



International Civil Aviation Organization

**Fifteenth Meeting of the APANPIRG ATM/AIS/SAR Sub-Group
(ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/15)**

Bangkok, Thailand, 25 – 29 July 2005

Agenda Item 4: Consider problems and make specific recommendations concerning the provision of ATM/AIS/SAR in the Asia/Pacific Region

**ON-THE-JOB TRAINING REQUIREMENT FOR THE GRANT OF NON-RADAR
APPROACH CONTROL PROFICIENCY IN HIGH DENSITY TERMINAL CONTROL
CENTRES**

(Presented by India)

SUMMARY

This paper presents the constraints in fulfilling the ICAO provisions for the OJT requirement for non-radar approach control.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 ICAO Annex 1 (Chapter 4, section 4.4.2.2.1) stipulates 90 days/ 180 hours of on the job training requirement for the grant of non-radar procedural approach control rating. Difficulties are being experienced in fulfilling this mandatory requirement especially in high density terminal control area where there is no scope for non –radar approach control.

1.2 PANS ATM DOC 4444(Chapter 8, section 8.8.4.1) also stipulates that in case of Radar failure, Radar controller shall hand-over responsibility for providing the service to the non-radar controller. This requires that a non Radar approach controller shall all the time be available for taking over the control function in case of Radar failure.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 In view of the provisions contained in PANS ATM DOC 4444 (Chapter 8, section 8.8.4.1), a non – radar approach controller is required to be deployed in the approach control unit to take over the traffic in the event of radar failure . A non-radar controller is therefore required to hold a current non-radar approach control rating in accordance with the provisions outlined in Annex 1 requirement.

2.2 Further, after acquiring the rating, the controller is expected to keep his rating current by performing actual non-radar approach control duties in live traffic environment so as to maintain the proficiency and skill .The controller who is not practicing regularly is likely to loose the desired level of competency. Therefore the controller must get regular opportunity to practice his skill, if they are to function satisfactorily in the event of radar outage.

2.3 In the high density complex traffic environment with radar oriented approach control unit, there is hardly any scope for imparting non-radar approach control training for the reason that there will be delays to both arrival and departure and no aircraft will accept procedural approach clearance

in order to adhere to the slot time and fuel economy. It will result in lack of procedural training opportunity for the controllers. This kind of situation may have been faced in other states also.

2.4 Under such circumstances it becomes impracticable to fulfill ICAO Annex 1 requirement for the OJT of non-radar approach control i.e. 90 days / 180 hours.

2.5 The only possible alternate would be to provide simulator based training, recreating the actual traffic scenario for the non – radar approach control training.

3. CONCLUSIONS

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- (i) share their experience in this matter ,and suggest as how to provide non-radar approach training in live traffic environment;
- (ii) request the sub group to take up appropriately with the APANPIRG/ ICAO HQs for issue of suitable guidance for the OJT requirement in non-radar approach control rating, especially for the high density terminal control centres; and
- (iii) the sub-group may take up with APANPIRG/ ICAO Hqrs for suitable amendments to the Annex 1 provisions to accept simulator training to meet the OJT requirement.
