



ICAO

International Civil Aviation Organization

The Eighth Meeting of the Asia/Pacific  
Aerodrome Assistance Working Group (AP-AA/WG/8)

(Bangkok, Thailand, 21 to 24 April 2026)

## Agenda Item 10: Any Other Business

### COORDINATION MECHANISM AMONG AVIATION, LAND USE AND ENVIRONMENTAL AUTHORITIES

(Presented by DGCA India)

#### SUMMARY

This Paper presents and highlights the need to strengthen coordination among aviation, land-use, and environmental authorities to support aerodrome safety and sustainable development. USOAP-CMA findings in the Asia-Pacific region indicate recurring deficiencies in coordination, particularly concerning obstacle limitation surfaces (OLS), wildlife hazard management, and environmental approval processes.

The paper outlines common challenges and presents selected State practices, including India, where mechanisms such as the Airfield Environment Management Committee (AEMC) facilitate coordination between aerodrome operators and local authorities. Recent regulatory developments under the Bharatiya Vayuyan Niyam (BVN), 2025 further enhance coordination by empowering local authorities to take enforcement action on activities affecting aviation safety, addressing ICAO USOAP-CMA Protocol Question PQ 8.333 .

The paper emphasizes formal coordination mechanisms, clear roles and responsibilities, and integration of aviation requirements into land-use planning.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Safe and efficient aerodrome operations require effective coordination among aviation authorities, land-use planning agencies, and environmental authorities.

1.2 ICAO Annex 14, Annex 16, and Annex 19 emphasize safeguarding aerodrome surroundings from obstacles, incompatible land use, and environmental hazards.

1.3 USOAP-CMA findings in the Asia-Pacific region have identified recurring deficiencies in inter-agency coordination. Protocol Question 8.333 seeks information on:

*“Has the State promulgated regulations to:*

*a) require a wildlife (birds and animals) strike hazard study or assessment for each of its aerodromes; and*

*b) control the development of facilities likely to attract wildlife on or in the vicinity of an aerodrome?”*  
*Ref A14 Vol. I, 9.4.1 & 9.4.4, A14 Vol. I, 9.4.5 ,Doc 9774 App. 1, 4.12.*

1.4 This paper outlines key challenges, shares State practices, and proposes measures to strengthen coordination.

## 2. DISCUSSION

### ICAO Provisions and Expectations

2.1 ICAO SARPs require States to ensure protection of aerodrome environments from hazards related to obstacles, land use, and environmental factors.

2.2 Effective implementation requires coordinated action among aviation, land-use, environmental, and local authorities.

### Common Challenges

2.3 Common issues identified include:

- a) lack of formal coordination mechanisms;
- b) OLS infringements due to unauthorized constructions;
- c) wildlife-attracting activities near aerodromes;
- d) delays in environmental approvals;
- e) fragmented responsibilities and limited data sharing; and
- f) insufficient empowerment of local authorities for enforcement.
- g) Socio-Political & Agricultural Sensitivities: In states with significant agricultural sectors, land-use control is often complicated by decentralized governance and local political interests, making "top-down" mandates from a central Aviation Authority difficult to enforce without local buy-in.

2.4 In several States, the absence of specialized agencies for assessment of aerodrome environment aspects, including OLS, wildlife hazards, and environmental impacts, limits effective risk mitigation. In addition, capacity constraints among local authorities, regulators, and aerodrome operators highlight the need for structured training programmes to support implementation of ICAO requirements, including Critical Element 4 (CE-4) of the USOAP-CMA framework.

2.5 Increased aircraft operations have also amplified noise impacts on residential areas, particularly along approach and departure paths. Limited integration of noise assessment into land-use planning has resulted in incompatible development, underscoring the need for coordinated mechanisms to incorporate noise considerations into planning processes in line with ICAO provisions.

### State Practices

2.6 States have adopted measures such as:

- a) inter-agency coordination committees;
- b) digital systems for obstacle clearance;
- c) integration of aviation requirements into land-use planning; and
- d) stakeholder awareness programmes.

### Example: India

2.7 India has established a multi-agency framework involving aviation, environmental, and land-use authorities.

2.8 The Airfield Environment Management Committee (AEMC) acts as the primary institutional platform for structured coordination between the aerodrome operator and local authorities. It serves as a forum to translate technical aviation requirements into local administrative actions, such as waste management and the regulation of hazardous activities.

2.9 The AEMC facilitates:

- a) stakeholder coordination;
- b) wildlife hazard mitigation;
- c) resolution of land-use issues; and
- d) support for enforcement through local authorities.

2.10 India has also implemented digital systems and regulatory provisions for obstacle management and environmental control.

2.11 Challenges related to coordination and enforcement remain, consistent with regional findings.

2.12 The Bharatiya Vayuyan Niyam (BVN), 2025 provides the legislative "teeth" required to resolve safety issues outside the aerodrome boundary:

- a) Expanded Prohibition Zone: Rule 137 prohibits slaughtering, flaying animals, or depositing rubbish/garbage within a 10 km radius of the Aerodrome Reference Point (ARP).
- b) Wildlife Hazard Management: The rule extends to the development of any facility likely to attract wildlife, specifically citing hotels, meat shops, fish shops, and bone-processing mills.
- c) Verification Mechanism: Local authorities are empowered to grant permissions for such facilities only after receipt of a verification report from the aerodrome operator.
- d) Enforcement: If violations occur, the local authority is empowered to take immediate action against the owner or person in possession in the same manner as they would for unauthorized activities within their jurisdiction.

2.13 These measures support compliance with ICAO requirements and address deficiencies identified under USOAP-CMA Protocol Question PQ 8.333 (Wildlife Hazard Management).

#### Key Considerations

2.14 Effective coordination requires:

- a) clearly defined roles and responsibilities;
- b) formal coordination mechanisms;
- c) empowerment of local authorities;
- d) institutional coordination platforms;
- e) integration with land-use planning;
- f) digital information-sharing systems; and
- g) stakeholder capacity building.
- h) empanelment of expert agencies

### **3. ACTION BY THE MEETING**

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) note the information contained in this paper; and
- b) acknowledge coordination challenges identified under USOAP-CMA;
- c) encourage States to strengthen coordination mechanisms, including empowering local authorities and establishing institutional platforms;

- d) encourage sharing of best practices among States; and
- e) consider development of regional guidance material.

— END —