



International Civil Aviation Organization

MIDANPIRG Airspace Management Working Group

Fourth Meeting (ASM WG/4)
(Virtual, 20 – 21 May 2026)

Agenda Item 2: ASM Developments

PROJECT 30/10 ROADMAP

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY

This paper presents the progress of development of Project 30/10 (reduction of longitudinal separation) roadmap in the MID region.

Action by the meeting is at paragraph 3.

REFERENCES

- AN-Conf/14 (26 August to 6 September 2024, Montréal, Canada)
- ASM WG/2 Meeting (Virtual, 21 - 22 January 2026)
- MIDANPIRG/22 (Doha, Qatar, 4 - 8 May 2025)

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Separation is the generic term used to describe action on the part of ATS to keep aircraft operating in the same general area at such distances from each other that the risk of collision is maintained below an acceptable safe level. Such separation can be applied horizontally and vertically. Separation in the horizontal plane can be achieved either longitudinally (by spacing aircraft behind each other at a specified distance, which may be expressed in flying time) or laterally (by spacing aircraft side by side at a specified distance from each other, or by specifying the width of the protected airspace on either side of an air route center line). Vertical separation is achieved by requiring aircraft using prescribed altimeter setting procedures to operate at different levels expressed in terms of flight levels or altitudes.

1.2 Annex 11 specifies that the minima established by ICAO are published in the PANS-ATM and minima established by Regional Agreement are published in Doc 7030, Regional Supplementary Procedures (SUPPS). This material forms the initial source of reference material from which airspace planners may directly derive appropriate minima.

1.3 The AN-Conf/14 agreed that while uniform application of separation minima would reduce bottlenecks and improve air navigation safety and efficiency, akin to the goals of Project 30/10, modern ATM solutions should also be applied across large portions of airspace that have similar traffic flow characteristics. These included air traffic flow management (ATFM), flexible use of airspace (FUA), free route airspace (FRA) and civil-military cooperation (CMC). The Conference recognized that such initiatives should be based on the needs of a wide cross-section of the aviation community, which may entail sending out surveys, as necessary.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 The meeting may wish to note that regarding development of roadmap for Project 30/10 (reduction longitudinal separation between FIRs) in the MID region, the MIDANPIRG/22 meeting endorsed the following Decision:

MIDANPIRG DECISION 22/10: PROJECT 30/10 ROADMAP

That, the ATM SG develop roadmap for the implementation of Project 30/10 in the MID Region, including the inter-regional aspects.

2.2 Accordingly, the Secretariat, based on ICAO Doc 4444, Chapter 5, has extracted relevant longitudinal separation minima for aircraft operating on the same track and same level in non-surveillance environment and their corresponding requirements at **Appendix A**.

2.3 Given that the ASM WG/3 Meeting agreed to establish Project 30/10 Action Group to develop the required draft roadmap, the group was subsequently established and developed draft Roadmap at **Appendix B**.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) note the longitudinal separation minima at **Appendix A** for implementation of reducing longitudinal separation in non-surveillance environment; and
- b) review the draft roadmap developed by the action group at **Appendix B**.

Longitudinal Separation Minima and requirements in non-surveillance environments

Type of longitudinal separation	Minima	Requirements			
Based on Time	15 minutes	No NAVAID to permit frequent determination of position and speed			Communication: voice reports, CPDLC or ADS-C
Based on Time	10 minutes	NAVAID permits frequent determination of position and speed			Communication: voice reports, CPDLC or ADS-C
Based on Time	5 minutes	NAVAID permits frequent determination of position and speed	preceding ACFT maintain TAS 20 ⁺ kt faster than succeeding ACFT		Communication: voice reports, CPDLC or ADS-C
Based on Time	3 minutes	NAVAID permits frequent determination of position and speed	preceding ACFT maintain TAS 40 ⁺ kt or faster than succeeding ACFT		Communication: voice reports, CPDLC or ADS-C
Mach Number Technique Based on Time	10 minutes	True Mach number approved by ATC			Communication: voice reports, CPDLC or ADS-C
Mach Number Technique Based on Time	9 to 5 minutes	Mach number difference (0.02 to 0.06) as explained in para 5.4.2.4.3			Communication: voice reports, CPDLC or ADS-C
Mach Number Technique Based on Distance Using RNAV	80 NM	Separation established & maintain 80 ⁺ NM between ACFT positions by assigning Mach number	RNAV-equipped aircraft		Operating on designated RNAV routes or on ATS routes defined by VOR Direct controller-pilot communications
Based on Distance Using RNAV where RNP 10	50 NM	Separation established & maintain 50 ⁺ NM between ACFT positions by using speed control techniques, including assigning Mach number	This separation was developed in accordance with a collision risk analysis, so implementation requires safety risk assessments. Refer para 5.4.2.6.3.1 and notes		Distance verification at least every 24 minutes as well as procedure in 5.4.2.6.3.2 Direct controller-pilot communications shall be voice or CPDLC
Performance-Based Longitudinal Separation	50 NM	RNP 10	RCP 240	RSP 180	Max ADS-C periodic reporting interval 27 minutes considering para procedures in 5.4.2.9.6 & 5.4.2.9.7
Performance-Based Longitudinal Separation	50 NM	RNP 4	RCP 240	RSP 180	Max ADS-C periodic reporting interval 32 minutes considering para procedures in 5.4.2.9.6 & 5.4.2.9.7
Performance-Based Longitudinal Separation	30 NM	RNP 2 or 4	RCP 240	RSP 180	Max ADS-C periodic reporting interval 12 minutes considering para procedures in 5.4.2.9.6 & 5.4.2.9.7
Performance-Based Longitudinal Separation	20 NM	RNP 2 or 4	RCP 240	RSP 180	Max ADS-C periodic reporting interval 3.2 minutes considering para procedures in 5.4.2.9.6 & 5.4.2.9.7
Performance-Based Longitudinal Separation	5 minutes	RNP 2 or 4 or 10	RCP 240	RSP 180	Max ADS-C periodic reporting interval 14 minutes considering para procedures in 5.4.2.9.6 & 5.4.2.9.7
Based on Distance Using DME and/or GNSS	20 NM	ACFT positions report by reference to DME in conjunction with other appropriate navigation aids and/or GNSS			Direct controller-pilot VHF voice communication and frequent intervals to ensure that the minimum will not be infringed
Based on Distance Using DME and/or GNSS	10 NM	ACFT positions report by reference to DME in conjunction with other appropriate navigation aids and/or GNSS as well as the leading ACFT maintains a TAS 20 ⁺ kt faster than the succeeding ACFT			Direct controller-pilot VHF voice communication and frequent intervals to ensure that the minimum will not be infringed

Action Plan for Implementation of Project 30/10

Main action	Sub action		Target date	Deliverable	Champion	Reference	Status / RMK
	No.	Description					
Collection of data and Gap analysis	1.1	Develop template to collect data and information from States based on LoAs		Template for collection of data	ICAO MID	MIDANPIRG Conclusion 22/10	Completed Appendix A
	1.2	Follow up with States to submit required data and share with MID office		State Letter to MID States	ICAO MID		Completed
	1.3	Consolidate States input and conduct Gap analysis		Draft Gap Analysis	MID States and ICAO MID		Completed
	1.4	Prepare and present Gap analysis report to ATM SG for decision		Gap Analysis report	ICAO MID		Ongoing
Prioritization of the project	2.1	Develop draft priority criteria		Draft list of priority criteria	ICAO MID	MIDANPIRG Conclusion 22/10	Completed Appendix B
	2.2	Review and approve priority criteria		list of priority criteria	ATM SG		Ongoing
	2.3	Prioritize common FIR boundary points based on approved criteria in two phases		list of priority common FIR boundary points in two phases	ATM SG		Ongoing Appendix C
Development of Roadmap	3.1	Develop comprehensive list of actions for each common FIR boundary point to identify requirements related to performance improvement area, target, timeline, safety assessment, training, amendment of Letter of Agreement, set effective date etc.		list of detailed actions for each common FIR boundary point	Concern States for each FIR boundary point. ICAO MID to facilitate coordination between States as well as adjacent region(s), if requested	MIDANPIRG Conclusion 22/10 MIDANPIRG Conclusion 22/11	Guideline Appendix D

Main action	Sub action		Target date	Deliverable	Champion	Reference	Status / RMK
	No.	Description					
	3.2	Consolidate actions provided by States in coordinated manner to develop Draft Roadmap		Draft Roadmap	States and ICAO MID	MIDANPIRG Conclusion 22/10	
	3.3	Review Draft Roadmap by ATM SG		Mature Draft Roadmap	ATM SG	MIDANPIRG Conclusion 22/10	
	3.4	Present Mature Draft Roadmap to MIDANPIRG for review and endorsement		Approved Project Roadmap	MIDANPIRG	MIDANPIRG Conclusion 22/10	
Implementation of Phase One	4.1	Based on roadmap, focus on priority 1 common FIR boundary points for implementation of required actions and provide periodic feedback and progress report to ICAO MID		Progress report by States	MID States	Roadmap	
	4.2	Based on the feedback and request from States, provide required technical assistance and support.		ICAO Implementation Support initiative(s)	ICAO MID	Roadmap	
	4.3	Provide consolidated report as well as operational impact analysis to ATM SG and MIDANPIRG until successful implementation of Phase One.		Consolidated progress report with impact analysis	ICAO MID	Roadmap	
Implementation of Phase Two	5.1	Based on roadmap, focus on priority 2 common FIR boundary points for implementation of required actions and provide periodic feedback and progress report to ICAO MID		Progress report by States	MID States	Roadmap	

Main action	Sub action		Target date	Deliverable	Champion	Reference	Status / RMK
	No.	Description					
	5.2	Based on the feedback and request from States, provide required technical assistance and support.		ICAO Implementation Support initiative(s)	ICAO MID	Roadmap	
	5.3	Provide consolidated report as well as operational impact analysis to ATM SG and MIDANPIRG until successful implementation of Phase Two.		Consolidated progress report with impact analysis	ICAO MID	Roadmap	

B-5

Bahrain	Iran							Kuwait					Qatar				Saudi Arabia						UAE				
	ROTOX	OBTAR	KUVER	ALSER	DASUT	MIDSI	RAGAS	KUMBO	DAVUS	LONOS	RABAP	AMBIK	TULUB	LUBET	GIRMO	GESIT	DAROR	METLA	ULADA	ROTEL	LADNA	NARMI	DEMTA	TUMAK	ALPOB	NALPO	OBNET
Separation	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	10	20	10	10	10	8	8	8	8	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	8	8	8	8
Direction	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
From	BAH	BAH		IRN	BAH	IRN	BAH	BAH	BAH	BAH	KWT	KWT	BAH		BAH	BAH	KSA		BAH	KSA				UAE	UAE	BAH	BAH
No Traffic per day	1	1	1	7	18	13	5	49	267	124	180	1	7	64	86	34	188	1	178	17	44	1	1	280	192	180	200

Qatar	Bahrain				Iran				Saudi Arabia				UAE											
	TULUB	LUBET	GIRMO	GESIT	DASUT	MIDSI	RAGAS	ELIDU	ULIKA	ORLEK	LAEEB	DATRI	BUNDU	KUPRO	TOSNA	OVONA	TOVOX	ALPOB	TUMAK	ORMID	ASTOG	NALPO	OBNET	
Separation	8	8	8	8	20	10	20	20	10	10	10	10	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
Direction	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
From	BAH		BAH	BAH	QTR	IRN	QTR	IRN	QTR	KSA	KSA		QTR	QTR		UAE	UAE	UAE	UAE	UAE	UAE	QTR	QTR	
No Traffic per day	7	64	86	34	18	50	36	8	8	4	1	1	3	3	40	54	6	192	280	51	1	180	200	

Egypt	Cyprus			Greece						Jordan	Libya			Saudi Arabia						Sudan			
	RASDA	LAKTO	PASOS	SALUN	METRU	TANSA	PAXIS	ANTAR	KUMBI	ULINA	LOSUL	DITAR	KITOT	PASAM	IMRAD	GIBAL	DEDLI	SILKA	ALEBA	ENABU	ATMUL	NUBAR	SISID
Separation	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	15	80	80	20	15	15	80	40	40	80	80	80	80	80
Direction	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1
From				GRE	EGP	EGP	GRE	EGP	GRE							KSA	EGP	EGP					SUD
No Traffic per day	174	73	12	73	124	122	60	166	52	172	15	24	127	120	34	36	60	126	14	1	1	1	1

Libya	Algeria	Chad				Egypt		Malta										Sudan	Tunis			
	IMN	DEKTU	TUMMO	GARIN	TONBA	LOSUL	DITAR	ABRAM	SARKI	VARIG	LUMED	LOTIN	ELIMO	INDOT	OLMAX	BONAR	EKLIS	RASNO	ORNAT	GASRI	TANLI	FARES
Separation	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
Direction	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
From								MAL	LIB	MAL	LIB	MAL	MAL	LIB	LIB	MAL						
No Traffic per day	2	2	1	1	1	15	24	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	5	2	1	11	3	1

Jordan	Egypt	Iraq	Israel		Saudi Arabia							Syria				
	ULINA	PASIP	OSAMA	MOUAB	TRF	DEESA	GIBET	TULEP	GENEX	OTILA	SODAR	BUSRA	ZELAF	SOKAN	NAMBO	KAMEL
Separation	15	80	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	80	80	80	80	80
Direction	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	2
From			ISR	JRD				JRD	KSA	KSA				JRD		
No Traffic per day	172	15	52	6	23	157	18	62	17	17	4	5	23	22	2	1

Kuwait	Bahrain					Iran			Iraq		Saudi Arabia					
	KUMBO	DAVUS	LONOS	RABAP	AMBIK	TULAX	NANPI	PATIR	SIDAD	TASMI	BOSID	GOVAL	DERKO	COPPI	RAS	IVOBA
Separation	10	20	10	10	10	20	20	20	10	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Direction	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1
From	BAH	BAH	KWT	KWT	KWT			KWT	IRQ	KWT		KWT	KSA	KWT		KSA
No Traffic per day	49	267	124	180	1	20	16	1	316	374	4	13	18	9	4	11

Syria	Cyprus	Iraq			Jordan					Lebanon		Türkiye			
	NIKAS	MODIK	SIDNA	ELEXI	BUSRA	ZELAF	SOKAN	NAMBO	KAMEL	LEBOR	LATEB	TUSYR	TUNLA	NISAP	LESRI
Separation	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
Direction	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2
From			SYR	IRQ			JRD						TUR	SYR	
No Traffic per day	1	21	1	1	5	23	22	2	1	11	1	1	1	1	1

B-7

Iraq	Iran			Jordan	Kuwait		Saudi Arabia	Syria			Türkiye		
	PAXAT	RAGET	BOXIX	PASIP	SIDAD	TASMI	MURIB	MODIK	SIDNA	ELEXI	NINVA	KABAN	RATOV
Separation	20	20	20	80	10	20	10	80	80	80	20	20	20
Direction	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1
From	IRQ	IRN			IRQ	KWT			SUR	IRQ	IRQ	IRQ	TUR
No Traffic per day	36	43	2	15	316	374	14	21	1	1	198	129	294

Lebanon	Cyprus					Syria	
	LITAN	ELIKA	DIRRE	KUKLA	BALMA	LEBOR	LATEB
Separation	30	30	30	30	30	80	80
Direction	2	2	1	2	2	2	2
From			CYP				
No Traffic per day	1	1	1	1	9	11	1

Appendix B**Action Plan - Priority criteria**

The implementation of this Action Plan is structured into two phases. Accordingly, specific criteria have been established for each phase as follows:

Phase I:

- a) *If a common FIR boundary point is located within a surveillance environment on both sides, and the applied separation **15 NM** or more; or*
- b) *If the common FIR boundary point is not located within a surveillance environment, at least from one side, and the applied separation is **10 minutes** (equivalent to **80 NM**) or more, provided that traffic at that point reaches at least **40 flights per day**, based on TDS data reported to MIDRMA; or*
- c) *If the extended longitudinal separation at a common FIR boundary point results in increased workload for ATCOs and flight crews, potentially affecting operational safety, as evidenced by safety reports; or*
- d) *If the common FIR boundary point accommodates major traffic flows within the MID region and/or at interfaces with adjacent regions, as indicated in MIDRMA reports; or*
- e) *If there is a significant increase in traffic movements at the common FIR boundary point during contingency situations, based on historical data; or*
- f) *If mutually agreed upon by the concerned States.*

Phase II:

- a) *If a common FIR boundary point is located within a surveillance environment on both sides, and the applied separation exceeds **10 NM** but less than 15 NM; or*
- b) *If the common FIR boundary point is not located within a surveillance environment, at least from one side, and the applied separation is **10 minutes** (equivalent to 80 NM) or more, provided that traffic is **less than 40 flights per day**, based on TDS data reported to MIDRMA; or*
- c) *If the common FIR boundary point is not located within a surveillance environment, at least from one side, and the applied separation is **5 minutes** (equivalent to 40 NM) or more, provided that traffic at that point reaches at least **40 flights per day**, based on TDS data reported to MIDRMA; or*

B-9

Appendix C

FIR boundary point priority

Row	FIR point	States concerned	Factor to be considered							
			Environment	Separation	Major flow	No. movement	Safety	Contingency	States request	Priority/Phase
Phase I										
1.	TASMI	IRQ-KWT	Radar	20NM	Yes	374	-	Yes	-	1
2.	RATOV	IRQ-TUK	Radar	20NM	Yes	294	-	Yes	-	1
3.	RASKI	OMN-IND	Radar	20NM	Yes	286	Yes	Yes	OMN	1
4.	DAVUS	BAH-KWT	Radar	20NM	Yes	267	-	Yes	-	1
5.	APELO	OMN-PAK	Radar	40NM	Yes	234	-	-	OMN	1
6.	GABKO	UAE-IRN	Radar	20NM	Yes	214	-	Yes	-	1
7.	NINVA	IRQ-TUK	Radar	20NM	Yes	198	-	Yes	-	1
8.	PATAT	UAE-IRN	Radar	20NM	Yes	186	-	Yes	-	1
9.	PARAR	OMN-IND	Radar	50NM	Yes	175	-	Yes	OMN	1
10.	RASDA	EGP-CYP	Radar	20NM	Yes	174	-	Yes	-	1
11.	ULINA	EGP-JRD	Radar	15NM	Yes	172	-	Yes	-	1
12.	ANTAR	EGP-GRE	Radar	20NM	Yes	166	-	Yes	-	1
13.	TOTOX	OMN-IND	Radar	50NM	Yes	146	-	Yes	OMN	1
14.	RASKA	KSA-ERT	Non-radar	80NM	Yes	136	Yes	Yes	KSA	1
15.	KABAN	IRQ-TUK	Radar	20NM	Yes	129	-	Yes	-	1
16.	KITOT	EGP-KSA	Radar	20NM	Yes	127	-	Yes	-	1
17.	SILKA	EGP-KSA	Radar	40NM	Yes	126	-	Yes	-	1
18.	METRU	EGP-GRE	Radar	20NM	Yes	124	-	Yes	-	1
19.	TANSA	EGP-GRE	Radar	20NM	Yes	122	-	Yes	-	1
20.	BONAM	IRN-TUK	Radar	20NM	Yes	122	-	Yes	-	1
21.	PASAM	EGP-KSA	Radar	15NM	Yes	120	-	Yes	-	1
22.	DASIS	IRN-TUK	Radar	20NM	Yes	112	-	Yes	-	1
23.	ASVIB	IRN-PAK	Radar	50NM	Yes	105	-	Yes	IRN	1
24.	LOTAV	OMN-IND	Radar	50NM	Yes	97	-	Yes	OMN	1
25.	REXOD	OMN-IND	Radar	50NM	Yes	94	-	Yes	OMN	1
26.	ULDUS	IRN-AZR	Radar	20NM	Yes	74	-	Yes	-	1

27.	LAKTO	EGP-CYP	Radar	20NM	Yes	73	-	Yes	-	1
28.	SALUN	EGP-GRE	Radar	20NM	Yes	73	-	Yes	-	1
29.	TAPDO	OMN-PAK	Radar	40NM	Yes	62	-	Yes	OMN	1
30.	KITAL	OMN-IND	Radar	50NM	Yes	61	-	Yes	OMN	1
31.	PAXIS	EGP-GRE	Radar	20NM	Yes	60	-	Yes	-	1
32.	DEDLI	EGP-KSA	Radar	40NM	Yes	60	-	Yes	-	1
33.	ALPOR	OMN-PAK	Radar	40NM	Yes	54	-	Yes	OMN	1
34.	KUMBI	EGP-GRE	Radar	20NM	Yes	52	-	Yes	-	1
35.	IMKAD	OMN-YMN	Non-radar	80NM	Yes	48	-	Yes	OMN	1
36.	MIDGU	OMN-KSA	Radar	20NM	Yes	46	-	Yes	-	1
37.	AGINA	IRN-TUK	Radar	20NM	Yes	45	-	Yes	-	1
38.	NAZAR	IRN-TKM	Radar	50NM	Yes	44	-	No	-	1
39.	BATEV	IRN-AZR	Radar	20NM	Yes	43	-	Yes	-	1
40.	RAGET	IRN-IRQ	Radar	20NM	Yes	43	-	No	-	1
41.	MESPO	IRN-OMN	Radar	50NM	Yes	43	-	Yes	-	1
Phase II										
42.	SIDAD	IRQ-KWT	Radar	10NM	Yes	316	-	Yes	-	2
43.	TUMAK	UAE/QTR/BAH	Radar	8NM	Yes	280	-	Yes	-	2
44.	OBNET	UAE/QTR/BAH	Radar	8NM	Yes	200	-	Yes	-	2
45.	ALPOB	UAE-QTR	Radar	8NM	Yes	192	-	Yes	-	2
46.	DAROR	BAH-KSA	Radar	10NM	Yes	188	-	Yes	-	2
47.	RETAS	UAE-OMN	Radar	8NM	Yes	186	-	Yes	-	2
48.	RABAP	BAH-KWT	Radar	10NM	Yes	180	-	Yes	-	2
49.	NALPO	UAE-QTR	Radar	8NM	Yes	180	-	Yes	-	2
50.	ULADA	BAH-KSA	Radar	10NM	Yes	178	-	Yes	-	2
51.	ORSAR	UAE-IRAN	Radar	10NM	Yes	172	-	Yes	-	2
52.	DEESA	JRD-KSA	Radar	10NM	Yes	157	-	Yes	-	2
53.	LABRI	UAE-OMN	Radar	8NM	Yes	152	-	Yes	-	2
54.	MENSA	UAE-OMN	Radar	8NM	Yes	138	-	Yes	-	2
55.	LONOS	BAH-KWT	Radar	10NM	Yes	124	-	Yes	-	2
56.	PASOV	UAE-OMN	Radar	8NM	Yes	118	-	Yes	-	2
57.	GOMTA	UAE-OMN	Radar	8NM	Yes	105	-	Yes	-	2
58.	GIRMO	BAH-QTR	Radar	8NM	Yes	86	-	Yes	-	2
59.	LALDO	OMN-UAE	Radar	8NM	Yes	81	-	Yes	-	2
60.	TONVO	OMN-UAE	Radar	8NM	Yes	72	-	Yes	-	2
61.	LUBET	BAH-QTR	Radar	8NM	Yes	64	-	Yes	-	2

B-11

62.	TULEP	JRD-KSA	Radar	10NM	Yes	62	-	Yes	-	2
63.	OVONO	QTR-UAE	Radar	8NM	Yes	54	-	Yes	-	2
64.	OSAMA	JRD-ISR	Radar	10NM	Yes	52	-	Yes	-	2
65.	ORMID	QTR-UAE	Radar	8NM	Yes	51	-	Yes	-	2
66.	MIDSI	BAH/QTR/IRN	Radar	10NM	Yes	50	-	Yes	-	2
67.	KUMBO	BAH-KWT	Radar	10NM	Yes	49	-	Yes	-	2
68.	MUSAP	OMN-UAE	Radar	8NM	Yes	47	-	Yes	-	2
69.	LADNA	BAH-KSA	Radar	10NM	Yes	44	-	Yes	-	2
70.	TARDI	OMN-UAE	Radar	8NM	Yes	44	-	Yes	-	2
71.	MEMTU	OMN-UAE	Radar	8NM	Yes	41	-	Yes	-	2
72.	TOSNA	QTR-UAE	Radar	8NM	Yes	40	-	Yes	-	2

Appendix D**Guideline for Development of Roadmap**

Based on the FIR boundary points listed in phase I (Appendix C), the states concerned are requested to develop a comprehensive and structured roadmap. This roadmap should then be submitted to ICAO MID for consolidation into a unified document, which will serve as the basis for further coordination, discussion, and agreement within the ATM Sub-Group.

The roadmap should clearly outline all relevant elements required to support implementation. This includes but is not limited to: identification of applicable performance improvement areas, definition of specific targets, establishment of realistic timelines, and preparation of safety assessments. In addition, States should address training requirements for personnel, identify any necessary amendments to existing Letters of Agreement (LoAs), and propose an effective implementation date for the planned measures.

In developing this roadmap, States are encouraged to focus on practical and achievable “quick win” solutions that can be implemented in the short to medium term. For example, the application of alternative longitudinal separation minima, as described in ICAO Doc 4444 (Chapter 5), may offer immediate operational benefits depending on local conditions and requirements. In contrast, more complex solutions—such as the procurement and installation of new surveillance systems—require significant investment, longer timelines, and more extensive coordination, and should therefore be considered as part of longer-term planning.

Furthermore, States are strongly encouraged to enhance coordination and communication with adjacent FIRs. By doing so, they can maximize the use of existing capabilities, such as improving surveillance coverage through the sharing of surveillance data. This collaborative approach can reduce overall financial costs and accelerate the implementation of necessary improvements. Additionally, through updated or new Letters of Agreement, States may establish operational procedures—such as redefining transfer of control points—to take advantage of stronger surveillance coverage in neighboring FIRs. These interim measures can help mitigate gaps in coverage until permanent solutions are implemented and full operational capability in the affected areas is restored.

- END -