



ICAO

International Civil Aviation Organization

Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the Regional Airspace Safety
Monitoring Advisory Group (RASMAG/26)

Video Teleconference, 20 – 23 September 2021

Agenda Item 2: Review Outcomes of Related Meetings

RELATED MEETINGS OUTCOMES

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY

This paper presents a brief overview of outcomes from relevant high level meetings (except for airspace safety monitoring), that had been conducted since the last RASMAG meeting.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Eighth Meeting of the APANPIRG Air Traffic Management Sub-Group (ATM/SG/8) of the Asia Pacific Air Navigation Planning and Implementation Regional Group (APANPIRG) was held by video teleconference from 23 to 27 November 2020. The meeting was attended by 220 registered participants from 27 Administrations (CANSO, IATA, IFALPA, IFATCA and ICAO).

1.2 The Thirty-First Meeting of the Asia/Pacific Air Navigation Planning and Implementation Regional Group (APANPIRG/30) was held by video teleconference from 14 to 16 December 2020. The meeting was attended by 193 participants from 23 Administrations and eight International Organizations (AAPA, ACI, CANSO, IATA, ICAO, IFALPA, IFATCA and IFATSEA).

1.3 The annual Conference of Directors General of Civil Aviation, Asia and Pacific Regions was not held in 2020.

2. DISCUSSION

ATM/SG/8

RASG and APRAST Meeting Outcomes

2.1 The ATM/SG/8 meeting was informed of the outcomes of the Ninth Meeting of the Regional Aviation Safety Group – Asia and Pacific Regions (RASG-APAC/9, Bangkok, Thailand, 07-08 November 2019) and the Fifteenth Meeting of the Asia/Pacific Regional Aviation Safety Team (APRAST/15, VTC, 24 – 25 June 2020).

2.2 RASG-APAC/9 had agreed to **Decision RASG-APAC 9/6 – Asia/Pacific Regional Aviation Safety Plan (AP-RASP) 2020-2022**. The AP-RASP document is available on the ICAO Asia/Pacific Regional Office RASG-APAC web page at:

<https://www.icao.int/APAC/RASG/Pages/default.aspx>

APANPIRG/31

Call Sign Confusion

2.3 APANPIRG/31 was informed of the grave safety risks resulting from call sign confusion, noting that a successful alphanumeric call sign initiative that had been implemented in the Middle East (MID) Region had not been able to progress in the APAC Region. One of the reasons for this was the reluctance of aerodrome operators to implement change until an automated tool was available to accommodate alphanumeric call signs.

2.4 APANPIRG/31 agreed to the following Conclusion, drafted by RASMAG/25:

Conclusion APANPIRG/31/11: Alphanumeric Call Sign Initiative

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, ATM/SG Conclusions 505 and 506 regarding the Asia/Pacific Alpha Numeric Call-Sign (ANCS) 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..

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

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

.....