



International Civil Aviation Organization

ICAO

Sixteenth Meeting of the FANS Interoperability Team – Asia  
(FIT-Asia/16)

Bangkok, Thailand, 9 – 11 June 2026

---

## Agenda Item 6: Data Link-related ANS Deficiencies

### AIR NAVIGATION DEFICIENCIES RELATING TO DATA LINK PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND ANALYSIS

(Presented by the Secretariat)

#### SUMMARY

This paper provides an update on data link performance monitoring and analysis activities in support of Performance-Based Communication and Surveillance (PBCS) implementation in the Asia/Pacific Region. It highlights States' obligations for data link problem reporting, performance monitoring and corrective action, reviews the status of formal Service Arrangements with APANPIRG-recognized Central Reporting Agencies (CRAs), and discusses the implications of non-compliance with relevant ICAO provisions. The paper also provides an update on APANPIRG deficiencies relating to data link performance monitoring and analysis and invites the meeting to consider appropriate follow-up actions.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The FIT-Asia Terms of Reference (TOR) require that it supports FIT-Asia participant States' compliance with ICAO Annex 11 – *Air Traffic Services* requirements and Global Operational Data-Link Document (GOLD) guidance for data-link performance.

1.2 The transition to Performance-Based Communications and Surveillance (PBCS) also require FIT-Asia to support and monitor participant States' compliance with new standards in ICAO Annex 6 – *Operation of Aircraft*, Annex 10 – *Aeronautical Telecommunications*, Annex 11 – *Air Traffic Services*, and in ICAO Doc 4444 – *Procedures for Air Navigation Services (PANS-ATM)*, as well as the guidance provided in Doc 9869 – *PBCS Manual*.

1.3 Air Navigation Deficiencies are raised to share among States information about deficiencies in a transparent manner, and to assist States to define their implementation priorities and to indicate remedial action required. Information on deficiencies from the Air Navigation Deficiencies database is provided at APANPIRG meetings for review under its TOR to, *inter alia*, make detailed assessment of the safety impact of the deficiencies as shown and propose remedial action required by States, for subsequent review by the Air Navigation Commission and Council.

## 2. DISCUSSION

### Asia/Pacific CRA Website Registration and Data Link Problem Reporting

2.1 Monitoring, reporting and analysis of data-link performance and problems is essential for the achievement and maintenance of system performance required for the application of performance-based separation. The introduction of ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPS) for

PBCS, applicable from November 2016 but with regional implementation from 29 March 2018, requires that States fully engage in programs of data link problem reporting, and performance monitoring and analysis.

2.2 ***APANPIRG Conclusion 24/24: ADS-C and CPDLC Problem Reporting and Analysis*** requested States to register on the FIT-Asia website (formerly <http://www.ispacg-cra.com>, now <https://www.fans-cra.com/>) by 31 December 2013, report problems relating to Automatic Dependent Surveillance – Contract (ADS-C) and Controller-Pilot Data Link Communications (CPDLC) to the Central Reporting Agency (CRA) utilizing the FIT-Asia website, and ensure the CRA analysis was reported to FIT-Asia.

2.3 To support APANPIRG tracking of CRA engagement and data link performance monitoring and analysis activities for all Asia/Pacific Administrations, IPACG and ISPACG were requested to provide information on the FIT-IPACG and FIT-ISPACG Administrations that were registered on the CRA, had submitted problem reports to the CRA, and had provided data link monitoring analyses to the FIT.

2.4 While most States providing data link services provided performance data to FIT, few provided any information on their analysis of the data, or on any action taken to investigate and rectify data link performance and non-compliance issues, or to evaluate the need for withdrawal of PBCS-dependent separations where performance fails to meet RCP and/or RSP specifications.

2.5 The Meeting is reminded of the applicable ICAO Annex 11 standard, ***Conclusion RASMAG/23-2: PBCS Action List for ANSPs*** (drafted by FIT-Asia/8 in 2018), and ***Conclusion RASMAG/27-2: Updated Reporting of PBCS Implementation Status and Performance Monitoring Data*** (drafted by FIT-Asia/12 in 2022):

*Annex 11 3.3.5.2: Where RCP/RSP specifications are applied, programmes shall be instituted for monitoring the performance of the infrastructure and the participating aircraft against the appropriate RCP and/or RSP specifications, to ensure that operations in the applicable airspace continue to meet safety objectives. The scope of monitoring programmes shall be adequate to evaluate communication and/or surveillance performance, as applicable.*

***Conclusion RASMAG/23-2: PBCS Action List for ANSPs***

*That, the PBCS Action List for Air Navigation Service Providers (ANSPs) provided at Appendix C to the Report be uploaded to the the ICAO Asia/Pacific website to provide guidance in the steps for analysis and reporting of PBCS performance problems.*

***Conclusion RASMAG/27-2: Updated Reporting of PBCS Implementation Status and Performance Monitoring Data***

*That:*

1. *The revised Survey of the Status of Current and Planned Implementation of Performance-Based Separation Minima at Appendix C to the report, and the revised PBCS Action List for ANSPs at Appendix D to the report be uploaded to the ICAO Asia/Pacific Regional Office website to replace the existing; and*
2. *States are urged to submit the following to the Asia/Pacific Regional Office by not later than 28 February each year:*
  - a) *The completed Survey of the Status of Current and Planned Implementation of Performance-Based Separation Minima form; and*
  - b) *PBCS performance data for inclusion in the aggregated regional PBCS*

*performance data report, using the Data Link Performance Report Template – ANSP to FIT provided on the ICAO Asia/Pacific Regional Office website.*

*Note 1: Non-FIT-Asia States may submit their PBCS performance data through the relevant FIT.*

*Note 2: This Conclusion supersedes Conclusions RASMAG/22-3, 23-1, 23-2 and 23-3.*

2.6 ICAO Doc 9869 *PBCS Manual* Chapter 4 and Appendix D provides detailed guidance on compliance with RCP/RSP specifications, and continued operational compliance through PBCS monitoring programmes and corrective action.

#### CRA Formal Service Arrangement

2.7 The FIT-Asia meeting was recently informed that ICAO had learned that not all FIT-Asia member administrations had formal service agreements with APANPIRG-recognized CRAs. **Table 1** shows the current formal CRA service.

**Table 1:** Current Formal CRA Service Agreements

	<b>APANPIRG-recognized CRA</b>	<b>Scope of Application</b>	<b>Formal Service Agreement</b>
IPACG and ISPACG (United States)	CRA Boeing	IPACG States, ISPACG States, and NAT States	Yes
Japan	CRA Japan	Japan	Yes
SEASMA (Singapore)	CRA Boeing	Singapore, Philippines and Viet Nam	Yes

2.8 Subsequent to the FIT-Asia/13 meeting, ICAO reviewed the situation and considered that, given the importance of data link problem reporting in States' performance monitoring obligations under ICAO Annex 6 – *Operation of Aircraft Part 1*<sup>1</sup> and ICAO Annex 11 – *Air Traffic Services*<sup>2</sup>, APANPIRG/34 agreed the following Conclusion proposed by RASMAG/28.

#### ***Conclusion APANPIRG/34/8: Formal Service Arrangements with CRA***

*That, States are urged to ensure that formal service arrangements are made with an APANPIRG-recognized, competent Central Reporting Agency for the submission and analysis of data link problem reports.*

2.9 While several States have yet to establish formal Service Arrangements with the CRA, Malaysia has reported progress in discussions towards their conclusion, and Sri Lanka has advised that, although additional time has been required for internal coordination, efforts are ongoing in recognition of the objectives of Project 30/10 and the importance of PBCS implementation. For a number of other States, however, no information regarding the status of formal Service Arrangements has been made available. These States are kindly invited to review their current status in relation to **Conclusion APANPIRG/34/8** and **Conclusion APANPIRG/26/25**, noting that the continued absence of the necessary arrangements may have implications for regional performance monitoring and may be subject to consideration under the APANPIRG deficiency identification and reporting process.

<sup>1</sup> Annex 6 Part I 7.1.5 and 7.3.4

<sup>2</sup> Annex 11 2.29 and 3.3.5.2

ANS Deficiencies Relating to Data Link Performance Monitoring and Analysis

2.10 APANPIRG/26, held in September 2015, agreed to the following Conclusion:

***Conclusion APANPIRG/26/25 – ANS Deficiencies Relating to Data Link Performance Monitoring and Analysis***

*That, an Air Navigation Deficiency should be raised against non-implementation of the provisions of Annex 11 Paragraph 2.27.5 when any FIT-Asia administration has implemented operational ADS-C/CPDLC services and:*

- a) has not made arrangements for the reporting and analysis of data link problems to a competent CRA as identified by the Regional Airspace Safety Monitoring Advisory Group (RASMAG); or*
- b) does not report data link problems to the CRA; or*
- c) does not provide data link problem analysis reports to a recognized FANS Interoperability/Implementation Team (FIT); or*
- d) does not provide data-link performance analysis reports to a recognized FIT.*

2.11 To date, this matter has primarily been discussed within FIT-Asia and RASMAG. The Meeting is invited to note that it may also have relevance to the implementation of Project 30/10 and may therefore be brought to the attention of the ATM Sub-Group (ATM/SG), as appropriate. Further information regarding Project 30/10 is provided in WP/14 under Agenda Item 7.

2.12 **Attachment A** provides the relevant excerpt of the APANPIRG ATM and Airspace Safety Deficiencies list as updated by APANPIRG/36 held from 24 to 26 November 2025 in Bangkok, Thailand. The information in the deficiency list is based on the information provided (or not provided) to FIT-Asia by States, and the information provided to and by the FIT-Asia CRA, IPACG FIT and ISPACG FIT.

2.13 The following deficiency was withdrawn:

**India:** Performance monitoring and analysis not reported for Mumbai FIR.

2.14 At present, no new deficiencies related to data link operations have been identified.

2.15 The Meeting is invited to note that future assessment of data link-related deficiencies will take into account the requirement for continuous monitoring of performance against RSP180 and RCP240 criteria, where performance-based separations requiring PBCS are in place, and appropriate analysis and corrective action to ensure communications and surveillance performance continues to support the application of performance-based separation minima.

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

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) note the information contained in this paper;
- b) encourage States and Administrations to analyse data link performance information, investigate and address identified performance and non-compliance issues, and assess the continued applicability of PBCS-dependent separation minima where RCP and/or RSP requirements are not achieved;
- c) encourage States and Administrations that have not yet established formal Service Arrangements with the CRA to review their current status, and note the potential impact of communication and surveillance performance issues on the implementation

- of Project 30/10 and related APANPIRG initiatives.; and
- d) discuss any relevant matters as appropriate.

— — — — —

ATM and Airspace Safety Deficiencies List (Updated 21 October 2025)

States/facilities	Deficiencies			Corrective Action		
	Description	Date first reported	Remarks	Executing body	Target date	Priority **
	<b><u>WGS-84</u> Requirements of Paragraph 1.2.1 of Annex 15</b>					
Afghanistan	WGS-84 - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Afghanistan	TBD	A
Brunei Darussalam	WGS-84 - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Brunei Darussalam	31/12/2025	A
Marshall Islands	WGS-84 - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Marshall Islands	TBD	A
Micronesia	WGS-84 - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Micronesia	TBD	A
Nauru	WGS-84 - Not implemented		Conferring with consultant	Nauru	TBD	A
Palau	WGS-84 - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Palau	TBD	A
Samoa	WGS-84 - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Samoa	TBD	A
Vanuatu	WGS-84 – Not implemented	2/7/1999	Implemented at main airports	Vanuatu	1999	A
	<b><u>AIP Format</u> Requirements of Chapter 5 of Annex 15</b>					
Kiribati	AIP Format - Not implemented	7/7/99	ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/18 (June 2009) was advised AIP in draft stage	Kiribati		A
	<b><u>AIS Quality Management System</u> Requirements of Paragraph 3.6.1 of Annex 15 Quality Management System - Not implemented</b>					
Afghanistan	AIS Quality Management System - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Afghanistan	TBD	A
Bangladesh	AIS Quality Management System - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Bangladesh	TBD	A
Bhutan	AIS Quality Management System - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Bhutan	TBD	A

States/facilities	Deficiencies			Corrective Action		
	Description	Date first reported	Remarks	Executing body	Target date	Priority **
Brunei Darussalam	AIS Quality Management System - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Brunei Darussalam	31/03/2026	A
Cambodia	AIS Quality Management System - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Cambodia	TBD	A
Kiribati	AIS Quality Management System - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Kiribati	TBD	A
Lao PDR	AIS Quality Management System - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Lao PDR	TBD	A
Maldives	AIS Quality Management System - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Maldives	30/09/2024	A
Marshall Islands	AIS Quality Management System - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Maldives	TBD	A
Micronesia	AIS Quality Management System - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Micronesia	TBD	A
Myanmar	AIS Quality Management System - Not implemented	9/6/2016		Myanmar	31/12/2025	A
Nauru	AIS Quality Management System - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Nauru	TBD	A
Nepal	AIS Quality Management System - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Nepal	TBD	A
Palau	AIS Quality Management System - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Palau	TBD	A
Samoa	AIS Quality Management System - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Samoa	TBD	A
Solomon Islands	AIS Quality Management System - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Solomon Islands	TBD	A

States/facilities	Deficiencies			Corrective Action		
	Description	Date first reported	Remarks	Executing body	Target date	Priority **
Timor-Leste	AIS Quality Management System - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Timor-Leste	TBD	A
Vanuatu	AIS Quality Management System - Not implemented	24/6/2014		Vanuatu	TBD	A
	<b><u>Aeronautical Data Area of Responsibility</u> - requirements of Paragraph 2.1.2 of Annex 2 15 to ensure that the provision of aeronautical data and aeronautical information covers its own territory and those areas over the high seas for which it is responsible for the provision of ATS</b>					
Bangladesh	Aeronautical Data Promulgation Within the State's Area of Responsibility - Not implemented	29/03/2019 SAIOACG/9		Bangladesh	TBD	A
	<b><u>Designation of Restricted Areas</u> - requirements of Annex 2 (Definitions) to ensure that restricted areas are designated above the land areas or territorial waters of a State</b>					
Australia	<del>Designation of Restricted Areas Above the Land Areas or Territorial Waters of a State - Not implemented</del>	29/03/2019 SAIOACG/9	<del>Danger areas within international airspace that is part of a State's responsibility is acceptable</del> Australia has completed the corrective actions concerning the designation of restricted areas over land or territorial waters	Australia	December 2022	A
India	Designation of Restricted Areas Above the Land Areas or Territorial Waters of a State - Not implemented	29/03/2019 SAIOACG/9	Danger areas within international airspace that is part of a State's responsibility is acceptable	India	TBD	A

States/facilities	Deficiencies			Corrective Action		
	Description	Date first reported	Remarks	Executing body	Target date	Priority **
	<b><u>Airspace Classification Requirements of Paragraph 2.6 of Annex 11</u></b>					
China	Airspace Classification - Not implemented	7/7/99	Difference to Annex 11 is published in AIP, China.	China	APANPIRG/19 updated, implementation planned by end 2010.	A
Macao, China	Airspace Classification - Not implemented	05/09/2018		Macao, China	TBD	A
Nauru	Airspace Classification - Not implemented	7/7/99		Nauru	TBD	A
Solomon Islands	Airspace Classification - Not implemented	7/7/99		Solomon Islands	TBD	A
	<b><u>ATS Message Addressing Requirements of Doc 4444 PANS-ATM Section 11.4 (Message Types and their Application)</u></b>		Note: the threshold for a Deficiency is 5% or more DEP messages reported to have not been sent, and where the analysed data provided evidence of a systemic (either systems or human factors) failure to send the message			
Maldives	DEP message transmission	09/08/2019	DEP messages inconsistently transmitted Conclusion APANPIRG/27/12 and ICAO correspondence	Maldives	TBD	A

States/facilities	Deficiencies			Corrective Action		
	Description	Date first reported	Remarks	Executing body	Target date	Priority **
	<b>SAR capability: Requirements of Annex 12 as defined in the Regional Air Navigation Plan Volume II Part I – GENERAL PLANNING ASPECTS Section 3 SPECIFIC REGIONAL REQUIREMENTS, failure to reach 90% or more implementation of the Asia/Pacific SAR Plan</b>					
Afghanistan	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	<del>APSAR/WG/6</del> 56% <del>APSAR/WG/10</del> 55%	Afghanistan	2019	U
Bangladesh	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	17/05/2019	<del>APSAR/WG/9</del> 65% <del>APSAR/WG/10</del> 66%	Bangladesh	2019	U
Bhutan	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	<del>APSAR/WG/8</del> 28% <del>APSAR/WG/10</del> 26%	Bhutan	2019	U
Brunei Darussalam	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	17/05/2019	<del>APSAR/WG/4</del> 63% <del>APSAR/WG/10</del> 62%	Brunei	2019	U
Cambodia	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	<del>APSAR/WG/9</del> 76% <del>APSAR/WG/10</del> 74%	Cambodia	2019	U
Macao, China	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	<del>APSAR/WG/9</del> 88% <del>APSAR/WG/10</del> 86%	Macao, China	2019	U
Cook Islands	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	<del>APSAR/WG/8</del> 62% <del>APSAR/WG/10</del> 60%	Cook Islands	2019	U
DPR Korea	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	<del>APSAR/WG/8</del> 71% <del>APSAR/WG/10</del> 70%	DPR Korea	2019	U
French Polynesia	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	17/05/2019	<del>APSAR/WG/8</del> 84% <del>APSAR/WG/10</del> 82%	French Polynesia	2019	U
Kiribati	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	<del>APSAR/WG/4</del> 26% <del>APSAR/WG/10</del> 25%	Kiribati	2019	U
Lao PDR	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	<del>APSAR/WG/4</del> 57% <del>APSAR/WG/10</del> 56%	Lao PDR	2019	U

States/facilities	Deficiencies			Corrective Action		
	Description	Date first reported	Remarks	Executing body	Target date	Priority **
Maldives	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	<del>APSAR/WG/8 78%</del> APSAR/WG/10 76%	Maldives	2019	U
Marshall Islands	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	<del>APSAR/WG/5 17%</del> APSAR/WG/10 17%	Marshall Islands	2019	U
Micronesia	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	<del>APSAR/WG/5 17%</del> APSAR/WG/10 17%	Micronesia	2019	U
Mongolia	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	17/05/2019	<del>APSAR/WG/9 89%</del> APSAR/WG/10 87%	Mongolia	2019	U
Myanmar	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	<del>APSAR/WG/9 69%</del> APSAR/WG/10 68%	Myanmar	2019	U
Nauru	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	<del>APSAR/WG/4 0%</del> APSAR/WG/10 0%	Nauru	2019	U
Nepal	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	<del>APSAR/WG/9 66%</del> APSAR/WG/10 50%	Nepal	2019	U
New Caledonia	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	17/05/2019	<del>APSAR/WG/8 78%</del> APSAR/WG/10 77%	New Caledonia	2019	U
Pakistan	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	17/05/2019	<del>APSAR/WG/9 89%</del> APSAR/WG/10 89%	Pakistan	2019	U
Palau	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	<del>APSAR/WG/5 17%</del> APSAR/WG/10 17%	Palau	2019	U
Papua New Guinea	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	<del>APSAR/WG/7 54%</del> APSAR/WG/10 37%	Papua New Guinea	2019	U
Samoa	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	<del>APSAR/WG/4 0%</del> APSAR/WG/10 0%	Samoa	2019	U
Solomon Islands	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	<del>APSAR/WG/4 0%</del> APSAR/WG/10 0%	Solomon Islands	2019	U
Sri Lanka	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	17/05/2019	<del>APSAR/WG/9 84%</del> APSAR/WG/10 86%	Sri Lanka	2019	U
<del>Thailand</del>	<del>Asia/Pacific SAR Plan</del>	<del>17/05/2019</del>	<del>APSAR/WG/9 85%</del> <del>APSAR/WG/10 92%</del>	<del>Thailand</del>	<del>2025</del>	<del>U</del>

States/facilities	Deficiencies			Corrective Action		
	Description	Date first reported	Remarks	Executing body	Target date	Priority **
Timor-Leste	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	APSAR/WG/4 0% APSAR/WG/10 0%	Timor-Leste	2019	U
Tonga	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	APSAR/WG/4 70% APSAR/WG/10 68%	Tonga	2019	U
Tuvalu	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	28/05/2022	APSAR/WG/7 0% APSAR/WG/10 0%	Tuvalu	2024	U
Vanuatu	Asia/Pacific SAR Plan	6/07/2015	APSAR/WG/4 0% APSAR/WG/10 0%	Vanuatu	2019	U
	<b><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></b>					
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	TBD	U
	<b>State Responsibility to comply with the Annex 6 Height-Keeping Monitoring Requirement Annex 6 Part I Section 7.2.9 (10<sup>th</sup> Ed.) and Part II Section 2.5.2.10 (9<sup>th</sup> Ed.)</b>					
Afghanistan	Non-compliance with LTHM requirement (remaining monitoring burden more than 30%)	RASMAG/23	Remaining monitoring burden of 50% (RASMAG/29) MAAR informed ICAO that all known airframes in Afghanistan have complied with the monitoring requirement (November 2022).	Afghanistan	TBD	A

States/facilities	Deficiencies			Corrective Action		
	Description	Date first reported	Remarks	Executing body	Target date	Priority **
			Deficiency retained due to the unknown status of the Afghanistan aeronautical authority responsible for ensuring monitoring is conducted.			
India	Non-compliance with LTHM requirement (remaining monitoring burden more than 30%)	RASMAG/29	Remaining monitoring burden of 46% (RASMAG/30)	India	TBD	A
Nepal	Non-compliance with LTHM requirement (remaining monitoring burden more than 30%)	RASMAG/28	Remaining monitoring burden of 45% (RASMAG/30)	Nepal	TBD	A
Philippines	Non-compliance with LTHM requirement (remaining monitoring burden more than 30%)	RASMAG/29	Remaining monitoring burden of 40% (RASMAG/29) Remaining monitoring burden of 22% (RASMAG/30)	Philippines	TBD	A
	<b>Data Link Performance Monitoring and Analysis Requirements of Paragraph 2.28 and/or 3.3.5.2 of Annex 11 not met</b>					
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/15): India had submitted the data link performance report for all the three FIRs, including Mumbai FIR.	India	TBD	A

\*\* 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.

— END —