



INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION  
EASTERN AND SOUTHERN OFFICE

**First Meeting of the AFI VSAT Networks Managers (AFI VSAT/1)**  
(Kwa-Zulu Natal, South Africa, 13 to 15 June 2011)

**Agenda Item 2a:**

**MEMBERSHIP**

*(Presented by Kenya and IATA)*

**SUMMARY**

This paper provides a briefing on NAFISAT Membership and its administration

**REFERENCE(S)**

- AFI/7 RAN Meeting
- APIRG Recommendation 13/15
- NAFISAT MOU
- Contracts between States and NAFISAT Network Provider

**1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1. AFI Plan includes requirements for AFTN and ATS/DS with the view to supporting flight coordination throughout the Region.

1.2. Terrestrial links have not been able to fully meet the Regional requirements due to AFI geographical challenges. Several implemented circuits had reliability shortcomings while many deficiencies resulted from non-implementations.

1.3. In 1997, the ICAO AFI/7 RAN Meeting approved the Recommendation 9/2 to support the use of VSAT technology to improve the ATS/DS circuits and AFTN links between adjacent FIRs in the Region.

1.4. Therefore, to resolve shortcomings and deficiencies, the June 2001 APIRG 13 Meeting held in Sal, Cape Verde adopted Conclusion 13/15 recommending the establishment of the North Eastern African Indian Ocean VSAT Network (NAFISAT<sup>1</sup>).

<sup>1</sup> Chad, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Tripoli, Mogadishu, Entebbe, and Uganda

## 2. DISCUSSION

2.1. In response to APIRG Conclusion 13/15, an informal CNS/ATM co-ordination meeting was held in September 2001 in Nairobi; it was attended by Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mogadishu, Entebbe and Uganda. The meeting decided to:

2.1.1. Advise ICAO their acceptance in principle of their participation in the NAFISAT Network and;

2.1.2. Establish a Working Group for the NAFISAT implementation composed of Kenya, IATA and ICAO.

2.2. The Working Group convened for the first time in January 2002 and noted the initial list of States and proposed that adjacent States<sup>2</sup> to the “NAFISAT” Region be invited to participate in the implementation of the NAFISAT network.

2.3. IATA presented the Working Group with a proposed institutional and a funding mechanism, which were fine-tuned and circulated among the relevant States.

2.4. At its second meeting in September 2002, the Working Group considered the architecture based on a Multi Channel per Carrier Frame Relay VSAT technology platform together with a basic costing and network implementation concept and a cost recovery mechanism to be funded by the airlines.

2.5. IATA was requested to prepare a business case for the implementation. Subsequently, NAFISAT States held their first meeting on 4 and 5 February 2003 in Nairobi and approved the tasks performed by the Working Group as the proposed plan provided an opportunity to address the users’ requirements, in order to eliminate deficiencies, which were recorded against the approved AFI Plan in NAFISAT area.

2.6. The States indicated the need for interoperability with the existing AFISNET and other neighboring VSAT networks under development;

2.7. Furthermore, it was requested that IATA, in co-ordination with ICAO, to prepare a detailed tender documentation set and that such documentation be approved by a NAFISAT Management Committee by July 2003.

2.8. The selection of a Network Provider competitively was found difficult to implement in the absence of an existing institutional framework and funding mechanism and after consultations on possible scenarios, the Working Group opted to support a joint proposal from IATA and ATNS for the provision and operation of the NAFISAT network and circulated it to the Member States for consideration.

2.9. NAFISAT States held their second Meeting on 6 and 7 July 2003, reviewed, adopted the circulated joint IATA/ATNS Network Provider proposal and accepted the joint IATA/ATNS proposal and designated ATNS/IATA as the NAFISAT Network Operator.

2.10. The meeting further concluded that a Memorandum of Understanding be developed defining relationships and the concept for the implementation of the NAFISAT Network; a couple of States, IATA

---

<sup>2</sup> Democratic Republic of Congo, India, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Tanzania and Yemen

and ATNS signed the MOU in October 2004 at the 35th ICAO Assembly in Montreal while other member States requested clarifications.

2.11. By 2006 all 13 States, namely, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles and Yemen signed the MOU enabling the implementation process to commence.

2.12. A joint NAFISAT – SADC VSAT 2 call for tender was made, followed by the implementation in 2008 and the commissioning of NAFISAT in July 2009.

2.13. Attached is the Institutional Frameworks, that administers the NAFISAT Network, which ensure that:

2.13.1. The network provide services meeting or exceeding service level agreed and;

2.13.2. The cost recovery mechanism is effectively implemented.

### **3. CONCLUSION**

3.1. The Supervisory Committee has been strategically driving down operating costs while managing better revenue collection.

3.2. That is making a positive difference in ensuring infrastructure safety.

---END---

### **NAFISAT Attachment Relating to Institutional Framework**

1.2.1. **Objective:** To provide support for ATS communications in ATS-DS, AFTN (migration to ATN), FDPS, OPMET, AIS data exchange, and any other agreed Aeronautical service between the NAFISAT States

1.2.2. **MOU:** It was agreed that an MOU be signed by NAFISAT States, ATNS and IATA to define the relationships.

1.2.3. **Membership:** The members are Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles and Yemen.

1.2.4. **Management:** The Network was funded, implemented and is managed, operated and maintained by the Network Provider consisting of IATA and ATNS of South Africa on behalf of the Members.

1.2.5. **Supervisory Committee:** Each State, the Network Provider and ICAO, as Secretary, are represented in this committee that meets once a year to oversee the performance of the Network Provider and approve the Budget and any major developments.

1.2.6. **Cost Recovery:** The network provider recovers its cost by a bilaterally agreed on cost recovery mechanism where for most States Airlines contribute directly on the basis of the number of flights that cross the NAFISAT region FIRs.

1.2.7. **Ownership:** The Network Provider owns the Network and equipment in 11 States on behalf of the States until Its expenses are fully recovered. Two States opted to purchase their VSAT equipment and directly pay for their share of operational costs and so do not provide Statistics on FIR crossings by Aircraft.