



ICAO

International Civil Aviation Organization  
North American, Central American and Caribbean Office

WORKING PAPER

AIDC/NAM/ICD/4 — WP/03

22/02/21

**Fourth NAM/CAR Air Traffic Services Inter-facility Data Communication (AIDC) and North American Interface Control Document (NAM/ICD) Implementation Follow-up Meeting (AIDC/NAM/ICD/4)**

Online, from 9 to 11 March 2021, 9AM to 12PM, GTM -6

**Agenda Item 2: Updating of the Implementation Activities of the Automated Protocols**

**CARRIED OUT ACTIVITIES IN CUBA FOR AUTOMATION OF THE NEW SYSTEM IN 2020**

(Presented by Cuba)

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	
This working paper presents a summary of the automation AIDC tests in the Havana Control Centre (CCTA) during 2020.	
<b>Action:</b>	Suggested actions are presented in Section 4.
<b>Strategic Objectives:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Safety</li><li>• Air Navigation Capacity and Efficiency</li></ul>
<b>References:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• ICAO Doc 4444</li><li>• Interface control document (ICD) for North America (NAM) (AIDC/NAM/ICD/4).</li></ul>

**1. Introduction**

1.1 Cuba maintained activities for automation during 2020. The AIDC Regional implementation plan was update by the States locating Cuba with a Class 1 messaging and logical rejection messages (LRM) Version E with Miami, CENAMER and Merida adjacent areas, and in testing process with Jamaica, which have not finished yet, and that will continue during March 2021.

1.2 On the other hand, Cuba continues updating and putting in operation a new air traffic control automation system. It has been working in the test to start up all the modules of the new system despite the official refusal received from EUROCONTROL to have official access to BADA databases.

1.3 In the second semester we concentrated in the tests (AIDC-NAM) tests with Miami, CENAMER and Merida, and were fundamentally carried out with the FAA laboratories. These tests were carried out to prove the system response when receiving established messaging for the NAN-ICD (Class I and Class II).

## 2. **Analysis**

2.1 Results of the planned tests at the tests platforms:

### 2.1.1 **Miami ACC**

2.1.2 With the FAA laboratories three tests were carried out, which included Class I and Class II messaging. The objective was to review the parameters and the changes that were carried out, the result was positive. In the Class II messages, sending and responses were correct. In January 2021 Class II tests continued, and in February two tests were carried out with Houston area (Class I) and we plan to bond in June.

### 2.1.3 **Merida ACC**

2.1.4 With the control centre of Merida the tests were Class I; two tests were planned but three tests were carried out at the end in which some difficulties were faced when receiving reply messages.

2.1.5 The same satisfactory considerations were experienced due that when analysing the structure of the sent messages, these arrived correctly (this is not currently happening and it what determines the effectiveness percentage in Merida and La Havana).

2.1.6 This circumstance was already studied and analysed with specialist from Merida at the beginning of 2020, as part of the recommendations of the las automation meeting carried out in 2019 and when the error was recognized it was communicated to the Directorate of Merida that due to security problems it was not the best time to work on the operating system code.

2.1.7 For this year we are going to continue the tests before implementing the exchange with Houston due that part of this traffic would be destined for landing in the airport of Cancun.

### 2.1.8 **CENAMER ACC**

2.1.9 We planned three tests with COCESNA but only one was carried out and we could prove sending Class I messages; the rest of the tests were suspended due to the COVID-19 affectations in the control centre of Houston.

2.1.10 We expect to restart Class I and II tests when availability is informed.

2.1.11 **Kingston ACC**

2.1.12 Two tests were planned with Houston control centre, which were not carried out due to communication problems in both systems. Airspace between La Havana and Kingston is a transition area for those that have established procedures with Class I automation, that explains the automation need due that the work of the controllers is humanized and tens of communications between both FIR are eliminated, in addition of the mitigation of possible errors in comprehending diverse mother tongues.

3. **Conclusions**

3.1 Cuba advances in its automation implementation work on messaging and the enhancement of the ATS work.

3.2 Up to date, Kingston ACC difficulties continue despite the efforts made.

4. **Suggested actions**

4.1 The Meeting is invited to take note of the work carried out by Cuba in collaboration with the adjacent ACC.

4.2 Is necessary to continue advising the Kinston control centre so that it can begin implementing automatized exchange with La Havana ACC.