

Agenda Item 1: Review of ATM matters

ATM general matters

1.1 Upon examining the agenda items in the ATM area, the meeting deemed it advisable to address SAR and ATM issues separately, and thus decided to modify the tentative agenda to include item 4, Review of SAR matters, moving Other Matters to agenda item 5.

a) Review of the status of implementation of the CAR/SAM AIS/ATM/CNS 02/00 Informal Meeting conclusions related to the ATM area

1.2 The meeting recalled that the First Meeting of the Informal Coordination Group of the East Caribbean and North Eastern South America (E-CAR/SAM-NE ICG) was held in Cayenne, from 27 to 29 March 2001, with the main purpose of studying and proposing measures to resolve the deficiencies affecting the provision of air traffic services in the area in question, which comprises the FIRs of Belem and Manaus (Brazil), Rochambeau (French Guyana), Paramaribo (Suriname), Georgetown (Guyana), Maiquetía (Venezuela), and Piarco (Trinidad and Tobago).

1.3 The meeting felt the need to review the conclusions of the aforementioned meeting in order to determine the status of implementation of said conclusions, in the understanding that some of such conclusions might suffer modifications as a result of the debate on the various agenda items. To this end, the following classification was adopted:

Classification of the status of Conclusions	
Effective:	Valid
Not effective:	Not valid
Pending:	Not implemented
Finalized:	Completed
Ongoing:	Continuous or of a permanent nature
Replaced:	Superseded by another conclusion or decision

1.4 The delegations submitted a number of working papers on the actions adopted by their States with respect to the conclusions in question, and these were derived to the *ad-hoc* groups that were created to review the agenda items related to the ATM area.

1.5 The results of the debate and the classification of the conclusions appear in **Appendix A** to this part of the report.

b) Conclusions/Decisions adopted by GREPECAS/11 in the ATM area

1.6 The Secretariat submitted a summary of the conclusions and decisions adopted in the ATM area by the Eleventh Meeting of the CAR/SAM Planning and Implementation Group (GREPECAS/11), held in Manaus, Brazil, from 3 to 7 December 2002, for its review and, if necessary, for the adoption of the actions it might deem appropriate.

1.7 The meeting took note of the information provided and observed that the actions were being taken by the meetings of ATM Authorities and Planners sponsored by Project RLA/98/003, and considered that it was the best forum to review matters related to RNAV and RVSM implementation programmes and take the relevant action for their implementation.

c) Follow-up of ATM and SAR deficiencies identified in the area

1.8 The meeting recalled that the Eighth Meeting of Civil Aviation Authorities of the SAM Region (RAAC/8) held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in April 2003, examined the issue of air navigation the deficiencies and took note of the follow-up carried out by the ICAO SAM Regional Office on Conclusion 7/13 of the RAAC/7 meeting, according to which the States had to send, by 31 October 2002, a plan of action to correct the deficiencies which had been identified, validated and classified at said meeting. Following some formal contacts with the States, the ICAO Regional Office had only received plans corresponding to 6 States.

1.9 Likewise, the meeting took note of Conclusion 8/10 of RAAC/8 concerning the regional strategy to improve coordination procedures and the implementation of measures to resolve, in an efficient manner, the deficiencies identified by the various mechanisms contained in the methodology developed by the ICAO Council. This methodology highlights the importance of clearly defining the corrective measures to be taken.

1.10 In this respect, the meeting examined the deficiencies which had been identified and classified by GREPECAS as “U” deficiencies, and the delegates reported on the action taken regarding each deficiency. The Netherlands Antilles and France reported that the deficiencies corresponding to their FIRs had been resolved (see Appendices B1 and B3). The States in which the deficiency was still present agreed to formulate a plan of action through the following conclusion:

Conclusion 2/1 Plan of action to resolve the deficiencies identified in the ATM area

That Brazil, Trinidad and Tobago and Venezuela adopt, no later than the dates of the plan of action that appear in **Appendices B2, B4 and B5**, to this part of the report, respectively, appropriate measures to resolve definitively the deficiencies identified and classified by GREPECAS as “U” deficiencies.

d) Review of letters of operational agreement (LOAs) between ACCs

1.11 The meeting recognised that coordination between adjacent ATS authorities is essential for the regional planning of airspace, since it permits an understanding of common problems and leads to effective airspace and traffic organisation. It also recognised that this co-ordination can be achieved through bilateral agreements or as a result of informal regional/sub-regional meetings.

1.12 In keeping with these basic assumptions and in view of the time elapsed since the initial application of the LOAs associated to the need to modify coordination procedures, route networks, separation criteria, etc., the States participating in the informal coordination group of the East Caribbean and North East South America reviewed their letters of operational agreement through the *ad-hoc* groups established for that purpose.

1.13 On the other hand, as a result of RVSM implementation in the CAR/SAM Regions foreseen for 20 January 2005, the Secretariat submitted a list of RVSM matters that could be considered by the States for inclusion in the letters of operational agreement. The meeting examined these matters and decided that the agreements containing RVSM matters would be signed on the first half of 2004. Consequently, the States formulated the following conclusion:

Conclusion 2/2 Inclusion of RVSM matters in the letters of operational agreement

That the Netherlands Antilles, Brazil, France, Trinidad and Tobago and Venezuela:

- a) during the first half of 2004, include RVSM-related issues in their letters of operational agreement; and
- b) to this effect, take into account the draft agreements shown in **Appendices E1, E2, E3, E4 and E5**.

1.14 The meeting reviewed a series of draft operational agreements, which later served as the basis for the work of the *ad-hoc* groups.

1.15 The agreements reviewed by the meeting were the following:

Maiquetía ACC/Curaçao ACC (including visual traffic agreement)
Maiquetía ACC/Piarco ACC
Maiquetía ACC/Amazónico ACC
Amazónico ACC/Rochambeau ACC
Atlántico ACC/Rochambeau ACC
Piarco ACC/Rochambeau ACC

1.16 The delegate of France informed the meeting that he was not authorised to sign the operational agreements for the Rochambeau FIR and thus requested the adjacent States to allow him to analyse the operational agreements with the relevant authorities, after which the original agreements, duly signed, would be exchanged by mail.

1.17 In view of the above, the meeting adopted the following conclusions:

Conclusion 2/3 Update of the Letter of Operational Agreement between the Maiquetía and Curaçao ACCs

That:

- a) the Netherlands Antilles and Venezuela adopt the letter of operational agreement for the Curaçao and Maiquetía area control centres that appears, as reviewed, in **Appendix F** to this part of the report; and
- b) the letter of operational agreement become effective on the AIRAC date of 10 June 2004.

Conclusion 2/4 Update of the letter of operational agreement between the Maiquetía and Piarco ACCs

That:

- a) Trinidad and Tobago and Venezuela adopt the letter of operational agreement for the Piarco and Maiquetía area control centres that appears, as reviewed, in **Appendix G** to this part of the report; and
- b) the letter of operational agreement become effective on the AIRAC date of 19 February 2004.

Conclusion 2/5 Update of the letter of operational agreement between the Amazónico and Maiquetía ACCs

That:

- a) Brazil and Venezuela adopt the letter of operational agreement for the Amazónico and Maiquetía area control centres that appears, as reviewed and duly signed, in **Appendix H** to this part of the report; and
- b) the operational letter of agreement become effective on the AIRAC date of 10 June 2004.

Conclusion 2/6 Update of the letter of operational agreement between the Amazónico and Rochambeau ACCs

That:

- a) Brazil and France adopt the revised letter of operational agreement for the Amazónico and Rochambeau area control centres that appears, as reviewed, in **Appendix I** to this part of the report; and

- b) the letter of operational agreement become effective on the AIRAC date of 10 June 2004.

Note: Once the respective aeronautical authorities have reviewed and signed the letters of operational agreement, Brazil and France will exchange such letters as soon as possible and no later than 1 March 2004, and send a copy to the ICAO South American Regional Office.

Conclusion 2/7 Update of the letter of operational agreement between the Atlántico and Rochambeau ACCs

That:

- a) Brazil and France adopt the letter of operational agreement for the Atlántico and Rochambeau area control centres that appears, as reviewed, in **Appendix J** to this part of the report; and
- b) the operational letter of agreement become effective on the AIRAC date of 10 June 2004.

Note: Once the respective aeronautical authorities have reviewed and signed the letters of operational agreement, Brazil and France will exchange such letters as soon as possible and no later than 1 March 2004, and send a copy to the ICAO South American Regional Office.

Conclusion 2/8 Update of the letter of operational agreement between the Rochambeau and Piarco ACCs

That France and Trinidad and Tobago:

- a) review the draft letter of operational agreement for the Rochambeau and Piarco area control centres that appears, as reviewed, in **Appendix K** to this part of the report; and
- b) take the appropriate measures in order to sign this operational agreement to become effective on the AIRAC date of 10 June 2004.

Note: Once the respective aeronautical authorities have reviewed and signed the letters of operational agreement, France and Trinidad and Tobago will exchange such letters as soon as possible and no later than 1 March 2004, and send a copy to the ICAO South American Regional Office.

1.18 The delegation of Brazil requested the ICAO Secretariat to send the letters of agreement between the Amazónico and Georgetown ACCs and between the Amazónico and Paramaribo ACCs that appear in **Appendices L** and **M** to Guyana and Suriname, respectively, for their analysis and comments, so as to have them ready and signed as soon as feasible, in order that they become valid in the AIRAC date of 10 June 2004.

e) **ATS contingency plans**

1.19 The meeting recalled that, in 2002, ICAO re-examined the issue of ATS contingency plans, and that the Council, at the 10th meeting of its 168th Session, adopted amendment 42 to Annex 11 – Air Traffic Services, effective on 27 November 2003. This amendment contained, *inter alia*, guidelines for drafting, promulgating and implementing contingency plans, and became the new Attachment D to Annex 11.

1.20 The objective of ATS contingency plans is to have available other facilities and services that will come into operation in the event that those foreseen in the regional air navigation plan suffer a temporary failure, and States are responsible for adopting the necessary measures to ensure the safety of international civil aviation operations.

1.21 These ATS contingency plans must take into account the activities of each FIR so that they may be included in a national contingency plan covering not only international but also domestic civil aviation activities.

1.22 The national ATS contingency plans for the FIRs of each State should be reviewed in light of the new provisions contained in the aforementioned Attachment D to Annex 11. Since these contingency plans directly affect adjacent FIRs, especially as refers to operational procedures, coordination and traffic re-routing, this analysis should be carried out jointly with neighbouring States, if applicable, so as to harmonise the contingency plans of all the parties concerned.

1.23 The administrations of Brazil, France and Venezuela submitted their contingency plans, which reflected the main international and domestic traffic flows, for consideration by the participating States.

1.24 The Brazilian administration submitted the contingency plan for the Amazónica FIR (see **Appendix N** to this part of the report) containing the main international traffic flows, for consideration by Venezuela and French Guyana, and, if possible, through the ICAO Secretariat, by Suriname, Guyana, Colombia, Peru and Bolivia.

1.25 The meeting was informed that the contingency plan for the Maiquetía FIR was in its final phase and that it had been harmonised to the extent possible with the contingency plan for the Amazónica FIR, and that it was awaiting comments by the adjacent States for harmonising the traffic flows (see **Appendix O**).

1.26 In turn, Brazil informed the meeting that the representation of French Guyana had taken note of the contingency plans for the Amazónica FIR and that it would exchange information in order to be able to draft its contingency plan.

1.27 Trinidad and Tobago submitted a draft ATS contingency plan for the Piarco FIR, which appears in **Appendix P** to this part of the report.

1.28 The meeting also agreed on the need for the States involved to apply the regulations contained in Annex 11 in order to develop precise, consistent and harmonised contingency plans from the beginning.

1.29 In view of the above, and in order to fulfill the tasks aimed at the harmonisation and publication of the contingency plans of the Sub-region, the meeting adopted a plan of action to review and harmonise the contingency plans of the Amazónica, Curaçao, Maiquetía, Piarco and Rochambeau FIRs, and requested the ICAO Secretariat, inasmuch as possible, to adopt the necessary measures so that all other adjacent States would also update their plans, taking into account the contingency plans of the aforementioned FIRs.

1.30 Consequently, the meeting agreed to formulate the following conclusion:

Conclusion 2/9 ATS contingency plans

That:

- a) the Netherlands Antilles, Brazil, France, Trinidad and Tobago and Venezuela, based on Appendix D to Annex 11:
 - (i) review, with their adjacent States, the ATS contingency plans for the Amazónica, Maiquetía, Piarco and Rochambeau FIRs, and agree on the most appropriate measures for their harmonisation, including RVSM-related issues;
 - (ii) to that end, comply with the five phases of the Plan of Action, according to the timetable contained in **Appendix D** to this part of the report; and
- b) the ICAO SAM Regional Office take the necessary steps so that ECARSAMNE and adjacent States, to the extent possible, implement the Plan of Action in order to harmonise these contingency plans with those corresponding to such FIRs.