



ICAO

International Civil Aviation Organization

First Meeting of the APAC Project 30/10 Task Force

Tangerang, Indonesia, 16 – 18 June 2026

Agenda Item 3: Review and Update Work Plan

BASELINE ANALYSIS OF ATC SEPARATION STANDARDS WITHIN APAC STATES AND BETWEEN ADJACENT FIRS

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY

This paper presents the Q2 2026 baseline survey of ATC separation standards applied across 34 Flight Information Regions (FIRs), covering 1,229 Transfer of Control (TOC) points reclassified against the ICAO Project 30/10 targets endorsed at the Fourteenth Air Navigation Conference (AN-Conf/14, Montréal, Canada, 2024): ≤ 30 NM for remote/oceanic and ≤ 10 NM for elsewhere. The survey shows an overall regional readiness of 27.7%.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 AN-Conf/14 adopted Recommendation 3.1/1, urging Member States to reduce ATC longitudinal separation minima to the following target values, hereinafter referred to as the “ICAO Project 30/10”:

- a) 55.5 km (30 NM) or less in oceanic and remote airspace; and
- b) 19 km (10 NM) or less elsewhere.

1.2 Subsequently, APANPIRG/36 (Decision 36/7) established the APAC Project 30/10 Task Force (AP30-10/TF) under the ATM Sub-Group to coordinate regional implementation.

1.3 The Task Force held its Kick-off Meeting on 21 April 2026 (VTC), attended by 101 participants from 15 APAC States/Administrations, IATA and the ICAO APAC Office. The Meeting endorsed the Task Force draft Terms of Reference (TOR) and tasked the Secretariat with delivering a baseline assessment of the current situation in the region.

1.4 In response, the Secretariat conducted the 2026 Baseline Survey of ATC Separation Minima, covering 1,229 TOC points across 34 FIRs. This paper presents the results of that survey and is the first deliverable against draft TOR item (a).

2. DISCUSSION

Background

2.1 Prior to AN-Conf/14, longitudinal separation in the APAC region was framed by the *APAC Seamless ANS Plan*, which classified separation at TOC points using Category R (50 NM) for remote/oceanic environments. Member States are progressively migrating these provisions into the *APAC Air Navigation Plan Volume III*, with publication targeted by end of 2026.

2.2 The 2026 baseline survey covers 1,229 TOC points across 34 FIRs, drawing on the most recent data submissions to ICAO Secretariat. Q2 of the survey looked at three categories of separations at Inbound FIR TOC points shown below and the total number of TOC points surveyed this year.

Q2 Criteria

- a) Category R/S → R TOC - Acceptable standard: ≤ 50 NM
- b) Category R → S TOC - Acceptable standard: ≤ 50 NM
- c) Category S → S TOC - Acceptable standard: ≤ 10 NM

2.3 The analysis of the responses was carried out against the following Project 30/10 requirement:

- a) oceanic and remote (Category R): ≤ 30 NM; and
- b) elsewhere (Category S): ≤ 10 NM.

2.4 For the purposes of this baseline survey, TOC points have been re-classified as follows:

- a) Category R/S → R TOC: target ≤ 30 NM;
- b) Category R → S TOC: target ≤ 30 NM; and
- c) Category S → S TOC: target ≤ 10 NM.

2.5 Time-based separation values reported in the Survey are also identified separately, as such values typically reflect non-PBSC or non-surveillance environments requiring immediate assessment before conversion to distance-based standards.

2.6 When comparing the latest survey results with Project 30/10:

- a) only 10 APAC Administrations (23%) uses the 30 NM and less horizontal separation in the “Category R within State/Administration’s FIR”; and
- b) only four APAC Administrations uses 30 NM of less in the “Category R/S → R TOC ATC Horizontal Spacing at Inbound FIR TOC points”.

Current Situation

2.7 **Table 1** summarizes overall regional readiness based on data submitted for 34 FIRs: of 1,229 TOC points surveyed, 341 (27.7%) meet the Project 30/10 target, 455 (37.0%) carry a distance-based gap, and 423 (34.4%) use time-based separation requiring PBCS assessments before conversion.

Table 1. Regional Overview, Q2 2026 Baseline Survey

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%

Note: The "TOC Points Not Meeting Project 30/10 Target with Distance-based Separation Gap" and "TOC Points Not Meeting Project 30/10 Target with Time-based Separation" rows are not mutually exclusive; a TOC may fall into both categories. The sum of percentages therefore less than 100%.

2.8 **Table 2** shows the comparison of Inbound TOC points; the highest non-compliant TOC points is observed for Category S → Category S FIR TOC Points. Even with surveillance coverage, the separation minimum of more than 10 NM is 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%
Not compliant	132	147	609	888	72.3%
Total	176	396	657	1229	100%

2.9 Readiness differs widely by accepting State. **Table 3** groups the surveyed States/Administrations into four tiers.

Table 3. Readiness Tier by Accepting States

Tier	Accepting States
Ready (100%)	Cambodia, Fiji, New Zealand, United States
Near Ready (70–99%)	Australia
Partial (10–69%)	Japan, Indonesia
Gap / Near-Zero (<10%)	Bangladesh, China, Hong Kong China, DPR Korea, India, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Viet Nam

2.10 In addition to distance-based gaps, 423 of the 1,229 TOC points (34.4%) currently apply time-based separation. The FIRs with the highest concentration of time-based TOC points are summarized at **Table 4**.

Table 4. Time-Based Separation Concentration

Accepting FIR	Time-based TOC Points	% of FIR
Yangon	32	100.0%
Delhi	29	93.5%
Dhaka	18	90.0%
Chennai	55	88.7%
Kolkata	83	83.8%
Mumbai	69	82.1%
Male	15	78.9%

2.11 Key findings:

- a) the Q2 2026 baseline survey is the first quantitative assessment of ATC separation standards in the APAC region classified against the Project 30/10 targets;
- b) only 27.7% of TOCs are compliant with Project 30/10 target;
- c) 423 (34.4%) TOC points currently subjected to time-based longitudinal separation;
- d) 455 (37.0%) TOC points currently subjected to distance-based separation exceeding Project 30/10 target;
- e) Category S → S TOC represents the largest volume of challenge: 888 (72.3%) TOC points currently subjected to longitudinal separation minima of more than 10 NM; and
- f) survey data currency is a limiting factor.

Project 30/10 Implementation Plan

2.12 It is envisaged that implementation of Project 30/10 across the APAC region will be completed by 2028. Therefore, all States/Administrations should concentrate efforts to ensure adequate staffing, effective training, coordination with adjacent FIRs, and, where required, modernization of CNS-ATM capabilities.

2.13 To facilitate tracking of Project 30/10 and streamline reporting of implementation status to APANPIRG and its contributory bodies, States/Administrations are expected to complete the Project 30/10 Implementation Plan Tracking template provided in **Appendix A** to this paper.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) note the information contained in this paper;
- b) urge States/Administrations to provide Project 30/10 implementation plan status using the template provided in **Appendix A**;
- c) urge States/Administrations to report progress to ATM/SG/14; and
- d) discuss any relevant matters as appropriate.

APPENDIX A

PROJECT 30/10 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN TRACKING

No.	TOC Point	Affected FIRs	Category of Airspace	Current Longitudinal Separation Implemented	Other Information	Implementation Plan
1.	e.g. IGOGU	e.g. Chennai / Kuala Lumpur	e.g. R ↔ R	e.g. 50 NM	e.g. RNAV 10, CRA formal service arrangement under coordination	e.g. Trial for 30 NM: 01/10/2026 e.g. CRA arrangement: 01/01/2027 e.g. Full implementation: 01/04/2027
2.	e.g. SAPAM	e.g. Bangkok (Cat. S) / Kuala Lumpur (Cat. R)	e.g. R ↔ S	e.g. 10 minutes	e.g. RNAV 10, Coordination ongoing between Malaysia and CRA	e.g. CRA arrangement: 01/01/2027 e.g. Trial for 30 NM: 01/04/2027 e.g. Full implementation: 01/07/2027
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						
7.						
8.						
9.						
10.						
11.						

No.	TOC Point	Affected FIRs	Category of Airspace	Current Longitudinal Separation Implemented	Other Information	Implementation Plan
12.						
13.						
14.						
15.						
16.						
17.						
18.						
19.						

Note 1: for "Category of Airspace" column, select one of the following:

- a) $R \leftrightarrow R$ (requires implementation of longitudinal separation ≤ 30 NM); or
- b) $R \leftrightarrow S$ (requires implementation of longitudinal separation ≤ 30 NM); or
- c) $S \leftrightarrow S$ (requires implementation of longitudinal separation ≤ 10 NM).

Note 2: for Category $R \leftrightarrow S$, indicate the airspace category for each FIR in the "Affected FIRs" column.

Note 3: date format must be DD/MM/YYYY.