International Civil Aviation Organization

MID Region Flight Procedure Programme Steering Committee
Tenth Meeting (MID FPP SC/10)

(*Virtual, 12 October 2026)*

Agenda Item 3: MID FPP Revised Project Document

MID FPP REVISED PROJECT DOCUMENT

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY

This paper presents the draft revised MID FPP Project Document, Version 2. The draft proposes revised institutional, operational and financial arrangements intended to strengthen programme continuity, support the delivery of regional capacity-building and technical services, and clarify the respective responsibilities of ICAO, the Host State and participating States.

Action by the meeting is at paragraph 3.

REFERENCES

- Report of the Seventh Meeting of the Directors General of Civil Aviation-Middle East Region (DGCAMID/7)
- MIDANPIRG/22 Report (PIRG/RASG Conclusion 5)
- Reports of MID FPP SC/9
- Current MID FPP Project Document (RAB18801)

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The MID Flight Procedure Programme was established to support States in developing sustainable capabilities in instrument flight procedure design, Performance-Based Navigation implementation and related technical disciplines. Its activities have included training, technical assistance and project-specific consultancy, supported by cooperation with participating States and international partners.

1.2 Experience during the initial implementation period demonstrated the continuing relevance of these services, while highlighting difficulties in securing predictable funding, maintaining programme management capacity and sustaining delivery.

1.3 Building on the Host State Model endorsed by SC/8 and reaffirmed by SC/9, the ICAO MID Office has prepared a revised Project Document. The draft seeks to address these challenges through clearer institutional responsibilities, a defined hosting arrangement, resource-based work planning and strengthened financial and performance monitoring.

1.4 The revised MID FPP Project Document is presented as a consultation draft. Its outstanding policy options, resource commitments and provisions requiring confirmation should be resolved through the appropriate review and approval processes before implementation.

2. DISCUSSION

Strategic direction

2.1 The MIDFPP should provide a practical regional mechanism through which States can access qualified expertise, strengthen national capabilities and obtain flight procedure design and related technical services. Its added value lies in pooling expertise and organizing assistance that individual States may find difficult to sustain independently.

Hosting and governance

2.2 The draft revised MID FPP Project Document should reflect the agreed hosting arrangements with Jordan. Egypt also expressed its willingness to host. After learning of Jordan's interest, Egypt offered to be an alternative option should the agreement with Jordan not be concluded.

2.3 The hosting package should define facilities, personnel support, technical resources, the duration of commitments and an implementation timetable.

2.4 Programme governance should distinguish the Steering Committee's strategic and oversight functions from ICAO's applicable administrative and financial responsibilities. Any authority exercised by the Chairperson between meetings should be expressly defined.

2.5 The proposed part-time Programme Manager should be supported by documented administrative arrangements and an appropriately qualified expert pool. The annual work programme should be proportionate to confirmed management capacity, expert availability and funding.

Technical services and State responsibilities

2.6 The draft revised MID FPP Project Document clarifies MID FPP's potential role in providing instrument flight procedure design services and related technical assistance. Annex 11, section 2.34 and Appendix 7 provide the relevant framework for State arrangements for such services, including joint provision and provision through external agencies.

2.7 Within the applicable institutional and national arrangements, the Programme may also provide technical reviews of procedure design deliverables and assistance supporting a State's oversight of the IFP process. These services should be clearly distinguished from the exercise of regulatory oversight.

2.8 The use of MID FPP services would not relieve a State of its responsibilities for procedures within its jurisdiction. Under the proposed programme scope, approval of procedures and regulatory decisions would remain with the competent State authority.

2.9 Each assignment should specify its scope, deliverables, applicable criteria, expert qualifications, review arrangements and responsibilities through an approved written agreement. Any proposal involving formally delegated safety oversight functions should undergo a separate assessment of its legal basis, institutional suitability and safeguards before acceptance.

Funding and service access

2.10 The draft revised MID FPP Project Document proposes a funding structure combining annual Active State contributions, Host State in-kind support, service revenue and voluntary contributions. The annual contribution, service entitlements, fee schedule and treatment of Host State support remain to be determined by the SC.

2.11 The meeting is therefore invited to provide guidance on the preferred near-term membership and funding approach.

2.12 Before operations begin, the Programme should have an approved and costed work plan, confirmed commitments of essential in-kind resources, and enough cash to fund the agreed initial operating period. Projected revenue and the value of in-kind contributions should be reported separately from available cash.

2.13 As of 30 June 2026, the MID FPP account held **USD 32,473**. Outstanding contributions from States, totalling **USD 46,253**, are still to be received.

Finalization of the Project Document

2.14 Before the revised MID FPP Project Document is formally circulated to States for review, the relevant ICAO Bureaux will be invited to review it within their areas of responsibility.

2.15 The main areas of revision are summarized in **Appendix A**. The draft revised Project Document is at **Appendix B**.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

a) note the draft revised MID FPP Project Document, and agree on the institutional, operational and financial arrangements (provide guidance on the near-term membership and funding model, including annual contributions, service entitlements); and

b) task the secretariat to consolidate the Project Document, together with any outstanding decisions, for consideration through the applicable approval process.

APPENDIX A
Summary of Substantive Changes — Revised Project Document (Version 2)

The full revised Project Document is available separately from the Secretariat. The table below summarizes, by area, the principal changes from the current Project Document (RAB18801); it does not repeat every drafting change.

Area	Current Project Document	Revised Project Document
Institutional model	Programme Manager recruited directly by ICAO, based at Host State premises; no separate Hosting Agreement.	Host State secondment model: part-time Programme Manager seconded in kind by a Host State under a separate Hosting Agreement, jointly vetted by ICAO and the Steering Committee.
Host State candidacy	Not applicable under the prior institutional model.	Jordan recorded as the working-assumption primary Host State (§7.5); Egypt's Letter of Interest recorded as a contingency candidate only, at the Steering Committee's own decision if Jordan's Hosting Agreement is not concluded by the decision-point date.
Contingency for institutional failure	None defined; a sequence of undated ad hoc interim extensions from 2023 to 2026.	A contingency concept is stated in general terms (Egypt as candidate, at the Committee's own decision)
Funding model	Mandatory USD 20,000 annual contribution, largely unpaid in practice; weak non-payment sanctions.	Lower, more defensible contribution figure (Steering Committee decision pending)
Legal/technical grounding of services	Service catalogue described in general terms, without citation to governing ICAO provisions.	IFP design, technical-review and oversight-support services grounded explicitly in Annex 11 §2.34/Appendix 7, Doc 8168 §4.5–§4.6, and Doc 9734 Part A §3.3.2–§3.3.4, with explicit non-transfer-of-State-responsibility and independence/conflict-of-interest provisions (§5.5–§5.9, §7.9).
Results framework and risk register	Activity-count-only reporting; risk register unchanged since original 2016–2019 drafting.	Dedicated results framework with baselines and Committee-confirmable targets (§13); risk register rebuilt for the current institutional transition, including Egypt as a named contingency mitigation (§10.2).
Document structure and length	Extensive duplication between the Project Document and the standalone Hosting Agreement (Host State resource inventory, Programme	redundant parts removed

Area	Current Project Document	Revised Project Document
	Manager secondment terms, in-kind financial treatment, withdrawal arrangements each stated twice); narrative sections carrying illustrative examples and notes not essential to a decision-ready instrument.	
Free-of-charge service entitlement	Stated only in general terms (§5.4 of the prior draft), without a stated activity-by-activity basis or an exhaustive list of chargeable exceptions.	New training and capacity-building within the approved Work Plan and available capacity is free of charge to an Active State in good standing; instrument flight procedure design, PBN airspace design, validation, technical review, regulatory-oversight support and any delegated function are delivered under a costed Statement of Work, including for an Active State in good standing.
Programme Manager cost	Implicit in the Host State in-kind valuation (Hosting Agreement Annex 2); not stated as an explicit undertaking in the Project Document itself.	Explicitly confirmed at §7.5, §7.6 and §9.1: the Host State bears the Programme Manager's remuneration and all employment costs in full, at no charge to MID FPP funds, consistent with the Hosting Agreement's own §5.2.

Table A.1. Summary of principal substantive changes. A full, itemized Summary of Substantive Changes and Decision and Information Gaps Register are available separately from the Secretariat.

MID FPP SC/10-WP/5
Appendix B

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION
ICAO Middle East (MID) Regional Office

DRAFT PROJECT DOCUMENT

MID Region Flight Procedure Programme

MID FPP — Phase II Project Document (Revised)

Draft dated 17 September 2026 — for substantive consultation with ICAO and Participating States — Version 7

DRAFT FOR SUBSTANTIVE CONSULTATION WITH ICAO AND MEMBER STATES — NOT AN APPROVED ICAO DOCUMENT

Table of Contents

1. Project Identification and Executive Summary
2. Background and Justification for Renewal
3. Lessons Learned from the Previous Phase
4. Development Objective and Immediate Objectives
5. Programme Scope, Beneficiaries and Eligibility for Services
6. Expected Outcomes, Outputs and Activities
7. Governance and Institutional Arrangements
8. Implementation and Service Delivery Arrangements
9. Staffing, Technical Expertise and Capacity Development
10. Technical Quality Assurance and Risk Management
11. Funding Model, Budget and Financial Management
12. Work Plan and Implementation Schedule
13. Results Framework, Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation
14. Sustainability
15. Assumptions, Prerequisites and Obligations of Participating Parties
16. Annexes

1. Project Identification and Executive Summary

Project Title	MID Region Flight Procedure Programme (MID FPP) — Phase II
Project Number	RAB18801 [retained pending confirmation by ICAO CDI Bureau]
Sector / Sub-sector	Air Navigation / Air Traffic Management / PANS-OPS and PBN
Executing Agency	International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)
Government Executing Agencies	Civil Aviation Authorities of Participating States
Proposed Host State	The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (Civil Aviation Regulatory Commission, CARC) — PROPOSED, pending a signed Hosting Agreement. See §7.5.
Programme Location	Jordan (proposed), subject to the Hosting Agreement; ICAO MID Regional Office, Cairo, Egypt, retains programmatic oversight throughout
Duration	Phase II: 3 years from the date of signature ("T0") [exact calendar dates to be inserted at signature]
Estimated Programme Cost	Illustrative range USD 120,000–330,000 over 3 years (Baseline scenario ≈ USD 225,000), presented as labelled scenarios, NOT an approved budget — see Table 11.1 at §11.2
Sustainability Model	Host State model (Jordan-led), with Egypt recorded as a contingency Host State candidate, pursued at the Steering Committee's own decision if a Hosting Agreement with Jordan is not concluded — see §7.5

Table 1.1. Project identification summary.

1.1 Executive Summary

The MID Region Flight Procedure Programme (MID FPP) assists Middle East States in developing sustainable national capability in instrument flight procedure (IFP) design, PBN airspace design, and PBN operational approval, consistent with ICAO Assembly Resolution A37-11. Operational since January 2022, it built a genuine service record that a funding and staffing model unable to sustain a single, centrally funded Programme Manager position ultimately undermined. This Revised Project Document preserves what has worked and rebuilds what has not funding, staffing, legal completeness and performance monitoring, adopting a Host State model, reaffirmed by MID FPP SC/9 Conclusion 9/1 as the most viable governance option.

Following SC/9, the ICAO MID Office issued a renewed call for hosting; Jordan submitted an Expression of Interest on 22 July 2026 and is treated as the working-assumption primary Host State candidate, pending signature of the Hosting Agreement, the companion instrument to this Project Document. Egypt has since submitted a Letter of Interest, recorded as a contingency Host State candidate, activated by Committee decision solely if Jordan's Hosting Agreement is not concluded by the decision-point date; it does not compete with or displace Jordan's status.

This Project Document also grounds MID FPP's design, technical-review and regulatory-oversight-support services explicitly in the applicable ICAO provisions; states that training and capacity-building within the approved Work Plan is provided free of charge to an Active State in good standing, with design, validation and technical-review work delivered under a costed Statement of Work; and confirms that the Host State bears the Programme Manager's remuneration and employment costs in full, at no charge to MID FPP funds.

2. Background and Justification for Revision

The case for a dedicated Middle East flight procedure design mechanism was studied under DGCA-MID Conclusion 2/5 (2013) and taken forward at DGCA-MID/4 (2017). The founding Project Document (RAB18801) was signed at DGCA-MID/5 (Kuwait, November 2019) by Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Syria, the UAE and Yemen, with Saudi Arabia as a Donor; the UAE became Host State. The Programme became operational in January 2022, hosted by the UAE's General Civil Aviation Authority at the Sheikh Zayed Air Navigation Centre, Abu Dhabi, through 2022–

2024/25, and by May 2026 had delivered 33 training and technical-assistance activities to 162 participants across 14 States, plus IFP design and regulatory-oversight consultancy for several member States.

PBN implementation against ICAO Assembly Resolution A37-11 targets has nonetheless been uneven across the Region, constrained by limited funding for regulators and air navigation service providers, a shortage of trained procedure-design personnel, and insufficient regulatory-oversight expertise. Two facts justify renewing the Programme rather than discontinuing it: demand for its services has been sustained and growing, while DGCA-MID/7 (Riyadh, May 2024) found that the Programme's institutional and funding model, not its relevance , had failed. This renewal corrects that design fault; it does not re-found the Programme's purpose.

3. Lessons Learned from the Previous Phase

A diagnostic review found a genuine service record a training portfolio sustained every year since 2022 through partnerships with DGAC France/ENAC and APAC FPP, a working quality-assurance allocation in which MID FPP designs and validates while the State Authority retains final approval, and durable external partnerships that absorbed gaps in the Programme's own capacity, undermined by institutional design rather than relevance. The funding mechanism went substantially unpaid (2022–2024 arrears reached USD 100,000); the single, centrally funded Manager position could not survive the shortfall. The Revised Project Document keeps the service model and partnerships intact while rebuilding funding (§11), staffing (§7, §9) and results monitoring (§13).

4. Development Objective and Immediate Objectives

4.1 Development Objective

To assist Participating States in developing sustainable national capability in instrument flight procedure (IFP) design, PBN airspace design and PBN operational approval, including regulatory oversight, so as to meet their commitments under ICAO Assembly Resolution A37-11 and comply with ICAO provisions related to flight procedure design and PBN.

4.2 Immediate Objectives

1. Establish a sustainable institutional and funding footing for MID FPP through a Host State arrangement, with Egypt recorded as a contingency candidate should that arrangement not materialize.
2. Deliver a regionally coordinated programme of PANS-OPS and PBN training and capacity-building to Participating States, aligned with their national implementation priorities.
3. Provide instrument flight procedure design, validation and regulatory-oversight support services to Participating States on request, within the resource envelope confirmed under the funding model at §11.
4. Operate a results framework that reports Programme performance against measurable indicators, baselines and targets, replacing the activity-count-only reporting of the previous phase.

5. Programme Scope, Beneficiaries and Eligibility for Services

5.1 Membership Categories

The Programme retains its existing four-category membership structure:

- Active State — a Participating State that funds the Programme via an annual financial contribution in line with the approved budget.
- User State — a State that uses MID FPP services on a fee basis without an annual funding commitment.

- Donor — a State, organization or entity supporting the Programme through financial and/or in-kind contribution (experts, equipment, training capacity); Donors whose contribution is at least equivalent to the Active State annual contribution receive comparable service benefits.
- Observer — a State or organization with an interest in the Programme that is neither a Participating State nor a Donor.

5.2 Current Membership

Active States — Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, and the current Host State (UAE); User States — Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Oman, Syria, Yemen; Donor States — Qatar, Saudi Arabia; Donor Organization or Industry (United ATS). This list should be reconfirmed before circulation (Gaps Register item 12). Jordan's and Egypt's status as Host State candidates does not itself change either State's membership category; the Host State is an Active State by definition (§5.1), and this list is updated once a Host State is confirmed.

5.3 Scope of Services

MID FPP's service catalogue continues to include: PANS-OPS and PBN training (initial, recurrent and advanced, delivered remotely, on-site, or at the Host State's premises); on-the-job training in procedure design, quality assurance and operational approval; instrument flight procedure design assistance; PBN airspace design and implementation-planning assistance; ground and flight validation support; and consultancy services for national regulatory-oversight projects under a Statement of Work. Training and services may, per applicable ICAO policy, be extended to air navigation service providers of Participating States. Each activity's delivery capability, coordinating and responsible entity, and charging basis are set out at §5.10.

5.4 Free-of-Charge Entitlement and Chargeable Services

(a) Training and capacity-building delivered within the approved annual Work Plan is provided free of charge to an Active State in good standing, subject to available Programme capacity (expert-pool availability, the Programme Manager's part-time capacity, and approved budget), the core service entitlement of Active State status.

(b) Instrument flight procedure design, PBN airspace design, validation, technical review, regulatory-oversight support and any specifically delegated function (§5.7, §5.9) are delivered under a dedicated Statement of Work and separately costed per a Steering-Committee-approved formula, consistent with established practice, including for an Active State in good standing. Flight validation requiring third-party aircraft or pilot resources, and travel, accommodation and subsistence costs for on-site missions, are charged on the same basis.

(c) User States and other non-Participating beneficiaries are charged for all services per the Fee Schedule at Annex D.

(d) An Active State that falls into arrears loses the entitlement at (a) and reverts to fee-for-service terms, per §11.3, until its contribution is brought current.

5.5 Applicable ICAO Provisions

MIDFPP's role as a regional mechanism for instrument flight procedure (IFP) design and related technical services rests on the following ICAO provisions.

Instrument	Provision	Amendment / Edition	Core Requirement
Annex 11 — Air Traffic Services	Chapter 2, §2.34	Amendment No. 52 (2020)	"States shall ensure that an instrument flight procedure design service is in place in accordance with Appendix 7."

Instrument	Provision	Amendment / Edition	Core Requirement
Annex 11, Appendix 7	State responsibilities for an IFP design service	Dated 8 November 2018	A State may provide, jointly provide, or delegate the service, but remains responsible for approving all IFPs under its authority, designed to its own criteria, by a provider meeting its regulatory framework, using a quality management system, with periodic review at least every five years.
Doc 8168 (PANS-OPS), Vol. II	§4.5, Documentation for regulatory approval	Amendment No. 10 (2024)	The regulator's approval documentation shall include design, independent design-review, flight operational review, flight validation, and (if required) flight inspection documentation.
Doc 8168 (PANS-OPS), Vol. II	§4.6, Regulatory oversight of the IFP process	Amendment No. 10 (2024)	"States shall oversee the IFP process according to the State's regulatory framework."
Doc 9734 (Safety Oversight Manual), Part A	§3.3.2.6–§3.3.4.2, delegation of safety oversight functions	Edition/amendment not confirmed — see Gaps Register	A State lacking sufficient resources may delegate specific oversight functions to other recognized entities while retaining ultimate responsibility, subject to functional separation and conflict-of-interest safeguards.

Table 5.1. Applicable ICAO provisions governing IFP design services and related oversight-support functions.

5.6 MIDFPP as a Regional Mechanism for Instrument Flight Procedure Design Services

Subject to §5.8, MIDFPP may act as the vehicle through which a Participating State exercises either option (b) or option (c) of Annex 11, Appendix 7, paragraph 1, a joint design-service arrangement among States, or delegation to MIDFPP as an external agency. Either way, Appendix 7's remaining obligations stay fully intact: the requesting State approves and remains responsible for every procedure; MIDFPP designs to that State's own approved criteria; and MIDFPP operates the quality management system adopted as Programme policy at §10.1. Before obtaining the service, the requesting State's own regulatory framework must recognize MIDFPP as meeting its design-service-provider requirements, a national determination each State makes for itself (guidance: Doc 10068).

5.7 Technical Review, Consultancy, and Support to a State's Regulatory Oversight of the IFP Process

In addition to the design service, and subject to the same conditions (§5.8) and institutional-sufficiency assessment (§5.9), MIDFPP's service catalogue may include: management of design projects and consultancy, without MIDFPP taking any independent decision-making role; technical review and verification of design deliverables, including ones MIDFPP did not itself design (§7.9 applies); support to a State's regulatory oversight of the IFP process, without MIDFPP itself exercising that function; and specifically delegated safety oversight functions, limited to the "other recognized entities" category at Doc 9734 Part A §3.3.3.1, subject to a written delegation instrument and §5.9, and excluding any regulatory decision, enforcement action, certification or procedure approval. In every case, MIDFPP's output is a technical conclusion or recommendation, never a regulatory decision, and the decision to act on it remains exclusively the requesting State's.

5.8 State Responsibilities Retained; Conditions and Limits of Delegation

A Participating State's use of any service at §5.6–§5.7 does not, by itself, transfer, diminish or otherwise affect that State's responsibilities under the Chicago Convention and applicable ICAO Standards — including its Annex 11, Appendix 7 responsibility to approve and remain responsible for its own instrument flight procedures, consistent with Doc 9734 Part A §3.3.3.3. Nothing in this Project Document, and no Service Agreement or Statement of Work under it, authorizes MIDFPP to approve procedures, certify design-service providers, or otherwise exercise a State's regulatory powers.

5.9 Institutional Sufficiency for Delegated Functions

MIDFPP's institutional status, an ICAO-coordinated regional programme without separate legal personality, governed by a Steering Committee and supported by a part-time, Host-State-seconded Programme Manager, is sufficient to support MIDFPP acting as an IFP design service provider and to provide the bounded functions at §5.7, subject to §5.8 and the independence safeguards at §7.9. It is not established, and this Project Document does not assume, that this status is sufficient for the fuller range of delegated functions ICAO guidance associates with a Regional Safety Oversight Organization.

5.10 Scope of Activities in FPP Phase II

No.	Activity	Internal	External	Coordinating Entity	Responsible Entity	Charging Basis
1	PANS-OPS / PBN training (initial, recurrent, advanced)	X	X	Programme Manager	N/A	Included (Active States); Fee (User/non-Participating States)
2	On-the-job training (procedure design, QA, operational approval)	X	X	Programme Manager	N/A	Included; Fee (User/non-Participating States)
3	Instrument flight procedure (IFP) design	–	X	Programme Manager	Requesting State	Fee — Statement of Work
4	PBN airspace design and implementation-planning assistance	X	–	Programme Manager	Requesting State	Fee — Statement of Work
5	Procedure validation — ground	X	–	Programme Manager	Requesting State	Fee — Statement of Work
6	Procedure validation — flight	–	X	Programme Manager	Requesting State	Fee (third-party aircraft/pilot resources)
7	Technical review and verification of design deliverables	X	–	Programme Manager	Requesting State	Fee — Statement of Work
8	Regulatory-oversight support (capacity-building, consultancy)	X	–	Programme Manager	Requesting State	Fee — Statement of Work
9	Specifically delegated safety oversight functions (§5.7, §5.9) including certification of third party IFPDS	X	–	Programme Manager	Requesting State	Fee — dedicated delegation instrument required
10	Expert-pool / partner-sourced technical support	–	X	Programme Manager	N/A	Included or Fee, per the underlying activity above
11	Steering Committee secretariat support	X	–	Programme Manager	N/A	N/A — governance function

Table 5.3. Scope of Activities in FPP Phase II. "Included" means free of charge to an Active State in good standing under §5.4(a); "Fee" means costed under a Statement of Work per §5.4(b), or the Fee Schedule at Annex D for User/non-Participating States. Internal/External capability reflects the current documented service model and should be confirmed by the Steering Committee as the expert pool and partnerships evolve.

6. Expected Outcomes, Outputs and Activities

The expected outcome of this Phase is that Participating States attain measurably improved national capability in IFP design, PBN airspace design and PBN operational approval, evidenced by training completed, procedures designed and validated, and by the Programme operating on a stable institutional and financial footing by the end of the Phase.

Output	Description	Principal Activities
Output 1	Institutional relaunch completed	Hosting Agreement negotiated and signed (or contingency triggered); revised Project Document endorsed by the Steering Committee and DGCA-MID; Programme Manager in post; expert pool nomination cycle refreshed regionally
Output 2	Annual training and capacity-building Work Plan delivered	PANS-OPS/PBN courses and workshops delivered per the annual Work Plan (§12); training outcomes reported to participants' national authorities
Output 3	Consultancy and IFP design/validation projects delivered on request	Requests assessed and prioritized (§8); Statements of Work issued and executed; deliverables submitted to the requesting State Authority for approval
Output 4	Results framework and financial management operating	Quarterly financial statements issued; annual results report against §13 presented to the Steering Committee; risk register reviewed annually

Table 6.1. Outputs and principal activities.

7. Governance and Institutional Arrangements

7.1 Steering Committee

The MID FPP Steering Committee ("the Committee") is the Programme's governing body, comprising the CAAs (or designated representatives) of Active States including the Host State, ICAO representatives (MID Regional Director, CDI Bureau, Air Navigation Bureau), and the Programme Manager as Secretary; Donor, User and Observer States and industry partners may attend as non-voting observers. The Committee meets at least once a year and elects a Chairperson from among Active States' CAAs for a three-year renewable term. The Chairperson holds delegated authority to confirm the Programme Manager's appointment and to act as point of contact between meetings; the annual work plan and budget, results-framework targets, the contribution figure, and activation of the Egypt contingency are reserved to the full Committee. Full Terms of Reference are at Annex A.

7.2–7.4 ICAO Roles

The ICAO MID Regional Office supports the Programme Manager, ensures alignment with regional priorities, and retains programmatic oversight of MID FPP irrespective of hosting location. The Capacity Development and Implementation (CDI) Bureau facilitates secondment and recruitment, and administers Programme finances and procurement per ICAO's Financial Regulations, Rules and Procurement Code. The Air Navigation Bureau provides technical and operational advice and facilitates coordination with the other regional Flight Procedure Programmes (AFI FPP, APAC FPP).

7.5 Host State

Subject to a signed Hosting Agreement, the Host State provides, in kind, the minimum resources: a part-time Programme Manager, administrative support, office and meeting-facility access, IT infrastructure, and facilitated access to a procedure design software platform. The Host State bears the Programme Manager's salary or remuneration and all associated employment costs in full, as an in-kind contribution, at no charge to MID FPP funds.

As of this draft, Jordan (through its Civil Aviation Regulatory Commission) submitted an Expression of Interest on 22 July 2026, within the renewed call's window; this draft proceeds on that basis pending confirmation of the call's

formal outcome (Gaps Register item 1A), with Jordan's specific commitments to be negotiated and fixed in the standalone Hosting Agreement (Annex B; Gaps Register item 2).

7.6 Programme Manager (Part-Time)

The Programme Manager, a part-time post seconded in kind by the Host State, whose remuneration and employment costs the Host State bears in full at no charge to MID FPP funds, acts as Secretary of the Steering Committee, develops and executes the annual work plan and budget under Committee oversight, coordinates the pool of experts and external training partners, and reports quarterly to the ICAO MID Regional Director and annually to the Committee. Because the post is part-time, the annual work plan (§12) should scope activity volume to what it, and the Pool of Experts, can reasonably deliver. Full functions, qualifications and secondment terms are at Annex C and in the Hosting Agreement (§5).

7.7 Decision-Making Process

Participating States submit requests to the Programme Manager, who assesses each against national PBN implementation plans, available capacity, and funding, and proposes a consolidated draft Work Plan for Committee approval; out-of-cycle requests may be accepted at the Programme Manager's discretion, within budget, with retrospective reporting. Each accepted request is formalized in a Statement of Work; deliverables are accepted by the requesting State Authority's formal sign-off, and final regulatory approval remains, in every case, that State's own retained authority (§10). Performance against the Work Plan and results framework (§13) is reported to the Committee at least annually.

7.8 Conflicts of Interest

Programme personnel shall not participate in the technical review, validation or approval of a procedure or project in which they, or an entity by which they are seconded, have a direct interest beyond their Programme role. Requests from the Host State are assessed against the same criteria as any other Participating State's, without automatic priority; the decision to approve and publish any instrument flight procedure remains exclusively the requesting State's own regulatory responsibility.

7.9 Independent Review of MIDFPP-Designed Procedures

Doc 8168 §4.5(b) requires independent design-review documentation among the minimum documents for approval of a designed procedure. Where MIDFPP itself designed a procedure, its own internal quality-assurance check under §10.1 is not that independent review. Where a requesting State wishes MIDFPP to provide or arrange it, the review shall be conducted by personnel functionally separated from the design team; MIDFPP shall not present such a review as independent regulatory oversight, nor describe internal separation as equivalent to a State's own independent safety oversight.

8. Implementation and Service Delivery Arrangements

Services are delivered through formally scheduled training courses and workshops (remote, on-site, or hosted by another Participating State), on-the-job training embedded in live design or validation work, and project-based consultancy under a Statement of Work; where the Programme's own expert-pool capacity is insufficient, the Programme Manager may draw on the standing partnerships with DGAC France/ENAC, APAC FPP and AFI FPP. Requests are submitted in writing to the Programme Manager, who logs, assesses and schedules each within the annual Work Plan or as an out-of-cycle Statement of Work (§7.7); where demand exceeds capacity, requests are prioritized per criteria the Committee approves annually, with unmet demand reported to the Committee. Training deliverables are accepted on course completion and issuance of participant assessment reports; design, validation and consultancy deliverables are accepted by formal written confirmation from the requesting State Authority, at which point MID FPP's role concludes.

9. Staffing, Technical Expertise and Capacity Development

9.1 Programme Manager and Support Posts

The Programme is led by a part-time Programme Manager, seconded in kind by the Host State; indicative qualifications are at Annex C. Additional support posts (for example, a Data Specialist or Administrative Assistant) are filled by in-kind secondment from the Host State.

9.2 Pool of Experts and Capacity Development

The Programme maintains a regionally nominated pool of experts — Flight Procedure Designers, Airspace Planners, Instructors, OPS Approval/Quality Assurance specialists, and PANS-OPS Inspectors — available on an on-call basis, with nomination open annually and tied to the annual Work Plan approval cycle, addressing the plateau in pool growth documented since 2023 (19 experts from 7 States). The Programme continues its established training partnerships (DGAC France/ENAC, APAC FPP, AFI FPP) and its own progressive PANS-OPS/PBN curriculum, giving capacity-building priority scheduling in the annual Work Plan while retaining consultancy/design services within available resources. The Programme Manager monitors and reports annually to the Committee on participation.

10. Technical Quality Assurance and Risk Management

10.1 Quality Assurance Policy

MID FPP formally adopts, as Programme policy, the allocation of responsibility observed in practice: the Programme designs, validates and quality-assures instrument flight procedures and airspace design products per ICAO Doc 9906 and Doc 9997; the requesting State Authority retains, in every case, final regulatory review and approval authority, including publication in its Aeronautical Information Publication.

10.2 Risk Register

Risk	Level	Mitigation
Hosting Agreement not signed by the decision-point date	High	Sequential, Committee-decision-gated contingency: the Committee decides whether to pursue Egypt for a further period it fixes.
Host State concentration — continuity depends on one State's commitment	Medium to High	Expert nomination and support-post staffing kept open regionally; Egypt named as a contingency Host State candidate without altering Jordan's primary status.
Active State contributions remain unpaid or delayed, as in 2022–2024	High	Advance-funding prerequisite before relaunch (§15.2); graduated non-payment measures (§11.3).
Legal/liability exposure in the Hosting Agreement or revised institutional model	Medium	Mandatory ICAO Legal Affairs and CDI Bureau review of the Hosting Agreement and this Project Document before signature (Gaps Register item 10).
Expert-pool nomination stalls again after an initial refresh	Medium	Nomination tied to the annual Work Plan approval cycle rather than a one-time campaign; reviewed annually
Regional political or security conditions disrupt a Participating State's engagement	Low to Medium	Programme retains flexibility to extend reduced-fee or free support in documented hardship cases, at Committee discretion

Table 10.1. Risk register (rebuilt for the current institutional transition).

10.3 Risk Management Process

The Programme Manager maintains the risk register and reports on it to the Steering Committee at least annually, or immediately if a High-level risk materializes. The Committee reviews mitigation measures and escalates to DGCA-MID or MIDANPIRG matters beyond its own authority.

11. Funding Model, Budget and Financial Management

11.1 Funding Sources

- Annual financial contributions from Active States, including the Host State, at a figure to be fixed by the Steering Committee [Gaps Register item 8; the previous USD 20,000 figure went substantially unpaid and should not be assumed].
- The Host State's in-kind contribution (premises, training facility, and Programme Manager secondment). The Host State bears the Manager's remuneration and all employment costs in full.
- Fee-for-service revenue from Statements of Work (§5.4(b)), User States, and other non-Participating beneficiaries, per the fee schedule at Annex D.
- Voluntary and Donor contributions (financial or in-kind), consistent with the pattern of support already shown by Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Industry (United ATS).

11.2 Illustrative Budget Structure and Scenarios

Budget Line	Conservative (USD/yr)	Baseline (USD/yr)	Enhanced (USD/yr)
Programme Manager (Host State in-kind, at no charge to MID FPP funds)	0 (in-kind)	0 (in-kind)	0 (in-kind)
Consultants / short-term experts	5,000	10,000	15,000
International travel and mission costs	10,000	15,000	20,000
Training delivery (materials, facilitator costs not covered by partners)	10,000	20,000	30,000
Equipment and software (design/validation tools, data storage)	10,000	20,000	30,000
Administrative overhead and miscellaneous	5,000	10,000	15,000
Indicative Total (per year)	**40,000**	**75,000**	**110,000**

Table 11.1. Illustrative budget structure and scenarios — NOT approved figures. See Gaps Register items 6, 8 and 9.

11.3 Non-Payment Measures

Where an Active State does not pay its annual contribution by the due date, the Programme Manager issues a reminder notice; continued non-payment beyond a defined grace period [placeholder] triggers a formal notice from the Steering Committee Chair; continued non-payment thereafter may result in suspension of the §5.4(a) entitlement.

11.4 Financial Reporting and Audit

ICAO provides annual financial statements to Participating States and a final statement at the conclusion of the Phase. The Programme Manager additionally provides the Committee an annual results and financial report per §13.

12. Work Plan and Implementation Schedule

Implementation proceeds in three phases, each with defined readiness conditions and a decision point:

Phase	Period	Readiness Conditions	Decision Point
II-A: Transition	T0 to Hosting Agreement signature or the contingency date, whichever is earlier [placeholder — e.g., T0+9 months]	Legal review of the Hosting Agreement completed; advance-funding prerequisite (§15.2) confirmed available; expert-pool nomination cycle launched	Jordan Hosting Agreement signed → proceed to Phase II-B. Deadline unmet → Committee decides on Egypt.
II-B: Stabilization	Signature (or contingency trigger) to T0+18 months	Programme Manager in post; annual Work Plan approved; results framework baseline confirmed	Mid-Phase Committee review of delivery and financial performance against §13
II-C: Full Operations	T0+18 months to end of Phase (T0+36 months)	Training and consultancy at or above Baseline Scenario levels (§11.2); Active State membership stable or growing	End-of-Phase review at least 1 year before Phase III would begin

Table 12.1. Phased implementation schedule with readiness conditions and decision points.

Within Phase II-B and II-C, an annual Work Plan is developed by the Programme Manager and approved by the Steering Committee (§7.7): Work Plan and budget approval (Q1); mid-year delivery review (Q3); annual results reporting (Q4), aligned with §13.

13. Results Framework, Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation

The following results framework replaces the activity-count-only reporting used throughout 2022–2026. Baselines are drawn from the documented record; targets are placeholders for Steering Committee confirmation.

Indicator	Baseline (documented)	Target (TBD by SC)	Reporting Frequency	Accountable Owner
Institutional relaunch milestone achieved	Not applicable — in progress at drafting	100% by the Phase II-A decision point	At the decision point	Steering Committee / ICAO MID Office
Active State contributions collected as % of invoiced	Historical low (2023–2024 arrears reached USD 100,000 against USD 166,095 invoiced)	[SC to set — e.g., ≥90%]	Quarterly	Programme Manager; ICAO CDI Bureau
Training/capacity-building activities delivered per year	33 activities over 2022–2025 (SC/9)	[SC to set]	Annual	Programme Manager
Consultancy/IFP design projects completed per year	4 projects documented 2024–2026	[SC to set]	Annual	Programme Manager
Active nominated experts in the Pool	19 experts / 7 States (plateaued since 2023)	[SC to set — net growth target]	Annual	ICAO MID Office
Active State membership	4 Active States (2026)	[SC to set — net growth target]	Annual	ICAO MID Office / SC Chair
Trained-personnel retention in national procedure-design roles	Not previously tracked — evidence gap	[SC to set, pending a baseline survey]	Annual, from a first baseline survey	Programme Manager

Table 13.1. Results framework. All target values are placeholders pending Steering Committee confirmation.

The Programme Manager reports quarterly financial status and delivery progress to the ICAO MID Regional Director, and presents an annual results report to the Steering Committee. An end-of-Phase evaluation is conducted at least one year before the Phase's scheduled conclusion, per §12.

14. Sustainability

Long-term sustainability depends on broadening the Active State base, diversifying funding beyond a small number of contributors (§11.1), and building durable national capability, tracked through the trained-personnel retention indicator at §13.

A separate concept-development exercise explored an eventual fee-free membership model sustained by earned revenue. It is not adopted; this Project Document's funding model (§11) remains the near-term design.

15. Assumptions, Prerequisites and Obligations of Participating Parties

15.1 Assumptions

- That Jordan's Expression of Interest matures into a binding Hosting Agreement proposal within the Phase II-A window.
- That DGCA-MID/8 (or the appropriate governing body — Gaps Register item 1) endorses the Host State model as described, or that any divergent decision is reflected in a revision before finalization.
- That ICAO Legal Affairs and CDI Bureau review of the Hosting Agreement and this Project Document is completed without obstacles requiring fundamental redesign (Gaps Register item 10).

15.2 Prerequisites

- Signature of this Project Document by the Host State (once confirmed) and a minimum of five (5) Active States.
- Confirmation of at least one year's approved budgetary cost available in the ICAO-administered account before relaunch.
- Completion of the expert-pool nomination refresh described at §9.2 before the annual Work Plan for the first full Programme year is finalized.

15.3 Obligations of Participating Parties

Party	Principal Obligations
ICAO (CDI Bureau, Legal Affairs Bureau, ANB HQ)	Administer Programme funds and procurement; provide legal review of the Hosting Agreement and this Project Document; provide technical backstopping and coordination with AFI FPP and APAC FPP
ICAO MID Regional Office	Support the Programme Manager; ensure alignment with regional priorities; retain programmatic oversight throughout
Host State (proposed: Jordan)	Provide the in-kind contributions in the Hosting Agreement, including the Programme Manager's remuneration and employment costs in full at no charge to MID FPP funds.
Active States	Pay the annual contribution per §11 by the due date; nominate qualified experts to the Pool; participate in the Steering Committee.
User States	Pay applicable fees per Annex D; may nominate experts to the Pool; confirm national legal basis and execute the corresponding Service Agreement where obtaining a service under §5.8/Annex J
Donor States / Organizations	Provide agreed financial or in-kind support; may participate as Steering Committee observers, or as voting members where their contribution is recognized as equivalent to an Active State's
Steering Committee	Approve the annual work plan, budget and results framework targets; review Programme and financial performance; take or escalate decisions at the contingency trigger and other defined decision points
Programme Manager	Execute the approved work plan; manage the expert pool and Statements of Work; report per §13; maintain the risk register per §10.3

Table 15.1. Obligations of participating parties.

16. Annexes

The following annexes form an integral part of this Project Document. Annexes marked [TO BE FINALIZED] require input identified in the Decision and Information Gaps Register. Host-State-specific operational detail is set out once, in the standalone Hosting Agreement, and cross-referenced rather than repeated here.

- Annex A — MID FPP Steering Committee Terms of Reference: a full, separately maintained document — see the enhanced Terms of Reference.
- Annex B — Hosting Agreement: the standalone companion instrument (§7.5, §9.1).
- Annex C — Job Description: Programme Manager (part-time) — at §16.1.
- Annex D — Fee Schedule (illustrative, based on 2022 and 2025 figures) [TO BE FINALIZED — Gaps Register item 13].
- Annex E — Results Framework — Table 13.1, §13.
- Annex F — Risk Register — Table 10.1, §10.2.
- Annex G — Illustrative Budget Scenarios — Table 11.1, §11.2.
- Annex H — Phased Implementation Schedule — Table 12.1, §12.
- Annex I — Minimum Hosting Requirements: reproduced in full in the Hosting Agreement's own Annex 1; the illustrative in-kind valuation is set out in the Hosting Agreement's own Annex 2.
- Annex J — Model Service Agreement Elements and Design/Review Separation and Conflict of Interest Policy — at §16.2.

16.1 Annex C — Job Description: Programme Manager (Part-Time) (Summary)

Leads day-to-day management of MID FPP within the time commitment agreed with the Host State; acts as Secretary of the Steering Committee; develops and executes the annual work plan and budget (§7.6); coordinates the pool of experts and external training partners; reports quarterly to the ICAO MID Regional Director and annually to the Committee. Indicative qualifications: PANS-OPS/PBN/ATM expertise; a relevant university degree or ATPL/ATC licence in lieu; substantial relevant operational experience; fluent English essential, Arabic desirable. Full terms, including remuneration (borne by the Host State at no charge to MID FPP funds, §7.5), are fixed in the Hosting Agreement (§5).

16.2 Annex J — Model Service Agreement Elements and Conflict of Interest Policy

A Service Agreement or Letter of Agreement between ICAO (on MIDFPP's behalf) and a requesting State, for any service at §5.6–§5.7, should at minimum: reference this Project Document and the State's own confirmed national legal basis (§5.8); state the scope and limits of MIDFPP's role, including that MIDFPP is not authorized to approve procedures, certify design-service providers, or otherwise exercise the State's regulatory powers; restate the non-transfer of the State's Chicago Convention responsibilities; specify the independence or delegation arrangement under §7.9 where relevant; set term and termination consistent with ICAO's standard terms; and cross-reference any relevant open item in the Gaps Register.

Design/Review Separation and Conflict of Interest Policy, applicable to every Statement of Work combining a design function with a review or oversight-support function: a designer or project lead shall not act as independent reviewer of the same procedure; review assignments are allocated by the Programme Manager (or, where the Manager was involved in the design, by the Steering Committee Chairperson) with the rationale documented; personnel with a prior role in a State's regulatory chain for the procedure under review, or another disqualifying interest, shall disclose it and be recused; and records of assignment and recusal are retained and made available to the requesting State and, on request, to the Steering Committee.

- END -