace. The current procedures contained in the PANS-ATM (doc 4444) do not reflect current separation standards that have been considerably reduced since the provisions were initially written. New procedures are being developed whereby the pilot who has an in-flight contingency will be encouraged to descend below the high density, closely spaced airspace into a less congested airspace which is likely to be below FL290. These procedures are still being developed but are hopefully going to include a simplified "checklist".

- 6.1.2 ICAO Surveillance Panel (SP) Ground Based Safety Nets Sub Group (GBSNSG)** **17ATS026
17ATS043**
- The reports were presented and it was noted that the Manual of Ground Based Safety Nets was near completion. There would be one further meeting in February 2017 to address the final comments and then the Manual could be progressed through the ICAO system for publication. The new task would then be to draft a manual on ACAS-X. Wolfgang Starke will be the pilot representative for this. **WOLFGANG
STARKE**
- 6.1.3 Wake Turbulence Working Group**
- This Working Group continues to face issues in agreeing to a new categorisation of aircraft, and until the differences are resolved it will be hard to make any progress. Those involved with the RECATs had met but no solution to their differences had been found. Despite this, there had been interesting updates in developments of LIDAR campaigns in various parts of the world and also interesting presentations concerning LIDAR campaigns for helicopter operations particularly for hover taxiing. In addition, with the considerations of the many different types of helicopters it had been suggested that maybe it was time to expand the helicopter categorisation. As the working group is in abeyance it was agreed to remove this item from the agenda and work programme. **SENIOR
TECHNICAL
OFFICER**
- 6.2 Policy/Position Papers**
- 6.2.1 Discussion Paper SSR Mode S DAP** **17ATS049**
- The paper raised the issue of if IFALPA should address the concerns within the pilot community about the downlinking of surveillance data. The paper highlighted the concerns of easily downlinked data being used for accident/incident investigation and for policing flight crews. In addition, the concern of cyber security was also discussed. The Committee recognised the problem but at this stage had no suggestions as to how to resolve the problems. It was agreed that the paper would need to go to AAP and the Security Committee but the Committee was asked to provide some suggestions for resolution of the problem in a paper for the next meeting before sending any referrals. **ATS
COMMITTEE**
- 6.3 Information Papers**
- 6.3.1 Report from ALPA on Enhanced Surveillance WG** **17ATS050**
- The report was presented with limited discussion as to the purpose of the FAA questions.

**7. SUPPORTING LOGISTICS
AERONAUTICAL INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (AIM)
METEOROLOGY (MET)
SEARCH AND RESCUE (SAR)**

7.1 External Representation

7.1.1 ICAO Information Panel (IMP)

The Senior Technical Officer explained the situation with being an adviser with IATA on the Panel for the time being. It was expected that IFALPA would be invited as a full Panel Member in due course. It was also explained that the Panel were covering many items connected with SWIM and also reviewing how NOTAMs and other Aeronautical Information was produced and distributed.

7.1.2 ICAO METEOROLOGY PANEL (METP)

The reports from the MET Panel meetings were reviewed and Klaus Sievers was again commended for his continuing work with the Panel. It was recognised that there were several work streams he needed to participate in and that despite the large work load progress was being made. It was requested that the Committee still need to look for other representative to assist Klaus with the work.

17ATS024

17ATS028

17ATS047

It was explained that the Meteorology Panel comprises of five groups: Meteorology Requirements and Integration (MRI); Meteorology Information and Service Development (MISD), Meteorology Information Exchange (MIE); Meteorology Operations Group (MOG) and Meteorological cost recovery guidance and governance (MET CRGG). In addition, there is a Management Group made up from the rapporteurs, Chairman and World Meteorology Organization (WMO). The Panel has 11 job cards that they are currently working on. IFALPA is involved with many of them and particularly Space Weather and Volcanic ASH and other hazardous gases.

7.1.3 ICAO EUR Meteorology Group (METG)

There were no reports for this agenda item but the agenda is being monitored.

7.1.4 Volcanic Ash - Report on VOLCEX 16

The exercise was very welcome event to test existing procedures and try out new developments, e.g. charts. Overall, it worked well, however, the ash-cloud made it only to Ireland, the UK and Norway, it did not touch the centre of Europe during the exercise. Even so, divisions between States were visible. Two States decided not to use VAAC London ash guidance over their territory in the course of the exercise. This will complicate the already difficult operations during ash episodes, and therefore arrangements need to be in place to resolve this.

17ATS041

7.1.5 International COSPAS-SARSAT Programme

This organization and its meetings continues to be monitored by Captain Klaus Sievers. There was a short discussion related to the Normal Aircraft Tracking provisions now in force and it was explained that COSPAS-SARSAT would only become involved if the normal aircraft tracking became an alert phase.

7.2 Policy/Position Papers

7.2.1 Policy for VHF VOLMET

17ATS034

The paper described the ICAO and IFALPA Annex 3, 9.5.1 policies for the content and availability of voice-VOLMET. It was suggested that this information can be transferred to flight decks via ACARS. Transmission via ACARS is regularly used nowadays and has certain advantages compared to voice-transfer such as no pilot is required to leave the active ATC-frequency and problems with poor quality of audio and errors in transmission/hearing/understanding of the information given can be resolved using ACARS. It was recognised that the equipage of aircraft with ACARS must be sufficiently high assuring a reasonable low number of pilots would need to ask the ATCO for current weather at a given station.

The committee recommended the approval of the additional policy. The IP can be found in Appendix 6

APPENDIX 6

7.2.2 Referral from AAP on ICE Crystals

17ATS052

The referral from the AAP Committee concerned several accidents related to ice crystals in connections with thunderstorms leading to e.g. engine failure and thereby loss of control, that had been analyzed and the need for continuous awareness about this subject and the need for avoiding weather if possible was discussed. It was noted that it was not always possible to circumnavigate weather due to restrictions imposed by ATC, this being more pronounced in some part of the world than in others. The AAP were looking for advice on how best to persuade ATC to soften airspace restrictions when the planned flight path takes the aircraft through potential ICI conditions.

The ATC situation was discussed and it was recognised that there are times when ATC cannot give approval for the deviation due to airspace restrictions where they have no responsibility; however, this should not preclude the pilot from deviating to maintain the safety of the flight. It was suggested that the AAP develop a briefing leaflet describing the event and what the pilot should look for and then suggest necessary actions to avoid the area, stating that if approval has not been given it should not stop the pilot from deviating and for those intentions to be relayed to the controller. IFATCA would like to use the briefing leaflet as an article in their magazine, which is how they relay information to their members.

AAP
COMMITTEE

7.2.3 Discussion Paper on Internet on the Flight Deck and Expanded METAR information 17ATS060

This paper contained two separate proposals for additional policy for Annex 3. The first proposal was to include the use of internet connections on the flight deck, if available, to display Met information. The Committee recommended this for approval. The proposed policy is included in Appendix 6.

APPENDIX 6

The second proposal referred to METAR MOTNE. This provoked a detailed discussion on MOTNE and it was recognised that the source for the METAR and the MOTNE are different, so to include additional information on the METAR from a different source was not feasible. It was also noted that there was already ICAO and IFALPA policy contained in Annex 11 that should cover the issue raised. Therefore, the second policy proposal was not accepted. The authors were requested to review the policies in Annex 11 and submit further policy proposals if necessary at the next meeting

**JAMES
GASKELL,
KLAUS
SIEVERS**

7.3 Information Papers

7.3.1 Aeronautical Charting Forum 2016/2 17ATS059

The report from the US Charting Forum was presented and the Committee were requested to contact the Chairman if they required any further information.

8 MISC

8.1 Additional ICAO Update

Report from the ICAO 39th Assembly

17ATS032

The Senior Technical Officer presented the report from the 39th ICAO General Assembly, explaining the format of the Assembly and the various Commissions and Committees. The resolutions developed at the Assembly are the highest mandate for ICAO, these are now available from the ICAO website:

<http://www.icao.int/Meetings/a39/Pages/default.aspx>

It was also noted that in future much of the Technical and Safety work would be presented at the Air Navigation Conference which would be held a year before the Assembly to ensure the budgetary considerations could be discussed and approved during the Assembly. The next Assembly would be in 2019, with the Air Navigation Conference planned for 2018.

Report from the Flight Operations Panel

17ATS056

The EVP Technical and Safety Standards presented his report from the recent Flight Operations Panel Meeting highlighting issues that affected the ATS Committee. These were applying cold temperature corrections already discussed under agenda item 3.1.2; In-Flight Contingencies in Oceanic Airspace already discussed under 6.1.1 and the NAT papers; and the RNP approval process. There was considerable discussion relating to RNP approval related to RF legs and the difference between RF legs and DME arcs.

During the meeting, the ATS Committee was joined by Mr Nic Cojocariu from Eurocontrol, chairman of the Airspace Planning and Development Sub Group (APDSG) in Eurocontrol. His presentation explained the role of the APDSG as the European coordination forum for European ATM procedures and the guidelines and draft proposals they work on not only for Europe but for ICAO. He asked for feedback concerning RECAT wake turbulence categories and the development of revised phraseology for warning of Wake Turbulence for crews. He was pleased with the feedback received which showed that the Committee and the APDSG had similar viewpoints and would be pleased to receive any further feedback as necessary.

8.2 Future Meeting Venues

The ATS Committee was informed that the next meeting would be as follows:

ATS/1 2017 Montreal

ATS COMMITTEE

The meeting would be held in ICAO 13-15 June 2017.

ATS 2/2017 Singapore

The proposed dates for Singapore are 24-26 October 2017. Following the meeting, Singapore will host a ATCAS/ALPAS symposium on the 27th October to which the ATS Committee were invited to attend.

8.3 Any other business - None

8.3 Feedback

The members of the Committee were all pleased with the progress that had been made during the meeting. Those attending for the first time were very pleased to be involved and indicated they wished to continue.

Close of Meeting

In closing the meeting, the Chairman thanked the Committee Members for their active participation during the meeting and for completing the many papers with relevant actions for policy and positions, which had made the meeting not just successful but also very productive.

The whole meeting thanked VC for their very generous hosting of the meeting commenting on the excellent facilities the Association had.

Lastly, the Senior Technical Officer was thanked for her work in preparation for the meeting and for the continued support to the ATS Committee.

NOTE: Please read this summary of Action Items in conjunction with the whole report.
Items shown in **bold** have been completed

CHECKLIST OF ACTION ITEMS			
PAGE NO.	AGENDA ITEM NO.	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
1	1.0.4	The Committee were requested to inform the Senior Technical Officer of any updates or changes that needed to be made to the IFALPA websites.	ATS COMMITTEE
2	1.0.6	The first IP on Radiotelephony call signs for aircraft, was recommended for approval and to progress to Conference. The IP can be found in Appendix 1.	APPENDIX 1
2	1.0.6	The second IP concerned the updating of Policy in PANS-ATM. The Committee made some adjustments to suggested policies including deleting existing policy in reference to information required prior to take-off. The rationale was explained, as the ICAO policy was sufficient. The IP can be found in Appendix 2	APPENDIX 2
2	1.0.6	The draft IP for the expiring resolution calling for IFALPA and the Member Associations to ensure that there should be no reduction or erosion of standard separation minima as a result of the operational availability of an airborne collision avoidance function and that this function remains independent and is used for collision avoidance only was reviewed. The Committee recommended that the expiring resolution is reaffirmed at the 2017 Conference. The IP can be found in Appendix 3.	APPENDIX 3
2	1.0.6	The Committee discussed a proposed position paper dealing with trials and demonstration flights used to validate and test new technology in actual, real-time conditions. It was agreed that the position paper should be sent to the AAP, ADO and HUPER Committees for review and comment before proceeding any further.	AAP/ADO/HUPER COMMITTEES
3	2.1.5	It was suggested that the Reduced Separation in the Monitored Ongoing Projects should be added to this section and that RVP NAT, Mike Hynes should lead it..	MIKE HYNES

6	3.1.4	The meeting noted that representatives were needed for both the COG and EANPG. Paul Vissers volunteered to the representative for the EANPG.	PAUL VISSERS
6.	3.2.1	Revised Policy on Remote Aerodrome Control Towers. Policy recommended for approval. The IP can be found in Appendix 4.	APPENDIX 4
6.	3.2.2	In returning the Position Paper to the author, the Committee requested that the definition of UAS should be clearly indicated and how RPAS fitted into the definition. In addition, a request was made that a full grammar and spelling check is made once all the changes have been agreed to and that emotive language is removed. The paper will be returned to ADO.	ADO COMMITTEE
7	3.2.3	With the advent of the DataLink Mandate (DLM) within the North Atlantic High Level Airspace (NAT HLA) all aircraft operating on the Oceanic Track System (OTS) between FL350-390 are required to be ADS and CPDLC equipped and operative. There had been a request for some operators to receive an exemption for equipment. The ATS Committee were not in favour of any exemptions for equipment	MIKE HYNES
7	3.2.3	Loss of Separation (LOS). Currently no ICAO definition or IFALPA policy exists concerning the definition of LOS. However, to date no LOS criteria have been established for safety analysis purposes when datalink connectivity and navigation performance become degraded. The ATS Committee suggested that the development of Criteria should be sent to the Separation and Airspace Safety Panel (SASP) and may be the definition should reflect a loss of capability. In addition, it may also be helpful to look at the criteria for the loss of the C2 link for RPAS.	MIKE HYNES
7.	3.2.3	The mechanism for monitoring PBCS compliance appears unclear. Comments from certain regulators indicated they do not intend to play an active role in monitoring operator PBCS compliance. Various ANSP comments indicate that they will assume a “denial” of service role based on PBCS compliance monitoring. Would this type of “non-regulatory” but mandatory compliance monitoring be acceptable to IFALPA? The ATS Committee considers this as not acceptable.	MIKE HYNES

8.	3.2.4	<p>However, the changes for including Class D airspace as an acceptable environment for commercial air transport operations, where local procedures are established to effectively segregate IFR and VFR traffic flows, for example geographically within control zones was recommended for approval.</p> <p>There were discussions as to whether this would affect helicopter operations. There was no consensus so the paper would be sent to the Helicopter Committee for review. The IP can be found in Appendix 5.</p>	<p>HELICOPTER COMMITTEE</p> <p>APPENDIX 5</p>
9	4.1.3	<p>ICAO Communications Failure Coordination Group (CFCG) - There had still been no further progress on the proposed provisions for the revision of the Communications Failure procedures. The Senior Technical Officer was asked to raise this issue at ICAO.</p>	<p>SENIOR TECHNICAL OFFICER</p>
9.	4.1.4	<p>RTCA SC214/Eurocae WG78 Data Link Standards - There were no reports or discussions under this agenda item and it was suggested that this could be removed from the ATS Agenda and work programme</p>	<p>SENIOR TECHNICAL OFFICER</p>
10.	4.2.1	<p>There was considerable discussion as to the need for phraseology for Safety Nets but it was agreed to develop this further. It was suggested that the warnings should remain as consistent as possible to avoid any confusion either for pilots or for controllers. Wolfgang Starke was asked to provide a paper for the next meeting and it was envisaged that the paper would also be sent to the ATMOPSP to assist them in their development of phraseology.</p>	<p>WOLFGANG STARKE</p>
10.	4.2.2	<p>SEPLA called for IFALPA's position on the use of English in Air-Ground Radiotelephony Communications to be reviewed in order to promote a new policy that would require a risk assessment to be performed before implementing any given measure related to radiotelephony communications or any other aviation safety related issue. It was recommended that this is referred to the HUPER Committee for consideration and also the AAP Committee. SEPLA will organise a workshop to be held in March 2017, open to all, to discuss this further.</p>	<p>HUPER COMMITTEE SEPLA</p>
11.	5.2.1	<p>It was agreed that the paper on RNP FMS Display should be referred to the ADO Committee for further comment and review.</p>	<p>ADO COMMITTEE</p>

13	6.1.2	The new task in the GBSNSG would be to draft a manual on ACAS-X. Wolfgang Starke will be the pilot representative for this.	WOLFGANG STARKE
13	6.1.3	As the ICAO working group on Wake Turbulence is in abeyance it was agreed to remove this item from the agenda and work programme.	SENIOR TECHNICAL OFFICER
14	6.2.1	The Discussion Paper SSR Mode S DAP would need to go to AAP and the Security Committee but the Committee was asked to provide some suggestions for resolution to the problem in a paper for the next meeting before sending any referrals.	ATS COMMITTEE
15	7.2.1	The committee recommended the approval of the additional policy concerning VOLMET. The IP can be found in Appendix 6	APPENDIX 6
15	7.2.2	It was suggested that the AAP develop a briefing leaflet describing how accidents related to ice crystals in connections with thunderstorms leading to e.g. engine failure and thereby loss of control could occur. The leaflet should identify what the pilot should look for and then suggest necessary actions to avoid the area, stating that if approval had not been given by ATC, it should not stop the pilot from deviating and for those intentions to be relayed to the controller. IFATCA would like to use the briefing leaflet as an article in their magazine, which is how they relay information to their members.	AAP COMMITTEE IFATCA
16	7.2.3	The first proposal was to include the use of internet connections on the flight deck, if available, to display Met information. The Committee recommended this for approval. The proposed policy is included in Appendix 6.	APPENDIX 6
16	7.2.3	It was noted that there was already ICAO and IFALPA policy contained in Annex 11 concerning information to be provided on the ATIS and other information services and that should cover the issue raised. Therefore, the second policy proposal was not accepted. The authors were requested to review the policies in Annex 11 and submit further policy proposals if necessary at the next meeting	JAMES GASKELL KLAUS SIEVERS

17	8.2	<p>The ATS Committee was informed that the next meeting would be as follows:</p> <p>ATS/1 2017 Montreal</p> <p>The meeting would be held in ICAO 13-15 June 2017.</p> <p>ATS 2/2017 Singapore</p> <p>The proposed dates for Singapore are 24-26 October 2017. Following the meeting, Singapore will host a ATCAS/ALPAS symposium on the 27th October to which the ATS Committee were invited to attend.</p>	ATS COMMITTEE
----	-----	--	---------------

Reference: Annex 10

IP 17ATS

INTRODUCTORY PAPER
72nd IFALPA CONFERENCE
MONTREAL, CANADA, 5-8 MAY 2017

1. ITEM NO.	SUBJECT	STATUS
D 1.3	ANNEX 10 VOLUME II	
	RADIOTELEPHONY CALLSIGNS FOR AIRCRAFT	
2.	SOURCE AND DATE SUBMITTED	
	The Chairman of the ATS Committee, on behalf of the Committee,	
3.	PRESENT ICAO POLICY	
3.1	<p><i>5.2.1.7.2 Radiotelephony call signs for aircraft</i></p> <p><i>5.2.1.7.2.1 Full call signs</i></p> <p><i>5.2.1.7.2.1.1 states that an aircraft radiotelephony call sign shall be one of the following types:</i></p> <p><i>Type a) — the characters corresponding to the registration marking of the aircraft; or</i></p> <p><i>Type b) — the telephony designator of the aircraft operating agency, followed by the last four characters of the registration marking of the aircraft;</i></p> <p><i>Type c) — the telephony designator of the aircraft operating agency, followed by the flight identification.</i></p>	ICAO ANNEX 10 VOL II
3.2	<p>CURRENT IFALPA POLICY</p> <p>5.2.1.7.2.1 Full call signs</p> <p>The development of radiotelephony procedures has led to the large scale use of numbers for both the contents of messages and identification of flights. This in turn has been the cause of many ATC incidents, and misidentification of flights or call sign confusion by pilots or controllers has caused several near misses and at least one accident involving aircraft damage and serious personal injury.</p> <p>Research into the call signs actually used by commercial aircraft shows first that this is a very common and significant problem and then also that the scale of this problem could be reduced to less than one tenth of the present level by the widespread use of an alternative alphabetic form of a call sign., as described below which is designed to fit the following requirements:</p>	POL STAT 1989 (REAFFIRMED 2013)

- 1) Usable world-wide as an alternative standard form at the discretion of the airline operators.
- 2) Usable with the repetitive flight plan system (RPL).
- 3) Usable with airline designators containing three letters (a requirement after 1987).
- 4) Compatible with either computerised or simple handling technology in airport, airline and ATC procedures.
- 5) Able **at the flight planning stage** to provide alternative, but totally dissimilar call signs without interfering with the use of flight numbers for commercial purposes, whenever necessary for supplementary flights, flights with altered flight plan details or to avoid conflict with similar call signs of other flights.

Note. It is not intended that this procedure should be used for an aircraft already in flight. It is not possible to add suffix letters to flight numbers containing four digits or three digits and an existing suffix, e.g. ANZ1234 or BAL123A may not have a suffix letter added. Possible alternatives are:

FLIGHT NUMBER FORM	IFALPA PROPOSAL
ANZ1234	ANZ E4JR
ANZ 1234A (8 characters, not allowed, but alternatively)	
ANZ_11234	ANZ Y4HL
BAL123	BAL C3HJ
BAL123A =1123	BAL E3EV
BAL123AQ (8 characters, not allowed, but alternatively)	
BAL10123	BAL W3FE

- 6) Reduce mental saturation with numbers and eliminate confusion between the aircraft call sign and other numeric parts of the message, and confusion in the call sign due to phonetic similarity of some numerals (e.g. fIve and nIne, T'o and T'ree, etc.) and the transposition of digits (1301-1031).
- 7) Reduce the effects of equipment deficiencies and poor R/T discipline.
- 8) Highly effective but at very low cost.

Aircraft call signs based on company designator followed by a flight identification in numeric form have been found to be a potential source of confusion when two similar call signs are on an ATC sector together. While poor R/T discipline may at times be a contributory factor, research from various sources has shown that the following characteristics are potential causes of confusion, even when diction is good:

- i) **Perception Errors.** (English language only in accordance with IFALPA policy on the use of language in R/T. Similar problems have been found in other languages.)
- a) The same flight number with different company designators, particularly if the designators themselves are phonetically similar (e.g. Comair 123/Conair 123).
- b) As in a) above or with the same company, but with three digits of one call sign the same as three digits of the other which may be four digit number or three digits and a suffix letter. (e.g. Lionair 234/Ryanair 1234/Orion 234A).
- c) Flight numbers of the same company with the same digits transposed in different order. (e.g. AAO11, AA1O1, AA11O).
- d) As c) above but different operators.
- e) The same company with flight numbers containing the same characters in the last two or three positions. (e.g. AA1234, AA2234, AA234, AA334, AA334Q).
- f) As e) but different operators.
- ii) **Phonetic Misidentification** may occur, particularly in the noisy environment of the flight deck, with numbers containing:
- oNe and niNe
 Two and T'ree
 Four and Five
 fIve and nIne
 sEEEx and zEEero
- (O has also been mistaken for "eight" when that was spoken as "Oh")

Where **airline flight numbers are used** as call signs, they should be so selected that pairs of flight number call signs likely to cause confusion on the lines indicated in i) and ii) above do not occur for aircraft in flight on the same ATC sectors.

All callsign systems should be tested in a simulation of airline traffic with regard to possible misidentification of flights or callsign confusion by pilots or controllers. Possible causes of callsign confusion found should be eliminated by changing the callsigns of the flights concerned.

The computer studies should encompass flights of all airlines operating in a given area and be repeated at least twice a year to consider the changes in flight plans.

**POL-STAT 1990
 (REAFFIRMED
 2013)**

**DRAFT POLICY
 1989
 (REAFFIRMED
 2013)**

IFALPA opposes the elimination of plain language, spoken designators (e.g. Clipper, Swissair, Empress, etc.) or any requirement for the three letters to be pronounced in ICAO phonetics. A company designator should be spoken as a distinctive word on radiotelephony (e.g. Clipper, Empress, etc.). It should not sound similar to the designator of another company, (e.g. "Nordair", "Wardair"). Where the ICAO designator letters are to be spoken on radiotelephony, they should not be pronounced in the phonetic alphabet, but rather as a word, (e.g. Kay eLI, eM).

**POL-STAT 1983
(REAFFIRMED
2013)**

4. PROPOSED IFALPA POLICY (New Text in *Bold Italics*,)

Delete existing policy and **insert** the following:

5.2.1.7.2 Radiotelephony call signs for aircraft

POL-STAT 1

The usage of similar call signs containing numbers as flight identifiers only in connection with increasing traffic numbers create a safety thread. The possibility of “call sign confusion” is mainly associated with flights of one operator using a similar-sounding flight numbers (e.g. AB120 and AB126) or different airlines using the same or similar sounding numbers (e.g. AB120 and YZ120).

One countermeasure to avoid this is changing similar flight numbers of flights taking place at roughly the same time to eliminate and/or reduce to an absolute minimum, the chance of having two (or more) aircraft with phonetically similar call signs on the same radio frequency at the same time.

In order to avoid confusion operators are encouraged to use alpha-numerical flight identifications. Using Call Sign Similarity software tools, these should be coordinated in advance on a regional and preferably global scale to avoid any possible overlap. These alpha-numeric call signs should not be complicated to pronounce and limited to a maximum of three characters.

Alpha-numeric flight identifiers should be coordinated and assigned to flights in the planning stage and not to aircraft in flight.

5.2.1.7.2.1 Full call signs

POL-STAT 2

Type d) the telephony designator of the aircraft operating agency, followed by an alpha-numerical code with a maximum length of three digits.

Note 4.- Type d) The alpha-numerical codes should be coordinated with the respective regional bodies to ensure an even contribution of non-conflicting call signs, using Call Sign Similarity software tools.

5.2.1.7.2.2 *Alpha-Numerical call signs*

POL-STAT 3

In order to avoid confusion between aircraft with similar call signs, aircraft operators are encouraged to replace the numeric flight identification of type c) as in 5.2.1.7.2.1.1 by an alpha-numerical code. This should be coordinated with the respective regional bodies to ensure an even contribution of non-conflicting call signs, using Call Sign Similarity software tools.

5. PRESENT ICAO POLICY

5.1 Monitoring Frequencies

ICAO para. 5.2.2.1.1.2 states that aircraft shall continuously guard the VHF emergency frequency 121.5 MHz in areas or over routes where the possibility of interception of aircraft or other hazardous situations exist, and a requirement has been established by the appropriate authority.

**ICAO ANNEX 10
VOLUME II
6TH EDITION
(INC AMD 88A)**

5.2 PRESENT IFALPA POLICY

IFALPA objects to the manner of guarding the emergency frequency of 121.5 MHz as prescribed in this paragraph. Instead, the Standard in 5.2.2.1.1.1 should be amended to state simply that aircraft shall continuously guard the VHF frequency 121.5 MHz, except when interrupted by cockpit duties. ICAO para. 5.2.2.1.1.2 can then be deleted. A Note should be added to the amended para. 5.2.2.1.1 to the effect that in areas where Traffic Information Broadcasts by Aircraft (TIBA) procedures are applied (see ICAO Annex 11, Attachment B), aircraft should be so equipped as to permit the simultaneous guarding of the ATC frequency in use, the TIBA frequency and the emergency frequency. This requirement also applies in areas where other position broadcast procedures are used.

**POL-STAT 1985
(REAFFIRMED
2009)**

5.2.2.1.x When it is necessary for two or more ATC sectors to be merged for control from a single operating position, one VHF radiotelephony channel should be designated for that operating position; except that, if frequency coverage difficulties arise with the designated channel, additional channels may be allocated provided that suitable 'talk through' facilities exist permitting all users of all the combined channels to hear all transmissions on all of those channels.

**POL-STAT
(REVISED 1984)
(REAFFIRMED 2016)**

6. PROPOSED IFALPA POLICY (New Text in *Bold Italics*.)

ADD a note to the existing policy as follows:

AR-1

Note: ANSP's are encouraged to ensure radios are sufficiently tuned to prevent "co-channel interference".

7. COMMENTS BY THE PROPOSERS

7.1 The existing policy is concerning callsigns is complex and very difficult to understand and therefore implement. The introduction of the alpha-numeric code is a simpler process to follow. It also acknowledges call sign similarity tools that are now in use in some regions.

Several examples where co-channel interference have been given to the ATS Committee, these can usually be resolved by revising the tuning.

8. COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD**8.1**

Reference: PANS-ATM

IP 17ATS

INTRODUCTORY PAPER
72nd IFALPA CONFERENCE
MONTREAL, CANADA, 5-8 MAY 2017

1. ITEM NO.	SUBJECT	STATUS
D 1.4	PANS-ATM	
	MINIMUM CRUISING LEVELS FOR IFR FLIGHTS	
2.	SOURCE AND DATE SUBMITTED	
	The Chairman of the ATS Committee, on behalf of the Committee,	
3.	PRESENT ICAO POLICY	
3.1	<p><i>ICAO para 4.10.3.2 states that ATC units shall, when circumstances warrant it, determine the lowest usable flight level or levels for the whole or parts of the control area for which they are responsible, and use it when assigning flight levels and pass it to pilots on request.</i></p> <p><i>Note 1. – Unless otherwise prescribed by the State concerned, the lowest usable flight level is that flight level which corresponds to, or is immediately above, the established minimum flight altitude.</i></p> <p><i>Note 2. – The portion of a control area for which a particular lowest usable flight level applies is determined in accordance with air traffic services requirements.</i></p> <p><i>Note 3.— The objectives of the air traffic control service as prescribed in Annex 11 do not include prevention of collision with terrain. The procedures prescribed in this document do not relieve pilots of their responsibility to ensure that any clearances issued by air traffic control units are safe in this respect. When an IFR flight is vectored or is given a direct routing which takes the aircraft off an ATS route, the procedures in Chapter 8, 8.6.5.2 apply.</i></p>	<p>ICAO PANS-ATM 15TH EDITION</p>
3.2	<p>CURRENT IFALPA POLICY</p> <p>IFALPA believes that the temperature should be taken into consideration when determining lowest usable flight levels. Therefore the following POL-STAT should be added as a further statement:</p> <p>4.10.3.2.x The effect of low temperatures on altimeters shall be taken into consideration when determining the lowest usable flight level.</p>	<p>POL-STAT 2002 [REAFFIRMED 2011]</p>

4. **PROPOSED IFALPA POLICY** (Deleted text is ~~struck through~~.
New Text in ***Bold Italics***.)
- IFALPA believes that *to emphasize the importance of* the temperature ~~should~~ *to* be taken into consideration when determining lowest usable flight levels, ~~Therefore~~ the following POL-STAT should be added as a further statement:
- 4.10.3.2.x ~~The effect of low temperatures on altimeters shall be taken into consideration when determining the lowest usable flight level.~~ *To ensure safe terrain clearance, consideration should be given to the effect of low temperature on altimeters when determining a) minimum cruising levels for IFR flights, b) vectoring an IFR flight.*
- POL-STAT 1
5. **PRESENT ICAO POLICY**
- 5.1 *ICAO para 7.4.1.2.3 states that, prior to entering the traffic circuit or commencing its approach to land, an aircraft shall be provided with the following elements of information, in the order listed, with the exception of such elements which it is known the aircraft has already received:*
- a) the runway to be used;*
- b) the surface wind direction and speed, including significant variations therefrom;*
- c) the QNH altimeter setting and, either on a regular basis in accordance with local arrangements or, if so requested by the aircraft, the QFE altimeter setting.*
- ICAO
PANS-ATM
15TH EDITION
- 5.2 **PRESENT IFALPA POLICY**
- Amendments are required to this paragraph to render it more specific.
- After the statement "with the exception of such elements which it is known the aircraft has already received" should be added "in which case elements a) and b) may be omitted".
- In sub-para. b), "the mean surface wind direction and speed" should be replaced by "the runway wind direction and speed".
- POL-STAT 1975
[REAFFIRMED
2011]
6. **PROPOSED IFALPA POLICY** (Deleted text is ~~struck through~~.
New Text in ***Bold Italics***.)
- ~~After the statement "with the exception of such elements which it is known the aircraft has already received" should be added "in which case elements a) and b) may be omitted".~~
- Prior to entering the traffic circuit or commencing its approach to land, an aircraft shall be provided with the following elements of information, in the order listed, with the exception of elements a) and b) when it is known the aircraft has already received them:*
- ~~In sub-para. b), "the mean surface wind direction and speed" should be replaced by "the runway wind direction and speed".~~
- POL-STAT 3
- POL-STAT 4

7. COMMENTS BY THE PROPOSERS

- 7.1 The revised text stresses the importance of the temperature, particularly low temperature as an effect when determining not just the lowest usable flight level but also to determine cruising levels for IFR flights and vectoring an IFR flight.

The revision for information to be given to aircraft entering the traffic circuit provides for a phrase that is grammatically correct and accounts for ICAO using the term “surface wind” consistently and has provisions to make clear that this refers to the active runway.

8. COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD**8.1**

Reference: Annex 2

IP 17ATS0

INTRODUCTORY PAPER
72nd IFALPA CONFERENCE
MONTREAL, CANADA, 5-8 MAY 2017

1. ITEM NO.	SUBJECT	STATUS
D 3.1	REVIEW OF EXPIRING RESOLUTIONS – SYSTEMS FOR COLLISION AVOIDANCE	
2.	SOURCE AND DATE SUBMITTED The Chairman of the ATS Committee, on behalf of the Committee,	
3.	PRESENT ICAO POLICY	
3.1	ICAO Text	
	3.2 AVOIDANCE OF COLLISIONS <i>ICAO Note 1.- It is important that vigilance for the purpose of detecting potential collisions be exercised on board an aircraft, regardless of the type of flight or the class of airspace in which the aircraft is operating, and while operating on the movement area of an aerodrome.</i>	ICAO ANNEX 2 10TH EDITION (INC AMD 43)
3.2	PRESENT IFALPA POLICY	
	4) Systems for collision avoidance The ATC system should provide the basic service of separation between aircraft. States should strive to establish an adequate ATC system as defined in IFALPA Annex 11, Chapter 1, where such a system is not yet implemented, and to continuously improve this service.	POL-STAT 2001 (REAFFIRMED 2016)
	This does not prohibit short term or local air traffic separation based solely on the cockpit display of information (CDTI) in accordance with the limitations laid down in Annex 2, Attachment X (IFALPA).	DRAFT POLICY 1995 (REAFFIRMED 2016)
	To prevent collisions as a result of technical failures or human errors, the carriage of independent airborne collision avoidance systems should be mandatory on a world-wide basis.	POL-STAT 1995 (REAFFIRMED 2016)
	There should be no reduction of separation minima as a result of the implementation of airborne collision avoidance systems, as these last resort back-up systems only complement the ATC system, but do not substitute the adequate ATC separation service.	POL-STAT 2001 (REAFFIRMED 2016)

IFALPA at international level and Member Associations at national level should make every effort to ensure that there should be no reduction or erosion of standard separation minima as a result of the operational availability of an airborne collision avoidance function and that this function remains independent and is used for collision avoidance only. **RESOLUTION 2001 (REAFFIRMED 2015)**

Devices implementing such a function should be suitable for installation in all aircraft, at a reasonable cost on a world-wide basis. **POL-STAT 2001 (REAFFIRMED 2016)**

4. PROPOSED IFALPA POLICY

4.1 **RE-AFFIRM** the **RESOLUTION** in the present policy for a further period of two years. **RES 1**

5. COMMENTS BY THE PROPOSERS

5.1 This **RESOLUTION** becomes due for review at the 2017 Annual Conference in accordance with para. 2.6.2.2 of Section VI of the Federation's By-Laws.

6. COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

6.1

Reference: PANS-ATM

IP 17ATS0

INTRODUCTORY PAPER
72nd IFALPA CONFERENCE
MONTREAL, CANADA, 5-8 MAY 2017

1. ITEM NO.	SUBJECT	STATUS
D	FUNCTIONS OF AERODROME CONTROL TOWERS	
2.	SOURCE AND DATE SUBMITTED	
	The Chairman of the ATS Committee, on behalf of the Committee,	
3.	PRESENT ICAO POLICY	
3.1	None	
3.2.	Present IFALPA Policy	
	7.1. X Remote Aerodrome Control (<i>Note: There is no current ICAO text available on this subject</i>)	
	Aerodrome Control requires the establishment of controlled airspace (Control Zone) of adequate classification – Class C for air transport operations (IFALPA Annex 11 Policy – para 2.6.2 refers);	POL-STAT 2008 [REAFFIRMED 2016]
	Changes to operational procedures should be implemented only if appropriate Safety Assessments as required by ICAO Annex 11 para 2.27 and ICAO Doc 4444 PANS-ATM para 2.6.1. have been carried out successfully, addressing, in particular, but being not limited to	POL-STAT 2008 [REAFFIRMED 2016]
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Effects of loss of human redundancy, in particular related to visual observation of the manoeuvring area, ➤ Recognition of and reaction to possible accidents, and ➤ Definition of the need for appropriate tools to mitigate some of these risks, for example A-SMGCS and / or surface radar. 	
	An acceptable system to support the operation of an Aerodrome Control Service from a location remote from the aerodrome requires that all of the services normally provided by a local tower controller be made available by other means.	
	In detail, these requirements include but are not limited to:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • detection of passive and active targets anywhere within the aerodrome boundary • detection of foreign objects of defined minimum properties anywhere on the movement area 	

- detection of ground targets of defined minimum properties to a specified distance beyond the threshold(s)
- detection of airborne targets of defined minimum properties to a specified distance beyond the aerodrome boundary
- imminent runway intrusion detection and alerting for passive and active targets
- imminent collision detection and alerting for passive and active targets
- real-time weather observation and reporting at least as timely, accurate and comprehensive as a human controller
- real-time runway surface condition observation and reporting at least as timely, accurate and comprehensive as a human controller
- real-time detection and reporting of bird hazard
- ability to direct standard visual signals to an aircraft on the ground or in the air
- unaffected by any weather condition under which the airfield would be used for airborne or ground movement
- defined minimum latency,
- system failure detection and controller alerting to degradation of capability
- visual assistance in case of an incident or accident
- contingency procedures.

4. **PROPOSED IFALPA POLICY** (Deleted text is ~~struck through~~. New Text in ***Bold Italics***,

7.1. X Remote Aerodrome and Virtual Control (*Note: There is no current ICAO text available on this subject*) **POL-STAT 1**

Aerodrome Control requires the establishment of controlled airspace (Control Zone) of adequate classification – Class C for air transport operations (IFALPA Annex 11 Policy – para 2.6.2 refers);

Until sufficient experience in Single Remote and Virtual Aerodrome operations has been gained and the concept has been proven to at least satisfy the same level of safety as conventional operations; IFALPA is opposed to implementing Simultaneous and/or Multiple Remote and Virtual Aerodrome operations. **Draft Policy 1**

Changes to operational procedures should be implemented only if appropriate Safety Assessments as required by ICAO Annex 11 para 2.27 and ICAO Doc 4444 PANS-ATM para 2.6.1. have been carried out successfully, addressing, in particular, but being not limited to **POL-STAT 2008 [REAFFIRMED 2016]**

- Effects of loss of human redundancy, in particular related to visual observation of the manoeuvring area,
- Recognition of and reaction to possible accidents, and

- Definition of the need for appropriate tools to mitigate some of these risks, for example A-SMGCS and / or surface radar.

An acceptable system to support the operation of an Aerodrome Control Service from a location remote from the aerodrome requires that all of the services normally provided by a local tower controller be made available by other means.

- In detail, these requirements include but are not limited to:
 - detection of passive and active targets anywhere within the aerodrome boundary
 - detection of foreign objects of defined minimum properties anywhere on the movement area
 - detection of ground targets of defined minimum properties to a specified distance beyond the threshold(s)
 - detection of airborne targets of defined minimum properties to a specified distance beyond the aerodrome boundary
 - imminent runway intrusion detection and alerting for passive and active targets
 - imminent collision detection and alerting for passive and active targets
 - real-time weather observation and reporting at least as timely, accurate and comprehensive as a human controller
 - real-time runway surface condition observation and reporting at least as timely, accurate and comprehensive as a human controller *or meteorologist*
 - real-time detection and reporting of bird hazard
 - ability to direct standard visual signals to an aircraft on the ground or in the air
 - unaffected by any weather condition under which the airfield would be used for airborne or ground movement
 - defined minimum latency, *data integrity and security*
 - system failure detection and controller alerting to degradation of capability
 - visual assistance in case of an incident or accident
 - contingency procedures, *especially those that are unique to the Remote and Virtual Aerodrome Control concept.*

POL-STAT 2

POL STAT 3

POL-STAT 4

The concept of Remote and Virtual Aerodrome Control allows for cross-border service provision in which the actual controller is located in another country than the aerodrome concerned. Caution should be taken in regards to the legal and legislative aspects of this kind of operation.

DRAFT POLICY 2

5. COMMENTS BY THE PROPOSERS

5.1 The concept of Remote and Virtual Tower (RVT) operations has been studied in many regions of the world for several years now and the first remote tower went operational in Sundsvall, Sweden in 2015, serving the tower of Örnsköldsvik Airport. Other countries are operating similar system, such as the remote tower for runway 18R at Amsterdam Schiphol Airport, The Netherlands or are planning to start RVT operations at bigger airports (Germany, Hungary). Single RVT where one controller is responsible for one tower seems to be acceptable (at least at small airports), yet it is currently questionable if all implications on human performance in interaction with the current technical solutions in a Multiple RVT environment is fully understood, respectively catered for. Trials concluded during the European SESAR project suggest that more research work has to be done in that regard and that it might not be advisable to implement Multiple RVT operations live at a real airport at this time. As the concept of RVT enables data transfer over long distances, it also enables establishing remote control across the borders of nations. This might have implications in terms of legal and legislative aspects (which law is being applied) and is a potential threat to the integrity and security of data.

6. COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD**6.1**

Reference: Annex 11

IP 17ATS

INTRODUCTORY PAPER
72nd IFALPA CONFERENCE
MONTREAL, CANADA, 5-8 MAY 2017

1. ITEM No.	SUBJECT	STATUS
D 1.	ANNEX 11	

CLASSIFICATION OF AIRSPACES

2. SOURCE AND DATE SUBMITTED

The Chairman of the ATS Committee, on behalf of the Committee,

3. PRESENT ICAO POLICY

3.1 2.6 CLASSIFICATION OF AIRSPACES

**ICAO ANNEX
11**

ICAO para. 2.6.1 states that ATS airspaces shall be classified and designated in accordance with the following:

Class A IFR flights only are permitted, all flights are subject to air traffic control service and are separated from each other.

Class B IFR and VFR flights are permitted, all flights are provided with air traffic control service and are separated from each other.

Class C IFR and VFR flights are permitted, all flights are provided with air traffic control service and IFR flights are separated from other IFR flights and from VFR flights. VFR flights are separated from IFR flights and receive traffic information in respect of other VFR flights.

Class D IFR and VFR flights are permitted and all flights are provided with air traffic control service, IFR flights are separated from other IFR flights and receive traffic information in respect of VFR flights, VFR flights receive traffic information in respect of all other flights.

Class E IFR and VFR flights are permitted, IFR flights are provided with air traffic control service and are separated from other IFR flights. All flights receive traffic information as far as is practical. Class E shall not be used for control zones.

Class F IFR and VFR flights are permitted, all participating IFR flights receive an air traffic advisory service and all flights receive flight information service if requested.

Note.- Where air traffic advisory service is implemented, this is considered normally as a temporary measure only until such time as it can be replaced by air traffic control. (See also PANS-ATM, Chapter 9)

Class G IFR and VFR flights are permitted and receive flight information service if requested.

3.2 CURRENT IFALPA POLICY

The lack of separation service between IFR and VFR flights in airspace Class D, even though all VFR flights are required to establish radio contact with ATC and are subject to ATC clearances and control, makes this airspace class unacceptable to IFALPA for normal commercial air transport. With the full information available about all traffic, ATC should be able to provide the same level of separation service to IFR flights as in airspace Class C.

Note: See also IFALPA policy in Chapter 3 of this Annex.

At present, ICAO PANS-ATM Chapter 9 paragraph 9.1.4.1.2 describes advisory airspace as an interim measure, before full control service can be provided. This qualification is not included for airspace Class F and should be re-introduced.

ICAO para. 2.6.2 states that States shall select those airspace classes appropriate to their needs.

IFALPA POLICY

IFALPA, however, maintains that States should select classes in accordance with the general requirements for air traffic services and the related airspace planning as spelled out in paragraph 2.4 of this Chapter.

In consequence, effective separation for IFR flights is ascertained only by the selection of airspace Class A to C. Therefore, States should provide airspace Class A to C with sufficient total dimensions to encompass commercial air transport operations. The operation of normal commercial air transport aircraft in classes D, E, F or G of airspace should be avoided.

Furthermore, and consistent with the goal of providing optimum service to all traffic, the number of different airspace classes selected within a region should be kept to a minimum by regional air navigation agreement.

4. PROPOSED IFALPA POLICY, (deleted text struck through, new text in *Bold Italics*)

4.1 2.6 CLASSIFICATION OF AIRSPACES

DELETE policy in IFALPA Annex 11 (ATS) Section 2.6.1

Note: Retain quote of ICAO alphabet airspaces for reference

~~The lack of separation service between IFR and VFR flights in airspace Class D, even though all VFR flights are required to establish radio contact with ATC and are subject to ATC clearances and control makes this airspace class unacceptable to IFALPA for normal commercial air transport. With the full information available about all traffic, ATC should be able to provide the same level of separation service to IFR and VFR flights as in airspace Class C.~~

~~Note:~~ See also IFALPA policy in Chapter 3 of this Annex.

~~At present, ICAO PANS-ATM Chapter 9 paragraph 9.1.4.1.2 describes advisory airspace as an interim measure, before full control service can be provided. This qualification is not included for airspace Class F and should be re-introduced.~~

**POL-STAT 1995
(REAFFIRMED
2010)**

**POL-STAT 1995
(REAFFIRMED
2010)**

AR-1

- 4.2 **AMEND** policy in IFALPA Annex 11 (ATS) Section 2.6.2, as shown hereunder (deletions struck out, additions ***bold italics***):

IFALPA POLICY

IFALPA, however, maintains that States should select *airspace* classes in accordance with the general requirements for air traffic services and the related airspace planning as spelled out in paragraph 2.4 of this Chapter. **POL-STAT 1**

In consequence, ~~effective separation for IFR flights is ascertained only by the selection of airspace Class A to C.~~ Therefore, States should ***generally*** provide airspace Class A to C with sufficient total dimensions to encompass ~~*airline-type*~~ commercial air transport operations. **POL-STAT 2**

As all VFR flights are required to establish radio contact with ATC and are subject to ATC clearances and control, Class D airspace may also be regarded as an acceptable environment for commercial air transport operations, where local procedures are established to effectively segregate IFR and VFR traffic flows, for example geographically within control zones. **DRAFT POLICY 1**

~~*Airline-type Commercial air transport operations*~~ The operation of normal commercial air transport aircraft in classes ~~D~~, E, F or G of airspace should be avoided. **POL-STAT 3**

Furthermore, and consistent with the goal of providing optimum service to all traffic, the number of different airspace classes selected within a region should be kept to a minimum by regional air navigation agreement.

5. COMMENTS BY PROPOSERS

While IFALPA policy in Annex 11 Section 2.4 – Determination of the Need for Air Traffic Services states that controller and uncontrolled traffic should be effectively *segregated* and that IFALPA opposes the operation of *uncontrolled* and controlled traffic in one airspace volume. Policy in Section 2.6 – Classification of Airspaces states that airspace Class D is not acceptable for normal commercial air transport operations in view of the lack of a *separation* service between IFR and VFR flights.

The intention at the time was to effectively exclude airspace Class D from the catalogue in favour of Class C that exhibits similar airspace user requirements but offers separation service for all IFR flights. Operational experience shows that Class D is widely implemented, in particular for control zones with ATC procedures in place to effectively segregate VFR from IFR traffic flows. Under such circumstances, the basic requirement expressed in Section 2.4 is achieved, in addition, airspace Class D and the original policy regarding Class D may be deleted. Appropriate safeguards are proposed in the new policy with reference to the selection of appropriate airspace classes.

6. COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

6.1

Reference: Annex 3

IP 17ATS

INTRODUCTORY PAPER
72nd IFALPA CONFERENCE
MONTREAL, CANADA, 5-8 MAY 2017

1. ITEM NO.	SUBJECT	STATUS
D 1.	ANNEX 3	
	INFORMATION FOR AIRCRAFT IN FLIGHT	
2.	SOURCE AND DATE SUBMITTED	
	The Chairman of the ATS Committee, on behalf of the Committee,	
3.	PRESENT ICAO POLICY	
3.1	9.5 INFORMATION FOR AIRCRAFT IN FLIGHT	ICAO ANNEX 3
	ICAO para. 9.5.1 states that <i>9.5.1 Meteorological information for use by aircraft in flight shall be supplied by a meteorological office to its associated air traffic services unit and through D-VOLMET or VOLMET broadcasts as determined by regional air navigation agreement. Meteorological information for planning by the operator for aircraft in flight shall be supplied on request, as agreed between the meteorological authority or authorities and the operator concerned.</i>	
	<i>9.5.2 Meteorological information for use by aircraft in flight shall be supplied to air traffic services units in accordance with the specifications of Chapter 10.</i>	
	<i>9.5.3 Meteorological information shall be supplied through D-VOLMET or VOLMET broadcasts in accordance with the specifications of Chapter 11.</i>	
3.2	CURRENT IFALPA POLICY	
	Surface weather (e.g. heavy snow, fog, large thunderstorms) covering a large area should be briefly summarised at the beginning of the VOLMET cycle. Where reports of CB are contained in VOLMET, the bearing and distance of the centre from the aerodrome should be available on request, and should be inserted in the report if considered significant by ATC.	POL-STAT 2004 REAFFIRMED 2011
	Repetition of phrases (e.g. "This is London Volmet") should be avoided, as should unnecessary pauses.	POL-STAT 2004 REAFFIRMED 2011
	Weather information presented to pilots shall have the same information content as that available on the ground and in automatic systems.	POL-STAT 2015
	Access to the information shall be continuous; and available while on the ground as well as in the air. The information shall be displayed in easy to understand, graphical form.	

4. **PROPOSED IFALPA POLICY** (New Text in ***Bold Italics***,)
- Generally, IFALPA supports the provision of voice-VOLMET service on published frequencies. These VOLMET services should be sufficiently widespread to allow weather briefing for aircraft whenever operating in airspaces that are not remote.* **POL-STAT 1**
- To mitigate against negative effects of pilots leaving the active ATC-frequency and against errors in transmission / understanding of content, voice-VOLMET should be expanded by additional ACARS datalink VOLMET service wherever feasible.* **POL-STAT 2**
- Generally, IFALPA is against any replacement of voice-VOLMET by solely ACARS datalink services. If such replacement is planned, a sufficiently high equipage of ACARS datalink in all aircraft concerned has to be guaranteed.* **DRAFT POLICY 1**
- Note: Sufficient equipage of aircraft concerned is of particular interest to not increase ATC-frequency usage by requesting weather information of aircraft not equipped.*
- For replacement of voice-VOLMET a proven continuity of service of ACARS datalink of at least 95% of time is a prerequisite.* **DRAFT POLICY 2**
- For the case of only one source of enroute weather briefing available, IFALPA calls for sufficient resilience of this sole source of information. Further a practicable and reliable redundancy / contingency planning allowing continuous weather briefing for all aircraft concerned shall be in place.* **POL-STAT 3**
- Note: It should be noted that continuous weather briefing is essential for safe air transport.*
- On aircraft equipped with Internet access, an appropriate selection of Meteorological information should be available via a secure, self-briefing website. Display-options should enhance situation awareness, e.g. by display of a weather-layer over a navigation chart.* **DRAFT POLICY 3**

5. COMMENTS BY THE PROPOSERS

- 5.1 There is policy contained the ICAO and IFALPA Annex 3, 9.5.1 for the content and availability of voice-VOLMET. It is suggested that this information can be transferred to flight decks via ACARS. Transmission via ACARS is regularly used and has certain advantages compared to voice-transfer such as no pilot is required to leave the active ATC-frequency and problems with poor quality of audio and errors in transmission/hearing/understanding of the information given can be resolved using ACARS. It was recognised that the equipage of aircraft with ACARS must be sufficiently high assuring a reasonable low number of pilots would need to ask the ATCO for current weather at a given station.

There is a further proposal to include the use of internet connections on the flight deck, if available, to display Met information

6. COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD**6.1**