



ICAO

International Civil Aviation Organization

**Twenty-Ninth Meeting of the Regional Airspace Safety
Monitoring Advisory Group (RASMAG/29)**

Bangkok, Thailand, 19 – 22 August 2024

Agenda Item 6: Air Navigation Services Deficiencies

ATM AND AIRSPACE SAFETY DEFICIENCIES LIST

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY

This paper presents a list of Airspace Safety Deficiencies (previously Air Navigation Deficiencies) noted by the Asia/Pacific Air Navigation Planning and Implementation Regional Group (APANPIRG) in for review by the meeting. The list is based on the uniform methodology for the identification, assessment and reporting of such deficiencies as described in Part V of the *APANPIRG Procedural Handbook*.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Under the Terms of Reference of APANPIRG, one of the primary objectives is to identify and address specific deficiencies in the air navigation field. In meeting this objective, APANPIRG facilitates the development and implementation of action plans by States to resolve identified deficiencies, where necessary. Consequently, APANPIRG and its Sub-groups regularly review deficiencies in their respective fields and develop recommendations for remedial actions.

1.2 The Twenty-First Meeting of APANPIRG (APANPIRG/21, September 2010) agreed:

Conclusion APANPIRG21/ 53 –Elimination of ATM Air Navigation Deficiencies

That, States concerned

- a) be urged to take urgent actions to correct the deficiencies in the ATM/AIS/SAR fields identified in Attachment A to the Report on Agenda Item 4;*
- b) notify details of the problems/difficulties to the Regional Office; and*
- c) designate a point of contact in each State to deal with deficiencies and provide details to the Regional Office by 22 October 2010.*

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 The relevant extract from the List of APANPIRG ATM and Airspace Safety Deficiencies is appended at **Attachment A** to this paper.

Safety Reporting Deficiencies

2.2 The following States have Deficiencies recorded for non-provision of safety-related data:

- **Afghanistan** (Failure to submit Kabul FIR Large Height Deviation (LHD) data).

Note: This Deficiency was originally recorded as a result of non-provision of Kabul LHD data for January to December 2018, and 2020. Afghanistan submitted data for the period January to July 2021, but no further LHD reports were received.

Long Term Height Monitoring Requirement Deficiencies

2.3 The following States have Deficiencies recorded concerning responsibility to comply with the height-keeping monitoring requirements of Annex 6 (Long Term Height Monitoring requirement – remaining burden more than 30%):

To be retained in the Deficiencies list:

- **Afghanistan** (Remaining monitoring burden of 50%, RASMAG/29).
- **Nepal** (Remaining monitoring burden of 45%, RASMAG/29).

RASMAG/29-WP/28 proposed to remove the following States:

- **Mongolia** (Remaining monitoring burden of 18%, RASMAG/29).
- **New Zealand** (Remaining monitoring burden of 11%, RASMAG/29).
- **Pakistan** (Remaining monitoring burden of 27%, RASMAG/29).
- **Papua New Guinea** (Remaining monitoring burden of 15%, RASMAG/29).
- **Solomon Islands** (Remaining monitoring burden of 0%, RASMAG/29).

Furthermore, it was proposed to add the following States:

- **India** (Remaining monitoring burden of 48%, RASMAG/29).
- **Philippines** (Remaining monitoring burden of 40%, RASMAG/29).

ATS Datalink Deficiencies

2.4 FIT-Asia/14 agreed that India's deficiency remained current.

To be retained in the Deficiencies list:

- **India:** Post implementation monitoring not implemented (Performance monitoring and analysis not reported for the Mumbai FIR).

2.5 Maldives had not provided PRs to CRA or reported performance monitoring and analysis to FIT. However, it was confirmed that Maldives had disabled the ADS-C function from the ATM system due to an application issue, and CPDLC/HF is used beyond VHF coverage. Therefore, ICAO proposed to remove the Maldives from the Deficiencies list:

- **Maldives:** Post implementation monitoring not implemented (*Problem reports not provided to CRA. Performance monitoring and analysis not reported to FIT*).

2.6 Note: Amendments to the Deficiencies List arising from discussion of other Working Papers are not yet included in this paper or its **Attachment A**.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) review and update the Airspace Safety Deficiencies, for further review by APANPIRG/35;
- b) where possible, identify actions to be taken to correct the identified deficiencies; and
- c) discuss any relevant matters as appropriate.

.....

ATM and Airspace Safety Deficiencies List (Updated 14 August 2024)

States/facilities	Deficiencies			Corrective Action		
	Description	Date first reported	Remarks	Executing body	Target date	Priority **
	<u>Non Provision of Safety-related Data Requirement of Paragraph 3.3.5.1 of Annex 11 (provision of data for monitoring the height-keeping performance of aircraft) and APANPIRG Conclusion 16/6 – Non Provision of safety related data by States</u>					
Afghanistan	Non-provision of safety related data	12/07/2019	Failure to submit Kabul LHD data for January-December 2018 and 2020. Afghanistan had submitted data for the period January to July 2021, but no further LHD reports were received after August 2021.	Afghanistan	RASMAG/27	U
	State Responsibility to comply with the Annex 6 Height-Keeping Monitoring Requirement Annex 6 Part I Section 7.2.9 (10th Ed.) and Part II Section 2.5.2.10 (9th Ed.)					
Afghanistan	Non-compliance with LTHM requirement (remaining monitoring burden more than 30%)	RASMAG/23	Remaining monitoring burden of 85% (RASMAG/26) MAAR informed ICAO that all known airframes in Afghanistan have complied with the monitoring requirement (November 2022). Deficiency retained due to the unknown status of the Afghanistan aeronautical authority responsible for ensuring monitoring is conducted.	Afghanistan	RASMAG24	A
Mongolia	Non-compliance with LTHM requirement (remaining monitoring burden more than 30%)	RASMAG/28	Remaining monitoring burden of 43% (RASMAG/28)	Mongolia	TBD	A

States/facilities	Deficiencies			Corrective Action		
	Description	Date first reported	Remarks	Executing body	Target date	Priority **
Nepal	Non-compliance with LTHM requirement (remaining monitoring burden more than 30%)	RASMAG/28	Remaining monitoring burden of 45% (RASMAG/29)	Nepal	TBD	A
New Zealand	Non-compliance with LTHM requirement (remaining monitoring burden more than 30%)	RASMAG/28	Remaining monitoring burden of 36% (RASMAG/28)	New Zealand	TBD	A
Pakistan	Non-compliance with LTHM requirement (remaining monitoring burden more than 30%)	RASMAG/22	Remaining monitoring burden of 45% (RASMAG/28)	Pakistan	RASMAG24	A
Papua New Guinea	Non-compliance with LTHM requirement (remaining monitoring burden more than 30%)	RASMAG/28	Remaining monitoring burden of 69% (RASMAG/28)	Papua New Guinea	TBD	A
Solomon Islands	Non-compliance with LTHM requirement (remaining monitoring burden more than 30%)	RASMAG/28	Remaining monitoring burden of 50% (RASMAG/28)	Solomon Islands	TBD	A
India	Non-compliance with LTHM requirement (remaining monitoring burden more than 30%)	RASMAG/29	Remaining monitoring burden of 48% (RASMAG/29)	India	TBD	A
Philippines	Non-compliance with LTHM requirement (remaining monitoring burden more than 30%)	RASMAG/29	Remaining monitoring burden of 40% (RASMAG/29)	Philippines	TBD	A
	Data Link Performance Monitoring and Analysis Requirements of Paragraph 2.28 and/or 3.3.5.2 of Annex 11 not met					
India	Post-implementation monitoring not implemented	13/07/2017	Performance monitoring and analysis was reported for the Chennai and Kolkata FIRs, but was not reported for the Mumbai FIR. (FIT-Asia/14): Insufficient data/evidence to discuss the deficiency	India	TBD	A
Maldives	Post implementation monitoring not implemented	29/5/2015	Problem Reports not provided to CRA. Performance monitoring and analysis not reported to FIT. (FIT-Asia/14): Disabled the ADS-C	Maldives	TBD	A

States/facilities	Deficiencies			Corrective Action		
	Description	Date first reported	Remarks	Executing body	Target date	Priority **
			function from the ATM system due to an application issue, and CPDLC/HF is used beyond VHF coverage.			

** Note: In accordance with the *APANPIRG Handbook - Asia/Pacific Supplement to the Uniform Methodology for the Identification, Assessment and Reporting of Air Navigation Deficiencies*, priority for Air Navigation Deficiencies is guided by the principle that a deficiency with respect to an ICAO Standard is accorded a “U” status, while a non-compliance with a Recommended Practice or a PANS is considered as “A” or “B” subject to additional expert evaluation. The final prioritization of deficiencies is the prerogative of APANPIRG.