

Panel # 2 Interoperability (challenges and opportunities)

Moderator: Rob Peters/EUROCONTROL

1545 – 1630	<p>Panel #2 Interoperability (challenges and opportunities)</p> <p>Moderator: Rob Peters/EUROCONTROL</p> <p>Discussion of themes/subjects related to Interoperability (challenges and opportunities) will be conducted in small groups. Rapporteurs will deliver the results of the discussions at the end of the panel’s session.</p>	
-------------	---	--

Expected Outcome:

1. Opportunities to increase interoperability between civil/military within the ASIA Region based on the related ICAO Circular 330 material.
2. Understand current UAS initiatives in the Region.
3. Potential opportunities to increase civil/military cooperation in mid/long term.
 - Optimize airspace efficiency
 - Reduce aviation environment foot print.

Planning Panel 2 in 4 break-out sessions

Intro Presentation to audience – setting the scene of Panel # 2

Interoperability is very often used in technological discussions be it in a Civil-Civil, Military-Military or Civil-Military context. Fact is however that IOP is not only applicable to systems but also in Procedures, Consultation and Decision-making mechanisms and even Organisational structures. Panel # 2 aims to discuss a variety of questions around the theme of Interoperability including UAV’s. You will be split in 4 Groups and each group will be asked to discuss 2 questions during 20 minutes. The outcome of your Group needs to be presented (on flipovers) to the whole audience by one of the facilitators. The Moderator Rob Peters will then (pending time available) moderate the outcome with the facilitator and audience.

Group 1

Civil/Military Coordination is often perceived as yet another political must without clear indicators as to what it might bring. Do Civil Aviation representatives realize that Military can provide technological support preventing civil financial investments, enhance aviation security, make Military airbases available for Civil use? Do Military realize that CMC might facilitate better suitable training areas, regulatory support, and financial incentives?

Question: Should enhanced Civil/Military Coordination be seen as a threat or an opportunity?

Group 1

Interoperability is often perceived as a technological marketing activity. Are we prepared to accept that Interoperability facilitates optimized use of the airspace, enhances Safety, and supports security? Moreover do we believe that Interoperability is not just about technology but also about Governance and Regulation, i.a.w. can we afford not to be interoperable?

Question: Is Interoperability a must or just an extra and what opportunities do you see in the ASIA region at present?

Group 2

Can we achieve Civil/Military Coordination without Interoperability? Dovetailing to a practical example, wouldn't it be of joined interest if both GAT and Military Flight plans could be processed by both Civil and Military Flight Data Processing Systems?

Question: Is Interoperability a joined requirement?

Group 2

Aviation at large is considered as a major financial contributor to the National GDP. Growth in aviation directly brings money to States, Users and Providers. If Interoperability is considered as an enabler for growth in aviation, should the required financing then be carried by States or by Industry or joined. Moreover, the financing of new ATM systems and technologies is not of prime interest of Military aviation. Who should finance this?

Question: Is the financing of Interoperability a State or Industry responsibility?

Group 3

Assuming that Interoperability has a high price, should we seek for possibilities for alternative means for the Military to become interoperable? Is the colour and the size of the Navigation box important or is the output the determining factor? Is compliance through technical equivalence an option?

Question: Is alternative means of Interoperability an option and what opportunities do you foresee in the ASIA region?

Group 3

If Interoperability is considered as a major enabler for airspace optimization which in return supports capacity, efficiency, environment, Civil/Military Coordination, should we then determine a mandatory set of legal interoperability requirements or should we stay in a voluntary mode? This can be considered as a challenge or an opportunity.

Question: Should Interoperability be regulated or voluntary and why?

Group 4

Safeguarding the Airspace is a Sovereign State responsibility. Can we afford ourselves to create or maintain an aviation environment in which Civil and Military Aviation authorities are not interoperable? Are we prepared to share the responsibilities then?

Question: Is Interoperability vital in support of Airspace Security?

Group 4

UAS's are very often perceived as an Industrial marketing toy primarily used by the military. It seems that the public awareness about the potential role that UAS's could play in support of public domain functions like Safety, Security and environment doesn't exist. Do we think that UAS's can support states in their aforementioned responsibilities and if so do we then agree that UAS's have a vital position in Civil/Military Coordination?

Question: Are UAV'S an Industry or State civil/military necessity?

SPARE QUESTIONS IN CASE WE HAVE MORE THEN 4 GROUPS

As UAS's are very often considered as a military system, they are almost defacto condemned to operate outside controlled airspace. Yet more and more we deploy UAS's in a civil role, i.e. border patrol, pollution flights etc. Should aviation not make all efforts to enable UAS's to be deployed within controlled airspace? Isn't this another good example of Civil/Military interest?

Question: Could you share with us some of the UAS activities in the ASIA region that respond to this?

Civil/Military Coordination can take place in all sorts and types. We can work together at political level but from different ministries, at operational level e.g. Airports, system level e.g. sharing radar services. Is the time ripe, are we prepared to consider full integration at Political Level e.g. an integrated ATM Policy Unit, Technical Level e.g. sitting back to back in one ATC Centre? Shouldn't we consider this as an opportunity?

Question: Are or should we be READY for Civil/Military Cooperation or even integration?

How to measure success? If we intend to establish an integrated aviation environment we should establish agreements and set performance objectives on inter alia Safety, Capacity, Environment. Setting objectives is one thing but measuring and reporting is another thing not to mention how to respond or act if objectives are not met. The latter requires preparedness and transparency.

Question: Do we support a Performance Framework in an attempt to bring Civil/Military Coordination at a higher level?