



ICAO

The Third Meeting of the Asia/Pacific Aerodrome Assistance Working Group (AP-AA/WG/3)  
*Video Teleconference, 23 to 26 March 2021*

## Agenda Item 2: Review Outcomes of Relevant Meetings

### RELEVANT OUTCOMES OF APANPIRG/31

(Presented by the Secretariat)

#### SUMMARY

This paper presents the outcomes of APANPIRG/31 (Video Teleconference, 14 – 16 December 2020) relevant to Asia/Pacific Aerodrome Assistance Working Group.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Thirty-first Meeting of the Asia/Pacific Air Navigation Planning and Implementation Regional Group (APANPIRG/31) was held as a video teleconference from 14 to 16 December 2020.

1.2 The meeting was attended by 193 participants from 23 Member States, 2 Special Administrative Region of China and 8 International Organizations. The meeting adopted 17 Conclusions and 3 Decisions. The final report of APANPIRG/31 is available at:

<https://www.icao.int/APAC/Meetings/Pages/2020-APANPIRG31.aspx>

## 2. DISCUSSION

2.1 Some important discussions of APANPIRG/31 are summarized in the ensuing paragraphs.

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

2.2 In order to assist States in tracking the implementation progress of GRF-related provisions, based on a template developed by COSCAP-SEA earlier, APANPIRG/31 noted that ICAO APAC Office prepared a GRF Implementation Action Plan Template. The template is available in **Appendix B** to APANPIRG/31 Report on Agenda Item 3.1 (reproduced from **Appendix L to AOP/SG/4 Report**).

2.3 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.

2.4 To maximize the benefits brought by the template, APANPIRG/31 adopted the following Conclusion endorsed by AOP/SG/4:

**Conclusion APANPIRG/31/5 (AOP/SG/4–10): GRF Implementation Action Plan Template**

That,

a) The GRF Implementation Action Plan Template contained in **Appendix B** to Report on Agenda Item 3.1 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**.

Runway Safety Team (RST)

2.5 APANPIRG/31 noted that an aerodrome operator shall establish a Runway Safety Team (RST) comprised of relevant organizations operating or providing services on the aerodrome. The terms of reference and composition of the RST should be established and included in the aerodrome manual. Activities to be included in the terms of reference as well as the proposed composition of an RST were included in the Appendix to the Chapter 8 of Part II of PANS-Aerodromes (Doc 9981).

2.6 APANPIRG/31 also 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>

2.7 Considering the importance of RST, APANPIRG/31 adopted the following Conclusion endorsed by AOP/SG/4:

**Conclusion APANPIRG/31/6 (AOP/SG/4–11): Runway Safety Team**

That, States/Administrations to urge operators of aerodromes used for international operations to:

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.

Runway with Holding Bays or Multiple Entrance Taxiways

2.8 APANPIRG/31 noted the following issues brought up during AOP/SG/4: (a) a figure in ICAO Aerodrome Design Manual, Part 2 did not tally with Annex 14, Volume I SARPs and the actual aircraft operation; and (b) the possibility of aircraft ground collision when a runway was equipped with holding bay or multiple entrance taxiways and when an aircraft was passing behind another aircraft holding short of runway.

2.9 In addition to the consideration raised in WP/24, jet blast effect should also be taken into account especially for scenarios where small aircraft were involved.

2.10 To further address the matters, APANPIRG/31 adopted the following Conclusion endorsed by AOP/SG/4:

**Conclusion APANPIRG/31/7 (AOP/SG/4-13): Holding Bays and Multiple Entrance Taxiways**

That, the ICAO HQ be invited to consider to:

- a) Review Figure 2-2 of ICAO Aerodrome Design Manual (Doc 9157), Part 2 *Taxiways, Aprons and Holding Bays* to tally with SARPs of runway-holding position marking and actual aircraft operations; and
- b) Review the current SARPs in Annex 14, *Aerodromes – Volume I, Aerodrome Design and Operations* to cater for the design of multiple entrance taxiways.

Air Navigation Deficiencies in the AOP Field

2.11 APANPIRG/31 noted the List of Air Navigation Deficiencies in the AOP field which was reviewed and updated by AOP/SG/4 (10 – 13 November 2020).

2.12 In accordance with the Conclusion APANPIRG/30/4 (Certification of aerodromes used for international operations in Asia Pacific States), new deficiencies related to the certification of aerodromes used for international operations and publication of the status of certification of aerodromes in AIP, as identified and endorsed by AOP/SG/4 Meeting, are included in **Appendix B** to APANPIRG/31 Report on Agenda Item 4.

2.13 Subsequent to AOP/SG/4, the List was further updated after Bangladesh and Thailand provided evidence about aerodrome certification and AIP respectively. **Appendix B** to APANPIRG/31 Report on Agenda Item 4 (reproduced from the same Appendix in APANPIRG/31 WP/14) presented the updated List of Air Navigation Deficiencies in the AOP field.

2.14 Bangladesh advised the Meeting that the full name of VGSY was “Osmani International Airport, Sylhet”, and suggested that a common layout be adopted for Air Navigation Deficiency List in different fields. APANPIRG/31 noted the remarks from ICAO Headquarters that the *uniform methodology for the identification, assessment and reporting of air navigation deficiencies* was being reviewed and targeted to complete in Q3 2021.

2.15 Japan advised the Meeting that the Japan Civil Aviation Bureau did not have the power to certify the four aerodromes listed under Japan in **Appendix B** to APANPIRG/31 Report on Agenda Item 4, as they were operated by the defence agency. In response, the Secretariat reminded the Meeting of Standard 1.4.1 of Annex 14, Volume I, which stipulated that States shall certify aerodromes used for international operations, and this Standard applied to all such aerodromes regardless of ownership or operators. In this connection, the Meeting noted that ICAO Headquarters had been requested to provide guidance on an alternative safety oversight framework for military aerodromes undertaking limited civil international operations (**Conclusion APANPIRG/31/8** under Agenda Item 3.1 refers). The Meeting also noted that the Aerodrome Design Working Group was reviewing Doc 9774 *Manual on Certification of Aerodromes*, and relevant guidance might be available subsequently.

**3. ACTION BY THE MEETING**

3.1 The Meeting is invited to:

- a) note the information contained in this paper; and
- b) discuss any other relevant matters as appropriate.