



International Civil Aviation Organization

AN Min. 196-10
16/7/14

AIR NAVIGATION COMMISSION

196TH SESSION

Minutes of the Tenth Meeting

(ANC Chamber, Wednesday, 25 June 2014, at 1000 hours)

PRESIDENT: Mr. F. Zizi

ACTING SECRETARY: Mr. H. Gourdji, DD/MO

COMMISSIONERS:

Mr. A.H. Alaufi
Mr. S. Allotey
Mr. D.C. Behrens
Mr. J. Bollard
Mr. R. Carboni
Mr. A.M.F. Crespo
Mr. M.G. Fernando
Mr. D. Fitzpatrick
Mr. P.D. Fleming
Mr. M. Halidou
Mr. E.Ö. Héðinsson
Mr. J. Herrero
Mr. C. Hurley
Mr. A.A. Korsakov
Mr. H. Park
Mr. F. Tai
Mr. H. Yoshimura

OBSERVERS (cont'd):

Mr. F. Ortiz Acheritogaray – Chile
Mr. S. Dutta – India
Mr. A.J. Baraybar González – Peru
Mr. K. Yillikçi – Turkey

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. J-L. Ammeloot – EASA Representative to ICAO

SECRETARIAT:

Mr. Y. Wang – C/AGA
Mr. J. Cheong – TO/AGA
Mr. G. Ville – TO/AGA
Mr. A. Shilo – Associate TO/AGA
Mrs. D. Cooper – PO/PW
Ms. L. Wirtanen – Précis Writer

OBSERVERS:

Mr. D. Gamper – ACI
Mr. F. Hofmann – IAOPA
Mr. M.T. Comber – IATA
Mr. M.F. Jackson – IFALPA
Dr. R. Stilwell – IFATCA

1. On behalf of the Commission, the President welcomed Mr. Jeffrey Bollard, a new Commissioner. He also welcomed Mr. Avner Shilo, a new Associate Technical Officer in the Airport Operations and Interoperability (AOI) Section.

19603 Final review of proposed amendments to Annex 14, Volume I and proposed Procedures for Air Navigation Services — Aerodromes
AN-WP/8837, AN-WP/8837.PDP

2. TO/AGA introduced AN-WP/8837 which presented the results of a consultation with States and international organizations (State letter AN 4/1.1. 53-13/81) on a proposal for amendment of Annex 14 — *Aerodromes*, Volume I — *Aerodrome Design and Operations* and the proposed *Procedures for Air Navigation Services — Aerodromes* (PANS-Aerodromes). TO/AGA noted that the proposed PANS-Aerodromes, emanating from the PANS-Aerodromes Study Group (PASG), covered the areas of aerodrome certification, safety assessment and aerodrome compatibility, and concentrated on the operational aspects of aerodromes rather than on specifications for design that were contained in Annex 14, Volume I. He recalled that the PASG was directed to prioritize concerns arising from the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme and that Amendment 10 to Annex 14, Volume I introduced the concept of using procedures in the State regulatory framework for certification. In this regard, the PANS-Aerodromes contained measures to improve the levels of aerodrome certification. TO/AGA advised that the PASG was currently working on the second edition and was expected to complete the draft on the priority topics for Chapter 5 in the latter part of the year.

3. The Chairperson of ANC Working Group of the Whole on AN Work Programme Deliverables Production (AN-WG/PDP) summarized the group's review of proposals as contained in AN-WP/8837-PDP and explained that due to time constraints their review ended on page B-93. From this page onward, the comments and proposals of Commission Group 5 (CG-5) were incorporated as reflected in Discussion Paper No. 1 to AN-WP/8837. He commended the efforts of all involved in the work on the proposed PANS-Aerodromes.

4. The Commission began its review of AN-WP/8837.PDP with the President opening the floor for general comments. In referring to the tight timeframe for discussion on this item, a speaker suggested that the Commission consider continuing the discussion in the 197th session, if deemed necessary. The Observer of IATA noted that IATA's perspective was to move forward as soon as possible with the publication of the PANS-Aerodromes, highlighting that considerable work had been involved and that its publication afforded time to receive feedback and for States to prepare the regulatory framework. Echoing this view, the Observer of ACI pointed out that industry needed this guidance and that the first edition would clarify many issues not covered in Annex 14. Other speakers also concurred on the importance of completing the review in the current session.

5. A comment spoke of the need to move forward quickly in addressing the deficiencies in Annex 14 and the PANS-Aerodromes, considering that once regulations were in place and were being implemented deficiencies would take much longer to address. The President recalled that Job Card AP006 on aerodrome provisions took into account the substantial work to be done in the future.

6. Turning to Appendix B, page B-36, it was pointed out that the definition of on-site verification was agreed by the Commission in the preliminary review, but had been omitted from the State letter. The Commission agreed that this item be brought to the attention of the PASG for inclusion in the second edition.

7. On page B-44, paragraph 2.2.2.1 f), a concern was raised that the wording for the new sub-paragraph 6) on minimum RVR could lead to a potential conflict with flight operations. TO/AGA replied that proposal was intended for aerodrome operators and pointed out that the foreword of the PANS-Aerodromes stated that the procedures were not intended to limit the operations of aircraft, which was taken from Annex 14, Volume I, Note to Chapter 1. The Commission agreed to the AN-WG/PDP proposal and requested that it be brought to the attention of the Aerodromes Panel and the PASG to ensure consistency.

8. Turning to page B-53, Section 2.3.2.8, an editorial correction was noted in the original text of the State letter to insert the paragraph number 2.3.2.7 and renumber the paragraphs accordingly.
9. On page B-61, paragraph 2.3.6.3, a comment emphasized that the conditions for maintaining the validity of a certificate needed to be specified and any temporary changes in conditions such as low visibility operations or service ability of certain navigational aids or ground aids should not nullify the certificate. It was also pointed out that the word “open-ended” could be misinterpreted as meaning that no further conditions needed to be maintained in the future. The Principal of CG-5 remarked that there was an inconsistency in the text in terms of the wording, pointing out that both types of certificates needed to refer to maintaining the granting conditions. The Acting Secretary suggested that the Secretariat review the language used in the *Airworthiness Manual* concerning the validity of two types of certificates, which made reference to “continuous” instead of “open-ended”. The Commission requested the Secretariat to revise the proposal and to add a note, taking into account the comments raised during the discussion, for the consideration of the Commission at its next meeting.
10. On page B-64, with regard to section 2.4.3 (State’s feedback on occurrences), the Secretariat was requested to verify the correct paragraph structuring to ensure that the relationships between the paragraphs was clear.
11. In reference to page B-72, in addition to the Secretariat’s proposed action on paragraph 2.4.4.3 d), the Commission agreed to the AN-WG/PDP recommendation on paragraphs 2.4.4.3.1 and 2.4.4.3.1.1. With a related comment, the Chairperson of the AN-WG/PDP advised of an editorial correction on page B-74 to delete the Secretariat’s proposed action at the top of the page.
12. Turning to page B-94, paragraph 2.2 b) 1), a speaker favoured the retention of the reference to other tasks attributed to rescue and fire fighting (RFF) personnel. Attention was also drawn to the concern expressed in the PIRG report for an indication of the number of RFF personnel required for each airport category. TO/AGA remarked that although RFF personnel undertook other tasks, the main objective of the service was to save lives in the event of an accident. He indicated that the CG-5 proposal was appropriate within the context of Annex 14, Volume 1 that contained a provision related to the use of task-resource analysis in determining the minimum number of RFF personnel and a note indicating that guidance could be found in the *Airport Services Manual* (Doc 9137). The Observer of ACI expressed support of the CG-5 proposal, remarking that Annex 14 contained all the requirements and the primary purpose of the RFF service was covered in the reference to aerodrome RFF category. He was of the opinion that there was no need to mention the secondary tasks. The Commission agreed to the CG-5 proposal with the addition of a note to indicate that guidance material on staffing levels for RFF at aerodromes was found in Doc 9137.
13. On page B-96, paragraph 2.3 d), the discussion focused on the inconsistent use of the word “wildlife” among Annexes 14 and 19, the PANS-Aerodromes, and related guidance material. TO/AGA explained that in Chapter 9 to Annex 14, Volume 1, the term appeared in the first instance as “wildlife (birds and animals)” and thereafter as “wildlife”. The Commission agreed to the CG-5 proposal on page B-97 and requested that the PASG review the use of the term to ensure consistency among all texts. A proposal put forward but not agreed was to refer to “accidents” in paragraph 2.3 d) 1); it was felt that this addition could lead to some confusion.
14. Turning to page B-113, paragraph 5.8, a speaker questioned the need to include a reference to VASIS because there was currently a proposal to remove it from Annex 14. C/AGA explained that the consequential amendment would be reflected in the PANS-Aerodromes once the proposed amendment to Annex 14 had been approved.

15. On page B-126, paragraphs 3.4.3 and 3.4.4, it was pointed out that the terminology in the PANS-Aerodromes was not consistent with Annex 19. The importance of ensuring that terminology be used uniformly throughout ICAO documents was highlighted. In replying to a query from the President on the mechanism used by the Secretariat to ensure that the terminology was kept up to date, the Acting Secretary indicated that a n ICAO terminology reference guide and internal documents were used. The Secretariat was *requested* to inform the Commission in due course on the status of the latest updates to terminology.

16. In relation to page B-143, paragraph 2.2.1, a speaker favoured rewording the proposal on runway width based on the original text, noting that the word “requirements” was unclear in terms of whether it was addressed to aircraft operators or airport operators. He also pointed out that since the runway width requirements were related to a code associated with wing span as well, this statement could potentially be misinterpreted and lead to the use of lesser runway width than specified in Annex 14. C/AGA explained that the original text, stemming from *Operation of New Larger Aeroplanes at Existing Aerodromes* (Circ 305), contained two parts: one related to design as contained in Annex 14 that established the width based on the reference code; and the other referring to operations for cases that went beyond the reference code for which the performance of a specific aircraft would need to be analysed in terms of its characteristics. The Principal of CG-5 proposed that the word “primarily” be deleted and a reference to Annex 14 be added to clarify the aspect of design. In addition, he proposed that the text include the basic operational characteristics and a reference to the additional safety factors of the requirements. The Observer of IATA, recalling that Circular 305 had been developed with a great deal of care in response to the need to accommodate other aircraft, suggested that the wording be taken into consideration when redrafting the proposal. In light of the discussion, the Commission *requested* the Secretariat to revise the proposal for the consideration of the Commission at its next meeting.

17. Drawing attention to page B-144, paragraph 2.2.3, the Observer of ACI suggested that the words “the risk of” be added before “aircraft damage”. Another speaker felt that the main issue was not the available runway width but rather the secondary effects associated with increasing runway width such as changing the centre line and the width of the taxiways. Moreover, he indicated that runway width should not be associated with aircraft veering off the runway because the aircraft operator should do a risk assessment on whether or not the runway width available was suitable for its operation. He questioned whether aircraft operators subject to the PANS-Aerodromes would be able to conduct this type of assessment and make these decisions. An editorial correction was also noted to align the wording of “aircraft” and “aeroplane”. The Commission *agreed* to the CG-5 proposal as amended by the wording suggested by the Observer of ACI and *requested* that the text be brought to the attention of the PASG for their review for the next edition of PANS-Aerodromes.

18. All other proposals in AN-WP/8837.PDP, up to and including page B-146, were *agreed* without change.

19. In view of the hour, the Commission *deferred* further consideration of AN-WP/8837.PDP to the next meeting.

20. The meeting *adjourned* at 1255 hours.
