

CRA number	Region	Status	Type	Title	Description	Findings
<b>2012 PRs</b>						
1108-SN	NAT	CLOSED	GROUND	No auto transfer from Santa Maria to New York	CPDLC DID NOT AUTOMATICALLY SWITCH OVER FROM SANTA MARIA TO NEW YORK AT 44N040W. LOGGED ON TO NEW YORK MANUALLY. LOG ON WAS SUCCESSFUL.	Santa Maria (automation or controller) neglected to initiate the transfer to KZWW (no contact advisory and no END SERVICE). There was nothing in the log to indicate an airplane, network, or ground system automation problem, so this was likely due to controller error. A subsequent manual logon was successful.
1109-SN	NAT	CLOSED	NETWORK	Issue with Digital ATIS at EDDF	DIGITAL ATIS AT EDDF IS SHOWING US DEPARTURE ATIS FOR BOTH ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE. DIGITAL ATIS IS SHOWING INFO D FOR ARRIVAL WHEN IT SHOULD BE U.	ARINC Response 17 Jan 2012: EDDF switched from a combined ATIS message to split Arrival/Departure messages. ARINC updated configurations to reflect this change.
1110-GS	NAT	CLOSED	AIR-p	Unable to Logon to ATC	CPCLC INOP. UNABLE TO LOGON TO ANY ATC FACILITIES. ATTEMPTED DATALINK RESET.	The airplane attempted logons with New York (KZWW), Santa Maria (LPPO), ZZZZ (I guess he was getting desperate) and Cape Verde (GVSC). The first two responded with a reject (reason code 4 - flight plan mismatch). The reason for that is almost certainly that the crew logged on as a different flight ID than was filed (logon contained the 2-char airline ID and the flight filed with the 3-char ID) and an exact match is required. Cape Verde didn't reject them (probably implying they don't do the required flight plan check), but at least didn't establish a CPDLC connection.
1111-GS	SOPAC	CLOSED	GROUND	Invalid ATC uplinks	Flight required to divert to PHNL due to a passenger medical issue. They sent several free text re-route requests. INVALID ATC UPLINK' response to each one. Flight requested and received clearance via HF radio.	The free text downlink request included the text DCT to indicate Direct routing. The controller used DCT as a route element in the clearance and the ground automation encoded it incorrectly. The operator commented, "I don't believe our crew requesting a diversion by free text is the best method".
1112-GS	SOPAC	OPEN	NETWORK	SATCOM Uplinks Not Delivered, But Downlinks Are	TRANSFER AND 3 LOGONS FAILED. D/L RESET AND 1 LOGON FAILED. C- VHF SWITCHED TO DATA LOGON AT 1206Z.	Reference ISPCAG/26-FIT/19 WP-06: "Issues with Uplink Message Delivery Discovered during FIT PR Investigation"  In the event that the satcom system has become temporarily unavailable but there has not been a complete loss of connectivity (e.g., VHF is still available), some aircraft do not generate a Satcom Established Media Advisory when satcom becomes available again. When this occurs, SITA's tracking logic may not allow for successful delivery of uplink messages.
1113-GS	NOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	AIR-t	Missing Airway Intersection Waypoints	The airplane was executing a DARP reroute procedure. The route uplink was received from Dispatch, including the waypoints. The route was then requested from Oakland Center. The clearance received did not include the intersection waypoint. This makes it difficult for the flight crew to verify that the clearance is the same as the company-proposed reroute.	The original AOC uplink included the fix SCORE between the two airways (OTR11 and Y811). That was missing from the downlink request, and therefore also missing from the actual clearance.  This is a known issue with B777 (not including airway intersection fixes in route downlinks). It has been reported in the South Pacific as presenting a problem for DARPs where the coordination messages passed from one ATC center to another require a fully-developed route, including airway intersections. However, the standard defining datalink operation (RTCA DO-258A/EUROCAE ED-100A) does not include any specific requirements for what to include.  Closed as a duplicate of PR-1030_GS; PR confirmed fixed in BPV 17, to be closed when retrofit Service Bulletin available
1114-SN	SOPAC	ACTIVE	AIR-t	Incorrect estimates following route modification	An incorrect estimate was received from an A320 following a re-route.  A subsequent ADS-C report corrected the error.	Airbus investigation in progress.
1115-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	GROUND	Multiple logon and downlink issues	Multiple attempts required to logon to WAAF. In YBBB ATC unable to respond to downlinks, no ADS-C.	Closed as a duplicate of 1112.
1116-SN	NAT	ACTIVE	AIR-t	NEXT and NEXT+1 reports Grossly Out of Conformance	Aircraft was east bound going from TFFF to LFPO. Cleared route of flight was 18N058W 21N056W 29N050W 37N040W 42N030W 46N020W 47N015W ETIKI UN480 REGHI UN482 KURIS UN482 NIMER. Flight was ADS-C and CPDLC connected.  All ADS-C reports were normal until the periodic report that was received just after the aircraft had reported over the FIR between NY and Santa Maria (37N040W). When this periodic was received, the NEXT and NEXT+1 were grossly out of conformance. Instead of reporting a NEXT of 42N030W and a NEXT+1 of 46N020W the aircraft reported 4847N00240E and 48746N00236E.  If you look at the way point report or periodics that came in at 0144Z or 0203Z, you will see that the NEXT and NEXT+1 were correct. However if you look at the periodic that came in at 0205Z, you will see the incorrect NEXT and NEXT+1.  After receiving this report at 0205Z, a DEMAND was initiated and the ADS-C report that was returned contained the correct information.	Airbus investigation in progress.

CRA number	Region	Status	Type	Title	Description	Findings
1117-SN	NAT	CLOSED	AIR-t	A333 receives CPDLC messages via SATCOM but responses are lost	<p>The aircraft had been in contact with BIRD via ARINC's VHF network (with intermittent SATCOM messages) and with the exception of a very late CLA message received at 12:10 (possibly held by the aircraft until VHF contact made?) nothing remarkable occurred until 15:23 (other than a rejected uplink at 15:01, No Ack) at which time a clearance was sent, a MAS/S received but no operational response followed. The clearance was repeated at 15:29 with the same result. When the clearance was delivered via voice shortly afterwards it turned out that the crew were already at the cleared level, having received the CPDLC message(s). The crew advised of "intermittent contact" via data link.</p> <p>Interestingly, starting at 16:03 we received, via VHF, a number of FANS messages that had obviously been waiting for transmission, these included the response to our END SERVICE and a number of ADS messages but NOT the WILCO messages that were presumably actioned by the crew in response to the clearance messages.</p> <p>Two issues are raised by this - one is why the aircraft was using SATCOM in the first place (it should have been within reliable range of SFJ RGS) and secondly why SATCOM was, apparently, "one way". It would also be interesting to get clarification of just what messages are held and queued for (delayed) transmission and for how long.</p>	Issue identified with operator's satcom system. Airbus is working with the operator to install corrected software.
1118-MM	NAT	OPEN	AIR-t	First RCL Timeout Rejection experienced from Shanwick	<p>Requested NAT Oceanic Clearance from EGGX via ORCA. We were within 90-minute window when request was made. Received usual initial "XXXXNNN RCL RECEIVED IF NO CLEARANCE WITHIN 15 MINUTES REVERT TO VOICE PROCEDURES" message at 1157Z. At 1205Z received the following: "RCL RECEIVED SHANWICK CLEARANCE NOT ACKNOWLEDGED SEND DATALINK ACCEPTANCE NOW". The problem was that we had not received any datalink clearance to acknowledge.</p> <p>At 1208Z we received the following: "XXXXNNN RCL REJECTED TRANSACTION TIMEOUT REVERT TO VOICE PROCEDURES END OF MESSAGE".</p> <p>While I have experienced and written up this problem on numerous occasions from Gander OCL, this is the first time that I have experienced this from Shanwick using ORCA.</p> <p>I am aware of the operator-specific issues which have been articulated by the DLMA and which the operator has said that they have a fix for; in fact, one of my previous reports remains open until this fix has been implemented. To date I am unaware that this has occurred, as more times than not on the Gander side we have to revert to voice to receive our OCL.</p> <p>What is disturbing here is that those same specific aircraft that had issues with Gander did NOT have the same issue with Shanwick. So for the first time the problem has crept in on the east side of the Atlantic.</p>	The PR investigation revealed that (1) Shanwick did in fact send the oceanic clearance at 1158Z and (2) the avionics rejected it as invalid. A review of the aircraft operator's Airline Modifiable Information (AMI) table indicated that the AMI rejected the oceanic clearance because it contained twelve lines (i.e., <CR><LF>s) in the clearance text (i.e., the part of the clearance following "- /PIKLYA.CLX") while the AMI only allows ten lines.
1119-GS	NAT	OPEN	GROUND	Failed logons and transfers	<p>Advised by BIRD that address forwarding to CZQX had failed and to logon manually. Crew queried this as according to the chart the next airspace was CZUL. Attempted manual logon to CZQX, successful for about 1 min, ADS-C established then displayed CZUL as Next Centre but transfer to CZUL failed. Two or three attempted logons to CZUL failed.</p> <p>Note for CRA: CZQX transfer CPDLC without a CONTACT or MONITOR instruction.</p>	<p>Reykjavik set up Gander as the NDA, and then the address forwarding to Gander (CZQX) failed at 1917z. Gander rejected it as a flight plan mismatch (FAK4). Reykjavik then sent a CPDLC free text "DESIGNATION OF CZQX AS CPDLC NEXT DATA AUTHORITY HAS FAILED. LOG ON MANUALLY TO CZQX WHEN ENTERING THE CZQX AIRSPACE".</p> <p>The manual logon to CZQX after the one in the automatic transfer had failed was actually successful. Gander then tried to transfer them to Montreal (CYUL). That failed, and the manual logon attempts to CYUL also failed (all reason code 4 - flight plan mismatch).</p> <p>The crew report was that they didn't think they should be logging on to Gander anyway, as they weren't entering their airspace, because they were North of N65. The flight plan, based on ADS waypoint change event reports was: N65W040 - N65W050 - N65W060 - N6430W063 - ...</p> <p>After further investigation, it appears that the reason that Gander rejected the initial logon was because they had not received the filed flight plan. They had received a CPL from Reykjavik at 1913z. This will create a flight plan in the Gander system but this flight plan will not contain the registration. It also only contained routing as far as NALDI with an indication that there was additional routing. After the failed logon, Gander made a request for the flight plan from Eurocontrol. Hence the successful second logon.</p> <p>Montreal did in fact receive a flight plan from the airline; however the core problem here was that they did not file one with Gander and as such the most recent data Montreal had was the information sent to them by Gander missing the registration. The data was transferred to Montreal prior to updating the registration.</p> <p>The core issue was therefore the failure to send the flight plan to Gander. The route went through N65W060, which is actually on the boundary between Gander and Edmonton FIRs. However, the airspace in that area is delegated to Gander Oceanic.</p> <p>The airline is looking to ensure that their flight plan filing process reflects this, and that crews are aware of the airspace delegation.</p>
1120-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED	NETWORK	A388 CPDLC uplinks sent via HFDL	<p>One operator's A388 CPDLC uplinks are again being incorrectly routed via HFDL. This issue started again in March 2011 after an earlier problem with this that was noted in FANS PR #711 was resolved by ARINC in March 2010.</p>	ARINC updated configs on 9 Feb12 for this tail to choose SITA SATCOM over HFDL regardless of most recent media advisory.

CRA number	Region	Status	Type	Title	Description	Findings
1121-SN	IO	OPEN	AIR-t	Delayed ADS position for one operator's B744 aircraft	Aircraft sent a ADS position report that was delayed by 6 minutes while aircraft was on the ground. Aircraft was exchanging ACARS messages between both ADS reports.	The FMC generated a waypoint change event report and a periodic report generated at the exact same time (to the tenth of a second). The event went straight away. The other one took several minutes, while other downlinks got sent.  This is the result of a known Rockwell-Collins C CMU problem.
1122-SN	NOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	AIR-t	Delayed ADS report	Aircraft sent 2 Waypoint Change ADS reports, one to RJJJ and the other to PAZN. Second one was delayed by 12 minutes.	Closed as a duplicate of 1121.  The FMC generated two identical event reports. The first goes immediately. The second takes a long time. Again, there are downlinks (and ADS uplinks) in between. There's also a "lost HF" media advisory right before the second one came down.  This is the result of a known Rockwell-Collins C CMU problem.
1123-GS	SOPAC	OPEN	AIR-t	Delayed ADS report	Aircraft had multiple ADS and CPDLC messages delayed. Aircraft was going from NFFF FIR to YBBB FIR. Aircraft sent a Wilco over HFDL followed by the same Wilco on SATCOM. Subsequent CPDLC POS report and ADS reports were delayed by several minutes. All DBIs and MSNs are sequential reports that were delayed by several minutes.	The only particularly unusual aspect is the delivery of the WILCO on HFDL before its delivery over SATCOM, but that may just be an artifact of the way SATCOM was performing. Apart from that, the log appears to show very poor SATCOM performance. The WILCO (time stamp 06:01:25) was received on SATCOM at 06:10:56 (nine and a half minutes), but that was actually 8 minutes after the last downlink (received at 6:03:03) - not too inconsistent with multiple retries on SATCOM (and perhaps additional delays in getting a channel assigned on the last attempt). Later downlinks were probably simply queued behind this downlink (and building on the delay with their own poor SATCOM performance).
1124-SN	IO	CLOSED	AIR-p	Unable LOGON VABF	Tried several times to Logon to VABF, MSG returned says "Re-LOGON to ATC" Mumbai VHF 132.7 informed, they believed there was no problem with their system. Tech log entry made, No apparent technical Problem	The following NOTAM WAS provided by the reporting operator: "FANS 1/A EQUIPPED ACFT OPR WI CHENNAI FIR OVER BAY OF BENGAL IN OCEANIC AIRSPACE ON ATS ROUTES B466E, N877, P628, P761,P762, P574, N571, N563, L645 AND L510 DESIRING DATA-LINK SERVICES ARE REQUIRED TO LOGON TO THE ADDRESS 'VOMM' AND 'VOMF'. CPDLC WILL BE AVBL ONLY WITH AFN LOGON ADDRESS 'VOMM'". The logon was apparently sent to the wrong address.
1125-SN	NOPAC	CLOSED	AIR-p	ADS Emergency Position Report Sent to PAZN	Aircraft was flying east to west from PAZA to PAZN. Initial contract request and handoff were both Emergency reports. Aircrew confirmed no emergency existed and that they had not initiated any control panel actions. A similar event occurred with another aircraft but was not captured in a trouble report. Is it possible that an avionics problem might have led to the false emergency condition?	Based on a review of the logs for this event, we suspect that this is the result of an issue we've seen a few times over the last several years. The 747-400 has a foot rest for the first officer on the side of the aisle stand, near to the MCDU (the primary interface to the flight management computer). When the FO has the ATC LOGON/STATUS page displayed on the MCDU, it is possible for him to inadvertently activate ADS in emergency mode with his foot.
1126-SN	NOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	NETWORK	Intermittant ADS-C and CPDLC connection	Aircraft was eastbound from KADW to LPAZ on 10 February 2012. AFN LOGON received at 12:44 and the proper ADS-C contracts were established. CPDLC also established.  Received all ADS-C reports up until the aircraft reached 41N050W. Starting at 1445Z, we could not contact the airplane via CPDLC. All messages sent to the aircraft either did not get through or did get through and we did not receive a response.  Starting at 1506Z, transfer of the CPDLC connection to Santa Maria did not occur since the aircraft was not acknowledging our NDA or any other transfer messages (FN_CAD, etc).  Same problem occurred with the same aircraft going westbound on 11 Feb 2012 from LPLA to KADW.  Aircraft came up on HF at 1239Z without a position report but instead with the typical message that we receive when a CPDLC aircraft calls for a SELCAL check. On this HF contact, the aircraft requested F430. It is obvious that the aircraft was thinking that it was connected via CPDLC and ADS-C but it actually was not.  At 1244Z, the first AFN LOGON is received from the aircraft. By this time, the aircraft is 5 minutes west of 40W. Starting with the LOGON attempt, the aircraft does not respond to any of our up-link messages trying to establish both an ADS-C connection or a CPDLC connection. All attempts to reach the aircraft via CPDLC are unsuccessful.	Closed as a duplicate of 1112.
1127-GS	NAT	CLOSED	GROUND	Incorrect address used in NDA	Controllers in Gander reported receiving a "not current data authority" message on aircraft on the Y track. Prestwick also reported to Gander that they were receiving CPDLC requests from flights that were still in our area.  Investigation by Gander showed that we were not the CDA for flights coming from New York on the Y track however when we received the FN_ACK, we did nominate Prestwick as the NDA. The end service from New York resulted in Prestwick becoming the CDA.	Further investigation showed that New York has been using an incorrect CPDLC address for Gander (CYQX instead of CZQX). New York has advised that they will be updating their adaptation in the next week.
1128-SN	SOPAC	OPEN	AIR-t	Incorrect lat/long uplinked in route clearance	The controller uplinked the following route clearance: CLEAR D 34N170E 32N180E 28N170W DANNO Arrival Procedure: ARRIVAL BOOKER. The pilot reported receiving 32N179E rather than 32N180E. The decoded message in the Oakland data showed the correct lat/long: 32N180E was uplinked rather than what the pilot reported: 32N179E.	This behavior is actually the result of a "fix" to correct a software reset that caused the FMC flight plan to clear when a longitude of E or W 180 was entered. The fix was to change 180 to 179.9998 to prevent the variable from blowing up. This is displayed in the flight plan as 179.777 and 787 have the same behavior. 777 fix in AIMS-2 BPV 17 (4Q13); 787 fix in BP2 (3Q13). 757/767 fix candidate for next software blockpoint. Software fix will allow for entry and display of E/W 180.
1129-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED	AIR-p	ADS-C reports possibly contained inactive route data	Aircraft was requesting a diversion to NWWW. For a period of time, ADS-C reports contained PRG indicating that the aircraft was flying east (towards NWWW), but the Basic positions indicated that the aircraft was actually flying west (towards YBBN).	The pilot changed the flight plan for the diversion prior to requesting clearance, but continued tracking to YBBN until cleared. Execution of the flight plan change would have triggered the out of conformance. The (old) 744 FMC does not compute predictions for the inactive route, so the pilot had to activate the diversion flight plan to get preds. The FMC appears to have behaved itself.

CRA number	Region	Status	Type	Title	Description	Findings
1130-SN	SOPAC	OPEN	AIR-t	Incorrect ADS-C estimate for NEXT - 8777	<p>ADS-C reports contained incorrect estimate for NEXT position</p> <p>Aircraft crossed TUBBY at 2328. An ADS-C report was received (most probably a Waypoint Change Event report).</p> <p>The Estimate for MIDAT (NEXT) contained within the ADS-C report was 2352. Over a leg length of 110NM, this would have resulted in an unrealistic groundspeed of 270 KTS.</p> <p>A DCR was uplinked to the aircraft at 2332 to try and correct the estimate error for MIDAT. The estimate for MIDAT from the resulting ADS-C report changed to 2350, but this was still unrealistic.</p> <p>At 2334, a subsequent DCR uplinked to the aircraft resulted in an ADS-C report with the correct estimate for MIDAT of 2340.</p> <p>Because MIDAT is at the FIR boundary between YBBB and NZZO, NZZO also had ADS-C contracts established with the aircraft at the time of the occurrence. NZZO confirmed that they had received the same erroneous estimates from the aircraft.</p>	<p>This problem can occur under the following condition: The flight plan contains a planned step down and an arrival procedure is selected which results in a top of descent prior the step down waypoint.</p>
1131-SN	NAT	CLOSED	NETWORK	KZWW Problem report	<p>-Requested climb</p> <p>-Received response "Unable heights due to traffic"</p> <p>-Tried to send auto response "Roger" - Failed</p> <p>-Tried to send free text "Roger" - failed</p> <p>-Followed by "Com Not Avail" message at 0605</p> <p>-CPDLC recovered at self at 0631</p> <p>-Subsequent response went through</p>	<p>This problem was the result of a temporary loss of satcom.</p> <p>18 October 2012 - Closed based on Airbus analysis</p>
1132-MM	SOPAC	OPEN	AIR-t	Incorrect next fix time in CPDLC position report	<p>Aircraft sends DM48 position report with incorrect time at next fix, 1322; should have been 1408. Time sent for next fix is actually reported time at current fix. ADS report shows estimate for 5S is 13:22:36 and CPDLC position report has a timestamp of 13:22:46 so we suspect this is another instance of the position report being sent too soon after waypoint passage. Subsequent position report at 13:28 had correct estimate, but this report seems to include a lot of additional data other than the report.</p> <p>Same issue again: 8 April, CPDLC position report received for 321335 163020E at 0640 with next fix PAPT1 at 0640.</p>	<p>Reproduced in Boeing lab on 22 October 2012. Problem can occur when a Direct To the active fix is executed right as the active waypoint sequences. This problem is targeted to be corrected in 777 AIMS-2 Block Point Version 17A (pending approval).</p>
1133-GS	NAT	CLOSED	AIR-t	Received AFN LOGON contained incorrect Lat Long	<p>At 14:23:17, an AFN LOGON was received for this flight. The location of the aircraft, based upon the lat/long in the AFN LOGON was 353106N0722436W.</p> <p>Problem is, the aircraft had already left our airspace at 14:23:17 and was physically located in the vicinity of GTK which is about 12 degrees south of 353106N0722436W.</p>	<p>The logs show a gap in transmissions between 12:45:23 (when the transmission was received by ARINC's station at Salisbury-Ocean City in Maryland, and 14:23:09, when a link test was received by ARINC's stations at Puerto Plata (Dominican Republic) and Providenciales (Turks and Caicos). Shortly after that, a media advisory was sent indicating establishment of SATCOM (and that only SATCOM was available).</p> <p>The AFN logon that followed (received on the ground at 14:23:15) was time-stamped 12:51:15 (i.e. during the period of NO COMM). It must therefore have been delayed on the airplane, waiting for the link to be created.</p> <p>The operator was contacted to find out if there was a problem with their satcom system.</p>
1134-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED	AIR-t	Loss of comms	<p>Crew Report: AT 1047Z TO KZAK CONNEX LOST FOR APP 10 MINS</p>	<p>It appears that the airplane had a brief satcom issue (duration of approx 5 min). Closed due to no further issues reported with this airplane's satcom system.</p>
1135-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	NETWORK	Unable to establish CPDLC / ADS-C connections with GLF5	<p>Initial failure to establish CPDLC and ADS-C Connections (coincidentally outside VHF DL coverage?).</p> <p>Approaching TABAL, flight crew initiated AFN logon to YBBB. Logon received.</p> <p>CPDLC and ADS-C connections were initiated by the ground system. These were both unsuccessful.</p> <p>At 0539, flight crew initiated another AFN logon to YBBB. This time, both CPDLC and ADS-C connections were successfully automatically established by the ground system.</p> <p>Flight crew reported having established successful CPDLC and ADS-C connections with KZAK after departing PHNL, but had been unsuccessful with NFFF and initially unsuccessful with YBBB (as above).</p> <p>Of possible relevance is TABAL (when initial logon initiated) is outside VHF DL coverage, but the subsequent logon 20 minutes later (closer to mainland Australia) was probably within VHF DL coverage.</p>	<p>Closed as a duplicate of 1112.</p>

CRA number	Region	Status	Type	Title	Description	Findings
1136-MM	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	AIR-t	CPDLC Downlinks not received for B777	<p>Inactive CPDLC connection with YBBB successfully established at 2047.</p> <p>At 2119, YBBB sent free-text CPDLC uplink "REQUEST YOU SEQUENCE WAYPOINT POXAK" to aircraft and a NOT CURRENT DATA AUTHORITY response was received by YBBB at 2124 (actually – our records indicated two NCDAs responses received – were two sent by the avionics? Possibly related to transition from VHF DL to SATCOM).</p> <p>The preceding ATSU was requested to uplink the CPDLC END SERVICE message. This appeared to be successful.</p> <p>From this point on, YBBB appeared to be the CDA but could not receive CPDLC downlinks from the aircraft. The flight crew subsequently confirmed the following sequence of (CPDLC) events:</p> <p>2126 YBBB uplinked "REQUEST POSITION REPORT"  - Flight crew confirmed receipt and sent a CPDLC position report  - Position report not received by YBBB</p> <p>2129 YBBB uplinked "SQUAWK [code]"  - Flight crew confirmed receipt and sent a response  - WILCO response not received by YBBB</p> <p>2155 Flight crew contacted on VHF  - Confirmed YBBB as "active centre"  - Downlinked another CPDLC position report  - Position report not received by YBBB</p> <p>2157 YBBB uplinked "SQUAWK [code]"  - Flight crew received uplink within 30 seconds and sent response  - WILCO response not received by YBBB</p> <p>The flight crew did not indicate any indication of system inoperability.</p>	<p>The ARINC log exactly corroborates the PR description. Aside from the two NOT CURRENT DATA AUTHORITY downlinks addressed to BNECAYA (YBBB), ARINC received no other downlinks from the aircraft.</p> <p>No apparent reason exists for the aircraft to have sent two separate (same subnetwork, different MSNs, 13 seconds apart) NOT CURRENT DATA AUTHORITY downlinks. These downlinks are also suspect because neither included the required timestamp.</p> <p>Closed as duplicate of PR 1145-SN.</p>
1137-GS	NAT	CLOSED	AIR-t	Incorrect time and position in ADS-C Report and also loss of connection for both ADS-C and CPDLC for a while	<p>Two issues here:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Had an active ADS-C and CPDLC connection and at some point, we lost the ability to communicate via CPDLC and receive ADS-C reports from the aircraft.</li> <li>Once the ADS-C connection was re-established, both the lat/long in the OV of the report and the time in the reports were grossly incorrect.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SATCOM Power supply interrupt failures (Intermittent) are present, which may explain the instability, very rare case. (This issue could come from either SatCom power supply or A/C power supply or manual reset).</li> <li>The ADS report received on the ground at 18:31:57 was for passing N22 50.5 W064 02.4, and was time-stamped at 28 minutes 8 seconds past the hour. That is consistent with it being issued at 17:28:08 (i.e. only 10 seconds out from the previous estimate), but delayed on the airplane for over an hour while there was no communication link.</li> </ol>
1138-SN	SOPAC	OPEN	AIR-t	Unsolicited WILCO downlinked to YBBB (B777)	<p>WILCO response received during multiple requests for weather deviations. No uplink had been sent to the aircraft by YBBB which required a WILCO response.</p> <p>The aircraft entered AGGG FIR at 1412, with YBBB as controlling authority. CPDLC connection established normally, and position report downlinked at 1413.</p> <p>No further CPDLC transactions until the following occurred.</p> <p>At 1439, the aircraft downlinked a CPDLC weather deviation request (10NM LR). This was shortly followed by a second CPDLC weather deviation request (10NM LR) and a WILCO response. This WILCO response was not linked to any dialogue with YBBB.</p> <p>The flight crew was subsequently queried regarding the transactions at 1439.</p> <p>They advised that just as they had selected SEND for the first CPDLC weather deviation request, another message was received. The weather deviation request did not change to SENDING, so the crew assumed that the inbound message had "blocked" their weather deviation request downlink.</p> <p>The flight crew acknowledged the inbound message (later advised to be a "weather deviation request from company") and re-initiated the weather deviation request to YBBB. This appeared to be coincident with the receipt of the unsolicited WILCO response.</p> <p>The flight crew downlinked another weather deviation request to YBBB, which is consistent with the second request received.</p> <p>The flight crew advised that their log indicated they had in fact sent 3 weather deviation requests. Is it possible the aircraft somehow sent itself the weather deviation request and in accepting the "weather deviation from company" they in fact downlinked their own response to YBBB? And therefore why YBBB only received two requests + one WILCO?</p>	<p>A second event occurred a week later.</p> <p>Reproduced in Boeing lab on 29 October 2012.</p>
1139-SN	NAT	CLOSED	NETWORK	SITA SATCOM Failure AOW and AOE	<p>SITA's SATCOM service (AOE and AOW) failed, the last transaction prior to the failure was logged at 05:46 and the first subsequent one at 06:42. SITA's own bulletin documents the outage as having started at 05:45 and ended at 06:43. The cause is given as an "unexpected service interruption at Aussaguel".</p> <p>The service bulletin advising users of the outage was not issued until 06:20, 35 minutes after the service had failed. More expeditious notification would be desirable.</p> <p>It should be noted that while centres totally reliant on SATCOM might be more severely impacted by such a failure than Reykjavik (where more than half the traffic is carried via VHF), in the absence of a service bulletin it isn't necessarily clear what is going on, aircraft being sometimes reachable, sometimes not. From logs it would appear that controllers were confused by the situation.</p>	<p>The problem was due to an Aussaguel GES computer issue. The chance of such issue occurring is very remote. However, to mitigate re-occurrence risk, an alarm has been set at the station to detect this type of abnormal condition to allow the operators to detect sooner and take corrective actions more quickly.</p> <p>The delayed notification was due to an e-mail capacity issue which has since been resolved".</p> <p>Closed on 23 Oct 2012 with originator's concurrence.</p>
1140-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	AIR-t	ADS Contracts not cancelled but MAS (S) was received	<p>Send Canel All Contracts uplink at 1827:08 and receive MAS(S) via VHF at 1827:14. No ADS Disconnect downlink received. ADS reports continue via SATCOM POR1 from 1838:58 until aircraft lands at Sydney at 2037.</p> <p>Feedback is that this has been seen from other B777 aircraft as well.</p>	<p>Closed as duplicate of PR-923. PR-923 was corrected in B777 AIMS Block Point Version 16. When this problem occurred, the avionics would acknowledge and then discard the uplink instead of forwarding it to the appropriate application.</p>

CRA number	Region	Status	Type	Title	Description	Findings
1141-GS	NAT	CLOSED	AIR-t	Another instance where a received AFN LOGON contained an incorrect Lat/Long	<p>Aircraft was ADS-C and CPDLC connected.</p> <p>First AFN LOGON occurred at 1602Z with a lat/long of 232842N0684318W. Successful establishment of ADS-C contracts and CPDLC connection soon followed.</p> <p>Between multiple ADS-C reports between 1605Z and 1746Z. The last report we received was at 1746Z with a position of 360724N0713908W at a time of 1746Z.</p> <p>ADS-C contract was normally terminated at 1754Z.</p> <p>At 1841Z, we received a new AFN LOGON for the aircraft. The position of the aircraft in the LOGON was 232842N0684318W which was at</p>	<p>The avionics vendor confirmed that this was caused by a software issue that is now fixed.</p> <p>This aircraft is at the first software level that had ADS-C (only) enabled.</p> <p>All FANS 1/A aircraft have the fix. Only the ones with just ADS-C are vulnerable.</p> <p>The update is being done progressively on the rest of the fleet; the majority have been migrated already.</p>
1142-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	NETWORK	Failed CPDLC transfer to Oakland	<p>Crew report failed CPDLC transfer at 5S. Required dadalink reset then new logon.</p> <p>We sent NDA at 1217, and I see two FCA,FRP,FCP sequences then a FCA,FRP followed by end service at 1258 approaching 0500S and terminate all contracts both of which are acknowledged.</p> <p><i>Next we see a logon from aircraft at 1420 and 1422 when aircraft is around 0400N both of which are rejected due no flight plan</i></p>	Closed as a duplicate of 1112.
1143-MM	NAT	OPEN	AIR-t	Incorrect time and position in ADS-C Report	<p>Aircraft was westbound and routed via AMENO JAINS DBN CANUK1 KATL. Aircraft was ADS-C and CPDLC connected. All ADS-C and CPDLC reports were normal up until time 0749Z.</p> <p>07:49:18 - An ADS-C report came in for 301359N 0665202W with at time of 07:49:02. The NEXT was for 312120 N077W (JAINS) with at time of 07:51:18. This is totally incorrect as the distance from 301359N 0665202W to JAINS is over 10 degrees and, unless we are talking about the Space Shuttle or a UFO, an aircraft cannot fly 10 degrees in 2 minutes.</p> <p>07:49:34 - Another ADS-C report in with an OV for 301410N 0665312W of 07:49:12 and a NEXT for 302743N 0682639W of 09:06:52. This too is incorrect since the aircraft had previously told us via voice that it's estimate for JAINS was 0906. Since JAINS, which is located at 312120N 077W, is nowhere near 302743N 0682639W the time in the ADS-C report is definitely not correct.</p> <p>07:57:24 - Basically the same problem. Aircraft reports over 302314N 0675448W at 07:57:09 and estimates JAINS at 08:01:17. That is 4 minutes to cover about 9 degrees.</p>	Multiple ADS-C predicted route groups contained incorrect time-to-go information for the indicated next waypoint. The time-to-go information may actually have been correct for the previous waypoint in some reports or for the next-plus-one waypoint in other reports, however. The problem was referred to 767 FMC engineering at Boeing.
1144-GS	NAT	CLOSED	AIR-t	Loss of ADS-C and CPDLC connection	<p>Aircraft was eastbound via ZIBUT TILED OVAPI 40N060W 44N050W 47N040W.</p> <p>23:23- AFN LOGON received. ADS-C and CPDLC connections established. ADS-C reports comes in as expected between this time and 0005Z.</p> <p>Starting after the ADS-C report at 0005Z, we received no further ADS-C reports. All attempts to reach the aircraft via CPDLC were unsuccessful. All DEMAND requests went unanswered. All expected (required) ADS-C reports were unreceived. This lasted until 0210Z.</p> <p>All messages to transfer the aircraft from New York to Gander went unanswered as well</p>	<p>The airplane stopped sending ADS reports after the report at 0005z on 8 April. The next transmission was the ADS report that should have been issued at 0025z, but it was actually transmitted at 0228z. Apart from one company downlink, sent just after the 0005z report, there was no transmission from the airplane for almost two and a half hours, and all uplinks (company and ATC) were returned as "airplane not logged on".</p> <p>The operator was asked to investigate whether the airplane had a SATCOM problem. It had lost VHF before that and been using SATCOM, and when datalink returned it was also using SATCOM.</p>
1145-SN	SOPAC	OPEN	AIR-t	B777 unable to send CPDLC messages after Data Authority Transfer	<p>Inactive CPDLC connection with YBBB successfully established prior to 1910. The aircraft was estimating the NFFF / YBBB FIR boundary at 1920.</p> <p>At 2024, YBBB uplinked CPDLC message "REQUEST POSITION REPORT". This was received by the aircraft, and the flight crew attempted to downlink a CPDLC position report.</p> <p>At 2028, YBBB uplinked CPDLC message "REQUEST POSITION REPORT". This was received by the aircraft, and the flight crew attempted to downlink a CPDLC position report.</p> <p>At 2030, YBBB uplinked CPDLC message "SQUAWK [code]". This was received by the aircraft, and the flight crew attempted to accept the message.</p> <p>Shortly after these exchanges, the flight crew noted that all downlinks they had attempted to send to YBBB had been "aborted".</p> <p>The flight crew subsequently reported that they had downlinked a "BACK ON ROUTE" CPDLC message at 1916 – coincidentally at the same time as the Data Authority transfer was occurring between NFFF and YBBB.</p> <p>Is it possible that the "BACK ON ROUTE" CPDLC Downlink was coincidentally downlinked as the CPDLC "END SERVICE" message was received from NFFF, resulting in a corruption of the CPDLC connection?</p> <p>Throughout this sequence of events, the ADS-C connection with the aircraft was operating normally.</p> <p><i>Subsequent to these events, the flight crew was instructed to re-initiate the logon process and from 1925 all CPDLC and ADS-C functionality</i></p>	Duplicated in the Boeing lab on 29 October 2012. The problem occurs if a downlink is sent and the End Service uplink is initiated during a media transition or period of No Comm.
1146-SN	SOPAC	ACTIVE	AIR-t	Unable to communicate with one aircraft from 2233z - 0028z	<p>The last ADS report for XASKY was received at 2154z(3312N/11839W). At 2228z, a position report over FOOTS was expected, but not received. From 2233z - 0028z, ATC unsuccessfully attempted to contact XASKY via CPDLC and AGM. Finally, at 0028z, ARINC established communications with XASKY and a position report over FIZEL was received via AGM. The pilot stated that he believed that he had been automatically reporting through CPDLC and did not have any indication that there was a problem with his system.</p>	Per ARINC review, it appears there was an avionics problem on the airplane. Problem under investigation at Honeywell and Gulfstream.
1147-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	NETWORK	Unable to establish an ADS connection	<p>From 2104z - 2339z, N455QS tried 16 times to establish an ADS connection. Each time the FN_CON was received an FN_AK was uplinked along with the Contract, however both appeared to not reach the aircraft due to "UP INTERCEPT AIRCRAFT NOT LOGGED ON".</p>	Closed as a duplicate of 1112.

CRA number	Region	Status	Type	Title	Description	Findings
1148-SN	SOPAC	OPEN	AIR-t	Loss of FANS functions	After ATC logon on VHF, at position FICKY the CPDLC position report and subsequent altitude request remained in the 'sending' mode. After attempting two master datalink resets and changing the GES to POR-Santa Paula, the OMB procedure to change the master datalink VHF radio to the right was carried out and this initially returned all datalink functions to normal. Following a routine printer paper change (0835Z), all AOC uplinks failed to display or print for the remainder of the flight.  The CPDLC transfer from KZAK to NZZO failed but subsequent logon was successful and FANS functions were normal for the rest of the flight. <del>Full report filed with manufacturer</del>	This problem is targeted for correction in 777 AIMS Block Point Version 17. Note that the failed transfer to NZZO was the result of the transferring agency failing to send the End Service. This aspect was not an airplane problem.
1149-GS	NAT	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	AIR-t	No auto transfer from SNN to Gander	On our flight westbound from TLV to EWR there was no Auto Transfer of the ADS/CPDLC between SNN and gander on 30W.	Closed as duplicate of PR-923. PR-923 was corrected in B777 AIMS Block Point Version 16.
1150-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	NETWORK	Unable to logon to KZAK	CPDLC normal in RJJJ but transfer and subsequent manual logons to KZAK failed. ATC advised flight to turn ADS-C off due aircraft equipment fault. Subsequent logon to YBBB successful and operations normal thereafter.	Closed as a duplicate of 1112.
1151-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	AIR-t	Unable to re-establish CPDLC with B777	CPDLC had been established with aircraft, but the connection was lost at 1230 (approx).  Several CR.1s were uplinked between 1236 and 1306, but with no success.  CPDLC connection re-established at 1351.	Closed as duplicate of PR-923. PR-923 was corrected in B777 AIMS Block Point Version 16.
1152-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED	AIR-t	Delayed downlinks from B772	<del>The aircraft should have been within VHF data link coverage at the time</del> A number of downlinks were received that had been delayed in excess of 5 minutes for an aircraft that should have been within VHF data link coverage.	The airplane had no satcom system and appeared to be operating at the fringe of VHF. Some downlinks were delayed while the airplane tried to find a good station.  Closed with originator's concurrence on 22 October 2012
1153-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED	NETWORK	Unable to establish ADS, CPDLC with B744	Between 1300 and 1400, YBBB was unable to establish CPDLC and/or ADS-C with the aircraft. The pilot stated that 'everything appeared to be working', but no connections were shown by ATC.  The flight plan indicated DAT/SV, and the aircraft should have been within VHF data link coverage at the time.  At 1400, it all "came good" and started working correctly.	ARINC confirmed there was a problem at Santa Paula at that time.
1154-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED	NETWORK	Unable to establish ADS, CPDLC with B737	Unable to establish CPDLC/ADS-C.	The airplane involved belongs to USAF. A contracted 3rd party investigated on their behalf. Based on the limited information provided to the CRA, the problem appeared to have been the result of a network issue.
1155-GS	SOPAC	OPEN	AIR-t	CPDLC Downlink message unreadable from B763	CPDLC DM decoded as "Bad length" by Eurocat-X AGDL, return UM159 with "Error 10" to the aircraft  DM was probably a weather deviation demand  No advertisement to the controller HMI <del>The aircraft was under VHF RPT1 coverage and send correct ADS report and CPDL before and after this corrupted message</del>	This problem has been duplicated in the Boeing lab and will be a candidate for the next 767 FMC block point.
1156-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	AIR-t	Delayed downlinks from B772	Same details as FIT PR ASA 2012-05 (CRA PR Ref : 1152-SN) (same aircraft as well)  Downlink transmitted at 1326 (REQUEST CLIMB TO FL360) was not received until 1350.  Questions: 1. Was SATCOM serviceable for the flight for the flight at any stage? (i.e. did the aircraft depart with U/S SATCOM, or did it fail en route?) 2. If the SATCOM failed en route, what notification would the flight receive? What about if the SATCOM was the only media available at the time?	Closed as duplicate of PR 1152
1157-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	AIR-t	5 failed connection requests CPDLC	Numerous attempts to get CPDLC connection as follows: 1216:04 AFN log on 1216:22 CR1 1216:37 Disconnect - Application Error 1216:51 CR1 1217:04 Disconnect - No Reason 1217:27 CR1 1217:37 Disconnect - Application Error 1220:46 AFN log on 1221:06 CR1 No response received from aircraft but did have MAS(S) 1221:37 AFN logon 1232:38 CR1 No response received from aircraft but did have MAS(S) 1238:55 AFN logon 1238:55 CR1 1239:13 CC1 - persistence pays off ;>)	Closed as duplicate of PR-923. PR-923 was corrected in B777 AIMS Block Point Version 16.
1158-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED	NETWORK	Uplinks via SATCOM in VHF coverage	Aircraft logged on via AKL RGS 1224:55 CPDLC CR1 sent at 1225:01 with MAS 205 no response. Aircraft logged on again via HZL RGS 1227:04 and CPDLC CR1 sent at 1227:05 with MAS 208(S) received via POR1 followed by CC1 via HZL RGS at 1227:19 MAS205(S) for original CR1 received via POR1 immediately prior to the CC1.  Analysis of uplinks shows all MAS are being received via SATCOM while aircraft is in VHF coverage and sending downlinks via VHF. Why is CSP uplinking via SATCOM to an aircraft in VHF coverage????	ARINC had a missing configuration for VHF Australia to internetwork to AeroThai. This configuration change was activated in May, 2012.
1159-GS	NAT	CLOSED	NETWORK	FANS traffic delivered, 623 traffic aborted	Aircraft successfully logged on for FANS and exchanged both ADS and CPDLC traffic with BIRD via various ARINC VHF RGSS.  Aircraft also requested a data link clearance (ARINC-623) but all attempts at transmitting said clearance failed with MAS/F code 231 - "No station to". Such abortive exchanges were intermingled with the successful FANS exchanges.  BIRD is a SITA customer for the ACARS connection, the aircraft appeared to exclusively use ARINC RGSS.	This airplane was not configured to allow internetworking of non-FANS messages, although it was configured to allow internetworking of FANS messages. The situation has now been corrected.

CRA number	Region	Status	Type	Title	Description	Findings
1160-GS	NOPAC	OPEN	GROUND	Ocean21 Treats Optional Lat/Long as Separate Waypoint	<p>A DARPS reroute was requested from Oakland Center, using a CPDLC route request. The route clearance uplink contained:</p> <p>... MORAY N34 18.0 E146 00.0 OTR15 ...</p> <p>The latitude longitude waypoint is in fact at exactly the same location as the preceding waypoint (MORAY).</p>	<p>The DARP request included the optional lat/long position information for waypoint MORAY.</p> <p>When Ocean21 constructed the routeclearance uplink, it inserted the latitude/longitude as a separate fix, following MORAY. This would have resulted in the crew seeing PARTIAL CLEARANCE LOADED and a F-PLN DISCONTINUITY between the latitude/longitude and SMOLT. It would have been impossible to load the airway, as airway entries cannot generally be specified with a lat/long.</p> <p>ATC ground systems must be able to deal properly with the lat/long when it is included. It is a basic part of the interoperability definition (the ASN.1 message encoding) for FANS.</p> <p>Fix expected to be fielded 2Q13.</p>
1161-SN	NAT	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	AIR-t	Flight reports receiving CPDLC uplink when none was sent.	<p>AT 0220z, pilot advised, via Gander Radio, that "when our CPDLC Changed over to CZQX we rcvd a msg to CTAM400". He later said that he couldn't find the message in his logs and we cannot find any record in ours. The flight had received a clearance a few hours prior for F400 from KZNY. The flight was cleared at FL370.</p> <p>We would like to understand if the message was received in the cockpit at that time and who was the originator. Had the flight not questioned this, he may have climbed.</p> <p>Could this be a case of the message from KZNY after a significant delay and just receive seconds prior to the transfer to CZQX?</p>	<p>Closed as duplicate of PR-930.</p> <p>What the pilot saw was the reminder to Climb to and Maintain FL400 from the uplink at 0027z rather than a new clearance.</p>
1162-SN	SOPAC	OPEN	AIR-t	CPDLC Anomaly	<p>Upon return to cockpit after crew rest, F/O briefed ATC CPDLC anomaly. At 1530Z, received and complied with clearance to climb/maintain FL360 report level. Report was armed and sent message upon level off. Subsequently, reported back on course from previous deviation clearance. Log displayed Level FL310. Sent second report back on course. Log again displayed Level FL310. Sent text Just to verify level FL360 Back on Course. Utilized back on course prompt for both messages but Log displayed Level FL310 vs back on course message.</p>	<p>On very rare occasions, the right FMC misses a synchronization event from the left. When this happens, the left FMC forces a resynch of the right side. One of the side effects is that the right FMC's ATC log gets messed up, as described in this PR. Originally documented in January, 2001 in FIT PR 338 which predates the current PR system.</p>
1163-GS	NAT	CLOSED	GROUND	Upstream Centre fails to relinquish connection at boundary	<p>The flight path took the aircraft from CZQX into BIRD, then back into CZQX. Reykjavik's system automatically transmitted a "greeting" message to probe for connectivity after the aircraft had been determined (by extrapolation from the coordinated position) to have entered BIRD's airspace.</p> <p>The aircraft responded with a "Not CDA" response, consistent with the upstream centre (Gander) having failed to issue an END SERVICE at the boundary.</p> <p>Repeated attempts to establish contact (by means of manually initiated greeting messages) similarly failed, we never achieved CPDLC contact with the flight during the time it spent in our airspace (a side effect being that we were unable to break the NDA connection, the aircraft did so eventually).</p> <p>This is believed to stem from a deficiency in Gander's automation system which we have repeatedly requested be fixed - but this needs to be confirmed.</p> <p>The problem has two aspects, both of which have safety implications. The first (and obvious) one is that we are denied the ability to communicate with aircraft for which we are responsible. The second - less obvious - one is that any requests from the crew would go to the wrong controller (in Gander) - with the resulting risk that he might issue a clearance to the flight, not realizing that it is outside his airspace.</p>	<p>28 Nov 2012 - Software fix was fielded at Gander and the problem has been corrected. Closed with originator's concurrence.</p>
1164-GS	NAT	CLOSED	GROUND	Downstream centre repeatedly	<p>As described in PR 1163-GS, Gander's automation system seems to be programmed to hang on to aircraft transiting from CZQX to BIRD if the flight path will later take the aircraft back into CZQX (this is merely a theory pending resolution of that PR).</p> <p>In order to establish a working CPDLC connection with such aircraft, Reykjavik controllers must therefore contact the flights by voice to instruct them to manually log on to Reykjavik, in whose airspace they are operating.</p> <p>This appears to confuse the software in Gander's system, when we (as per ED100) initiate the address forwarding by instructing the aircraft to log on to that system in preparation for returning to CZQX - a strange "ping pong" game ensues. Although the aircraft are within our airspace and we are their CDA, Gander's automation immediately sends the aircraft an FN_CAD instructing it to log on to us - without following the ED100-specified sequence of first ensuring that an NDA nomination is complete (which would of course fail since they are not CDA).</p> <p>The net effect of this strange design is that the aircraft keeps logging on to the two systems alternately (at a rate dictated only by the speed with which the network can deliver the relevant messages). The rate would of course be even higher were it not for the fact that we wait to see that our nomination of Gander as NDA succeeds before proceeding to the FN_CAD stage.</p> <p>Since our system is forced to keep establishing a CPDLC connection with these aircraft, despite their being in our airspace, the connection is</p>	<p>28 Nov 2012 - Software fix was fielded at Gander and the problem has been corrected. Closed with originator's concurrence.</p>



CRA number	Region	Status	Type	Title	Description	Findings
1165-DN	NAT	OPEN	AIR-t	Report of Large Data and Clearance Not Displayed by A/C Resulting in Failure of Climb Clearance.	The following is a transcript from the Shanwick Controller when dealing with a lack of response to an issued clearance resulting in the a/c not complying with a climb instruction. The a/c reported "Large Data Block" indication and no clearance displayed. SAATS logs indicate successful delivery of the uplink and return ROGER.  "At 1400 I took over the sector and shortly after received a non-conformance report for an aircraft as he had crossed 20W at a lower level than expected. His cleared profile showed '290 CX 20W 310' but on his automatic (FANS) report at 20W he was still maintaining F290. I took a copy and probed the following profile '290 CX 15W 310', this profile showed no conflicts so I left it PC'd and requested a demand contract from the aircraft. The demand report still showed the aircraft at F290 so I sent a priority message via HF instructing the aircraft to 'CLIMB NOW F310. REPORT REACHING'; this was backed up with a phone call to Ballygirreen to deliver the message to the flight as soon as possible. The aircraft read back the instruction. I checked the history and at time 1320 the aircraft requested climb to F350 via cpdcl. We were unable his requested level but could climb to a lower level so, as per procedure, sent the message 'UNABLE/DUE TO TRAFFIC/ [STANDBY FOR HIGHER LEVEL]. The aircraft ROGER'd this message at 1323 so the controller sent the clearance 'CLIMB TO REACH [F310] BY [50N/20W]/ REPORT LEVEL [F310]/ [.....UNABLE YOUR REQUESTED LEVEL.....]' at 1325. At 1326 we received the WILCO to the clearance. I asked the aircraft why they had failed to comply with the clearance issued via cpdcl and they advised that they had received no clearance. I told them that our history said otherwise and that I would need to take reporting action to establish what had gone wrong. The aircraft advised that 'FOR INFO WE HAVE ALSO CHECKED SYSTEM LOG AND FOUND INSTRUCTIONS BUT THIS WAS NEVER RECEIVED AND NEVER ACCEPTED. ONLY THING SHORTLY AFTER REQ RECD 2ND MSG HEADED AS LARGE DATA WHICH WE ACCEPTED HOWEVER NO CTC WAS GIVEN TO THAT MSG AND NO LVL CHANGE WAS INCLUDED AND WE WERE EXPECTING TO SEE THE LARGE DATA AFTER WHICH NEVER FOLLOWED.' At 1411 the aircraft reported level at F310 and shortly after passed into Shannon's area of responsibility".	A software bug has been identified and will be corrected in the next 747-8 FMC software update (Block Point Version 3 - 4Q13)
1166-GS	NAT	CLOSED	mult	Aircraft not logged on to DSP - multiple occurrences	Over the past couple of months we have been reviewing cases where we believe an aircraft is logged on to Gander yet we are not able to receive position information (ADS) or send and receive CPDLC messages. This happens randomly and in some cases, things just started working again.	Several different events were included under this one PR and were analyzed by the CRA. The CRA found a number of different causes such as apparent failures of the airborne satcom systems.
1167-GS	NOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	AIR-t	Unable to Establish CPDLC with RJJJ	CRASA-J PR 4337 001 The crew reported establishing CPDLC with KZAK, but messages were not acknowledged. Then, on reaching NATSS, they attempted to logon to RJJJ, but this failed.	Closed as a duplicate of 1121.
1168-GS	NOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	AIR-t	Unable to Connect to PAZN or RJJJ	CRASA-J PR 4417 001 The crew reported logging on normally to PAZA, but getting no auto-transfer to PAZN. They then attempted many times to logon to PAZN and RJJJ, but had no success.	Closed as a duplicate of 1121.
1169-GS	NOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	AIR-t	Unable to Logon to Edmonton	CRASA-J PR 4670 001 The crew reported being unable to logon to CZEG (Edmonton) Center.	Closed as a duplicate of 1121.
1170-GS	SOPAC	OPEN	AIR-t	Partial Load of Tailored Arrival	Tailored Arrival requested and received by CPDLC. TA displayed normally on MFD and also printed normally but when loaded into the FMC by LOAD FMC prompt, the waypoints between SXC and the runway were missing. TA speed and altitude restrictions prior to and at SXC loaded normally, indicating the flight plan was partially overwritten by the loaded data.  The load was attempted a total of four times with the same result so the uplink was rejected.	We have not been able to reproduce this problem in the Boeing lab and suspect this is related to a problem fixed in 777 BPV 16. Recommend this be left open and monitor for new occurrence with BPV 16.
1171-SN	SOPAC	OPEN	AIR-t	Corrupted Next Fix in CPDLC Position Report	CPDLC Position Report received has Next Fix decoded as \$10W1@  Expected position from FPL is 10S171W	Reproduced in the Boeing lab. This problem is targeted to be corrected in 777 AIMS-2 Block Point Version 17A (pending approval).
1172-MM	SOPAC	CLOSED	AIR-p	No .LOAD. prompt for route uplink	Aircraft was between ABARB and 31S160E.  An amended route was issued by CPDLC to the aircraft to route it north of 30S163E (corner of YBBB/NFFF/NZZO FIRs). The aircraft was still in VHF communication at the time:  CLEARED TO [26S170E] VIA [31S160E 2935S16300E]  No response was received from the aircraft for several minutes. When queried, the flight crew advised that they had received the amended route and were entering it into the FMS. When asked if they could load the clearance, the response was "no", and when queried they advised that there was "No LOAD prompt"	The aircraft position, positions in the filed flight plan, and positions in the route clearance uplink were consistent with each other. No error/rejection downlink in response to the route clearance uplink was present in the DSP message log. 777 avionics in a laboratory setting successfully loaded the same route clearance uplink. The LOAD FMC prompt may have been present but inhibited because a modified route (MOD) was pending, or because of a known software problem that causes an old route clearance uplink to be processed by the FMC and that uplink contained an element (e.g., a crossing constraint) which needed to be in the route but wasn't. The CRA and Boeing will monitor FIT PRs for recurrences of this issue.  6 November 2012 - Could not reproduce in the Boeing lab. I suspect there was a mod pending and the flight crew didn't notice, or didn't know the LOAD button would be inhibited with a mod pending. Closed with originator's concurrence.
1173-GS	NAT	OPEN	AIR-t	ADS Report Time Ahead of Real Time	The following was reported by Shanwick controller:  "At time 1043 the aircraft reported 20W correctly giving a 30W estimate of 1130. At time 1135 (5 minutes after his 30W estimate) I received a FANS report from the flight stating the coordinate 56S7N02020W at time 1144. Not only was this time in the future but the coordinate put him back to 20W when he should have been through 30W to Gander airspace. The coordinate given was plausible and the level was correct when compared to his clearance. I called Gander to request the 30W position report and detailed to them the FANS report I had received. I also requested ADS demand contract reports which indicated that he was through 30W as SAATS had calculated. Subsequently, I received the 30W position report advising the flight had crossed 30W at 1134".  Examination of the Shanwick logs confirmed the datalink traffic worked ok between 0914 and 1027. From 1027 to 1131 all uplink traffic failed i.e. MAS failure. At 1135 and 1136 two ADS downlinks were received with present position times of 1143 and 1144 respectively. From 1138 downlinks were received with the correct time	Per the investigator's analysis, the most plausible explanation is the ADS message "stacked up" beyond the top of the hour time tag that Prestwick assigns. When the message was finally transmitted, Prestwick assigned a newer time tag to an older message, resulting in an erroneous message timestamp of 1144Z instead of the correct timestamp of 1044Z.  CRA note: The timestamp in an ADS report is encoded as seconds past the most recent hour. The ground station converts that timestamp to an HH:MM:SS time. If a message is delayed in transmission (in this case due to a period of NO COMM) then an erroneous timestamp may result.
1174-GS	NOPAC	ACTIVE	TBA	Performance Issue with one operator's B77L fleet in Anchorage	SAT performance of one operator's B77L fleet in Anchorage FIR has been observed to be significantly lower than performance of same fleet in Oakland and New York FIRs.	The CRA are waiting for a set of specific reports to look at. The plan is to look at some of the long-delayed ones, to see what else was happening on the link. A lot of the apparent SATCOM delay may, in fact, be delays in retrying VHF.
1175-SN	NAT	CLOSED	GROUND	CPDLC Connection Not Completed #1	On 12 Jul two a/c from the same operator exhibited the same/similar issues with CPDLC connectivity in Gander and Shanwick airspace.  In Gander airspace one aircraft was sent a CR1. MAS delivery indicates uplink was delivered, but no CC1 was received.  When the a/c transitted to Shanwick, it was issued with CR1 but received a DM64 dowlink stating CZQX as CDA.	A software bug in the Gander gateway was identified and has been corrected.
1176-SN	NAT	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	GROUND	CPDLC Connection Not Completed #2	On 12 Jul two a/c from the same operator exhibited the same/similar issues with CPDLC connectivity in Gander and Shanwick airspace.  In Gander airspace one aircraft was sent a CR1. MAS delivery indicates uplink was delivered, but no CC1 was received.  When the a/c transitted to Shanwick, it was issued with CR1 but received a DM64 dowlink stating CZQX as CDA.	Closed as a duplicate of PR 1175-SN.

CRA number	Region	Status	Type	Title	Description	Findings
1177-GS	NOPAC	OPEN	AIR-t	Unable to DARP with step climb altitudes loaded in FMC	Unable to DARP. When requesting a DARP using the "Route 2" request function we kept getting a "downlink error" message.  <del>We did have our expected step climb altitudes loaded into the FMC prior to making the "Route 2" DARP request.</del>	Boeing investigation in progress.  So far, unable to reproduce this problem in the lab.
1178-MM	SOPAC	CLOSED	None	Invalid next+1 position and altitude over long period	Next+1 position and altitude shows as INVALID in all downlinked ADS-C reports. This is similar to that seen in PR 1084-SN in November 2011.  However, the filed route is A464 PAPTI BASIVSB where BASIVSB is a STAR into Auckland. The PAPTI fix gives normal position, altitude, and ETA as fix next and it would be the first fix in the STAR that is showing as INVALID. Possible correlation?	This is a non-problem. What was observed was correct behavior when there was only one fix left in the route and before the arrival and approach procedures had been loaded into the FMC. The (non-existent) next+1 fix was encoded as S180-0,0,W180 0,0, as required. After the procedure was loaded into the FMC, all was well. The originator is drafting guidance for the GOLD regarding the meaning of default data in ADS reports.
1179-MM	NAT	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	AIR-t	CPDLC downlinks contain invalid characters	New York is receiving many CPDLC requests which contain invalid characters in the message. The MOPS element that contains the characters is in DM67.	Closed as a duplicate of PR 1155-GS
1180-GS	NAT	ACTIVE	AIR-t	Fix JOBOC flagged as non-oceanic entry point by certain FMC's	Two aircraft were coming out of NY Domestic RADAR going into NY Oceanic. The Oceanic entry fix was JOBOC and both had routing after JOBOC of 41N060W 42N050W 43N040W then points east.  Both aircraft advised the NY Domestic RADAR controller that the fix JOBOC was "not an oceanic entry point" in their FMC and that their FMC was rejecting the routing.  These routes were not sent by CPDLC so they must have been loaded into the FMC on the ground. Seems like their databases did not recognize JOBOC.	Assigned to Gulfstream and USAF for investigation.
1181-SN	NAT	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	GROUND	CPDLC up-links rejected due to 'applicationerror'	We are receiving rejection messages in response to CPDLC MOPS 80 clearances. The format of the messages appear to be correct. Please explain the reason for the errors. If they are due to format then I would need to know that so that we can make corrections to our software.	Closed as a duplicate of PR-964 - Illegal Airway Name in DARP Trial Uplink. This problem is the result of a software bug in the FAA's Ocean 21 system.
1182-SN	NAT	ACTIVE	AIR-t	Unexpected ADS Report	The following was reported by Shanwick ATC: An ADS alert message was produced by SAATS for an aircraft. It indicated an altitude deviation. The flight had been cleared on a random route at fl350. The alert message indicated fl368 (with no vertical rate). A copy plan was produced to protect the airspace. The flight was then asked if it had climbed. ADS demand contracts indicated fl350, and the pilot reported not leaving fl350 during his flight.	Boeing investigation in progress. To date, they have been unable to duplicate this behavior in the lab.
1183-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	AIR-t	CPDLC Downlinks not received after CPDLC transfer	Inactive CPDLC connection with YBBB successfully established at 1800.  The aircraft crossed the FIR boundary at 1806.  At 1809, YBBB uplinked "REQUEST POSITION REPORT" - Flight crew confirmed receipt and sent a CPDLC position report at 1809 - Position report not received by YBBB.  At 1813, YBBB uplinked "REQUEST POSITION REPORT" - Flight crew confirmed receipt and sent a CPDLC position report at 1813 - Position report not received by YBBB.  At 1818, the flight crew sent a freetext downlink which read something like "CAN YOU LET US KNOW IF YOU GET THIS TEXT". This was not received by YBBB (hence why I don't know the exact wording...) :-)  At 1821, YBBB uplinked "MONITOR BRISBANE CENTRE 8867" - Flight crew confirmed receipt and sent a response - WILCO response not received by YBBB  At 1825, the flight crew disconnected their CPDLC connection and initiated another logon with YBBB. An active CPDLC connection was established, and all transactions from this point on were successful.  The flight crew did not indicate any indication of system inoperability.	Closed as a duplicate of PR-1145-SN.
1184-SN	NAT	OPEN	GROUND	YOSSI waypoint did not load into the FMC as it was not in the FMC database	<del>The following is a summary of events that the ATC Controller reported:</del> On our most recent tailored arrival into MIA YOSSI waypoint did not load into the FMC as it was not in the FMC database. Our internal investigation has confirmed that the waypoint was removed from the nav database. This was done by the NDB provider as YOSSI waypoint was removed by the ATC center and replaced by STAPL with the same coordinates. This event does however raise the question for us on how these waypoints are controlled by the appropriate authority. The TA system should monitor the waypoint status and only use 'existing' waypoints. It does not help the TA trials if the waypoints do no longer exist especially since the crews are instructed to reject the clearance if there is a route discontinuity (i.e. in the case of a waypoint not contained in the FMC NDB). In addition the crews shall not edit the clearance."	The reporting operator received the following email 3 weeks after the reported event:  Subject: Florida8/9 Tailored Arrival  The MIA Tailored Arrival has been suspended due to the waypoint YOSSI being recently deleted. New York ARTCC was unaware of this deletion and had been uplinking TA clearances containing a discontinuity to aircraft. The clearances were rejected per operational trial policy: "A clearance that includes a discontinuity is NOT acceptable and pilots must reject the TA".  The MIA TA is still in operational trial status, waiting for implementation. We are coordinating a Service Level Agreement with The Office of Advanced Concepts & Technology Development and are working the details of the program transfer. The Air Traffic and Flight Standard implementation notices and associated changes to FAAO 7110.65, Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM), and Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP) are in the coordination process.

CRA number	Region	Status	Type	Title	Description	Findings
1185-SN	NAT	CLOSED	AIR-t	B772 appears to have spotty SATCOM, falls back to HF	<p>This aircraft initially communicated with BIRD via VHF in Spitzbergen (Longyearbyen), switching between ARINC (LYR) and SITA (LYR1). It then switched to ARINC's SATCOM service (via GES XE). By the time of the first SATCOM report an ADS position report was overdue by about half an hour, this was requested from the flight.</p> <p>While the missing ADS report was never received, the flight did send down a CPDLC position report and the next ADS report via HF. After this the flight alternated between SATCOM and HF - where the performance was so poor that the controller sometimes thought that contact had been lost. Arguably everyone would have been better off without the HF "backup".</p> <p>The reason for this PR is that we would like to know why the aircraft had problems communicating via SATCOM and raise awareness of the problems associated with HF when message delivery times approach (as in this case) 20 minutes - in an environment where, after five</p>	The airplane involved had a temporary problem with its satcom system. The problem has been resolved.
1186-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	AIR-t	B772 CPDLC Estimate for NEXT same as time over PREVIOUS	<p>CPDLC Estimate for NEXT same as time over PREVIOUS.</p> <p>Position Report contained the following information:</p> <p>Current Position: 2006516259.4 E Time at Current Position: 1500</p> <p>Last Sequenced Waypoint: BODEG Time over Last Sequenced Waypoint: 1500</p> <p>Next Waypoint: IKODA ETA for Next Waypoint: 1500</p> <p>i.e. the estimate for NEXT (IKODA) was the same as the sequenced waypoint (BODEG) of 1500.</p>	Closed as a duplicate of PR 1132-MM
1187-SN	NAT	CLOSED	None	Flight Reports Receiving CLX Twice	<p>ATC Report: At time 1134 Clearance Delivery operator advised that a flight was up on frequency querying why he had received 2 clearances via the datalink. The 2 clearances were the same and on checking the history there was only 1 CLX but 2 CLA's indicating 2 acceptances of the clearance but they were the same.</p> <p>System Log Review: The system comms logs indicate the clearance was only sent once by SAATS via OCL (ORCA) and that two downlink CLA (accept clearance) messages were received. We have encountered similar before when the aircrew have 'hit' the accept button more than once. This does not disprove or otherwise the report that the aircrew stated they received the clearance twice. On this basis this PR is raised with the NAT DLMA to attempt to establish if more than one clearance was uplinked.</p>	The message was delivered to the airplane twice by the network. This can happen when the airplane receives an uplink, but the network doesn't "hear" the ack from the airplane. In this case, the uplink was attempted once over LHR4, then twice over station MAN3, and then once more over LHR4 at 11:30:35. The ACARS Ack was received over MAN3 at 11:30:37. All parties behaved "correctly", which can sometimes result in duplicate message delivery.
1188-SN	SOPAC	ACTIVE	AIR-t	UM166 + UM77 combination received by A388	<p>A CPDLC re-route was uplinked by NFFF to an aircraft at the request of YBBB.</p> <p>The uplink, sent at 1655, contained the following message elements: UM166 DUE TO TRAFFIC UM77 AT 20S166E PROCEED DIRECT TO 30S156E</p> <p>Shortly after uplinking this clearance, a WILCO downlink response was received, indicating they had accepted the clearance.</p> <p>However, the flight crew began tracking direct to position 30S156E, bypassing 20S166E as cleared.</p> <p>When later describing the receipt of the CPDLC clearance, the flight crew indicated that they had "interpreted the clearance as being direct to 30S156E". The description provided verbally by the flight crew appeared to indicate that no "LOAD" prompt had been presented in association with the uplinked clearance, creating the need to input the clearance manually.</p> <p>Does this uplink message element combination received by the A380 require manual interaction to load by the flight crew?</p>	Airbus investigation in progress.
1189-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED	NETWORK	Unnotified CSP outage	<p>CSP outage (ARINC) between 14/0515-14/1000 that was apparently due to a power outage in the ARINC network.</p> <p>No outage report was received from ARINC via the normal email reporting channel. Outage was detected at NZZO operational controller positions which initiated follow up action with ARINC.</p> <p>I've initiated follow up with ARINC to determine 1. Actual Outage Duration 2. Cause 3. Reason for no notification.</p>	On September 14, ARINC experienced a power outage during a planned UPS maintenance. Our global network processor recovered quickly and aircraft communication was re-established within a short period of time. Due to the nature of the power outage additional checks were also made on the application servers in the secondary system before all applications were recovered. We regret that this recovery impacted you and your services.
1190-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	NETWORK	airplane unable to logon to YBBB	<p>An aircraft was unable to logon to YBBB. Coordination with KZAK indicated that the aircraft had not successfully logged on to them either.</p> <p>Anecdotal evidence indicates that there were problems with this airframe several days earlier (11/9 1720)</p>	Closed with originator's concurrence. Closed as a duplicate of 1112.
1191-SN	NOPAC	ACTIVE	TBA	FANS PROBLEM REPORT OF NO LOG-ON	FMC MESSAGE "ATC COM TERMINATED", Unable to log-on to KZAK or RJJJ.	SITA are investigating with the operator. This was a recently delivered new airplane and may not have had its satcom system properly configured.
1192-SN	SOPAC	ACTIVE	AIR-t	Off Track Deviation in CPDLC Position Report from C17	<p>CPDLC Position Report from a C-17 on entering AGGG FIR (active centre YBBB) contained appended text "DEVIATING 128NM RIGHT OF ROUTE".</p> <p>The aircraft was not conducting a weather deviation, and were unable to explain the origin of the appended text in the CPDLC Position Report.</p> <p>A subsequent CPDLC Position Report with NZZO (somewhere closer to 2100) reportedly contained no such anomaly.</p>	Assigned to USAF for investigation.
1193-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	GROUND	Failed transfer	TRANSFER FAILED. NEXT CENTER YBBB BUT NO ADS-C CONTRACT ESTABLISHED. MANUAL LOGON OK.	Closed as a duplicate of PR 1195-SN.

CRA number	Region	Status	Type	Title	Description	Findings
1194-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED	GROUND	KLAX Tailored Arrival Trial	In early September, Tailored Arrival requests made by CPDLC began being denied. Communication with Oakland Center indicated that SOCAL TRACON and consequently L.A. Center are no longer supporting T.As. There was no consultation, or notification by way of a NOTAM to users.	The issues that prevented its use have been resolved. Aircraft may now request the Catalina 1 Tailored Arrival to Los Angeles.
1195-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED	GROUND	No Address forwarding from WAAF	For several days, late logons (i.e. as the aircraft approaches the YBBB FIR boundary) have been received for aircraft southbound from WAAF. Normally these logons are received ~30 minutes prior to the FIR boundary as a result of WAAF Address Forwarding the aircraft to YBBB.  Initial investigation by CRA in response to an airline report indicates that no FN_CAD message was sent by WAAF. This matches what we are seeing operationally – it is expected that the late logons are flight crews manually logging on to YBBB.  There was an ATC ground system data upgrade in WAAF last week – this could be the cause of the problem.	Problems with southbound transfers from WAAF appear to have been corrected. Closed with originator's concurrence.
1196-GS	NAT	CLOSED	AIR-t	B744 unable to obtain an ARINC-623 Oceanic clearance from BIRD	Crew claim to have requested oceanic clearance via datalink. No message from this airframe found in logs at Reykjavik. This may reflect a format error causing the message to be rejected - but it should be in raw ACARS logs even so. A more likely cause is the use of the wrong address for the OCL application causing the CSP to be unable to deliver the message - this can only be determined by tracing the message from the aircraft end.	The airplane avionics encoded the 7-character address REKCLYA for Reykjavik Center, and SITA then intercepted the downlink as "NO DISPOSAL FOR REKCLYA". The CMU on this airplane would need to be updated to use the proper address for Reykjavik Center.
1197-GS	ASIA	OPEN	GROUND	DCL failures at Hong Kong	In early September we started receiving informal reports that flights on the ground in Hong Kong were receiving an "INVALID UPLINK" response to both the RCL and CDA messages. Logs for a flight so affected on September 29 are attached and have been analysed by Gordon Sandell. Gordon identified the issue and we communicated this to Hong Kong CAA.	From looking at the logs, there appears to be a problem with the Flight System Message (FSM) uplinks that are sent in response to the RCL and CDA downlinks. The airline contacted Hong Kong and they confirmed that this was the problem, and had been introduced on 14 August when the Terma PDC system was replaced by a system from Frequentis, providing PDC capability and electronic flight strips operation. <i>The plan is to have a software build available to rectify this fault in early November 2012.</i>
1198-MM	SOPAC	CLOSED	AIR-t	Contact Message not received by aircraft	A contact instruction was sent to an airplane. However, there was no subsequent WILCO, and the pilot reported that they never received the contact instructions.	The reported problem cannot be explained. The aircraft avionics acknowledged receipt of the CONTACT KZOA CENTER 119.975 uplink from KZAK, but no corresponding WILCO downlink from the aircraft was received (and the PR originator stated that the flight crew reported that they did not receive the uplink).  The previous CPDLC exchange approximately 10 minutes earlier was normal.
1199-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED	None	Duplicate uplinks	FOLLOWING MESSAGE RECEIVED FROM YBBB: 10542 "IDENTIFICATION TERMINATED. AT KIKEM CONTACT 128.3" - RESPONDED "WILCO", BUT MESSAGE DUPLICATE ARRIVED, THEN ANOTHER, EACH RESPONDED TO WITH "WILCO". AT 1056Z RECEIVED "ERROR DETECTED BY ATC". DISCUSSED WITH YBBB VIA VHF WHO ADVISED THAT ONLY ONE ORIGINAL MESSAGE SENT AND OUR FIRST REPLY WAS RECEIVED WITHOUT DELAY. ACFT POSN WAS APPROX 50NM PRIOR TO KIKEM	The "IDENTIFICATION TERMINATED..." message was uplinked when the aircraft was flying out of VHF coverage. The uplink was attempted 8 times over VHF. When no ACARS ack was received from the airplane, the message was redirected to satcom. As sometimes occurs, the airplane received the message, but the VHF station did not "hear" the ACARS ack and continued to attempt the uplink. In this case, the airplane received the message 3 times (3 different WILCO messages received on the ground) – twice over VHF and once over satcom. So, all parties behaved "correctly", which can sometimes result in duplicate (or truncated) message deliveries. This is a much-reported problem with the Pegasus FMC installed on some B757s and B767s.
1200-SN	NOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	AIR-t	Invalid Characters in Downlinks	In the past fifteen days there have been 56 downlinks received with Invalid Characters. This has been seen with several 757 and 767 operators corresponding to a total of 29 different registrations.	<i>Closed as a duplicate of FIT PR 1155-GS.</i>
1201-SN	SOPAC	OPEN	NETWORK	Simultaneous SATCOM failures for one operator	Multiple aircraft belonging to one operator separately reported loss of SATCOM between 0140 and approximately 0150.  <i>Data link communications were successfully re-established with all affected aircraft by 0200.</i>	Per SITA's investigation, there was a GES glitch that they believe was the cause of the problem.
1202-SN	SOPAC	ACTIVE	AIR-t	Empty CPDLC downlinks received	As part of the investigation into 1138-SN (Unsolicited WILCO downlinked to YBBB - B777), an attempt was made to determine the frequency of the occurrence.  <i>During the analysis several "empty" downlink CPDLC messages were detected.</i>	Based on the log for the most recent event, the problem scenario appears to be similar to the scenario for PR-1138. Boeing has been unable to reproduce this problem in the lab and are monitoring for additional occurrences.
1203-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	AIR-t	No CPDLC CCL, then on next sector no ADS connection	On departure NZAA for NCRG, established ADS contract OK, but unable CPDLC. No response to CR1 although MAS(S) received. Further logon resolved issue. On return leg to NZAA from NCRG, established CPDLC connection OK, but could not get a response to the ADS contract request although a MAS(S) was received. Further logon resolved issue.	Closed as duplicate of PR-923. PR-923 was corrected in B777 AIMS Block Point Version 16. When this problem occurred, the avionics would acknowledge and then discard the uplink instead of forwarding it to the appropriate application.
1204-MM	NAT	OPEN	GROUND	Failed transfer	No CPDLC transfer at the CZEG > BIRD boundary. Log off and subsequent manual logon OK.	CZEG did not send an END SERVICE, which prevented transfer of the CPDLC connection from CZEG to BIRD (the designated NDA). PR accordingly assigned to NavCanada for further investigation.
1205-SN	SOPAC	ACTIVE	AIR-t	Random free text appended to position report	A CPDLC position report was downlinked shortly after RIGMI.  A free text message element had been appended to the position report "ESTIMATE TOREX 2058"  The aircraft: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Was not tracking via TOREX</li><li>• Was landing at Brisbane, with an ETA of approx 1123</li></ul> The flight crew said that they did not add any free text.	The appended free text seems to have been prepared during the flight that occurred the day before but was never sent. The reason why it has been erroneously appended without the crew being aware of it remains unexplained. It is the second case of such an anomaly (the previous one however, was on a previous standard) On going investigations before a fix is defined.
1206-SN	NAT	ACTIVE	TBA	No Aircraft ACK for ADS Contracts	Aircraft successfully logged on to SAATS at 1109. WP contract established at 1111. Default event issued at 1226. Default periodic issued at 1228.  Log files indicate that uplink events/periods were delivered i.e. MAS ok, but no a/c ACK downlinks rxd.	Gulfstream investigation in progress.

CRA number	Region	Status	Type	Title	Description	Findings
1207-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	GROUND	ADS-C WCE not received from A332	At 1819, aircraft was issued AT [WEENA] PROCEED DIRECT TO (ROWAN), which was WILCO'd.  (Note that this clearance is not loadable in A332)  At 1825 the ADS-C WEENA position report was received, generating a route conformance warning (ADS-C PRG containing old route information).  After about a minute a Demand request was uplinked, which cleared the discrepancy, and displayed the aircraft on the WEENA – ROWAN direct track.  It would have been expected that a second WCE should have been received when the flight crew modified the tracking direct to ROWAN (which would have removed the route discrepancy warning, and displayed the aircraft correctly)	Closed as a duplicate of (2013) PR-1236-SN.
1208-GS	NAT	ACTIVE	TBA	Flight logs on successfully but FANS activity subsequently fails for flight	This flight successfully logged on to Gander at 1319z, CPDLC was established at 1332z and ADS contracts were established at 1345z. Everything appeared to be working normal. At 1400z the controller was notified that the Welcome message was not delivered and after that no FANS activity occurred. All attempts to send messages failed and no ADS reports were received. This airline frequently has similar problems.	CRA investigation in progress.
1209-MM	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	AIR-t	ADS-C Periodic not received (or late) for MD-11	An ADS-C periodic report was delayed (or not received). This is a semi-regular event for this operator's MD-11 at this location.	Closed as a duplicate of PR 1219-SN.
1210-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	NETWORK	Loss of CPDLC, ADS-C with A332	An expected ADS-C periodic report was not received from the airplane. Subsequently it was determined that CPDLC was also not functioning.  While the timing of the actual failure is not known, it was possibly coincident with the transfer from VHF to SATCOM data link.  No response to CPDLC uplink sent at approx 1940, and it appeared that the End Service message that was uplinked was unsuccessful.  Interestingly a DR1 initiated by the flight crew was received at 1945.	This is another occurrence of PR-1112-GS.  ADS reports continue to be downlinked while all uplinks failed. There was a periodic contract request sent at 1910z which was not delivered. Perhaps the missing report was the one expected in response to that request.  The DR1 was the result of the pilot manually terminating the connection. As noted, the End Service failed.
1211-RP	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	NETWORK	Loss of CPDLC, ADS-C with B777	Airplane logged on OK at 1723. CPDLC and ADS-C OK CPDLC position report received OK (1748)  At 1814 a request for climb was received. No response to the uplink clearance was received.  At 1820 a request for a weather deviation was received. No response to the uplink clearance was received.  A Disconnect request was subsequently received, and over time new logons were received (1851, 1901). Any CPDLC connection request uplinked failed almost 'immediately' (i.e. it looked like the failure was initiated by SITA, rather than the aircraft).	This is another occurrence of PR-1112-GS.
1212-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED	AIR-t	Loss of CPDLC, ADS-C with A340	At approximately 0010, the controller was alerted to an ADS-C periodic report being overdue for the aircraft.  A CPDLC uplink was then unanswered.  Data link was working fine earlier when the aircraft was within 200NM of Sydney. Another SATCOM problem?  <i>I believe that there were data link problems with this aircraft for the earlier flight inbound to SYD.</i>	Per ARINC review, it appears there was a satcom problem on the airplane. No further issues with this airplane have been reported.
1213-GS	SOPAC	ACTIVE	TBA	Multiple waypoint event reports from B777	Aircraft transmits WPC reports at 1321:56, 1323:26, 1323:35, 1324:06, 1324:13, 1326:19, 1327:43, 1331:30. The WPC event at 1331:30 is for filed waypoint PAPT1. All others are not filed waypoints. The two waypoint events at 1324:06 and 1324:13 are concatenated into one report. This report corrupts coordinated OCS profile from F340 to F319. Corruption identified and resolved crossing into NZ20 at 1331.	CRA investigation in progress.
1214-GS	NAT	CLOSED	AIR-t	Nulls received in AFN message-incorrect message format	Nulls received in AFN message from a B788 caused issues with end system.	If the airplane's ICAO Identifier has a leading zero, the AFN logon message is created containing erroneous (NULL) characters. Problem corrected in 787 Blockpoint v1A.
1215-SN	NAT	ACTIVE	AIR-t	Multiple WILCO messages received in response to one uplink clearance from B777	At 0402Z, the aircraft was issued a multi-elemented clearance containing a MOPS80, MOPS19 and MOPS106.  <i>A WILCO was received at 0407Z followed by more than 1600 others between 0407Z and 1318Z.</i>	Boeing investigation in progress.
1216-GS	NOPAC	ACTIVE	TBA	RJJJ Terminated Early and Subsequent Logons Failed	RJJJ LOG OFF AND TRANSFERED TO KZAK AT AVLAS. LOGGED OFF KZAK LOGGED ONTO RJJJ. COMM WAS TERMINATED. TRIED 3 TIMES.	CRA investigation in progress.
1217-SN	NAT	CLOSED	GROUND	Inflight ATC Callsign change, no logon possible, multiple ATS-FPLs in ATC systems	A delayed flight was assigned a new callsign (XXXNNNA) following logon to New York Oceanic. The crew disconnected ATC Datalink COMM and sent a new AFN notification with the new callsign. However, NOTIFICATION FAILED was indicated in the cockpit. This issue had a knock-on effect concerning communication with all subsequent OCAs and FIRs. In this case voice communication was used as an alternative mean of communication. The operator is concerned which impact such problem may have in the future with the upcoming NAT CPDLC mandate. It has to be assured that the flight is not excluded from the 2 core tracks due multiple ATS-FPLs and new callsign assignment.	There were several issues that contributed to the problem. Among these were that the operator originally filed a flight plan for the delayed flight using a callsign that would also be used by a flight departing a few hours later. The operator subsequently filed a second flight plan for the delayed flight with a different call sign. The breakdown occurred when the tower at SKBO told the flight that there was no flight plan for the new callsign and instructed the flight crew to use the original callsign. New York Oceanic detected the problem and assigned a new call sign to the aircraft, but neglected to tell the flight crew to disconnect and re-logon with the new callsign.  The affected operator is considering a policy change regarding use of alphanumeric callsigns in case of delay when flying to/from South America.
1218-SN	SOPAC	ACTIVE	GROUND	Erroneous ADS-C report for A332	The airplane was approaching the FIR boundary position. An ADS-C report was received that caused the displayed ADS-C position symbol to jump forward 60NM. A further ADS-C report in response to a Demand contract re-positioned the position symbol correctly. <i>Indications are that there was an error in the initial ADS-C report.</i>	Airbus analysis indicates the problem was in the ATC ground station. The problem has been reassigned to Air Services Australia. ASA investigation in progress.
1219-SN	SOPAC	OPEN	AIR-t	Large CPDLC, ADS-C delays for MD11	The airplane position was unreported at MEPAB (no ADS-C or CPDLC report). At 0852 a CPDLC position report time stamped 0838 was received, and ADS-C was re-established. <i>More ADS-C problems at 0917 – an expected ADS-C report became overdue.</i>	An issue with the operator's CMU has been identified. Boeing is working with the operator and CMU vendor to rectify the problem.

CRA number	Region	Status	Type	Title	Description	Findings
<b>2013 PRs</b>						
1220-SN	SOPAC	ACTIVE	TBA	Data link delays for GLF5	Extensive ADS-C and CPDLC downlink delays with one airplane were observed.	Honeywell and Gulfstream investigation in progress
1221-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED	AIR-t	Data link failure - B744	Data link was lost with one aircraft. Data link problems were experienced with this airframe several days previous.	Per the DSP log, the airplane appeared to be experiencing problems with its satcom system. PR 1223-SN involved the same aircraft. Closed with originator's concurrence. Operator has completed maintenance action on the airplane's satcom system including replacement of the RFU.
1222-SN	SOPAC	ACTIVE	AIR-t	Data link failure but flight crew thought it was operational - A388	From the controller's perspective, datalink with one aircraft appeared to have failed. However flight crew indications were that it was still operational.	Airbus investigation in progress.
1223-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	AIR-t	Data link failure - B744	Data link failed with one aircraft. Same symptoms as PR-1221-SN (same airframe).	Closed as a duplicate of PR 1221-SN
1224-SN	NOPAC	ACTIVE	TBA	ADS Position Report Contained Bad Data for EST and NXT	An ADS event report received by ZAN's OceanZ1 system over POWAL had bad EST and NXT data. The erroneous position coordinates (40-29N/073-53W and 40-34N/073-49W) appear to be for approach fixes associated with JFK, the destination airport. Is it possible to determine whether this was caused by an error in the avionics software or was just the result of an erroneous flight plan data entry? ZAN automation reported that the OceanZ1 system worked as designed and that subsequent reports continuing eastbound were in conformance.	Airbus investigation in progress.
1225-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED	None	Multiple position reports - A388	Multiple CPDLC position reports were received from one aircraft. Apparently this is not uncommon for this aircraft type on this route.	This was the result of the same behavior as occurred in the PR 1199-SN report. The aircraft was leaving VHF coverage. As a result, 3 copies of the position report request uplink were received on the flight deck. The flight crew responded to all three requests. Duplicate uplink delivery is not uncommon at the fringe of VHF coverage.
1226-SN	SOPAC	ACTIVE	TBA	Delayed MTSAT ADS-C reports out of SITA TBU VHF coverage	Significant delays experienced leaving TBU VHF coverage back to MTSAT SATCOM. 2 aircraft for the same operator were affected.	An issues has been identified with the MTSAT GES. MTSAT investigation in progress.
1227-GS	NAT	OPEN	GROUND	Fix sent in UM74 not correctly identified in FMC	An UL74 clearance was sent stating "PROCEED DIRECT TO CHS". CHS had been filed in the original FPL and is Charleston NC. The pilot tried to load direct CHS, the FMC showed the fix to be at 0924.8514753.2E or 7909 miles from the aircraft's current position.	Navaid CHS was incorrectly encoded as a fix in the uplink. A PR will be generated against the ATC ground station software.
1228-SN	SOPAC	ACTIVE	TBA	Unable to establish data link A333 - odd errors	ATC was unable to establish CPDLC with one aircraft. Multiple logons were received and multiple attempts were made to establish a CPDLC connection. In the end, a connection was successfully established.	Per the CRA review, downlinks were received over SITA VHF and then satcom while uplinks were being internetworked to ARINC and uplinked over HF. The PR has been assigned to SITA for further investigation.
1229-SN	SOPAC	ACTIVE	TBA	Potential Problems with A332 ADS-C Reports	Suspect or invalid data were received in a waypoint change event report and two demand reports following an amended route clearance.	Airbus investigation in progress.
1230-MM	SOPAC	ACTIVE	TBA	B744 delayed data link performance	Near the YBBB/NFFF boundary, downlinks from one aircraft were observed to be excessively delayed.	CRA investigation in progress.
1231-GS	SOPAC	ACTIVE	TBA	Data link failure - B772	ATC received an indication of an Address forwarding failure for one aircraft. No response to CPDLC MONITOR message. Shortly afterwards, an ADS-C periodic report became overdue. A Disconnect Request was received at 1423.	CRA investigation in progress.
1232-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED	AIR-t	Data link failure - A332	CPDLC Connection was established and a CPDLC position report received. Approximately 20 minutes later, an ADS-C periodic report became overdue. No response to CPDLC uplinks.	Per CRA analysis, the airplanes satcom system appears to have failed. CRA received feedback from operator; satcom dropout reported by crew. System tested on ground with No Fault Found. Closed with originator's concurrence.
1233-GS	NOPAC	ACTIVE	TBA	Network Issues in the North Pacific	Anchorage ARTCC has been experiencing an unusual number of network/connectivity issues in the North Pacific (NOPAC). Data for a number of flights from January 16, 2013 were provided.	CRA investigation in progress. SITA reported that there were GES issues during the timeframe in question.
1234-GS	NOPAC	ACTIVE	TBA	Network Issues in the North Pacific Part 2.	Anchorage ARTCC has been experiencing an unusual number of network/connectivity issues in the North Pacific (NOPAC). Data for a number of flights from January 17, 2013 were provided.	CRA investigation in progress.
1235-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	mult	No CPDLC - B744	Following a logon YBBB was unable to establish CPDLC and/or ADS-C with one aircraft. ADS-C was eventually established, but no luck with the CPDLC	Closed as a duplicate of PR-688 (sulky ATC behavior), PR-1021_MM (Rockwell-Collins CMU bug), and PR-1236-SN (Air Services' ground station software bit-bucketing ADS reports)
1236-SN	SOPAC	ACTIVE	GROUND	No ADS-C WCF received - A332	An aircraft crossed WEENA at 1823, but no ADS-C WCF report was received. A Demand contract was unlinked and an ADS-C report received shortly afterwards.	CRA investigation indicates the problem was in the ATC ground station. The ground station appears to be randomly discarding ADS reports. The problem has been reassigned to Air Services Australia. ASA investigation in progress.
1237-SN	SOPAC	ACTIVE	NETWORK	LOAD prompt displayed for rejected CPDLC clearance - B744	An aircraft was issued a route clearance by CPDLC. Unfortunately there was an error in a lat/long in the clearance, and the aircraft was instructed (by voice) to disregard the clearance and to reject it. Shortly afterwards, an UNABLE response was received <OK>, and the correct clearance uplinked. This clearance was WILCO'd <OK> Approximately 5-10 minutes later, the flight crew (by voice) queried the fact that they had received another LOAD prompt, and asked for confirmation of their clearance. During the subsequent discussion they confirmed that the clearance they were being prompted for was the original (erroneous) clearance (via 2958515800E)	The flight crew received the first route clearance over SITA VHF and responded with UNABLE as requested by ATC. The airplane must have been at the fringe of VHF coverage, as the airplane received the message, but the ACARS ACK from the airplane did not reach the network. The flight crew received the second (corrected) route clearance over ARINC satcom and responded with WILCO. 15 minutes after the first route clearance timed out on VHF, the first route clearance was internetworked to ARINC and delivered over satcom. Hence, the crew confusion over the content of the uplink. PR has been reassigned to SITA to investigate.
1238-SN	SOPAC	OPEN	AIR-t	Data link failure - A332	Aircraft logged on OK (approx 0502). CPDLC and ADS-C established OK. At some stage between 0502 and 0535, CPDLC and ADS-C connectivity was lost. At 0541 a DR1 was received, followed by a logon. CPDLC and ADS-C re-established OK.	CRA investigation in progress.
1239-SN	SOPAC	ACTIVE	AIR-t	ADS-C failure - A332	The controller reported being unable to establish ADS-C with one aircraft (CPDLC connection was operational)	Airplane would not send ADS reports to anyone (not FUKJYA, nor OAKODYA, nor BNECAYA). ADS reports were sent on the previous flight. Assigned to Airbus for further investigation.
1240-DN	IO	ACTIVE	GROUND	CLAIRANCE CPDLC	Contact Cpdlc with Seychelles ( FSSS) established. Due to weather, we request a left deviation of 50 Nm. The Cpdlc answer message is: DEV 50NM LOT APPROVED. Firstly, both crewmembers understand " not approved", thinking that an error had occurred when the operator sent it. By the time we contact Seychelles in HF, we reestimate our understanding as LOT- Left Of Track. It only took us a few seconds, no outcome on flight path. But we thought it could be useful to transmit this experience.	Recommend this be discussed at the next FIT BOB meeting
1241-SN	SOPAC	CLOSED AS DUPLICATE	NETWORK	Data link failure - A332	CPDLC (uplinks) were not being delivered. In addition, ADS-C failed.	Closed as a duplicate of 1112.

CRA number	Region	Status	Type	Title	Description	Findings
1242-MM	SOPAC	ACTIVE	TBA	Unable to establish reliable CPDLC - A333	Airplane was logged on to YBBB. CPDLC was initially established but whenever a downlink occurred the CPDLC connection was lost.	CRA investigation in progress.
1243-SN	SOPAC	ACTIVE	TBA	CPDLC problems + multiple position reports - GLF5	There were a few problems establishing an active CPDLC connection, after which 9 CPDLC position reports were received.	Assigned to Gulfstream and Honeywell for investigation.

**"Status" Definitions**

RAISED - the PR has been filed by the originator but has not yet been processed by the CRA  
ACTIVE - CRA has processed the PR and allocated a CRA # and someone to investigate it. During this phase the PR is under investigation  
OPEN - The investigation is complete however some form of correction is required before it can be closed  
CLOSED AS DUPLICATE - Closed because problem is already covered under another PR  
CLOSED - Corrective action has been implemented or non-problem

**"Type" Definitions**

AIR - procedural - Problem due to flight crew action  
AIR - technical - Problem due to avionics fault  
GROUND - Problem due to issue at ATSU  
NETWORK - Problem at GES or in network