



ICAO

International Civil Aviation Organization

Twenty-First Meeting of the ICAO Aeronautical Information Services – Aeronautical Information Management Implementation Task Force (AAITF/21)

Bangkok, Thailand, 19 – 22 May 2026

Agenda Item 4: AIS-AIM Updates

PROPOSAL FOR THE HARMONIZATION OF DATA PROVISION PERIODICITY, DATA RESOLUTIONS, AND REGULATORY REFERENCES

(Presented by the Philippines)

SUMMARY

This paper presents the regulatory and implementation inconsistencies affecting the synchronization of aeronautical data and aeronautical information provision, with particular emphasis on the five-year periodic review cycle of Instrument Flight Procedures (IFPs). It highlights the need for strengthened alignment across relevant provisions in ICAO Annexes and Procedures for Air Navigation Services to ensure aeronautical data and aeronautical information remain current, accurate, and operationally relevant.

The paper further proposes the harmonization of “Publication” and “Charting” resolutions into a single high-precision standard to ensure data integrity. In addition, it recommends editorial corrections and reference clarifications in ICAO Annex 4, Annex 15, PANS-AIM (ICAO Document 10066) and AIS Manual (ICAO Document 8126) to improve consistency and support effective implementation by States.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The global transition to Aeronautical Information Management (AIM) requires a seamless and reliable data chain. Any lack of synchronization between the requirements for data originators and service providers introduces operational risks and regulatory non-compliance.

1.2 In particular, Instrument Flight Procedure Design Service Providers (IFPDSPs) depend on timely and accurate aeronautical data to meet the mandated five-year review cycle for published procedures. This paper outlines necessary amendments to ensure that the regulatory framework supports the practical work of IFPDSPs and promotes consistency and harmonization between aerodrome operators and AIS/AIM service providers, thereby safeguarding global navigation integrity.

1.3 Furthermore, this paper addresses the need for consolidated data resolutions to ensure consistency between publications and aeronautical charts. It also provides essential editorial and technical corrections to safety-critical references within Annex 11, Annex 15, and PANS-AIM (Doc 10066) to ensure global regulatory accuracy and consistency.

2. DISCUSSION

Alignment of Data Provision with Periodic IFP Reviews

Regulatory Requirement

2.1 ICAO Annex 11, Appendix 7 and ICAO Doc 8168 Volume II, require IFPs to be subject to periodic review at intervals not exceeding five years.

2.2 Annex 11 Appendix 7 section 6 — *A State shall ensure that maintenance and periodic review of instrument flight procedures for aerodromes and airspace under the authority of the State are conducted. Each State shall establish an interval for periodic review of instrument flight procedures not exceeding five years.*

2.3 ICAO Doc 8168 Vol. II (Part 1, Section 2, Chapter 4, 4.3.3.3) — *Published procedures shall be subjected to a periodic review to ensure that they continue to comply with changing criteria and meet user requirements. The individual States shall establish the interval for periodic review of instrument flight procedures according to the State’s regulatory framework. The maximum interval for this review shall be five years. (See Annex 11, Appendix 7). Guidance on periodic reviews can be found in the Quality Assurance Manual for Flight Procedure Design (Doc 9906), Volume 1, and in the Manual on the Development of a Regulatory Framework for Instrument Flight Procedure Design Service (Doc 10068).*

Implementation Constraint

2.4 In practice, Instrument Flight Procedure Design Service Providers (IFPDSPs) are often unable to complete these reviews due to the unavailability of updated aerodrome data, including obstacle information and surveyed coordinates. While Annex 15, Chapter 6 requires that aeronautical data be kept up to date, there is no corresponding provision in Annex 14 or Annex 15 establishing a defined maximum interval for aerodrome data periodic reviews and updates.

Resulting Gap

2.5 This lack of alignment between procedure review requirements and data provision obligations creates a regulatory gap, limiting the ability of service providers to validate and maintain IFPs in accordance with ICAO provisions.

Proposed Consideration

2.6 There is a need to strengthen harmonization across ICAO provisions to ensure that aeronautical data and information are provided, maintained, and updated in a timely manner, supporting both periodic IFP reviews and the overall integrity and consistency of the aeronautical information chain.

Consolidation of Publication and Charting Resolutions

Current Situation

2.7 A distinction currently exists between “Publication” and “Charting” resolutions, which may lead to inconsistencies and confusion among data originators, AIS/AIM service providers and stakeholders.

Proposed Consideration

2.8 The consolidation of publication and charting resolutions into a single harmonized standard would enhance data consistency, reduce ambiguity, and support the accurate representation of aeronautical information across all platforms.

Regulatory Consistency in ICAO Annex 4, Annex 15 and PANS-AIM References, Formats, and Terminology

Removal of Non-Existent Aerodrome Obstacle Chart – ICAO Type C

2.9 The Aerodrome Obstacle Chart – ICAO Type C is non-existent in the current version of ICAO Annex 4. However, a technical oversight exists where symbol references for Type C remain in Appendix 2 ICAO chart symbol, table name Symbols for Aerodrome Obstacle Charts -Type A, B and C, misleading chart originators and AIS personnel into believing that Type C is a valid or required practice.

2.10 The retention of these symbols contradicts the modern shift toward Digital Terrain and Obstacle Data (eTOD) and introduces ambiguity in aeronautical charting symbology.

SYMBOLS FOR AERODROME OBSTACLE CHARTS - TYPE A, B AND C

		Plan	Profile			Plan	Profile
162	Tree or shrub	✱		167	Terrain penetrating obstacle plane		
163	Pole, tower, spire, antenna, etc.	⊙		168	Escarpment		
164	Building or large structure	■		169	Stopway SWY		
165	Railroad	—+—+—+—+—		170	Clearway CWY		
166	Transmission line or overhead cable	—T—T—					

Technical Reference Discrepancy (ICAO Annex 15 and Annex 11)

2.11 Annex 15, section 6.3.2.3 (z) currently contains a Note referring to Annex 11, section 2.31 for contingency measures. Verification of Annex 11 reveals that section 2.31 pertains to Language Proficiency, while Section 2.32 specifically covers Contingency Arrangements.

2.12 A cross-reference in Annex 15 incorrectly points to a provision in Annex 11 that is not related to contingency arrangements, which may lead to misinterpretation during ATS disruption scenarios. The reference should point to the appropriate regulatory requirement.

Technical Reference Discrepancy (ICAO Doc 8126 and PANS-AIM)

2.13 PANS-AIM, Appendix 2, which specifies the contents of the Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP), includes a section for AD 2.25 (Visual segment surface (VSS) penetration). In contrast, ICAO Doc 8126, Part III Appendix B makes no reference to AD 2.25, resulting in a discrepancy between the two documents.

2.14 It is recommended that ICAO Doc 8126, Part III Appendix B be updated to incorporate AD 2.25, or that PANS-AIM, Appendix 2 be revised accordingly, to ensure alignment and eliminate ambiguity between these references.

Global Uniformity of Date-Time Formats in ICAO Doc 10066 (PANS-AIM)

2.15 In recent revisions of ICAO Doc 10066 (PANS-AIM) Appendix 4 – *Instructions for the Completion of the SNOWTAM Format*, the day of the month designator has been updated from "YY" to "DD".

MMDDGGgg = date/time of observation/measurement, whereby:
MM = month, e.g. January = 01, December = 12
DD = day of the month
GGgg = time in hours (GG) and minutes (gg) UTC;

2.16 SNOWTAM Format: While the primary format has been updated, Note 2 — *When reporting on more than one runway and individual dates/times of observation/assessment are indicated by repeated Item B, the latest date/time of observation/assessment is inserted in the abbreviated heading (MMYYGGgg)*, immediately following the format description still reflects the outdated "YY" nomenclature.

2.17 ASHTAM Format: Currently, Appendix 5, maintains the "YY" format. For consistency, the ASHTAM format should be harmonized with the SNOWTAM "DD" standard.

Volcanic Ash Notification Reference Error (ASHTAM)

2.18 There is an incorrect reference in the ASHTAM distribution standards. ICAO Doc 10066 (PANS-AIM) section 5.4.2.2 currently points to 5.2.5.1.6, which describes errors occur in a NOTAM, rather than the intended section 5.2.5.1.5 which deals specifically with ASHTAM.

2.19 An incorrect internal reference within the ASHTAM provisions currently points to a section associated with NOTAM procedures rather than ASHTAM-specific requirements. This should be *corrected* to ensure proper regulatory linkage.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) note the information contained in this paper; and
- b) consider the desirability of alignment of data provision with periodic IFP reviews, ensuring aeronautical data is updated in synchronization with the five-year cycle;
- c) consider the standardization of the Publication and Charting Resolution;
- d) consider the need for corrections to ICAO Annex 4, Annex 15 and PANS-AIM references, formats, and terminology; and
- e) discuss any relevant matters as appropriate.

— END —