



ICAO

International Civil Aviation Organization

The Eighth Meeting of the APANPIRG ATM Sub-Group

Video Teleconference, 23 – 27 November 2020

Agenda Item 7: AOP, MET, AIM, SAR

AOP SUBGROUP OUTCOMES

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY

This paper presents the outcomes of the Fourth Meeting of the APANPIRG Aerodrome Operation and Planning Sub-Group (AOP/SG/4) relevant to the ATM/SG.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Fourth Meeting of the Aerodrome Operations and Planning Sub Group (AOP/SG/4) was held via video-teleconference from 10 to 13 November 2020. The report of the AOP/SG/4 Meeting is available at <https://www.icao.int/APAC/Meetings/Pages/2020-AOP-SG4.aspx>.

2. DISCUSSION

Asia Pacific Airport Collaborative Decision Making Task Force (APA-CDM/TF)

2.1 AOP/SG/4 reviewed the *Report of the Fifth Meetings of the Asia Pacific Airport Collaborative Decision Making Task Force (APA-CDM/TF/5)* held as a video teleconference on 15 - 17 June 2020. The report of the Task Force meeting can be accessed at <https://www.icao.int/APAC/Meetings/Pages/2020-APA-CDM-TF5.aspx>.

2.2 AOP/SG/4 Meeting noted that the APA-CDM/TF/5 Meeting had been informed of outcomes from the 10th Meeting of the Asia/Pacific Air Traffic Flow Management Steering Group (ATFM/SG/10, Video Teleconference, 4 to 8 May 2020).

2.3 AOP/SG/4 Meeting noted information relevant to APA-CDM/TF including the APAC Flight Information Exchange Model (FIXM) 4.1 Extension (*Conclusion APANPIRG/30/12*) and AFTN/AMHS-Based Interface Control Document (Conclusion CNS SG/23/1). Any proposal to include additional attributes in the FIXM Extension must be supported by a suitable operational scenario proposed formally through ATFM/SG and/or APA-CDM/TF. It was further noted that a number of attributes relevant to A-CDM process, such as Actual Landing Time (ALDT) and Actual Take-off Time (ATOT), had already been included in FIXM 4.1 Core.

2.4 AOP/SG/4 noted that the APA-CDM/TF/5 Meeting reviewed the APA-CDM/TF Terms of Reference (ToR) to align the ToR with the APAC Seamless ANS Plan Version 3.0, 2019 approved by APANPIRG/30 and endorsed the Draft Decision for consideration of APANPIRG/31.

Draft Decision AOP/SG/4-1 (APA-CDM/TF/5–1): Proposal for Amendment of APA-CDM/TF TOR	
What: That, the Terms of Reference (TOR) of Asia/Pacific Airport Collaborative Decision Making Task Force (APA-CDM/TF) be amended as in Appendix A to the Report of AOP/SG/4.	Expected impact: <input type="checkbox"/> Political / Global <input type="checkbox"/> Inter-regional <input type="checkbox"/> Economic <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ops/Technical
Why: To align the TOR with the APAC Seamless ANS Plan Version 3.0.	Follow-up: <input type="checkbox"/> Required from States
When: 16-Dec-20	Status: Draft to be adopted by PIRG
Who: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub groups <input type="checkbox"/> APAC States <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ICAO APAC RO <input type="checkbox"/> ICAO HQ <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	

Aerodrome Operational Personnel Competency Small Working Group (AOPC/SWG)

2.5 AOP/SG/4 Meeting reviewed the *Report of the Fourth Meeting of the Aerodrome Operations Personnel Competency Small Working Group (AOPC/SWG/4)* held in Yangon, Myanmar from 10 to 14 February 2020, which can be accessed at <https://www.icao.int/APAC/Meetings/Pages/2020-APA-CDM-TF5.aspx>.

2.6 AOP/SG/4 Meeting reviewed the latest *draft Asia/Pacific Regional Guidance on Aerodrome Operations Personnel Competency Requirement Framework* developed by the AOPC/SWG and presented at the Meeting for adoption by the AOP/SG/4 Meeting. The AOP/SG/4 Meeting made the following Conclusion:

Conclusion AOP/SG/4-2 (AOPC SWG/4–1): Asia/Pacific Regional Guidance on Aerodrome Operations Personnel Competency Requirement Framework

That, the Asia/Pacific Regional Guidance on Aerodrome Operations Personnel Competency Requirement Framework provided in **Appendix B** to the **AOP/SG/4** Report be adopted and published on the ICAO APAC website.

Asia/Pacific Wildlife Hazard Management Working Group (AP–WHM/WG)

2.7 AOP/SG/4 Meeting reviewed the *Report of the Second Meeting of the Asia/Pacific Wildlife Hazard Management Working Group (AP–WHM/WG/2)*, which was held as a video teleconference from 27 to 29 May 2020. The report of the Working Group’s meeting can be accessed at <https://www.icao.int/APAC/Meetings/Pages/2020-AP-WHM-WG2.aspx>.

2.8 AOP/SG/4 noted that the AP-WHM/WG/2 Meeting was presented with the new submission formats for wildlife strike reports to ICAO.

2.9 To further enhance wildlife strike reporting by States, AOP/SG/4 endorsed the following Draft Conclusion formulated by AP-WHM/WG/2 for adoption by APANPIRG/31:

Draft Conclusion AOP/SG/4-4 (AP-WHM WG/2-1): Submission of Wildlife Strike Reports	
What: That, States are requested to submit wildlife strike reports to ICAO in the format of either ECCAIRS.e5f files or the standard ICAO ECCAIRS Excel-based form available at http://www.icao.int/ibis .	Expected impact: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Political / Global <input type="checkbox"/> Inter-regional <input type="checkbox"/> Economic <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ops/Technical
Why: To facilitate wildlife strike occurrence reporting and data analysis	Follow-up: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Required from States
When: 16-Dec-20	Status: Draft to be adopted by PIRG
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: Nil	

2.10 States were requested to submit the wildlife strike reports either through ECCAIRS.e5f files, or through an ECCAIRS Excel-based form and send to the following email addresses:

wildlife@icao.int, icaohq@icao.int, aoi@icao.int, and iaa@icao.int

Asia/Pacific Aerodrome Assistance Working Group

2.11 AOP/SG/4 Meeting reviewed the Report of the Second Meeting of Asia/Pacific Aerodrome Assistance Working Group (AP-AA/WG/2) held in Bangkok, Thailand from 27 to 30 January 2020.

2.12 AOP/SG/4 noted that AP-AA/WG/2 developed a set of *Generic Documents for Aerodrome Certification*: a) generic aerodrome certification procedure manual; b) draft generic aerodrome inspector handbook; c) generic procedures for accepting non-compliance; and d) draft generic aerodrome manual.

2.13 To provide guidance to APAC States which have been working on the certification of aerodromes for international operations, AOP/SG/4 adopted the following Decision:

Decision AOP/SG/4-7 (AP-AA/WG/2-1): Generic Documents related to Aerodrome Certification

That,

- a) the generic documents in **Appendix C (*Generic Aerodrome Certification Procedure*)** and **Appendix E (*Generic Procedures for Accepting Non-Compliances in Aerodromes*)** to the **AOP/SG/4 Report** be made available on the ICAO APAC Office Website for the reference by States in the APAC Regions; and
- b) the draft generic documents in **Appendix D (*Draft Generic Aerodrome Inspector Handbook*)** and **Appendix F (*Draft Generic Aerodrome Manual*)** to **AOP/SG/4**

Report be made available on the ICAO APAC Office Website for the advance information by States in the APAC Regions.

2.14 To identify the need of aerodrome assistance in enhancing the EI scores of APAC States, which (1) have not completed the certification of aerodromes used for international operations; (2) have AGA EI below 75%, and/or (3) are identified with AOP air navigation deficiencies, the AOP/SG/4 Meeting adopted the Conclusion, which is reproduced below:

Conclusion AOP/SG/4-8 (AP-AA/WG/2–2): Survey Questionnaire for Aerodrome Assistance in APAC States

That, the survey questionnaire in **Appendix G to AOP/SG/4 Report** be circulated to States to identify the need of aerodrome assistance among States in the APAC Region

Certification of Aerodromes in the Asia Pacific Region

2.15 AOP/SG/4 noted that approximately **43** aerodromes (i.e. 13 %) out of **342** aerodromes used for international operations in Asia and Pacific Regions were yet to be certified.

2.16 The status of certified aerodromes in different Sub Regions of Asia/Pacific Region is illustrated in the **Table 1** below:

Aerodromes	North Asia (5 States & 2 SARs)	South East Asia (11 States)	South Asia (8 States)	Pacific (15 States & 8 OTs)
Total Number of Int'l Aerodromes	134	98	52	58
Number of Certified Int'l Aerodromes	127	79	42	50
Number of Int'l Aerodromes <u>yet</u> to be certified	7	18	10	8
States with Int'l Aerodromes <u>yet</u> to be certified (number and percentage of aerodromes <u>yet</u> to be certified)	1) China (3, 3%) 2) Japan (4, 12%)	1) Brunei Darussalam (1, 100%), 2) Lao PDR (4, 100%) 3) Malaysia (2, 11%) 4) Philippines (4, 44%) 5) Thailand (5, 45%), 6) Timor-Leste (2, 100%)	1) Afghanistan (4, 100%) 2) Bangladesh (1, 33%) 3) India (5, 19%)	1) Kiribati (2, 100%) 2) Micronesia (Federal States of) (4, 100%), 3) Nauru (1, 100%), 4) Tuvalu (1, 100%)

Table 1 - Status of certified aerodromes in Sub Regions of Asia/Pacific Region

2.17 AOP/SG/4 further noted a number of States / Administrations that have yet to publish the status of certification of aerodromes in AIP AD 1.5. A summary is available in Table 2 below:

States	North Asia (5 States & 2 SARs)	South East Asia (11 States)	South Asia (8 States)	Pacific (15 States & 8 OTs)
No aerodromes listed in AD 1.5/ AD 1.5 missing in AIP	--	1) Brunei Darussalam 2) Lao PDR 3) Philippines 4) Timor Leste	1) Afghanistan	1) American Samoa (US) 2) Cook Is. 3) Guam (US) 4) Kiribati 5) Nauru 6) Niue (NZ) 7) N. Mariana Is. (US) 8) Samoa 9) Tonga 10) Tuvalu 11) Vanuatu
Some but not all aerodromes listed in AD 1.5	1) China 2) Japan	1) Malaysia 2) Thailand 3) Viet Nam	1) India 2) Pakistan	--
Status listed but not under AD 1.5	--	--	--	1) Fiji 2) New Zealand
AIP cannot be located	--	--	--	1) Marshall Is. 2) Micronesia (Federated States of) 3) Palau 4) Solomon Is.
Total	2 States	7 States	3 States	17 States / OTs

Table 2 – Status of AIP AD 1.5 in Sub Regions of Asia/Pacific Region

2.18 In connection with **Conclusion APANPIRG/30/4**, the States / Administrations / aerodromes identified in **Tables 1** and **2** above would be included in the APANPIRG AOP Deficiency List after review and endorsement by APANPIRG/31, with effect from **1 January 2021**.

2.19 AOP/SG/4 urged States and their aerodrome operators that have yet to certify aerodromes used for international operations to take an effective action on the 55th DGCA Action Item 55/42. In addition, AOP/SG/4 urged States to provide periodic updates on the progress of the certification of aerodromes and AIP AD 1.5 to the ICAO APAC Office.

Regional Guidance on Aeronautical Information Publication – AD 1.5 Status of Certification of Aerodromes

2.20 Since the adoption of the **Conclusion APANPIRG/30/4**, ICAO APAC Office received queries from a number of States requesting for clarification on the content to be published in AIP AD 1.5. As a result, a regional guidance on AIP AD 1.5 had been drafted by ICAO APAC Office to supplement the ICAO provisions and provide detailed guidance to States / Administrations.

2.21 To provide regional guidance on AIP AD 1.5, AOP/SG/4 adopted the following Conclusion:

Conclusion AOP/SG/4–12: Regional Guidance on Aeronautical Information Publication – AD 1.5 Status of Certification of Aerodrome

That, the *Regional Guidance on Aeronautical Information Publication – AD 1.5 Status of Certification of Aerodromes* provided in **Appendix M to AOP/SG/4 Report** be adopted and published on the ICAO APAC website

Global Reporting Format for Assessing and Reporting Runway Surface Conditions (GRF)

2.22 AOP/SG/4 noted that the SARPs and PANS related to GRF was originally set to become applicable on 5 November 2020. However, to alleviate the burden on Member States during, and in the aftermath of, the COVID-19 pandemic, the Council, at the eighth meeting of its 220th Session held on 19 June 2020, adopted amendments on the postponement of the applicability date, from 5 November 2020 to 4 November 2021, for provisions related to GRF. The corresponding State Letter Ref. AN 10/1.1, AN 11/1.3.33, AN 11/6.3.32, AN 3/5.13, AN 4/1.2.29, AN 2/2.7, AN 13/2.1, AN 4/27 and AN 2/33-20/73 dated 30 July 2020 was issued to States. The concerned Annexes and Procedures for Air Navigation Services (PANS) were:

- a) Annex 3 – *Meteorological Service for International Air Navigation*;
- b) Annex 6 – *Operation of Aircraft, Part I – International Commercial Air Transport – Aeroplanes* and Part II – *International General Aviation – Aeroplanes*;
- c) Annex 8 – *Airworthiness of Aircraft*;
- d) Annex 14 – *Aerodromes, Volume I – Aerodrome Design and Operations*;
- e) Annex 15 – *Aeronautical Information Services*;
- f) *Procedures for Air Navigation Services – Air Traffic Management* (PANS-ATM, Doc 4444);
- g) *Procedures for Air Navigation Services – Aerodromes* (PANS-Aerodromes, Doc 9881); and
- h) *Procedures for Air Navigation Services – Aeronautical Information Management* (PANS-AIM, Doc 10066).

GRF Implementation Action Plan Template

2.23 In order to assist States in implementation and tracking the progress of implementation of GRF-related provisions, ICAO APAC Office prepared a GRF Implementation Action Plan Template. The template identified **15** action items and a number of action parties to facilitate States in their preparation for GRF implementation. Target dates for each action items have also been set, which States may take reference when determining their own implementation dates.

2.24 To maximize the benefits brought by the template, AOP/SG/4 endorsed the following Draft Conclusion for consideration by APANPIRG/31:

Draft Conclusion AOP/SG/4–10: GRF Implementation Action Plan Template	
<p>What: That, a) The GRF Implementation Action Plan Template contained in Appendix L to AOP/SG/4 Report be uploaded to ICAO APAC Website for reference by States / Administrations; and b) States / Administrations are requested to make reference to the GRF Implementation Action Plan Template and submit their own action plans to ICAO APAC Office by 28 February 2021.</p>	<p>Expected impact: <input type="checkbox"/> Political / Global <input type="checkbox"/> Inter-regional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ops/Technical</p>
<p>Why: To assist States in the implementation of GRF-related SARPs and PANS.</p>	<p>Follow-up: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Required from States</p>
<p>When: 16-Dec-20</p>	<p>Status: Draft to be adopted by PIRG</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:</p>	

Runway Safety Team (RST)

2.25 As indicated in the GRF Implementation Action Plan Template (**Appendix L to AOP/SG/4 Report**), RST had been a major player in the implementation of GRF, providing feedback to the CAA in such matters as development of national procedures and guidance material, provision of on-the-job training, arrangement of trials prior to implementation, as well as the implementation plan. As such, the establishment and effective running of RSTs would be crucial for States to fine-tune and carry out their GRF implementation action plan.

2.26 During COVID-19 pandemic, aerodromes faced substantially different operational environment due to the sharp drop in the amount of air traffic movement. Runway safety might be impacted by a different operational environment, e.g. aircraft parked on runways and taxiways, increased wildlife presence, increase in towing activities associated with parked aircraft, and reduced headcount of operational personnel. AOP/SG/4 noted that an active and effective RST would be able to perform hazard identifications and safety risk assessments, so that runway safety risks might be mitigated in a timely manner.

2.27 AOP/SG/4 noted that ICAO has been maintaining a RST Survey to keep track of the establishment of RSTs at aerodromes used for international operations. The survey results and questionnaire were available at the following URL:

<https://www.icao.int/safety/RunwaySafety/Pages/Runway%20Safety%20Team%20Register.aspx>

2.28 Considering the importance of RST, AOP/SG/4 endorsed the following Draft Conclusion for consideration by APANPIRG/31:

Draft Conclusion AOP/SG/4–11: Runway Safety Team	
<p>What: That, States/Administrations to urge operators of aerodromes used for international operations to:</p> <p>a) establish runway safety teams (RSTs) in accordance with PANS-Aerodromes (Doc 9981) and ICAO RST Handbook; and b) participate in the ICAO RST Survey to register their RSTs.</p>	<p>Expected impact:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Political / Global <input type="checkbox"/> Inter-regional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ops/Technical</p>
<p>Why: To promote and keep track of the establishment of RSTs among aerodromes used for international operations to enhance runway safety.</p>	<p>Follow-up: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Required from States</p>
<p>When: 16-Dec-20</p>	<p>Status: Draft to be adopted by PIRG</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:</p>	

Runway Safety Go-Team (RSGT)

2.29 ICAO Runway Safety Go-Team (RSGT) assists States in developing a national runway safety programme. It also assists airports in establishing / improving the effectiveness of runway safety teams, as well as provides on-site technical assistance to all runway safety stakeholders. RSGT had been a voluntary multi-disciplinary assistance visit to an airport performed by an ad-hoc group of experts from ICAO and Runway Safety Programme (RSP) partner organisations; it was not an ICAO audit, validation, inspection nor certification.

2.30 AOP/SG/4 noted that COSCAP-SEA arranged the first two RSGT missions in the APAC Region in March 2020 – to Manila, Philippines and Makassar, Indonesia. Recommendations were provided to the States and airports for enhancing runway safety.

2.31 With the upcoming applicability of GRF-related SARPs and PANS, the scope of RSGT might be extended to assist States and airports in the implementation of GRF. In such cases, the duration of RSGT on-site activities might be slightly extended to incorporate additional activities.

2.32 AOP/SG/4 urged States in need of assistance in the area of runway safety and GRF to request for RSGT Assistance Missions through ICAO APAC Office and/or its corresponding COSCAP.

Alphanumeric Call Sign Initiative (WP/21)

2.33 At AOP/SG/4 Meeting, the RO/ATM presented WP/21 on *Alphanumeric Call Sign Initiative*. AOP/SG/4 noted that the root cause for a significant number of airspace incidents, including Large Height Deviations (LHDs) and runway conflicts had been identified for many decades as radiotelephony call sign confusion, when a pilot incorrectly responds to an Air Traffic Control (ATC) instruction to another aircraft, or in some cases, when an air traffic controller provided an incorrect instruction to an aircraft with a similar call sign to that intended.

2.34 Noting the grave safety risks from such occurrences, AOP/SG/4 reviewed and endorsed the *Draft Conclusion RASMAG/25-3* formulated by RASMAG/25, which would be reviewed by ATM/SG/8. ACI expressed its willingness to assist with the trial of alphanumeric call signs.

Draft Conclusion RASMAG/25-3: Alphanumeric Call Sign Initiative	
What: Noting: 1) the extreme safety risks associated with pilot-ATC miscommunication and the number of Category D (ATC Loop Error) Large Height Deviations (LHDs); 2) APANPIRG Conclusion 27/15. ATMSG Conclusions 5-5 and 5-6 regarding the Asia Pacific Alpha Numeric Call-Sign (ANCS) call sign project; and 3) alphanumeric call signs were a well-established call sign confusion mitigation, that: leading Air Navigation Service Providers (ANSPs) and aerodrome operators, in coordination with CANSO and ACI, were urged to consider a trial to identify and overcome any barriers for the implementation of alphanumeric call signs, with a view to developing a project for the Asia/Pacific (APAC) Region.	Expected impact: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Political / Global <input type="checkbox"/> Inter-regional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ops/Technical
Why: The Asia Pacific ANCS call-sign project had not been universally supported by aerodrome operators and ANSPs thus far.	Follow-up: <input type="checkbox"/> Required from States
When: 30-Oct-20	Status: Adopted by Subgroup
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: RASG	

2.35 AOP/SG/4 also noted that, for aerodrome operators, from the MID Region’s experience, the suggested course of action would be to target the interface point at which the airport systems ingest the flight information. At this interface a process would be required that translates an alphanumeric call sign into commercial flight numbers. The interface process could be an information technology ‘translator application’ or simply a person with a spreadsheet manually translating (most commonly at seasonal schedule submission). Once translated, all airport downstream systems would only deal with the commercial flight number. Hence, no further adaptation would be required.

2.36 All Appendices referred in this Working Paper have the same Appendix numbers as those in the Report of the AOP/SG/4 (<https://www.icao.int/APAC/Meetings/Pages/2020-AOP-SG4.aspx>).

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) note the information contained in this paper;
- b) encourage States/Administrations to use *Regional Guidance on AIP AD 1.5* for publication of status of certification of aerodromes in AIP;
- c) encourage States/Administrations to make reference to the GRF Implementation Action Plan Template and submit their own action plans to ICAO APAC Office by 28 February 2021;
- d) urge States/Administrations in need of assistance in the area of runway safety and GRF to request for RSGT Assistance Missions through ICAO APAC Office and/or its corresponding COSCAP;
- e) note that AOP/SG/4 reviewed and endorsed the *Draft Conclusion RASMAG/25-3* formulated by RASMAG/25; and
- f) discuss any relevant matters as appropriate.

.....