



International Civil Aviation Organization

Combined Eighth Meeting of the South Asia/Indian Ocean ATM Coordination Group (SAIOACG/8) and Twenty—Fifth Meeting of the South East Asia ATS Coordination Group (SEACG/25)

Siem Reap, Cambodia, 26 – 30 March 2018

Agenda Item 7: ANSP Coordination and Civil/Military Cooperation

**IMPOSITION OF MILITARY REQUIREMENTS AND RESTRICTIONS ON
INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION**

(Presented by IATA)

SUMMARY

This paper presents the issues faced by airlines and international civil aviation, with regard to the recent promulgation of requirements and restrictions placed on airspaces by military authorities in the APAC Region.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Annex 4 *Aeronautical Charts* and Annex 15 *Aeronautical Information Services* define an **Air Defence Identification Zone (ADIZ)** as “special designated airspace of defined dimensions within which aircraft are required to comply with special identification and/or reporting procedures additional to those related to the provision of air traffic services”. Annexes 4 and 15 also include requirements for the publication of information on an ADIZ, if established, in AIP and charts, and Annex 2, “*Rules of the Air*”, includes standards and recommended practices (SARPS) relating to the interception of aircraft. However, while the term ADIZ is listed and defined in ICAO documentation, there are no SARPS or procedures written for the establishment and operation of an ADIZ.

1.2 Although IATA recognizes the right of each State to ensure the integrity of its national security, IATA maintains that the implementation of an ADIZ, should be properly coordinated and together with accurate charting and very clear instructions, clearly promulgated to ensure airlines and international civil aviation is able to comply.

1.3 We are aware that often the requirement for an ADIZ is driven by Military or political sensitivities attributed to national security, however we would urge the applicable Civil Aviation Authorities, to strongly advocate for minimizing the impact to international civil aviation during the planning phase of a national ADIZ, or any other non-ICAO military requirement or restriction.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 A very recent example of an ADIZ implementation provides some “lessons learned” from an airline point of view.

2.2 An ADIZ was developed, established, and then promulgated via an AIP SUPP without proper dimensions overlaid on aeronautical charts to assist stakeholders in assessing the extent and impact of the ADIZ. This was done in contradiction to ICAO Annex 4 which specifies that, where established, an ADIZ shall be shown on Enroute Charts, and World Aeronautical Charts. The display of an ADIZ on Aeronautical Navigation Charts (ICAO Small Scale) is also recommended.

2.3 The boundaries of the established ADIZ penetrated the airspace of two adjacent FIRs and therefore impacted aircraft under the control of ATC units in the other States. To our knowledge no consultation occurred to ensure “host” air traffic controllers knew what procedures were required in order to comply with the ADIZ rules.

2.4 It was also evident that no consultation had taken place with adjacent States (even though the boundaries of the ADIZ penetrated the FIRs administered by these States), ICAO or the airspace users during the planning of this ADIZ.

2.5 What Information was Published?

1. An AIP SUPP was published, however it was unclear, and in parts contradictory with respect to airline/pilot required actions to ensure compliance with the ADIZ rules, in particular on how to obtain an Air Defence Clearance number (ADC) to avoid possible intercept actions by the Air Force of the state concerned.
2. During the period between the AIP SUPP publication and its effective date, it was necessary to make multiple and frequent representations (phone calls, emails, letters and face-to-face meetings) to the authorities in an attempt to clarify a number of issues.
3. Nine (9) working days before the effective date a NOTAM was published that attempted to address the concerns and issues raised by various stakeholders, including ICAO. The NOTAM:
 - Changed the original requirements and provided relief from obtaining an ‘Air Defence Clearance’ (ADC) Number for a number of routes over the High Seas, included in the original publication.
 - Sought to clarify the instructions for airlines to obtain an ADC
 - Maintained the requirement for pre-authorizations for each individual flight, imposing an unreasonable burden on aircraft operating agencies and their pilots, and on neighbouring States/ANSPs.

2.6 Unfortunately, on the effective date the procedures for obtaining an ADC remained unclear with conflicting instructions from the authorities. The end result was a significant increase in workload for airline dispatch personnel and confusion across the board due to:

- Phone numbers either not answered, or if answered, the personnel were not informed about the process
- ATFN messages not sent/received.
- Conflicting instructions issued.
- All the above necessitated multiple attempts through multiple media to try and get an ADC issued for a flight.

2.7 In response, a number of flights were re-planned via routes not requiring an ADC. The result was an increase in flight times, as airlines were concerned about the risks associated with possible intercept actions that could be taken by military fighter aircraft.

2.8 Problems with obtaining ADC authorizations persist. Reports indicate one airline showing 65% of their flights required multiple attempts, through various media, in order to obtain an ADC clearance number.

2.9 States are invited to note that there are a number of other States that have previously established an ADIZ or other non-ICAO compliant military airspace or procedure, that do not require pre-authorization for every affected civil flight. States should consider the best practices of other States, and obviate the need for pre-authorization for civil flights. Some of these practices include:

1. Flight plan and movement information can be obtained by, or forwarded to, military organizations easily, by monitoring or receiving on-forwarded Flight Plan (FPL) and other ATS messages;
2. Radar, ADS-B and other civil ATC surveillance data can be readily shared between the Air Navigation Service Provider (ANSPs) and military organizations;
3. Implementation of direct communications facilities between military organizations and the ANSP, in order to facilitate requests for information on any unknown aircraft; and
4. The establishment of civil-military coordination functions within civil air traffic control centres.

2.10 Conclusion:

1. IATA urges Civil Aviation Authorities to ensure civil aviation interests are raised and taken into account during the planning phase of any airspace requirement or procedure, imposed by the State, in support of military security measures that are non-ICAO standards.
2. Appropriate charting and the procedures associated with the requirements for compliance, must be promulgated in accordance with the Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPS) found in Annexes 4 and 15 to the Convention.
3. Consultation with adjacent states, airspace users and ICAO, should take place prior to publication to ensure proper processes are followed and procedures are in place to support the implementation.
4. If ADC or other authorization processes are absolutely necessary, State military and civil authorities should consider the establishment of automated approval systems that would issue an ADC on receipt of an FPL, and that these systems should be tested and implemented prior to the effective date of an ADIZ or other airspace rule.
5. If the options in 2.9.1 to 2.9.4 are not implemented, the processes associated with ADIZ/security areas, should be rigorously tested prior to the effective date to ensure those procedures actually work.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) note the information contained in this paper; and
- b) Consider adoption of the draft Conclusion; and
- c) discuss any relevant matters as appropriate.

Draft Conclusion SAIOACG/8&SEACG/25-X: Establishment of Non-ICAO Procedures and Requirements for Military Purposes	
<p>What: That, where the imposition of non-ICAO military requirements and procedures affecting international civil aviation is either planned or likely, States are urged to ensure that civil aviation interests are taken into account by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensuring military authorities are fully informed of the obligations of all States that are signatory to the Convention on International Civil Aviation; 2. Conducting full and timely consultation with airspace users, adjacent States and ICAO; 3. Implementing the capability to tactically share FPL and ATS messages, civil ATC surveillance data and other relevant information between the ANSP and military authorities; 4. Implementing direct communications facilities between military organizations and the ANSP to permit the coordination of requests for information on any unknown aircraft; 5. Establishing civil-military coordination functions within civil air traffic control centres; and 6. Promulgating timely, clear and unambiguous information on the requirements and procedures, and accurate, detailed charts in accordance with the requirements of ICAO Annex 4 and Annex 15; and <p>Where pre-authorizations for individual flights in affected areas are necessary, States are urged to either</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider issuing authorizations with the seasonal schedule approval; or 2. Develop and rigorously test clear and, ideally, automated procedures for compliance. 	<p>Expected impact:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Political / Global</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Inter-regional</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Economic</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Environmental</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ops/Technical</p>
<p>Why: To avoid confusion increased workload and increased risk of Military intervention for civil flights operating in airspace where non-ICAO military requirements and procedures are imposed.</p>	<p>Follow-up: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Required from States</p>
<p>When: 3-Aug-18</p>	<p>Status: Draft to be adopted by Subgroup</p>
<p>Who: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub groups <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> APAC States <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ICAO APAC RO <input type="checkbox"/> ICAO HQ <input type="checkbox"/> Other: XXXX</p>	

.....