9/30/2026 **FOR YOUR INFORMATION** 2026-338/10-31

2401522

To: Airport Manager, El Salvador International Airport (MSLP), San Salvador, El Salvador

Info: FAA (AVP-1, AVP-200, AFS-260, AFS-200, DFW-IFO), A4A, ALPA, AOPA, APA, ASAP, ATSG, CAPA, IBT, ICAO, ICASS, IFALPA, NBAA, NTSB, Autoridad de Aviación Civil (El Salvador), Jeppesen Sanderson Inc.

From: Becky L. Hooey, Director
NASA Aviation Safety Reporting System

Re: MSLP/SAL Runway 25 ILS X Approach Design

We recently received ASRS reports describing a safety concern that may involve your area of operational responsibility. We do not have sufficient details to assess either the factual accuracy or possible gravity of the report. It is our policy to relay the reported information to the appropriate authority for evaluation and any necessary follow-up. We feel you should be aware of the enclosed deidentified report.

To properly assess the usefulness of our alert message service, we would appreciate it if you would take the time to give us your feedback on the value of the information that we have provided. Please contact Dr. Becky Hooey at (408) 541-2854 or email at becky.l.hooey@nasa.gov.

Aviation Safety Reporting System
P.O. Box 189 | Moffett Field, CA | 94035-0189

ACN 2401522	
DATE / TIME	
Date of Occurrence	202608
Local Time Of Day	1801 to 2400
PLACE	
Locale	MSLP.Airport
State	FO
AIRCRAFT / EQUIPMENT X	
Make Model Name	Commercial Fixed Wing
Operating Under FAR Part	121
PERSON 1	
Function - Flight Crew	Captain
Function - Flight Crew	Pilot Not Flying
ASRS Report Number	2401522
EVENTS	
Anomaly	ATC Issue - All Types
Anomaly	Deviation - Track / Heading - All Types
Anomaly	Deviation / Discrepancy - Procedural - Published Material / Policy
Detector - Person	Flight Crew
Result - Flight Crew	Became Reoriented
Result - Flight Crew	FLC Overrode Automation

NARRATIVE 1

Originally planned a RWY 7 arrival. Once in range of VHF ATIS, discovered runway in use was now 25. Planned and briefed the URNOS arrival to the RNAV X 25 via MORAM as the most likely approach. Upon hand off to El Salvador Approach, we were directed to fly direct CAT VOR for the ILS X RWY 25. We worked together to reload/ brief the approach and were complete prior to arriving at CAT. We were high on energy and had already configured with gear and flaps 15 prior to crossing CAT outbound. We were at 5800’ over CAT as the FMS turned outbound on the leg from CAT to D091K. We captured the vertical path while in the turn at CAT. On the leg outbound to D091K, we discussed the ND (Navigation Display) presentation of our approach and noted that The ND was showing a turn approximately 2 miles prior to D091K along with a very wide turn that displayed a path overshooting final to the north, and a continued shallow bank/wide turn back around to an intercept of final from the north side. We discussed how the ND appeared to have D091K as a fly-by point, while the approach plate indicated a fly over of D091K was required. While the FO/PF continued to fly/monitor the approach, I did a quick re-look of company pages and special instructions to see if we missed some guidance and found nothing. At 6.7 DME (CAT) and 4000’, the FMS, in LNAV/VNAV initiated a 10 degree bank turn maintaining the depicted course on the ND. FD (Flight Director) still indicated VNAV PATH. We had not intervened yet. We continued to discuss that we were both uncomfortable permitting the aircraft to proceed along the depicted track to the north side of final. As we passed a heading of 360, a heading close to 280 was selected and heading select and LOC were also selected/armed. The aircraft increased bank and quickly captured the LOC. Almost immediately as we rolled out on final at 7.2 DME and 3000’, an amber alert appeared and we noted full scale deflection above glidepath. PF armed APP, then v/s down 1900 fpm. We captured the glidepath at 1600’ and were able to complete the approach uneventfully within stable parameters from there forward.

As we were in VMC, terrain clearance was not a concern, however the legalities of allowing the aircraft to proceed north of final on the non-protected side along with not overflying D091K are of concern. The early turn and how it impacted our altitude/energy state also made the design and then execution of this approach of great concern. I have been in contact with maintenance about this as well. Had we not been configured and in a frame of mind to fix a high energy state, it is unlikely the first approach would have been stable. My suspicion is that somehow this approach was designed/loaded with a fly by and not a fly over point. If it is a fleet problem, I would think that needs to be addressed. Certainly some company page notes or FOQA alerts should warn crews if these events actually unfolded as expected.

Cause: Later notice of runway, then approach change and some time lost with language barriers trying to ask for our desired approach created higher workload during a critical phase of flight. Less familiarity with the airfield in general and no experience using RWY 25.

Recommend changing the design of the approach to comply with flyover of D091K. If that is the problem, I believe no other action required. If the approach is kept as is, I would highly recommend notes addressing how it will depict and fly north of final without crew intervention and that a very steep decent may be required. Hopefully, the approach is indeed designed poorly because I believe the energy management techniques required for what we flew were at the maximum level of what is physically possible of the aircraft as we were already slowed and configured much earlier than what I would consider normal and the PF recognized and made inputs almost immediately to correct problems as we encountered them.

SYNOPSIS

Air carrier Captain reported the MSLP/SAL Runway 25 ILS X approach was designed with a fly by and not fly over point causing a track deviation during approach.