



International Civil Aviation Organization

**The Sixth Meeting of the APANPIRG ATM Sub-Group
(ATM/SG/6)**

Hong Kong, China, 30 July – 03 August 2018

Agenda Item 5: ATM Coordination (Meetings, Route Development, Contingency Planning)

TRANS-REGIONAL ATS COORDINATION

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY

This paper presents information on trans-regional Air Traffic Services (ATS) coordination, focusing on the interfaces between the ICAO Middle East (MID) Region and the Asia/Pacific Region (APAC), and between the European Region (EUR) and APAC.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 There were no trans-regional Special Coordination Meetings (SCMs) conducted in the period July 2017 – June 2018 (the last SCM was in 2016, mainly to discuss the Mogadishu Flight Information Region (FIR). Moreover, there was no Trans-Regional Airspace and Supporting ATM Systems Steering Group meeting (last was TRASAS/4 (Bangkok, Thailand, 29-31 October 2014), and no Inter-Regional Coordination Meeting (the most recent was IRCM/4 in 2015).

1.2 Therefore, the only formal trans-regional ATS coordination mechanism for the regions concerned was the Advanced Inter-Regional Air Traffic Services Route Development Task Force (AIRARD/TF).

1.3 The Second Meeting of the Advanced Inter-Regional Air Traffic Services Route Development Task Force (**AIRARD/TF/2**) was hosted by the Kazakhstan Civil Aviation Authority at Astana, Kazakhstan, from 26 to 27 October 2017.

1.4 The meeting was attended by 53 participants from 17 States and three International Organizations, including Armenia, Azerbaijan, Estonia, Finland, India, Islamic Republic of Iran (I. R. Iran), Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Norway, Russian Federation, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, United States, Uzbekistan, EUROCONTROL, IATA and ICAO and two flight plan service providers.

1.5 The Third Meeting of the Advanced Inter-Regional Air Traffic Services Route Development Task Force (**AIRARD/TF/3**) was kindly hosted by the Jordanian Civil Aviation Regulatory Commission at Amman, Jordan, from 01 to 02 May 2018.

1.6 The meeting was attended by 58 participants from 13 States and seven International and Regional Organizations, including Bahrain, Egypt, India, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Ukraine, UAE, USA, Yemen, EUROCONTROL, IFALPA, IFATCA, IATA, MAAR, MIDRMA and ICAO.

2. DISCUSSION

AIRARD/TF/2

Provisional Agenda

2.1 The provisional AIRARD/TF agenda (**Attachment A**) had already been adopted by the MID's MIDANPIRG, but needed to be also endorsed by the EANPG and APANPIRG. The meeting is invited to consider the following Draft Decision:

Draft Decision ATM/SG/6-X: AIRARD/TF Terms of Reference			
What:		That, the Advanced Inter-Regional Air Traffic Services Route Development Task Force (AIRARD/TF) Terms of Reference at ATM/SG/6/WP26 Attachment A be approved by the Asia/Pacific (APAC) Region.	
		Expected impact: ☐ Political / Global ☒ Inter-regional ☐ Economic ☐ Environmental ☐ Ops/Technical	
Why:		To endorse the AIRARD/TF Terms of Reference, as already approved by the MIDANPIRG.	
		Follow-up: ☐ Required from States	
When:		5-Sep-18	
		Status: Draft to be adopted by Subgroup	
Who:		☐ Sub groups ☐ APAC States ☒ ICAO APAC RO ☐ ICAO HQ ☐ Other:	

2.2 The meeting noted with concern that the contingency route between Karachi and Tehran FIRs (PEKES-New Boundary Point-IDEBA-NH), agreed upon during the SCM on Afghanistan Contingency Planning (Dubai, UAE, 25 August 2016) had not been implemented.

2.3 Based on the above, the meeting invited ICAO to arrange a Special Coordination Meeting (SCM) for Egypt, Cyprus and Lebanon and a SCM for Afghanistan, Iran and Pakistan to discuss the relevant ATS Route proposals and address the ATM issues at the two interfaces and provide feedback to the AIRARD TF/3 meeting.

Asia/Pacific Seamless ATM Plan Performance Expectations

2.1 The ICAO APAC Office provided a summary of the performance framework expected by the Asia/Pacific Seamless ATM Plan within the APAC Region, which could be modified for purpose and utilized as planning principles for PBN Highways.

2.2 The meeting discussed the performance expectations in terms of the minimum communication, navigation, surveillance and ATM standards that would be necessary where PBN Highways were being implemented (except where Free Route Airspace was in place or being planned).

2.3 India stressed that they supported the PBN Highways concept as it would assist the State to discuss optimised airspace pathways with military authorities, including the possible amendment of Special Use Airspace (SUA).

2.4 EUROCONTROL commented that RNAV5 was the standard en-route specification used in Europe, and that this was part of the EUR Air Navigation Plan. IATA asked for clarification as to the benefit of RNP 2. Noting that the PBN Highways concept was not planned to be implemented until at least 2022 and RNP 2 was expected to be commonly utilised by then, ICAO APAC recalled that RNP2 was a much higher performing navigation specification than RNAV5 because:

- RNP 2 required a database and waypoint sequencing (unlike RNAV5), which together with on-board monitoring provided greater track-keeping assurance;
- RNP 2 required a Global Navigation Surveillance System (GNSS) sensor input, unlike RNAV 5, which normally relied on a terrestrial navigation aid-rich environment and the correct geometry of those aids to service the entire route;
- RNP 2 had been proven to allow route spacing as close as 8NM within airspace served by ATS surveillance and 15NM without ATS surveillance, providing major benefits for airspace designers and users;
- RNP 2 was not dependent on ATS surveillance, so may provide a safety mitigation for potential ATS surveillance outages.

Surveillance-based Longitudinal Separation

2.5 The meeting emphasised that the horizontal separation minimum based on radar and/or ADS-B and/or MLAT systems shall be 5 NM. The meeting noted that the applicable longitudinal separation in a surveillance environment at the interfaces between MID/EUR and MID/APAC had been affecting the efforts to reduce the longitudinal separation to 10 NM within the ICAO MID Region (i.e. 50 NM between Karachi and Tehran ACCs, 30 NM between Cairo and Nicosia ACCs, etc.). Accordingly, the meeting requested ICAO to include the subject in the agenda of the SCMs.

2.6 The meeting requested ICAO APAC to urge Pakistan to implement a minimum spacing of 20NM longitudinally between the Karachi and Tehran Flight Information Regions (FIRs), instead of the 50NM requirement currently in place.

2.7 The ICAO APAC Office recalled that the Asia/Pacific Seamless ATM Plan's performance expectations for minimum horizontal separation at Transfer of Control (TOC) points between FIRs was between 5 – 10NM (dependent on ATS surveillance capability), to allow tactical measures such as coordinated vectoring when required.

SIDs and STARs New Phraseology

2.8 The ICAO MID Office highlighted the provisions of Amendment 7 to ICAO Doc 4444 related to the Standard Instrument Departures (SIDs) and Standard Terminal Arrival Routes or Standard Instrument Arrivals (STARs) radiotelephony phraseology, in order to agree on necessary measures to ensure an effective and harmonized implementation within the MID Region.

2.9 IATA expressed concern about the safety issues from an inconsistent implementation of the new standards), which had been creating confusion to pilots who had been using the old phraseologies within some FIRs and the new phraseologies in other FIRs. The meeting noted that an Initial MID Region Transition Plan for the implementation of the SIDs and STARs new phraseology would be developed and presented to the MID ATM SG/4 meeting (Cairo, Egypt, 29 April-3 May 2018) for endorsement.

AIRARD/TF/3

Airline Perspective

2.4 IATA (KLM) provided background information on the current flight planning process of airlines and the reasons behind route optimization requests by airlines, especially with regard to weather and airspace related deviations. IATA noted that airlines may have data available that can help ANSP traffic forecasting, and this can be part of an improved process for ATS route amendment.

2.5 IATA was urged by the meeting to provide more data on optimal pathways that may be suitable for implementation as future PBN Highways using end-to-end planning. This was related to Task 1/2 from the AIRARD/TF Task List, for which IATA would study the PBN Highway concept and provide data and analysis to AIRARD/TF/2.

Trans-Regional ATS Route Development Status

2.6 ICAO APAC presented the coordination and implementation of Trans-Regional Air Traffic Services (ATS) routes between the APAC, EUR/NAT and MID regions. Unfortunately, no progress had been possible with regard to the Russia-China interface, the Russia-Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK)-Republic of Korea (ROK) interface, the Russia-Japan interface, and only a few route amendments were able to be agreed on the MID – APAC interface, due to a lack of engagement by relevant States.

2.7 Coordination between the State ATM Corporation of Russia and China's Air Navigation Service Provider (ANSP) ATMB regarding new entry waypoints 5-Letter Name-Code (5LNC) around the waypoint SIMLI had been undertaken. Despite agreed actions and timelines from a bi-lateral meeting between China and the Russian Federation (held in Moscow, Russia on July 25-26 2017) there had been no progress in the implementation of the SIMLI package. The ICAO APAC Regional Office had recently received information that the matter was being progressed internally within Chinese administrations.

RDGE/28 Outcomes

2.8 ICAO EUR/NAT presented the main results from Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Route Development Group – Eastern Part of the ICAO EUR Region (RDGE/28, Paris, France, 10 – 13 April 2018). Turkey did not attend RDGE/28; however, Afghanistan, I.R. Iran and Iraq participated.

2.9 During the RDGE/28 a total number of 21 (+2) reports from States were discussed. These showed a strong annual average traffic growth of 10.1% when compared with the traffic figures for the previous year. It should be noted that the Russian Federation implemented 111 RNAV5 ATS Routes as part of their national PBN implementation plan in March 2018.

2.10 The RDGE/28 had reviewed ATS proposals from its Subgroups representing the Far East, Black Sea, Caucasus and Middle East Areas, and updated the EUR ATS Route Catalogue accordingly. The Far East Sub-Group members stressed again the importance of addressing necessary airspace improvements in China so that the implementation of the SIMLI dualisation project could be finalized before airspace changes and increased traffic complexity negatively impacted traffic flows.

2.11 The United Arab Emirates (UAE) stated that it was unfortunate that China, Russia, Pakistan and Turkey had not been able to attend the AIRARD/TF/3, and requested ICAO to convey to these States the importance of attendance. EUROCONTROL stated that Turkey had been busy with the preparations for the opening of the new Istanbul airport, planned for 29 October 2018.

ATS Route Proposals – Arabian Sea

2.12 India presented initiatives that had been undertaken to enhance airspace capacity in the Arabian Sea Region in collaboration with the adjoining States, including the Sultanate of Oman, Yemen and Somalia. India stated there was a need for an Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Controller Pilot Datalink Communication (ADS-CPDLC) mandate to allow priority for suitably equipped aircraft in order to enhance capacity over the Indian Ocean.

2.13 ICAO APAC recalled that such a mandate was consistent with the Asia/Pacific Seamless ATM Plan expectations, but to implement this a Proposal for Amendment (PfA) to Doc 7030 (Regional Supplementary Procedures) would be necessary.

2.14 The APAC/MID ATM Special Coordination Meeting (AMA SCM) was held on 02 May 2018 as a side meeting to the AIRARD TF/3 meeting between Iran, India, Oman, Yemen, MAAR, MIDRMA and ICAO (APAC and MID Regional Offices). The AMA SCM addressed issues related to ATM at the APAC/MID interface such as the large Height Deviation reports, improvements of ATM measures and ATS Route Network, etc.

2.15 The AMA SCM was apprised of the actions undertaken by India and Oman to reduce the level of coordination failures between Muscat and Mumbai ACCs. The meeting agreed on some measures that would enhance the ATM Operations at the APAC/MID interface, however, not all issues were addressed due to Afghanistan and Pakistan absence.

2.16 The meeting underlined that Afghanistan and Pakistan's presence was essential to achieve the objectives of the meeting to enhance safety and efficiency at the interface. Accordingly, the AMA SCM invited ICAO to arrange for another SCM with the presence of Afghanistan and Pakistan.

MID ATS Route Proposals

2.17 ICAO MID provided an update on ATS route development in the MID Region, including ATS route proposals affecting the interface between the MID and adjacent EUR and APAC Regions. The meeting noted that the contingency route between Karachi and Tehran FIRs (PEKES-New Boundary Point-IDEBA-NH), agreed upon during the SCM on Afghanistan Contingency Planning (Dubai, UAE, 25 August 2016) had still not yet been implemented.

2.18 The IATA delegation requested the meeting to raise the importance of holding the two SCMs to the appropriate levels and resolve the issues that were preventing the implementation of the important ATS Route developments.

2.19 I.R. Iran presented outstanding ATS route proposals between the Tehran and Karachi FIRs. It was noted that the barrier to important 'miles in-trail' reductions was caused by a 50NM longitudinal separation restriction on aircraft entering the airspace controlled by the Karachi Area Control Centre (ACC). Unfortunately, these proposals were not able to be progressed due to the non-attendance of and lack of responses from Pakistan.

CDR Re-categorisation

2.20 EUROCONTROL presented information on the European programme to re-categorise conditional routes (CDR).

Air Navigations Services Status and Development

2.21 On behalf of Afghanistan, the ICAO APAC Office presented information about the current status of Air Navigation Services (ANS) facilities in Afghanistan, and plans for ATM development.

2.22 Afghanistan had started the processes of implementing full radar coverage for the purpose of providing surveillance-based ATC services for air traffic within Kabul IFR. With implementation of the Multilateration/Wide Area Multilateration (MLAT/WAM) system, surveillance coverage would initially support the High Sector of the Kabul FIR, which mostly served overflying traffic. Upgrading of the system started on in April 2018 and would be completed in July 2018.

EUR FRA - Progress Report

2.23 EUROCONTROL presented Free Route Airspace (FRA) Concept requirements for a harmonized FRA AIP publication. IP04 provided an update on the implementation of FRA in the ICAO EUR Region, including Cross-border FRA expansion, short and medium term FRA implementation and operational system FRA issues. According to the European Union Implementing Rule, FRA operations above FL310 will become mandatory from 1 January 2022 onwards.

ATS Routes – Removal of Prefix ‘U’

2.24 ICAO EUR/NAT together with EUROCONTROL described the process of removal of prefix “U” from ATS routes designation and actions performed within the ICAO EUR Region. Stakeholders did not report any problems in regard to the operational systems and flight plan processing,

ATS Routes - Colocation Designation

2.25 ICAO EUR/NAT gave an overview to the AIRARD/TF about the process of removal of collocated ATS route designators and actions performed within the Western part of ICAO EUR Region. The main issue identified was that ATS Route Designation (RD) collocation leads to additional complexity. From a Computer Flight Plan Software Provider’s (CFSP’s) point of view it could lead to computational complexity, since all the route combinations needed to be considered in order to provide optimal routes.

2.26 The process of resolution of collocated (double/triple/quadruple) ATS route designation was initiated in May 2016 with presentation of a consolidated list of ‘RDs collocation resolution proposals’ for transfer into the European Route Network Improvement Plan (ERNIP) Database.

ATS Routes - Designation Inconsistencies

2.27 WP12 referred to identified inconsistencies in designation of ATS routes between adjacent ICAO Regions. The paper proposed ideas to extend existing route designators and resolve observed inconsistencies. ICAO EUR/NAT noted that EUR airspace development groups had Action Plans that aimed to rationalise use of route designators within the Region.

2.28 A random check of en-route charts provided by Jeppesen indicated inconsistencies inside adjacent ICAO Regions related to use of different RDs either on both sides of common FIR boundary or inside the same State. Examples in the ICAO MID Region were designation of ATS routes beyond the FIR boundary such as over significant points PATAT, RAGAS and TUMAK.

2.29 Examples provided by EUROCONTROL in the ICAO APAC Region was the designation of ATS routes over Phuket and Bangkok, where more than 15 RDs and 20 RDs respectively were used, so it was possible that some non-RNAV and RNAV RDs might be able to be released.

2.30 In accordance with Annex 11, Appendix 1, paragraph 2.2 the basic designator must consist of one letter of the alphabet followed by a number from 1 to 999. The meeting noted that in the MID Region one ATS route was designated as Y/UY001 while in the APAC Region there were ATS routes with the same start / end significant point but with different alignments, designated as W13 southbound and W13 northbound.

2.31 EUROCONTROL stated that that letter ‘T’ was being used for the establishment of so-called ‘temporary’ ATS routes, which were permanent routes in reality. This led to a significant number of double/triple/quadruple designations in adjacent ICAO Regions.

2.32 EUROCONTROL requested a process of RD rationalization be established and performed by all ICAO Regions. To facilitate this process, the meeting agreed that ICARD should be used as a common database by all ICAO Regional Offices. The meeting also agreed that the three ICAO Regions would coordinate as required through the Regional Offices to rationalise the RDs in order to simplify the aeronautical information and release more designators for the future.

ATS Route Designator Allocation

2.33 Information on appropriate procedures for the allocation of ATS route designators and to address the challenge related to the expected shortage of RNAV route designators was presented by the ICAO MID Office. The meeting noted with concern that the RNAV/Regional RDs reserved for the MID Region had been allocated to States. It was highlighted that a mechanism to optimize the use of RDs has been initiated by the MID Office

2.34 The MID ATM SG/3 (Cairo, Egypt, 22-25 May 2017) meeting recognized that the allocation of the Letters A, B, G, R for RNAV/Regional ATS routes could be a solution to resolve the foreseen shortage of route designators, which would hinder the implementation of PBN routes in the future. The MID ATM SG/3 meeting also noted that other ICAO Regions were supporting the proposal, which required the amendment of Annex 11 to remove the differentiation between RNAV and conventional route designators. This position had also been supported by the European working groups (RNDSG and RDGE).

2.35 ICAO EUR/NAT informed the meeting that the Instrument Flight Procedures Panel (IFPP) had recommended the use of C, D and E as additional designators but had not accepted the removal of the distinction between RNAV and non-RNAV route designators.

ICARD Issues

2.36 ICAO MID presented issues related to ICAO International Codes and Route Designators (ICARD), including publication of non-ICARD 5LNCs in State AIPs, duplicates and sound-like proximity, etc. The presentation clarified the ‘rules’ associated with 5LNC duplicates, especially the prioritisation of waypoints already registered in ICARD.

2.37 Jordan raised the issue of duplicated 5LNC that had national significance (for example, PETRA). The meeting recognised that these matters would be managed through the Regional Offices and where necessary, States might be requested to voluntarily change the waypoint.

2.38 ICAO APAC updated the meeting with a list of trans-regional duplicated five-letter name code extracted from the ICARD tool, and proposed resolution action by ICAO Regional Offices and States.

2.39 The ICARD 5LNC Task Force had been established in June 2017 to evaluate the pronounceability of the 5LNC available in the ICARD EUR/NAT reserve list and to identify related issues which may have applicability at the global level.

2.40 In their evaluation of the pronounceability of the remaining available codes in the EUR/NAT Reserve List at the first two meetings, the Task Force had highlighted that the issue of pronounceability was highly subjective depending on the native language of the persons performing the assessment. The TF also noted that the number of sound-alike 5LNC in the database was significant and therefore reduced considerably the actual number of available codes.

2.41 It was recalled that there were no rules for the letters forming a 5LNC, neither in the current ICAO provisions, nor in the ICARD database. The AIRARD/TF meeting noted that 73 available codes were found in the ICARD EUR/NAT database containing the letters I, Q, W, C and J, or the combination of the letters Y-I, C-K, Q-K, W-V, J-Y and G-K (such codes were pronounced in the same way, although they were spelt differently).

2.42 The EUR Region stated that such codes with similar pronounceability may pose potential safety issues as pilots may select the wrong 5LNC. The paper also noted problems with double consonants and/or vowels, 5LNC patterns and sound-like issues.

2.43 In summary, The ICARD 5LNC Task Force agreed that it would be very beneficial for both State Users and ICARD Data Managers to have the ICARD Database upgraded with a functionality that allowed the depiction of the FIR in a map.

2.44 It was further recommended that civil aviation authorities coordinate with military counterparts to address any potential safety issues related to military usage of 5LNCs, so that:

- such 5LNCs used by military stakeholders be registered in ICARD; and
- duplicated 5LNCs used by military stakeholders be replaced using ICARD.

2.45 Jordan asked about military coordination regarding 5LNCs, especially those codes that were not intended to be used by other agencies. ICAO reiterated the global position regarding the use of 5LNCs for military purposes and that the ICARD coordination was only necessary when the military waypoint would have the potential to be also used by civilian operations.

AIRARD/TF/4

2.46 IATA stressed that the AIRARD/TF was a vital forum for airlines, and that the airlines would provide the data needed to support any future meeting. The airlines/IATA recalled that the attendance of vital States was also crucial for airlines. EUROCONTROL supported the AIRARD/TF as it provided an opportunity to communicate with non-EUR States. ICAO HQ (Chief Airspace Optimization and Management), MID and EUR/NAT Offices supported the meeting, but recommended the format focus more on ATS route development outcomes, improvements of ATM measures, and amendments of ATS Letters of Agreement between adjacent ACCs. The arrangement of the AIRARD/TF back-to-back with other relevant ATM meetings was supported, as this ensured the right people could attend.

2.47 The meeting agreed that AIRARD/TF/4 would be tentatively planned at a venue in the APAC Region, at a time to be confirmed.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) note the information contained in this paper;
- b) agree to the Draft Decision, for further consideration by APANPIRG;
- c) discuss the ATS route and waypoint issues identified; and

- d) discuss any relevant matters as appropriate.

.....

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) of the

Advanced Inter-Regional ATS Route Development Task Force (AIRARD/TF)

1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

1.1 The terms of reference of the AIRARD Task Force are to:

- a) identify requirements and improvements for achieving and maintaining an efficient route network across the ICAO APAC, EUR/NAT and MID Regions based on the airspace user needs and in coordination with stakeholders (States, International Organizations, user representative organizations and other ICAO Regions);
- b) ensure harmonized planning and implementation of ATS routes and airspace improvement projects at the interfaces between the three ICAO Regions;
- c) monitor the status of implementation of the agreed ATS routes and airspace improvement projects;
- d) in case of implementation problems, identify the associated difficulties and propose/agree to solutions to further progress with the implementation;
- e) review and amend the components of the ATS route structure and airspace description in order to ensure their compliance with ICAO provisions (e.g. five-letter name-code (5LNC) uniqueness, ATS route designators, WGS-84 coordinates, flexible use of airspace (FUA) implementation);
- f) discuss and support the implementation of new concept;
- g) determine the CNS requirements, interoperable entry/exit points or areas, connections into the TMAs, weather related issues, terrain aspects, airspace organisation which would be needed in order to support the implementation of the new concepts;
- h) achieve common understanding and support from all stakeholders involved in or affected by the ATM developments/activities in the three ICAO Regions; and
- i) use the AIRARD/TF meetings as a forum for bilateral and multilateral discussions (such as review of ANS Letters of Agreements).

1.2 In order to meet the Terms of Reference, the AIRARD Task Force shall:

- a) Discuss and review the ATS route network and airspace improvement projects which involve States (including the Military) and all aviation stakeholders (airspace users, international organisations and Computer Flight Plan Software/Service Providers (CFSPs)) across the three Regions;
- b) propose a strategy and prioritized plan for development of improvements to the route network and/or airspace structure to facilitate harmonized and synchronized trans-regional planning, highlighting:
 - areas that require immediate attention (solution of safety, capacity or complexity constraints);
 - interface issues with adjacent ICAO Regions;
- c) monitor and report on the implementation status of the prioritized plan;
- d) develop a roadmap for the implementation of new concepts such as the PBN highways;

- e) develop a working depository for route proposals that will be used as a dynamic reference document for ongoing discussions on routes under development/modification. In this respect, the Task Force should explore the utility that can be realized from the route catalogue concept/ATS routes database; and
- f) address CNS and ATM interface issues with other regions and make specific recommendations to achieve a harmonized and interoperable environment in the interface areas between the regions.

2. In order to effectively perform its tasks and responsibilities:

- a) The AIRARD TF shall elect Co-Chairpersons (one from a State and one from the airspace users) for a cycle of three meetings, unless otherwise re-elected.
- b) The TF shall meet at least once a year and/or when deemed necessary.
- c) The TF meetings should be hosted by its members on rotation basis.
- d) The TF shall report to the relevant ATM Groups in the APAC and MID Regions under the Asia/Pacific Air Navigation Planning and Implementation Regional Group (APANPIRG), the European Air Navigation Planning Group (EANPG), North Atlantic Systems Planning Group (NAT SPG) and the Middle East Air Navigation Planning and Implementation Regional Group (MIDANPIRG).

3. COMPOSITION

The AIRARD Task Force is composed of:

- a) States from APAC, EUR/NAT and MID Regions, or States providing services in the APAC, EUR/NAT and MID Regions;
- b) concerned International and Regional Organizations; and
- c) other representatives from provider States and Industry may be invited on ad hoc basis, as observers, when required.

Draft – to be endorsed by APANPIRG and EANPG
Endorsed by MIDANPIRG