

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION



**REPORT OF THE FIRST MEETING OF THE APAC PROJECT 30/10 TASK FORCE
(AP30-10/TF/1)**

TANGERANG, INDONESIA, 16 – 18 JUNE 2026

The views expressed in this Report should be taken as those of the
Meeting and not the Organization

Approved by the Meeting
Published by the ICAO Asia and Pacific Office, Bangkok

AP30-10/TF/1
Table of Contents

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	i
Meeting	i
Attendance	i
Officers and Secretariat.....	i
Language and Documentation	i
Opening of the Meeting	i
Draft Conclusions, Conclusions, Draft Decisions and Decisions of AP30-10/TF – Definition	ii
List of Draft Conclusions, Conclusions, Draft Decisions and Decisions.....	ii
REPORT ON AGENDA ITEMS.....	1
Agenda Item 1: Adoption of Agenda.....	1
Agenda Item 2: States Challenges and Implementation Plan	1
Agenda Item 3: Review and Update Work Plan	12
Agenda Item 4: Any Other Business.....	15
Agenda Item 5: Date and Venue of Next Meeting.....	17
Closing of the Meeting.....	17

APPENDICES TO THE REPORT

Appendix A: List of Participants..... A-1

Appendix B: List of Working and Information PapersB-1

Appendix C: Draft AP30-10/TF Terms of ReferenceC-1

INTRODUCTION

Meeting

1.1 The First Meeting of the APAC Project 30/10 Task Force (AP30-10/TF/1) was held from 16 to 18 June 2026, in Tangerang, Indonesia. The Meeting was graciously hosted by AirNav Indonesia.

Attendance

2.1 There were 46 in-person and 30 online participants registered for the Meeting from 18 States, one Coordination Group and three international organizations, including Australia, Bangladesh, China, Hong Kong China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Pakistan, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, United States, IATA, IFATCA and ICAO.

2.2 A list of participants is provided at **Appendix A** to the report.

Officers and Secretariat

3.1 Mr. Setio Anggoro, Director of Operations, AirNav Indonesia, presided over the AP30-10/TF/1, as Chairperson.

3.2 Mr. Manjunath Krishna Nelli, Regional Officer Air Traffic Management (ATM), Mr. Mior Adli Bin Mior Sallehuddin, Regional Officer ATM, and Mr. Hiroyuki Takata, Regional Officer ATM were Secretaries for the Meeting. They were supported by Dr. Prakayphet Chalayonnawin, Programme Analysis Associate ATM.

Language and Documentation

4.1 The AP30-10/TF met as a plenary throughout the Meeting. The working language of the Meeting was English for all documentation and this Report. A total of 10 Working Papers (WPs), three Information Papers (IPs) and seven presentations considered by the Meeting.

4.2 The list of working and information papers is at **Appendix B** to the report.

DISCLAIMER: The presentation of material in this report does not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of ICAO, Asia/Pacific Air Navigation Planning and Implementation Regional Group (APANPIRG) or ATM Sub-Group of APANPIRG or AP30-10/TF concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Opening of the Meeting

Chairperson of AP30-10/TF

5.1 Mr. Setio Anggoro welcomed all the participants to the Meeting and highlighted the importance of the Project 30/10 implementation.

ICAO APAC Office

5.2 On behalf of Mr. Tao Ma, Regional Director of the ICAO Asia and Pacific (APAC) Office, Mr. Manjunath Krishna Nelli welcomed all participants to the Meeting.

5.3 The Meeting was provided with a brief background on Project 30/10. It was informed that the project was a global campaign, discussed and endorsed at the Fourteenth Air Navigation Conference (AN-Conf/14) in 2024. The Meeting noted ***AN-Conf/14 Recommendation 3.1/1***, which called for the optimized implementation of longitudinal separations of 55.5 km (30 NM) or less in oceanic and remote airspace, and 19 km (10 NM) or less elsewhere.

5.4 The Meeting was informed of ***Draft Decision ATM/SG/13-13*** to establish the APAC Project 30/10 Task Force, which was subsequently endorsed by APANPIRG through ***Decision APANPIRG/36/7: Establishment of APAC Project 30/10 Task Force***.

Draft Conclusions, Conclusions, Draft Decisions and Decisions of AP30-10/TF – Definition

6.1 The AP30-10/TF recorded its actions in the form of Draft Conclusions, Conclusions, Draft Decisions and Decisions within the following definitions:

- a) **Draft Conclusions** of the AP30-10/TF deal with matters that, according to APANPIRG terms of reference, require the attention of States, or action by the ICAO in accordance with established procedures;
- b) **Conclusions** of the AP30-10/TF deal with matters of a technical nature relating to regional guidance material for publication on the ICAO APAC Office website.
- c) **Draft Decisions** of the AP30-10/TF deal with the matters of concern only to APANPIRG and its contributory bodies; and
- d) **Decisions** of the AP30-10/TF relate solely to matters dealing with the internal working arrangements of AP30-10/TF.

List of Draft Conclusions, Conclusions, Draft Decisions and Decisions

7.1 List of Draft Conclusions

Nil.

7.2 List of Conclusions

Nil.

7.3 List of Draft Decisions

Draft Decision AP30-10/TF/1-1: APAC Project 30/10 Task Force (AP30-10/TF) Terms of Reference (TOR)	
What: That, the AP30-10/TF TOR at Appendix C to the Report be adopted.	Expected impact: ☐ Political / Global ☐ Inter-regional ☐ Economic ☐ Environmental ☒ Ops/Technical
Why: To support the Task Force in meeting its established objectives.	Follow-up: ☐ Required from States
When: 7-Aug-26	Status: Draft to be adopted by Subgroup
Who: ☒ Sub groups ☒ APAC States ☒ ICAO APAC RO ☐ ICAO HQ ☐ Other:	

7.4 List of Decisions

Nil.

REPORT ON AGENDA ITEMS

Agenda Item 1: Adoption of Agenda

- 1.1 The Meeting adopted the provisional agenda, as shown below:
- a) Agenda Item 1 – Adoption of Agenda
 - b) Agenda Item 2 – States Challenges and Implementation Plan
 - c) Agenda Item 3 – Review and Update Work Plan
 - d) Agenda Item 4 – Any Other Business
 - e) Agenda Item 5 – Date and Venue of Next Meeting
-

Agenda Item 2: States Challenges and Implementation Plan

APAC Project 30/10: Status of Separation Minima between Incheon FIR and Adjacent FIRs and Directions for Improvement (WP/02)

2.1 The Republic of Korea presented current horizontal separation minima applied at Incheon Flight Information Region (FIR) boundaries, highlighting gaps relative to Project 30/10 targets, and proposals for cooperative, phased actions for implementation.

- 2.2 The Meeting noted the regional air traffic context as follows:
- a) APAC region remained the world's largest air traffic market, accounting for 33.7 per cent of global revenue passenger-kilometres (RPKs), with 16.7 per cent growth in 2024;
 - b) Incheon FIR traffic had recovered strongly: 788,531 annual flights in 2025 (daily average 2,160), an increase of 9.2 per cent from 2024; and
 - c) SADLI, adjacent to the Shanghai FIR, remained the busiest Transfer of Control (TOC) point, handling approximately 228,000 flights in 2025.

2.3 The Meeting was informed that current longitudinal separation minima at Incheon FIR boundaries as follows:

- a) adjacent FIRs: Fukuoka FIR (east/south), Shanghai FIR (west), Pyongyang FIR (north). All Category S airspace, theoretically permitting 10 NM;
- b) actual longitudinal separation minima applied at the FIR boundaries TOC points were generally greater:
 - i) most TOC points: 20 NM;
 - ii) SADLI (to China): 10 minutes – highlights significant optimization need;
 - iii) limited cases: 10 NM (specific city pairs) or 15 NM (certain times);
 - iv) MUGUS (to Southeast Asia): 60 NM or 30 NM depending on destination-asymmetry created departure delays and user dissatisfaction; and
 - v) ATOTI (from Southeast Asia): 30 NM.

- 2.4 The Meeting was informed the following challenges and considerations:
- a) manual flight information exchange at SADLI increased workload; AIDC-enabled automatic hand-off arrangements needed;
 - b) increased traffic density from reduced separation required harmonized methods for determining Air Traffic Control (ATC) capacity (especially instantaneous capacity);
 - c) the need for better traffic demand forecasting and cross-border Air Traffic Flow Management (ATFM) cooperation;
 - d) separation reduction might constitute a "significant change" under SMS – common guidance on safety risk assessment and acceptable level of safety should be developed; and
 - e) implementation required cooperation among States/Air Traffic Services (ATS) units on transfer procedures, Letter of Agreements (LOAs), and contingency plans.

2.5 Information was provided on a phased, safety-oriented action plan based on technical and operational review. The Republic of Korea would actively participate in the AP30-10/TF, sharing experience on AIDC, information sharing, safety monitoring, training, ATFM, and capacity management.

2.6 China, while expressing support the proposal of implementation of reduce longitudinal separation minimum noted the following aspects:

- a) AIDC implementation would be discussed at the China and the Republic of Korea bilateral meeting;
- b) ATS route Y655 was established crossing ATS route A593. This newly added route had further complicated the airspace structure of this area and the separation minima for flight operations within the corridor required further evaluation; and
- c) due to uncoordinated flights in the area, the operational separation minima in this area must be evaluated prudently.

2.7 The Chairperson appreciated the updates from the Republic of Korea and feedback from China and encouraged them to continue the bilateral coordination for implementation of reduced horizontal separation.

Indonesia's Operational Experience in Implementing 30 NM Longitudinal and 10 NM Surveillance Separation and Proposed Implementation Framework (WP/03)

2.8 Indonesia provided an update on its implementation of reduced separation minima [30 NM longitudinal in remote (Category R) airspace, 10 NM in surveillance (Category S) airspace] within Ujung Pandang FIR and proposed a structured implementation framework for regional adoption.

2.9 The Meeting-noted the current implementation status as follows:

- a) Ujung Pandang FIR: 30 NM longitudinal separation applied at 18 TOC points (15 with Brisbane FIR and three with Port Moresby FIR) based on RNP 4 operations, supported by overlapping surveillance, AIDC, and bilateral LOAs;
- b) Manila FIR boundary: trial of 30 NM longitudinal separation commenced on 1 April 2026 on ATS routes A461, G578 and B472. Permanent implementation planned for June 2026;
- c) Jakarta FIR: 30 NM longitudinal separation not yet applied. The implementation required completion of ATC system migration [new Jakarta ATS Centre (JATSC), targeted June 2026], followed by safety risk assessment and procedural changes;

- d) Oakland Oceanic Sector 5: currently 50 NM longitudinal separation based on RNP 10. Future reduction pending coordination; and
- e) Performance-based Communications and Surveillance (PBCS) (RCP 240 and RSP 180): implemented at Ujung Pandang Area Control Centre (ACC). Publication of PBCS requirements in Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP) remained pending for both of Jakarta and Ujung Pandang FIRs.

2.10 The Meeting noted that key enabling conditions for implementation included surveillance coverage, AIDC, surveillance data sharing, bilateral LOAs, Air Traffic Management (ATM) automation capability, and trained ATC personnel.

2.11 Information was provided on an implementation framework comprising four interdependent pillars. The Meeting noted that the framework organized the key enabling dimensions of Project 30/10 implementation into four interdependent pillars, all converging to produce a coherent set of Project 30/10 rules and procedures:

- a) **Regulatory Framework:** review and amendment of civil aviation regulations, ATM procedures, and LOA instruments to accommodate reduced separation standards;
- b) **Airspace Organisation:** definition of vertical and horizontal limits, entry/exit point designations, airspace category determinations, near-boundary operation procedures, and cross-FIR coordination arrangements;
- c) **ATM Systems and Facilities:** verification and upgrading of ATM automation systems capabilities (including conflict detection tools, safety nets, and data-sharing arrangements), surveillance infrastructure [Automatic Dependent Surveillance - Broadcast (ADS-B), Automatic Dependent Surveillance - Contract (ADS-C), Controller Pilot Data Link Communications (CPDLC), where applicable], and flight planning system support; and
- d) **Personnel:** identification of impacted personnel, development and delivery of training (including PBN, procedure-specific, and simulation), ATC buy-in, and performance assessment.

2.12 A proposal was presented for the Meeting to adopt the framework as a regional reference methodology and develop a practical implementation guide/checklist for APAC States/Administrations. The detailed proposal was presented in **AP30-10/TF/1 WP/09**.

2.13 It was expected that the application of a common framework across the region could promote harmonization of implementation approaches, facilitate identification of gaps and interdependencies, and support systematic safety risk assessment at each implementation phase — consistent with the objectives of APAC Project 30/10.

2.14 The Meeting appreciated Indonesia for sharing the experience of implementation of reduced horizontal separation and lessons learnt from the process.

Identifying the Technical and Operational Enablers for Successful Implementation of Optimized Longitudinal Separation Minima (WP/04, SP/07)

2.15 The Meeting was informed of Pakistan's current separation minima applied, infrastructure status, and challenges related to implementing the 30 NM (oceanic/remote) and 10 NM (surveillance) longitudinal separation minimum under APAC Project 30/10.

2.16 The Meeting was informed that Pakistan had full ATS surveillance coverage [mode S Surveillance Secondary Radar (SSR) + ADS-B] and Very High Frequency (VHF) radio communications across its entire airspace, except a small gap at the Lahore and Urumqi FIR boundary. Pakistan currently applied 15 NM horizontal separation for enroute and 5 NM horizontal separation for terminal area. Pakistan was studying feasibility of reducing ATC separation minima to 10 NM enroute surveillance airspace.

2.17 The paper highlighted airspace interface challenges such as:

- a) Kabul FIR (non-operational ATS): 15-minute longitudinal separation. Due to ongoing contingency situation in Kabul FIR, 50 NM separation at TOC points could not be implemented;
- b) India (Delhi and Mumbai FIRs): 50 NM longitudinal separation at TOC points. Pakistan had initiated discussions with India for reduction of longitudinal separation to 30 NM;
- c) Muscat FIR: currently 5-minute longitudinal separation at TOC points. 30 NM longitudinal separation trial with AIDC was planned. Key issue for implementation of reduced longitudinal separation was that the traffic accepted at 30 NM from Muscat ACC must then be transferred to Delhi ACC at 50 NM, risking loss of optimum cruising levels; and
- d) Tehran FIR: future consideration once airspace conditions improve.

2.18 India also opined that the varied separation standard at its western and eastern boundary increases the controllers' workload and emphasized on harmonized separation standard across State boundaries.

2.19 The paper noted the following as required enablers and concerns for application of reduced longitudinal separation:

- a) CNS facilities: 10 NM separation required redundant surveillance and voice communications, and capable ATM systems. 30 NM for oceanic/remote airspace require RNP 4 or RNP 2, RCP 240, RSP 180, ADS-C and CPDLC implemented;
- b) cost-benefit: low-density traffic areas might not justify investment in required facilities;
- c) ACC sectorization: large sector sizes with reduced separation might increase controller workload. Guidance was needed on sector dimensions, complexity indicators, and workload assessment; and
- d) GNSS Radio Frequency Interference (RFI): ADS-B-only surveillance could be vulnerable to GNSS RFI, which could disrupt surveillance-based separation.

2.20 The Meeting noted the various separation minima being applied by Pakistan across six adjacent FIRs and within the two FIRs internally. The Meeting also took note of the challenges for implementation.

2.21 ICAO informed the Meeting about the development of the regional guidance document for reporting of GNSS RFI and coordination mechanisms so that it could be done in a harmonized way within the region. ICAO also informed the States/Administrations to take note of the development of regional guidance document on airport and airspace capacity assessment for assisting in airspace capacity assessment and ATC sectorization planning.

2.22 The Meeting also discussed the challenges of non-harmonized implementation of ATC separation due to downstream FIR constraints and consequent workload increase for controllers. The Meeting also discussed the need for contingency planning in case of GNSS RFI and loss of surveillance (ADS-B) data. India informed that the GNSS RFI not only affects ADS-B but also RNP capability of aircraft. The reduced separation application in oceanic airspace which uses RNP4/RNP2 would also be affected. Therefore, contingency procedures for the loss of RNP en-route needs to be developed.

2.23 The Meeting appreciated Pakistan for presenting the details and noted the plans for application of 10 NM ATC separation in Pakistan airspace.

Hong Kong China's Achievements in Longitudinal Separation Reduction at FIR Boundaries and Call for Collaboration for Further Reduction (WP/05)

2.24 Hong Kong China presented achievements in reducing longitudinal separation minima and identified key challenges that required collaborative resolution to further advance Project 30/10 objective.

2.25 The paper noted the operational achievements such as:

- a) 30 NM longitudinal separation on ATS routes A461/M501 (NOMAN) since 2021;
- b) 30 NM longitudinal separation on ATS route A583 (SABNO) since 2024; and
- c) 20 NM longitudinal separation on ATS routes L642 and M771 since 2024.

2.26 Information was provided on the technical readiness of the Hong Kong FIR. The Meeting was noted that Hong Kong FIR had full surveillance coverage, mature ATM automation systems, and well-established AIDC transfer arrangements with most adjacent ACCs.

2.27 The paper noted the following key challenges to address:

- a) **internal capacity enhancement project:** priority focus before implementing further separation reductions;
- b) **readiness of downstream/adjacent ACCs:** harmonized separation standards between upstream and downstream sectors was essential. Disparities could increase controller workload and safety risks;
- c) **TOC points without auto hand-off:** implementing 10 NM longitudinal separation would significantly increase controller workload. 20 NM as an interim standard could be a pragmatic approach where automated hand-off was unavailable; and
- d) **Performance-based Navigation (PBN) capability and aircraft equipage:** 30 NM longitudinal separation in oceanic/remote airspace required RNP 4/RNP 2, ADS-C, CPDLC, and airline operational readiness (training, certification, fleet capability).

2.28 Hong Kong China reaffirmed full commitment to Project 30/10 and the *APAC Seamless ANS Plan*, and readiness to collaborate with States/Administrations to progressively reduce longitudinal separation minima at the common TOC points.

2.29 On query from China regarding the application of reduced longitudinal separation between Guangzhou and Hong Kong FIRs, it was confirmed that Hong Kong China had been collaborating and discussing closely with counterparts in China in harmonizing the separation standard through tripartite meetings between Hong Kong, Guangzhou and Shanghai ACCs.

2.30 The Meeting discussed the requirement of automatic hand-off requirement for transfer of control between adjacent control centres for application of surveillance separation of 10 NM. The Meeting noted requirements for AIDC coordination in case of reduced procedural separation application. The Secretariat informed the Meeting that the requirement of automatic hand-off for application of 10 NM separation as existing in the current *APAC Seamless ANS Plan* would not be migrated to *APAC Air Navigation Plan (ANP) Volume III*, which had been under revision.

2.31 India emphasized importance of automated hand-off for 10 NM TOC spacing which might not be possible as Flight Data Processing System (FDPS) of the ATM Automation System (ATMAS) of the both the ATC units needs to be integrated. India suggested formalizing AIDC TOC and AOC function as auto hand-off within overlapping surveillance coverage area.

2.32 The Meeting was informed that Hong Kong China was planning for implementing independent parallel approaches for Hong Kong International Airport three runway system and internal airspace review as part of airspace capacity enhancement project.

Airline Capabilities Supporting AP30-10 Project (WP/06)

2.33 IATA presented IATA's survey results on airline fleet capabilities for RNP 2, RNP 4, and PBCS to support the implementation of reduced separation minima under APAC Project 30/10.

2.34 The paper noted the survey methodology as:

- a) 14 airlines responded: eight major APAC carriers, three second-tier APAC carriers, and three major carriers from other regions operating regularly in APAC; and
- b) data was reasonably indicative of total fleet capabilities [excluding Low-cost Carriers (LCCs)].

2.35 The following were the key findings relative to wide-body jets (13 airlines):

- a) almost all major carriers reported **100% fleet capability** for RNP2, RNP4, and PBCS;
- b) exceptions: one airline at 95% PBCS approval; one with no RNP 2 approval; and
- c) second-tier airlines showed lower PBCS approvals.

2.36 The following were key findings relative to narrow-body jets (11 airlines):

- a) majority reported full fleet RNP2 and RNP4 capability; and
- b) PBCS approval varies: four airlines at 100% and five airlines at 0%.

2.37 The Meeting was informed of the data gap resulting from the absence of LCCs in the dataset. It was noted, however, that their short- to medium-haul networks typically operated within surveillance airspace where 5 NM separation was applied.

2.38 The paper noted the operational and environmental benefits of reduced separation such as:

- a) greater route capacity, preferred flight level access, more Continuous Descent Operations (CDO);
- b) avoiding lower cruise levels saves fuel:
 - i) 4,000 ft below: 5 – 6% fuel increase (110–370 kg/h);
 - ii) 2,000 ft below: 2 – 3% fuel increase (60–170 kg/h); and

- iii) arrival holding/level-offs increase fuel burn significantly (e.g. wide-body at FL200 – 10,000 ft: ~ 40 kg/min extra).

2.39 IATA concluded that IATA and member airlines supported Project 30/10 to apply the most efficient separation standards where not already in use.

2.40 The Meeting noted the distinction in equipage requirements for RNP 2 continental and RNP 2 oceanic. The Meeting also noted the requirement for PBCS approval for application of performance-based separation. Malaysia and India commented that the equipage data in real time varies from Flight Plan (FPL) derived data. IATA assured the Meeting that they would investigate the discrepancy.

2.41 As regards to mandating equipage capability, IATA stated that they supported creating an enabling environment for encouraging “best equipped best served” and without denying access to non-equipped aircraft.

2.42 The Meeting also noted that the fleet capabilities and flight planning accuracy were crucial for application of reduced longitudinal separation and hence States/Administrations should work with the airspace users.

2.43 The Meeting appreciated the data provided by IATA in the paper.

Project 30/10: Operational Perspectives on Network Capacity, Safety, and Human Performance (WP/07, SP/02)

2.44 This paper, submitted by IFATCA, addressed the implementation of Project 30/10 in the APAC region, which aimed at enhancing air traffic efficiency through reduced separation standards.

2.45 The following are the key points highlighted in the paper:

- a) network approach needed: the project should be seen as a network performance initiative, not just a separation reduction;
- b) controller workload and capacity: reduced separation increases theoretical capacity but also raise complexity, monitoring needs, and tactical interventions. Human performance limits might be reached before airspace capacity limits;
- c) coordination across boundaries: benefits in one sector could be lost if adjacent sectors or FIRs were not harmonized. Updated agreements and traffic flow management were essential;
- d) technology and automation: success dependent on reliable CNS/ATM systems, safety nets, data links, and contingency plans for system degradation;
- e) training: controllers must train for peak demand, abnormal situations, and degraded operations, not just routine reduced ATC separation minima;
- f) safety assessment: comprehensive safety assessments (per ICAO principles) must cover normal, abnormal, and emergency conditions, with attention to reduced operational margins; and
- g) positive safety culture: open reporting of hazards and incidents without blame was critical for identifying risks and improving procedures.

2.46 The Meeting noted that human performance limit as a crucial factor to be considered for successful implementation of Project 30/10. The Meeting also took note of the challenges of mixed capability of aircraft operating during transition period of implementation.

2.47 The Meeting appreciated the insights provided by IFATCA from the controller perspective. Indonesia reiterated the emphasis on controllers' cognitive skill training for application of multiple separation minimum. Pakistan noted the challenges of airspace complexity and consequent requirement for rearranging the traffic flow to meet separation standard requirement at TOC points.

2.48 The Meeting supported the idea of prioritization of implementation planning based on traffic flow density at TOC points.

North Pacific (NOPAC) Route System Redesign (SP/03)

2.49 The Meeting received a presentation from the Japan on the NOPAC Route System Redesign project and the role of the Informal Pacific Air Traffic Control Coordinating Group (IPACG) in supporting airspace modernisation initiatives across the NOPAC region. The Meeting was informed that IPACG, jointly sponsored by Japan Civil Aviation Bureau (JCAB) and the United States Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), had provided an effective forum for cooperation among Air Navigation Service Providers (ANSPs), airspace users and industry stakeholders for many years, contributing to improvements in oceanic air traffic management through route optimisation, data link implementation and reduced separation standards.

2.50 Information was provided on the evolution of the NOPAC route system and the progressive implementation of advanced communication and surveillance capabilities within the oceanic airspace of Fukuoka FIR. The Meeting noted that the introduction of ADS-C and CPDLC, followed by the implementation of 50 NM longitudinal separation minima, 30 NM longitudinal and lateral separation minima, and subsequently RCP 240 and RSP 180 specifications, had enabled the gradual enhancement of operational efficiency and capacity within the NOPAC region. Traffic statistics presented during the Meeting indicated continued growth in oceanic traffic volumes and a high proportion of PBCS-capable aircraft operating on NOPAC routes.

2.51 Regarding the NOPAC Route System Redesign project, the Meeting noted that the initiative had originated from discussions within IPACG following the introduction of 23 NM lateral separation minima. The redesign had been developed collaboratively by JCAB, FAA, IATA and other stakeholders and implemented through a phased approach commencing in December 2021. The objective had been to improve airspace utilisation and operational efficiency through the more effective application of PBCS-based separation standards. The Meeting further noted that close engagement with airspace users throughout the planning and implementation process had been an important contributor to the project's progress and success.

2.52 The Meeting further noted that implementation challenges had been encountered, particularly in relation to data link outages and service degradations experienced during 2024. These events had affected confidence in data link availability and resulted in the postponement of Phase 3 implementation pending further assessment. The Meeting was informed that JCAB and FAA had undertaken extensive coordination through IPACG and bilateral arrangements to address these concerns. It was also noted that utilisation of certain redesigned routes had been lower than originally anticipated, prompting further analysis of traffic patterns and route design in consultation with operators.

2.53 With respect to contingency arrangements, the Meeting reviewed the operational impact of data link failures in oceanic airspace. It was noted that such events could require aircraft to revert to HF communications and necessitate the suspension of reduced ADS-C-based separation minima, thereby increasing operational workload and affecting traffic flows. The Meeting was informed that Anchorage ARTCC and Fukuoka ACC had continuously refined coordination and contingency procedures through LOAs and supporting Memoranda of Understanding to provide more flexible responses to operational disruptions.

2.54 In conclusion, the Meeting noted the lessons learned from the NOPAC Route System Redesign project, including the importance of reliable data link infrastructure, effective contingency planning and close coordination among neighbouring ANSPs. Emphasis was placed on the importance of continuous collaboration with airspace users, including IATA and airline operators. The Meeting noted that such cooperation had been a key factor in the successful implementation of previous initiatives, including the introduction of 50 NM and 30 NM separation minima, and remained essential for the continued advancement of the NOPAC Route System Redesign. The Meeting recognized the valuable role of IPACG in facilitating cooperation among States, ANSPs and airspace users in support of air traffic management improvements across the Pacific region.

2.55 The Meeting appreciated IPACG for providing valuable inputs to the forum. The Meeting took note of the lessons learnt, the data link outage events and contingency planning to ensure the safe operations of flights.

Reduced Oceanic Separation: Implementation and Interoperability (SP/06)

2.56 The Meeting received a presentation from the Informal South Pacific Air Traffic Services Coordinating Group (ISPACG) on the implementation of 30 NM lateral and 30 NM longitudinal separation (30/30) in oceanic airspace. The presentation outlined the role of ISPACG in facilitating regional cooperation amongst States, ANSPs, and airspace users to support the safe and harmonised introduction of reduced separation standards across the South Pacific region.

2.57 ISPACG highlighted that the implementation of 30/30 separation had required extensive coordination between participating ANSPs and airspace users. Through dedicated working groups and collaborative planning, stakeholders had aligned operational procedures, safety requirements, and implementation timelines, thereby ensuring a consistent application of the separation standard across FIR boundaries. Close cooperation with airspace users had also been essential in ensuring that aircraft met the necessary equipage and operational requirements.

2.58 The Meeting noted that a comprehensive regional safety assessment had been undertaken to support the implementation. Safety studies, hazard identification activities, operational data analysis, and post-implementation reviews had been conducted collaboratively, allowing participating organisations to share expertise, resources, and lessons learned. This cooperative approach had reduced duplication of effort and contributed to a common understanding of operational risks and mitigation measures.

2.59 Information was provided on key lessons learned from the implementation of 30/30 separation. These included the importance of maintaining data link performance, ensuring the accuracy of flight plan information, and applying harmonised operational procedures across FIR boundaries. It was emphasized that effective coordination between ANSPs and airspace users remained a critical factor in maintaining the safety and efficiency benefits of reduced separation operations.

2.60 The Meeting recognized that the successful implementation of 30/30 separation had demonstrated the value of regional collaboration and partnership with airspace users. The coordinated approach adopted through ISPACG had enhanced interoperability, supported seamless operations across the South Pacific region, and provided a framework for addressing future ATM challenges and opportunities.

2.61 The Meeting appreciated ISPACG for providing inputs on the implementation of 30/30 separation in South Pacific airspace.

Operational Status of PBCS Implementation by States (SP/04)

2.62 The Meeting reviewed the status of current and planned implementation of Performance-Based Horizontal Separation Minima in the APAC region based on the survey conducted by the Secretariat. The Meeting noted that responses had been received from 18 States/Administrations, namely Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, Hong Kong China, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nepal, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, the United States and Viet Nam. While the responses provided useful information on the regional implementation status, the Meeting noted that a significant number of States had not yet submitted survey responses and encouraged those States to complete and submit the survey at the earliest opportunity.

2.63 Information was provided on the development of the survey questionnaire, which had been based on the relevant provisions and guidance material contained in the appendices to ICAO Doc 9869 *PBCS Manual*. In this regard, the Meeting encouraged States and ANSPs to review the relevant sections of ICAO Doc 9869 when completing the survey and to ensure that survey responses were consistent with the provisions of the Manual. The Meeting also noted that States and ANSPs implementing PBCS were expected to complete all survey sections, namely Group A to E, while States and ANSPs that had not yet implemented PBCS were still expected to complete Group D and E in order to provide information regarding future implementation plans and operational readiness.

2.64 Reference was made to Section 4.2 of ICAO Doc 9869 concerning the responsibilities of the State of the Operator and the State of Registry in relation to PBCS operational approvals. The Meeting recalled that PBCS implementation was not limited to the operational application of PBCS separation minima by ANSPs. Even where PBCS separation minima had not yet been implemented within a State's airspace, the State of the Operator or the State of Registry might still need to approve suitably equipped aircraft and operators for PBCS operations. Such approvals would enable aircraft operators to indicate the appropriate PBCS capabilities and approvals in FPLs when operating in airspace where PBCS procedures were applied. States were therefore encouraged to review their national approval arrangements, as appropriate, to support international PBCS operations.

2.65 With respect to performance monitoring arrangements, information was provided on the role of Central Reporting Agencies (CRAs) within the PBCS framework. The Meeting noted that performance monitoring remained a fundamental element of PBCS implementation and that APANPIRG-recognized CRAs were responsible for collecting, analyzing and reporting operational performance data in support of ongoing compliance monitoring and safety oversight activities.

2.66 Regarding operational implementation requirements, the Meeting noted that States and ANSPs implementing PBCS operations were required to establish a formal service agreement with an APANPIRG-recognized CRA prior to the operational implementation of PBCS separation minima. The Meeting further noted that such arrangements were generally not required during limited trial or validation activities conducted before operational implementation. States and ANSPs planning future implementation were encouraged to engage with the relevant CRA at an early stage in order to facilitate implementation planning, performance monitoring arrangements and the operational approval process.

2.67 Secretariat encouraged States/Administrations to submit the updated PBCS status especially for Group D and E, even if they were not implementing PBCS, as it was necessary for aircraft operators operating in airspace where PBCS had been implemented. ICAO also emphasized the need for States/Administrations to establish formal service agreement with APANPIRG-recognized CRA, before operational implementation of PBCS.

2.68 It was clarified that it was necessary for aircraft operators and ANSPs to sign the PBCS Charter.

Minimum Longitudinal Separation Standards between Fukuoka FIR and Neighbouring FIRs- Japan (IP/02, SP/01)

2.69 Japan outlined the longitudinal separation minimum and coordination procedures between Japan's Fukuoka FIR and adjacent FIRs (i.e. Anchorage Oceanic, Incheon, Khabarovsk, Manila, Oakland Oceanic, Shanghai and Taipei). Harmonized standards, agreed via bilateral LOAs, were essential for safe and efficient international air traffic.

2.70 The paper highlighted key separation standards by FIR:

- a) Anchorage and Oakland Oceanic FIRs: 15 minutes (reducible to 10 minutes with Mach Number Technique, further with ADS-C); lateral separation 100 NM (reducible to 50 NM with RNP 10 and 30 NM with RNP 4);
- b) Incheon FIR: 20 NM (reducible to 15 NM depending on time/day) under AIDC, Category S airspace;
- c) Khabarovsk FIR: 20 NM or 10 minutes depending on route;
- d) Manila FIR: 15 minutes (non-AIDC, Category R), reducible to 10 minutes with Mach Number Technique;
- e) Shanghai FIR: 15 minutes (non-AIDC, Category R); and
- f) Taipei FIR: ranges from 10 – 70 NM under AIDC, Category S, depending on speed differentials and routing.

2.71 The Meeting noted that the application of reduced longitudinal separation minima (30 NM in oceanic/remote airspace and 10 NM in other airspace) was constrained by several factors such as:

- a) reduced separation was limited by surveillance gaps;
- b) non-AIDC environments;
- c) speed differentials;
- d) downstream FIR restrictions.; and
- e) ATS route structure complexity.

2.72 The Meeting was recommended a phased approach considering LOA optimization in the short term, AIDC expansion and ADS-B/PBN enhancements in medium term.

2.73 The Meeting appreciated the detailed explanation by Japan regarding the diverse ATC separation minimum currently implemented with the adjacent seven FIRs. It was also clarified by Japan that the longitudinal separation minima at waypoint ATOTI was 30 NM and not 20 NM as reported in the paper.

Application and Enhancement of Separation Minima in Kuala Lumpur Flight Information Region (KL FIR) and Kota Kinabalu FIR (KK FIR) (IP/03)

2.74 Malaysia presented the ATC separation minima currently implemented and ongoing improvements in Malaysia's two FIRs (i.e. Kota Kinabalu and Kuala Lumpur).

2.75 The current ATC separation minimum implemented, by airspace category:

- a) Terminal Area (Category T): 3 NM at Kuala Lumpur International Airport (WMKK); 5 NM in other terminal areas (reduction to 3 NM under review).

- b) Surveillance Airspace (Category S): standard 5 NM horizontal separation. However, at FIR TOC points, more conservative longitudinal spacing (20 NM, 30 NM, 50 NM, or 10 minutes) applied in accordance with the LOAs with adjacent ATS units.
- c) Remote Airspace (Category R, KL FIR only): currently 50 NM procedural separation. A trial of 30 NM longitudinal separation (PBCS-based) was underway, with permanent implementation planned within the year subject to safety assessment and regulatory approval. Malaysia was finalizing appointment of a CRA and had subscribed to a PBCS monitoring tool provided by Airways New Zealand.

2.76 Information was provided on support for progressive reduction of ATC separation minima, especially at TOC points, aligned with regional harmonization and AN-Conf/14 recommendations, Project 30/10.

2.77 The Meeting appreciated the updates from Malaysia. Indonesia and India expressed their support for the ongoing projects by Malaysia for reducing longitudinal separation at the FIR boundary TOC points.

Agenda Item 3: Review and Update Work Plan

Baseline Analysis of ATC Separation Standards within APAC States and between Adjacent FIRs (WP/09, SP/05)

3.1 The Secretariat presented an analysis of the ATC separation minimum survey response to the Meeting.

3.2 The Meeting noted the expected deliverables of AP30-10/TF, which included a baseline analysis, technical and operational assessments, and implementation roadmap. The Meeting was presented with supporting references and requirements from the *Procedures for Air Navigation Services – Air Traffic Management* (ICAO Doc 4444, PANS-ATM) and *APAC Seamless ANS Plan*.

3.3 Following AN-Conf/14, Project 30/10 targeted ATC longitudinal separation at TOC points: ≤ 30 NM for remote/oceanic airspace and ≤ 10 NM elsewhere. The AP30-10/TF was established by APANPIRG under **Decision APANPIRG/36/7: Establishment of APAC Project 30/10 Task Force**. ICAO Secretariat conducted a 2026 baseline survey across 1,229 TOC points in 34 FIRs

3.4 **Figure 1** illustrated the current analysis of longitudinal ATC separation minimum as reported by APAC States/Administrations.




Figure 1. Analysis of Longitudinal ATC Separation Minima, as of 31 March 2026

3.5 The Meeting noted that the current criteria used at TOC points involving Category R airspace was 50 NM, and required updating to reflect Project 30/10 requirements. The updated requirements were to be reflected in the *APAC ANP Volume III* following migration from the *APAC Seamless ANS Plan*, scheduled by end of 2026.

3.6 **Table 1** provided the current implementation status of ATC longitudinal separation minimum implemented across 34 FIRs:

Table 1. Current Implementation Status

Metric	Count	% of Total
TOC Points Meeting Project 30/10 Target (Ready)	341	27.7%
TOC Points Not Meeting Project 30/10 Target with Distance-based Separation Gap	455	37.0%
TOC Points Not Meeting Project 30/10 Target with Time-based Separation	423	34.4%

3.7 **Table 2** depicted the comparison of inbound TOC points. The highest non-compliant TOC points were observed for Category S → S TOC points. Even with surveillance coverage, the separation minimum of more than 10 NM was currently implemented at TOC points in the APAC region.

Table 2. Comparison of Compliance of Inbound TOC Points

	Category R → S TOC	Category R/S → R TOC	Category S → S TOC	Total	%age
Acceptable Separation Standards	≤ 30 NM	≤ 30 NM	≤ 10 NM		
Compliant	44	249	48	341	27.7%

AP30-10/TF/1
Report on Agenda Items

	Category R → S TOC	Category R/S → R TOC	Category S → S TOC	Total	%age
Acceptable Separation Standards	≤ 30 NM	≤ 30 NM	≤ 10 NM		
Not compliant	132	147	609	888	72.3%
Total	176	396	657	1229	100%

3.8 Key findings:

- a) only 10 (23%) States/Administrations applied ≤ 30 NM longitudinal separation within their own FIR for Category R airspace;
- b) only 27.7% of TOC points were compliant with Project 30/10 expectations;
- c) 423 (34.4%) TOC points was currently subjected to time-based longitudinal separation;
- d) 455 (37.0%) TOC points was currently subjected to distance-based separation exceeding Project 30/10 expectations;
- e) Category S → S TOC points represent the largest volume of challenge: 888 (72.3%) TOC points currently subjected to longitudinal separation minima of more than 10 NM;
- f) survey data currency was a limiting factor. Not all States/Administrations submitted annual survey responses;
- g) high concentration of time-based separation exists in Bangladesh, India (all FIRs), Maldives and Myanmar (100%); and
- h) readiness tiers vary widely.

Project 30/10 Implementation Plan

3.9 It was envisaged that implementation of Project 30/10 across the APAC region would be completed by end of 2028. Therefore, the paper urged all States/Administrations to concentrate efforts to ensure adequate staffing, effective training, coordination with adjacent FIRs, and, where required, modernization of CNS/ATM capabilities. The year 2028 was identified as a regional target for progressing the implementation of Project 30/10, subject to operational readiness and the availability of the necessary enablers.

3.10 To facilitate tracking of Project 30/10 and streamline reporting of implementation status to APANPIRG and its contributory bodies, the paper proposed all States/Administrations to complete the Project 30/10 Implementation Plan Tracking template provided in **AP30-10/TF/1 WP/09 Appendix A**.

3.11 The Meeting appreciated the detailed analysis. Singapore noted that there was a considerable effort required for completing Project 30/10 by end of 2028. Singapore would adopt a prudent approach and would implement Project 30/10 in a phased approach by focusing on the TOC points which already possess the prerequisite for the reduction in separation while working on the enablers for reduction of separation minima in other areas. The Chairperson acknowledged that the target completion of Project 30/10 by end of 2028 would be challenging and hence encouraged States/Administrations to develop comprehensive implementation plans accordingly.

3.12 In response to an enquiry raised by Hong Kong China regarding the definition of compliance of the Project 30/10 requirements, the Secretariat confirmed that the application of 30/10 NM might be subject to condition(s) and to be stipulated in the LOA, if State/Administrations considered such condition(s) appropriate and necessary.

3.13 As regards to conventional ATS routes originating from AFI region being enabled for PBN, the Secretariat informed the Meeting of establishing an inter-regional interface for improvement of separation standards at the India-Oman FIR boundary. Since this was a coordination mechanism between two different regions, a joint coordination mechanism between ICAO APAC Office and ICAO Middle East (MID) Office had been established. Considering the traffic flow from the AFI region to APAC region, ICAO APAC Office would consider establishing a joint coordination mechanism with the ICAO Eastern and Southern African (ESAF) Office as well as the ICAO European and North Atlantic (EUR/NAT) Office for coordination mechanism in the North Asia for harmonization of the ATC separation minimum between APAC and the EUR region.

3.14 The Meeting agreed to the implementation tracking mechanism as proposed. Malaysia requested information on the proposed APANPIRG Air Navigation Deficiency List for non-implementation of Project 30/10, including clarification on the assessment criteria in determining the deficiency. ICAO noted the request and would provide clarification.

AP30-10/TF Terms of Reference (WP/10)

3.15 The Secretariat presented the draft Terms of Reference (TOR) and explained the objectives and proposed tasks of the AP30-10/TF. The Meeting agreed to the draft TOR, which was provided in **Appendix C** to the report.

3.16 The Meeting agreed to the revised draft Terms of Reference and agreed to the following Draft Decision for ATM/SG endorsement:

Draft Decision AP30-10/TF/1-1: APAC Project 30/10 Task Force (AP30-10/TF) Terms of Reference (TOR)

That, the AP30-10/TF TOR at **Appendix C** to the Report be adopted.

Agenda Item 4: Any Other Business

Proposed Update to ICAO Doc 7030 to Reflect APAC Project 30/10 Implementation Developments in Indonesia (WP/08)

4.1 Indonesia requested an update to ICAO Doc 7030 *Regional Supplementary Procedures* to accurately reflect Indonesia's current implementation of performance-based horizontal separation minima under APAC Project 30/10.

4.2 The paper provided the following background information:

- a) ICAO Doc 7030 contained regional provisions supporting Project 30/10, including a list of participating FIRs; and
- b) Indonesia previously requested inclusion of Ujung Pandang FIR based on an earlier survey.

4.3 The Meeting noted the following developments since the previous amendment proposal:

- a) Ujung Pandang FIR: implemented 30 NM longitudinal separation at selected TOC points with adjacent FIRs, based on RNP 4 operations. Operational, procedural, and technical elements were established and applied; and
- b) Jakarta FIR: ongoing modernization of ATM automation systems and communications/surveillance enhancements, which would support future Project 30/10 implementation.

4.4 Indonesia proposed to update ICAO Doc 7030 Chapter 6 to include Jakarta and Ujung Pandang FIRs in the list of FIRs implementing performance-based horizontal separation minima.

4.5 The Meeting was informed that ICAO HQ was working on updating ICAO Doc 7030. States/Administrations would be informed of the latest status of the ICAO Doc 7030 update process, as well as guidance on how States/Administrations should handle existing and future Proposals for Amendment (PfAs) related to ICAO Doc 7030 during this transition period.

4.6 On a query from India whether ICAO Doc 7030 could be amended for PBCS without a CRA formal service agreement, ICAO informed that they would investigate the matter and provide the guidance.

Breakout Session

4.1 A breakout session was conducted to discuss current ATC separation minima at the FIR boundaries. The Secretariat proposed forming four geographically based working groups to focus on contiguous and adjacent airspace handling major traffic flows; the following groups were established:

- a) Group A: Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Thailand; Rapporteur -India
- b) Group B: Australia, Fiji, Indonesia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Sri Lanka and United States; Rapporteur - Indonesia
- c) Group C: Cambodia, China, Hong Kong China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Viet Nam; Rapporteur- Malaysia; and
- d) Group D: China, Hong Kong China, DPRK, Japan, Mongolia, Philippines, Republic of Korea and United States; Rapporteur – Japan.

4.7 The Meeting agreed to use the populated data prepared by Indonesia as the basis for discussion during the breakout session.

4.8 The working groups discussed the ATC separation standards currently implemented at FIR boundaries and the way forward to progress towards Project 30/10 requirements. The Rapporteur of each group presented brief overviews of the outcomes from their breakout session discussions to the Meeting.

4.9 The Meeting agreed to maintain the working groups' ATC separation minimum data spreadsheets as a living document and to continually update the data based on inputs from States/Administrations. The Rapporteur of each group would be responsible for keeping the data sheets up to date.

4.10 ICAO would explore the possibility of developing a mechanism to maintain a regional dashboard of ATC separation minimum data and progress of Project 30/10. The United States suggested the APAC Seamless Airspace Chart template maintained by ISPACG as an example.

Agenda Item 5: Date and Venue of Next Meeting

5.1 The Meeting was informed of the dates of the Second Meeting of the APAC Project 30/10 Task Force (AP30-10/TF/2), which would be held via video teleconference. The Meeting would be held in the week of 21 – 25 September 2026. The nominated members of the AP30-10/TF would be informed of the details of the meeting.

Closing of the Meeting

6.1 In closing the Meeting, the Chairperson thanked and congratulated the efforts made by the participants for their contributions to the Meeting.

6.2 The Meeting expressed sincere appreciation to AirNav Indonesia for graciously hosted AP30-10/TF/1.

— — — — —

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

	STATE/NAME		TITLE/ORGANIZATION
1.	AUSTRALIA (1)		
	1.	Mr. Neil Bain (Online)	ATM Standards and Assurance Manager Airservices Australia
2.	BANGLADESH (2)		
	2.	Mr. Md Nazim Uddin (Online)	Deputy Director (ATM) Civil Aviation Authority of Bangladesh
	3.	Mr. Md. Abdur Rahim Talukdar (Online)	Assistant Director (ATM) Civil Aviation Authority of Bangladesh
3.	CHINA (17)		
	4.	Mr. Wang Jun (Online)	Deputy Director of ATC Division, ATMB
	5.	Mr. Zhang Zhiyuan (Online)	Assistant of ATC Division, ATMB
	6.	Mr. Tian Ye (Online)	Deputy Director of ATC Division, Northeast ATMB
	7.	Mr. Zhao Xin (Online)	Supervisor of Harbin Area Control Center
	8.	Mr. Chen Zhen (Online)	Secretary of Dalian Area Control Center
	9.	Mr. Gong Yuanxiang (Online)	Director of Dalian Area Control Center
	10.	Mr. ZHOU Huixiong (Online)	Assistant of ATC Division, East China ATMB

AP30-10/TF/1
Appendix A to the Report

	STATE/NAME		TITLE/ORGANIZATION
	11.	Mr. Chen Xin (Online)	Director of the 3rd Division, Shanghai Area Control Center
	12.	Mr. Zhang Xiang (Online)	Assistant of ATC Division, South China ATMB
	13.	Mr Tao Gang (Online)	Deputy Director of Guangzhou Area Control Center
	14.	Mr. Fu Yongqiang (Online)	Director of Sanya Area Control Center
	15.	Mr. Zhu Mincong (Online)	Deputy Director of Nanning ATC Operations Department
	16.	Mr. Liu Yong (Online)	Deputy Director of Kunming Airspace Management Office
	17.	Ms. HouLi (Online)	Assistant of ATC Division, Northwest China ATMB
	18.	Mr. He Chao (Online)	Director of the 2nd division, Lanzhou Area Control Center
	19.	Mr. Du Zeyuan (Online)	Controller of Lanzhou Area Control Center
	20.	Mr. Zhu Yan (Online)	Assistant of ATC Division, Xinjiang ATMB
4.	HONG KONG CHINA (2)		
	21.	Mr. NG Koon Ting, Alex	Senior Safety & Quality Officer (En-route) Civil Aviation Department Hong Kong, China
	22.	Mr. LAU Cheuk Pui, Wentz	Safety & Quality Officer (En-route) Civil Aviation Department Hong Kong, China

AP30-10/TF/1
Appendix A to the Report

	STATE/NAME		TITLE/ORGANIZATION
5.	INDIA (5)		
	23.	Mr. Ravinder Singh Jamwal (Online)	Director (Operations), Airspace and Air Navigation services standards DGCA
	24.	Mr. Akash Kumar (Online)	Assistant Director (Operations), Airspace and Air Navigation Services Standards, DGCA
	25.	Mr. Asit Kumar Sinha	Joint General Manager (ATM-ASM) Airports Authority of India
	26.	Mr. Manoj Kumar Gupta	DGM(ATM-ASM) Airports Authority of India
	27.	Mr. Manikant Tiwari	Mgr (ATM-ASM) Airports Authority of India
6.	INDONESIA (13)		
	28.	Mr. Tian Kusdinar	Deputy Director of Air Navigation Operation, Directorate General of Civil Aviation Indonesia
	29.	Ms. Dewi Rosaria	Air Navigation Inspector, Directorate General of Civil Aviation Indonesia
	30.	Ms. Nadira S. Nurhaliza	Aviation Evaluator Directorate General of Civil Aviation Indonesia
	31.	Ms. Dian Graciella Simbolon	Air Navigation Safety Oversight Officer DGCA Indonesia, Directorate of Air Navigation
	32.	Mr. Muhammad Naufal Aryo Judanto	Aviation Inspector Directorate General of Civil Aviation
	33.	Mr. Setio Anggoro	Director of Operation Airnav Indonesia

AP30-10/TF/1
Appendix A to the Report

	STATE/NAME		TITLE/ORGANIZATION
	34.	Mr. Muh Ali Husein Bahweres	Vice President of Air Navigation Control Services ACC, Airnav HQ
	35.	Mr. Fajar Ari Wiranata	Assistant Vice President of ACC Perum Lppnpi Airnav Indonesia
	36.	Ms. Afin Hananiyah	Assistant Vice President of ACC West Airnav HQ
	37.	Mr. Imam Nurdin	Junior Manager ACC Operation Planning, Airnav Branch JATSC
	38.	Mr. Agit Prasetyo	Air Traffic Controller Airnav Branch JATSC
	39.	Mr. Didik Agus Suryono	Deputy General Manager of Planning and Evaluation Operation, Airnav Branch MATSC
	40.	Mr. Gatut Nugraha	Manager of Planning and Evaluation of UPG ACC Airnav Branch MATSC
7.	JAPAN (1)		
	41.	Mr. Takahiro Shibutani	Special Assistant to the Director Japan Civil Aviation Bureau
8.	LAO PDR (1)		
	42.	Ms. Soukanya Vayaphath	Air Navigation Standard Division Officer Department of Civil Aviation of Lao People's Democratic Republic

AP30-10/TF/1
Appendix A to the Report

	STATE/NAME		TITLE/ORGANIZATION
9.	MALAYSIA (1)		
	43.	Mrs. Nur A'fifah Binti Mansor	Manager Air Navigation Services Technical Division Civil Aviation Authority of Malaysia
10.	MALDIVES (2)		
	44.	Mr. Ismail Rameez	Manager at Maldives Air Traffic Control Center. Maldives National Air Traffic Services
	45.	Mr. Moosa Shahid Hussain	General Manager, ATS Maldives National Air Traffic Service
11.	MONGOLIA (2)		
	46.	Mr. Odgerel Chagnaadorj	Director of Planning and Regulation Department
	47.	Ms. Mandkhai Batjil	Civil Aviation Oversight inspector (in charge of Airspace management) Civil Aviation Authority of Mongolia
12.	PAKISTAN (3)		
	48.	Mr. Arif Mumtaz (Online)	Sr. Joint Director, AAR Pakistan Civil Aviation Authority
	49.	Mr. Shabbir Ahmed (Online)	Joint Director, AAR Pakistan Civil Aviation Authority
	50.	Mr. Muhammad Asif (Online)	Joint Director, AAR Pakistan Civil Aviation Authority
13.	PHILIPPINES (2)		
	51.	Mr. Edgardo I Estrivo	Facility-in-Charge, Manila West ACC, ATS Civil Aviation Authority of Philippines

AP30-10/TF/1
Appendix A to the Report

	STATE/NAME		TITLE/ORGANIZATION
	52.	Mr. Renato C. Tiu Jr.	Facility-in-Charge, Manila North ACC, ATS Civil Aviation Authority of Philippines
14.	REPUBLIC OF KOREA (3)		
	53.	Mr. KIM Jong-seong	Assistant Director for Air Traffic Service Division Korea Office of Civil Aviation Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport
	54.	Ms. WON Eun-Hee	Assistant Director for Air Traffic Management Office (ATMO, Incheon ACC) Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport
	55.	Ms. LIM Se-young	Assistant Director for Air Traffic Management Office (ATMO, Daegu ACC) Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport
15.	SINGAPORE (4)		
	56.	Mr. Tommy Tan	Chief (ATM) Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore
	57.	Mr. Jermaine Hoh	Chief (Area) Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore
	58.	Mr. Koong Jye Tay	Air Traffic Control Manager Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore
	59.	Ms. Amelia Yeo	Air Traffic Management - Asia Pacific Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore
16.	SRI LANKA (4)		
	60.	Mr. Thilina Sri Warnasinghe	Director Air Navigation Services Civil Aviation Authority of Sri Lanka

AP30-10/TF/1
Appendix A to the Report

	STATE/NAME		TITLE/ORGANIZATION
	61.	Mr. Indika Bandupriya	Senior Manager (Air Traffic Control) Airport & Aviation Services (Sri Lanka) Ltd
	62.	Mr. Kasun C Hapuarachchi	Air Traffic Controller Airport and Aviation Services (Sri Lanka)
17.	THAILAND (3)		
	63.	Mrs. Pantip Changpradit	Expert, Director Level Aeronautical Radio of Thailand Ltd.
	64.	Mrs. Siriporn Ruangraiwan	Air Traffic Control Manager Bangkok Area Control Center Aeronautical Radio of Thailand Ltd.
	65.	Ms. Chayanan Sanorjit	Air Traffic Control Manager Bangkok Area Control Center Aeronautical Radio of Thailand Ltd.
18.	UNITED STATES (2)		
	66.	Mr. Shayne A. Campbell	Senior Air Traffic Representative, Asia Pacific Federal Aviation Administration Air Traffic Organization, International Office
	67.	Ms. Angelina Jacobson (Online)	Air Traffic Control Specialist Ops Policy and Imp Directorate Federal Aviation Administration
19.	ISPACG (1)		
	68.	Jeremy Elich (Online)	East – Airspace Services Brisbane, ISPACG Co-Chair
20.	IATA (1)		
	69.	Mr. John Moore (Online)	Head ATM-CNS, Asia-Pacific Operations, Safety & Security

AP30-10/TF/1
Appendix A to the Report

	STATE/NAME		TITLE/ORGANIZATION
21.	IFATCA (2)		
	70.	Mr. Cheryl Chen (Online)	EVP Asia Pacific Region IFATCA
	71.	Ms. Umi Muthiah Syahirah	IFATCA Regional Secretariat for Southeast and West Asia IFATCA
22.	ICAO (5)		
	72.	Mr. Manjunath Krishna Nelli	Regional Officer, Air Traffic Management ICAO Asia and Pacific Regional Sub-Office
	73.	Mr. Liu Yonggang	Regional Officer, Air Traffic Management ICAO Asia and Pacific Regional Sub-Office
	74.	Mr. Hiroyuki Takata	Regional Officer, Air Traffic Management ICAO Asia and Pacific Regional Office
	75.	Mr. Mior Adli Bin Mior Sallehuddin	Regional Officer, Air Traffic Management ICAO Asia and Pacific Regional Office
	76.	Dr. Trish Prakayphet Chalayonnawin (Online)	Programme Analysis Associate, Air Traffic Management ICAO Asia and Pacific Regional Office

LIST OF WORKING PAPERS AND INFORMATION PAPERS

WORKING PAPERS

No.	Agenda Item	Subject	Presented by
01	1	Provisional Agenda	Secretariat
02	2	APAC Project 30/10: Status of Separation Minima between Incheon FIR and Adjacent FIRs and Directions for Improvement	Republic of Korea
03	2	Indonesia's Operational Experience in Implementing 30 NM Longitudinal and 10 NM Surveillance Separation and Proposed Implementation Framework	Indonesia
04	2	Identifying the Technical and Operational Enablers for Successful Implementation of Optimized Longitudinal Separation Minima	Pakistan
05	2	Hong Kong China's Achievements in Longitudinal Separation Reduction at FIR Boundaries and Call for Collaboration for Further Reduction	Hong Kong China
06	2	Airline Capabilities Supporting AP30-10 Project	IATA
07	2	Project 30/10: Operational Perspectives on Network Capacity, Safety, and Human Performance	IFATCA
08	4	Proposed Update to ICAO Doc 7030 to Reflect APAC Project 30/10 Implementation Developments in Indonesia	Indonesia
09	3	Baseline Analysis of ATC Separation Standards within APAC States and between Adjacent FIRs	Secretariat
10	3	AP30-10/TF Terms of Reference	Secretariat

INFORMATION PAPERS

No.	Agenda Item	Subject	Presented by
01	-	Provisional List of Working Papers and Information Papers	Secretariat
02	2	Minimum Longitudinal Separation Standards between Fukuoka FIR and Neighboring FIRs	Japan
03	2	Application and Enhancement of Separation Minima in Kuala Lumpur Flight Information Region (KL FIR) and Kota Kinabalu FIR (KK FIR)	Malaysia

FLIMSIES

No.	Agenda Item	Subject	Presented by
-	-	-	-

PRESENTATIONS

No.	Agenda Item	Subject	Presented by
01	2	Minimum Longitudinal Separation Standards between Fukuoka FIR and Neighboring FIRs (IP/02)	Japan
02	2	Project 30/10: Operational Perspectives on Network Capacity, Safety, and Human Performance (WP/07)	IFATCA
03	2	North Pacific (NOPAC) Route System Redesign	Japan
04	2	Operational Status of PBCS Implementation by States	Secretariat
05	3	Baseline Analysis of ATC Separation Standards within APAC States and between Adjacent FIRs (WP/09)	Secretariat
06	2	Reduced Oceanic Separation: Implementation and Interoperability	ISPACG
07	2	Identifying the Technical and Operational Enablers for Successful Implementation of Optimized Longitudinal Separation Minima (WP/04)	Pakistan

Terms of Reference

APAC Project 30/10 Task Force (AP30-10/TF)

Objectives

1. The objectives of the Task Force are:
 - a) to develop the APAC regional action plans for the implementation of Project 30/10; and
 - b) to facilitate, monitor and support harmonized implementation of Project 30/10 within the APAC region and in coordination with adjacent regions, with a view to achieving seamless regional and inter-regional operations by 2028.

Tasks

2. To meet its objectives, the Task Force shall:
 - a) conduct comprehensive analysis of the current separation minima applied within the APAC States/Administrations and between adjacent FIRs;
 - b) identify technical and operational enablers necessary for the successful implementation of Project 30/10, including reviewing and updating regional documents;
 - c) collaborate with adjacent regions to achieve harmonized implementation of Project 30/10; and
 - d) assess training needs for controllers to effectively apply more efficient separation minima.

Reporting

3. The Task Force reports to the Air Traffic Management Sub-Group (ATM/SG) of APANPIRG.

Membership

4. The membership of the Task Force is all APAC States/Administrations and related international organizations.

Approved by APANPIRG/XX in Decision APANPIRG/37/XX, November 2026

— END —