



International Civil Aviation Organization

AN Min. 196-11
22/7/14

AIR NAVIGATION COMMISSION

196TH SESSION

Minutes of the Eleventh Meeting

(ANC Chamber, Thursday, 26 June 2014, at 1000 hours)

PRESIDENT: Mr. F. Zizi

Secretary: Ms. N. Graham, D/ANB

COMMISSIONERS:

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

Mr. A.H. Alaoui
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

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. J-L. Ammeloot – EASA Representative to ICAO
Mr. S. Vuokila – former Commissioner

SECRETARIAT:

Mr. Y. Wang	– C/AGA
Mr. J. Cheong	– TO/AGA
Mr. G. Ville	– TO/AGA
Mr. A. Shilo	– ATO/AGA
Mr. M. Costa	– C/AIG
Mr. A. De Kock	– TO/AIG
Mrs. E.A. Gnehm	– TO/ISM
Mrs. D. Cooper	– PO/PW
Ms. L. Wirtanen	– Précis Writer

OBSERVERS:

Mr. D. Gamper	– ACI
Mr. M.T. Comber	– IATA
Mr. V. Galotti	– ICCAIA
Mr. M.F. Jackson	– IFALPA
Dr. R. Stilwell	– IFATCA
Mr. F. Ortiz Acheritogaray	– Chile
Mr. C. A. Bejarano Ramón	– Colombia
Mr. A.J. Baraybar González	– Peru
Dr. K. Yillikçi	– Turkey

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

1. The Commission resumed (196-10) its consideration of 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 proposals for amendment of Annex 14 — *Aerodromes*, Volume I — *Aerodrome Design and Operations* and proposed *Procedures for Air Navigation Services – Aerodromes* (PANS-Aerodromes) and AN-WP/8837.PDP which presented the review of the ANC Working Group of the Whole on AN Work Programme Deliverables Production.

2. A speaker, supported by another, expressed concern on the content of the PANS-Aerodromes which he felt was better suited for guidance material, and pointed out that many improvements needed to be made as soon as possible in conjunction with Annex 14 and any related guidance material. The President recalled that the issues had been identified for future work in job cards. Another speaker remarked that the idea of the PANS-Aerodromes was to help users of Annex 14.

3. The Commission resumed its review of AN-WP/8837.PDP in Appendix B, on page 149, paragraph 2.2.6. Drawing attention to the proposed wording “approved by the appropriate authorities”, the Principal of CG-5 explained that the generic wording would refer to authorizations from both airline and airport authorities. Another speaker underscored the importance of providing the related guidance material needed by States to take the appropriate measures. The Commission *agreed* to the CG-5 proposal.

4. Turning to page 153, paragraph 2.3.1, the Principal of CG-5 advised that the group had agreed with the concept of the proposal on inner and outer runway shoulders, but had found a lack of clarity in the text “when the aeroplane axis is displaced from the runway centre line by one-third of the runway width”. The Chairperson of AN-WP/PDP was of the opinion that the proposal, in principle, was necessary in the PANS but needed to be reworded and he proposed that 2.3.1 be deleted. TO/AG A advised that the concept of inner and outer shoulders was not currently defined in Annex 14, although the *Operation of New Larger Aeroplanes at Existing Aerodromes* (Circ 305) contained guidance arising from operations of aircraft. Another speaker felt that it would be useful to retain the reference to inner and outer shoulders in order to help mitigate the deficiencies in Annex 14. The Observer of ACI suggested that paragraph 2.3.1 a) and b) be redrafted by deleting the wording “when the aircraft axis is on the centre one-third of the runway”, thereby focusing on the purpose of the shoulder without entering into detailed specifications.

5. C/AGA proposed that paragraph 2.3.1 be deleted for the time being, pointing out that a description of the bearing strength of runway shoulders was contained in paragraph 2.3.2. To align the wording of 2.3.1 and 2.3.2, it was proposed to delete “Both the inner and outer” in paragraph 2.3.2, on line 1. In light of the discussion, *the Commission agreed to the proposal by the Secretariat and to refer the issue to PASG for further review and development of a new proposal.*

6. On page 156, paragraph 2.4.4, CG-5 had proposed deleting the reference to the Aircraft Characteristics for Airport Planning manual. The Observer of ACI pointed out, however, that this was a standardized document developed by the International Industry Working Group and was used routinely by airport planners. A proposal by the Chairperson of the AN-WG/PDP to add a mention of the manual in a Note was *agreed*.

7. Regarding, on page 165, paragraph 3.1 on runway end safety area (RESA), a speaker remarked on the emphasis in the PANS-Aerodromes on the mitigation of overruns by using an arresting system, instead of RESA, as contained in Annex 14, or by other means, and indicated that the PASG should consider this in their future work.

8. In relation to page 177, paragraph 9.4, it was pointed out that the text proposed by CG-5 for the new sub paragraph n) on azimuth guidance as a visual docking system was already contained in sub paragraph c). In this regard, the Commission *agreed* to the action proposed by the Secretariat with regard to 9.4 d) and with no new n).

9. On page 186, Chapter 4, Section 4, paragraph 5 b), the Principal of CG-5 remarked that the group had requested the Secretariat to clarify the reference to “obstacle density” because there could be many different interpretations. TO/AGA advised that the Secretariat and the Rapporteur of the PASG had concurred that the use of this term could lead to confusion and therefore suggested that “obstacle density” be replaced by “fuselage height and length”. Another opinion was that the paragraph should be deleted because the material was more appropriate for guidance material and appeared to relate more to aircraft separation. The Chairperson of the AN- WG/PDP voiced support to retain the paragraph, remarking that the critical and sensitive areas were not related to aircraft separation but to aircraft performance on the instrument landing system (ILS) beam and any interruptions on the beam could adversely affect the landing performance of an aircraft. A speaker proposed that reference be made to protection areas and navigation aids, considering both ILS and MLS, noting that considerable work was being undertaken by the Navigation Systems Panel (NSP) on these topics. The President remarked that once the NSP had completed its work, the terminology would be aligned accordingly; however, at this time, it was important to make aerodrome operators aware of their duties in terms of protecting ILS critical and sensitive areas. The Commission *agreed* to the CG-5 proposal with the change to replace “obstacle density” by “fuselage height and length”.

10. Drawing attention to page 191, Attachment B to Chapter 4, the Principal of CG-5 pointed out that the group had found an inconsistency between the title of the attachment and its contents. A proposal to use the wording “aeroplane ground servicing requirements” from the opening sentence as the title was *agreed*.

11. Referring to the CG-5 proposal on page 194 relating to Attachment D to Chapter 4, it was proposed to clarify the text related to engines in “optional weights and also engines and engine thrusts” by adding words such as types or models. The Commission *agreed* to the CG-5 proposal and *requested* the Secretariat to make the appropriate revision to the wording.

12. As previously requested (196-10), TO/AGA presented a revised proposal for paragraph 2.3.6.3, based on text from the *Airworthiness Manual* (Doc 9760), with a Note arising from comments from the Commission on the subject, as follows:

“2.3.6.3 The validity of the certificate can be expressed in either of the following two ways:

- a) the issuance of an aerodrome certificate with an expiring period of validity, renewable as long as the granting conditions are maintained; or
- b) the issuance of an aerodrome certificate with a non-expiring period of validity, remaining valid as long as the granting conditions are maintained.

Note.— Unavailability or downgrading of an infrastructure, facility or service, of a temporary nature, may not necessarily annul the validity of an aerodrome certificate.”

13. The Principal of CG-5 remarked that the concern expressed in the previous meeting in relation to the granting conditions being maintained for both cases had not been addressed in this proposal because it referred to the conditions affecting renewal and not the limited validation of the certificate. The President proposed that “as long as the granting conditions are maintained” be included at the end of the lead sentence instead of in the sub paragraphs. The Observer of IATA suggested modifying the wording to “In both cases, the granting conditions should be maintained”, and expressed support for the inclusion of the Note. Other related proposals were: to delete the reference to granting conditions because these conditions were unknown; and to refer to “specified granting conditions” which would leave it to the authority of the regulator. Referring to the Note, the Principal of CG-5 commented that other situations also needed to be taken into account, and suggested that different wording, such as “suspend” or “revoke”, be used instead of “annul”.

14. The Commission *requested* the Secretariat to revise the wording of paragraph 2.3.6.3 in light of the discussion, and *authorized* the President to approve the revised text on their behalf with the understanding that the Commissioners would be consulted. The Commission also *agreed* to refer the issue of temporary suspension of a licence to the PASG for further work.

15. As requested at the previous meeting (196-10), TO/AGA presented the following revised proposal for paragraphs 2.2.1 and 2.2.2. He noted that the text in paragraph 2.2.1 was revised to differentiate between the design principles in accordance with Annex 14, Volume 1, and the operational considerations as outlined in paragraph 2.2.2. Paragraph 2.2.2 incorporated comments from Australia and CG-5 that were originally proposed for 2.2.1 and included modified wording as proposed in the previous meeting.

“2.2.1 In accordance with the design principles in Annex 14, Volume I, the runway width is related to the outer main gear wheel span and the clearance required on either side of the outer main gear wheels when the aeroplane is centred on the runway.

Note.— Guidance is given in Doc 9157 — Aerodrome Design Manual, Part 1 — Runways.

2.2.2 For a given runway width, factors affecting aeroplane operations include the handling and performance demonstrated by the aeroplane. It may be advisable to consider other factors of operational significance in order to have a margin for factors such as wet or contaminated runway pavement, crosswind conditions, crab angle approaches to landing, aeroplane controllability during aborted take-off, and engine failure procedures.

Note.— Guidance is given in Doc 9157, Part 1”

16. A speaker proposed that paragraph 2.2.1 be deleted because runway width was already covered in other documents and, within this context, the issue might be misinterpreted. Another view was to retain the original text in the State letter because the proposal introduced new terms that required more discussion. Referring to paragraph 2.2.2, the Observer of IATA pointed out that deleting the wording “related to the operational behaviour demonstrated by the aeroplane”, as proposed by CG-5 on page 145, could lead to misunderstanding in terms of whether it would be possible to vary from Annex 14 to a lesser-width runway. The Observer of ACI felt that the intention of the paragraph was clear. The Observer of IFALPA suggested that “safety” be added before “margin” in paragraph 2.2.2, on line 4.

17. Based on the discussion, the Commission *agreed* to delete paragraph 2.2.1 and, in line 3 of the proposed 2.2.2 (paragraph 16 above), to refer to “safety margin”.

18. In relation to paragraph 3.4.3, discussed in the previous meeting (196-10), TO/AGA presented a revised proposal for both 3.4.3 and 3.4.4. The President, however, recalled that the Commission had identified work to be carried out in the future on the alignment of the vocabulary with

Annex 19 and had not expected this issue to be addressed at this meeting. Some speakers felt that the Secretariat would be in a position to adapt the language as needed for the final version. Another view was that it would be difficult to align the wording at this point because substantial changes were envisaged in the near future for Annex 19. The Commission *agreed* to retain the text as presented in the State letter.

19. Turning to page 3 of AN-WP/8837.PDP, paragraph 7, the Observer of ACI remarked that the PANS-Aerodromes was eagerly awaited by States and international organizations and, bearing in mind that its publication had been expected in 2013, he suggested that the Commission consider changing the applicability date from November 2016 to November 2015. The Acting Secretary explained that the rationale for the 2016 applicability date had been to align the PANS-Aerodromes with the two-year Annex amendment cycle; however, in this case, considering its importance, the Secretariat supported the 2015 applicability date. General support was expressed for the change in the applicability date.

20. A speaker raised a concern on the process being used to establish the PANS-Aerodromes, pointing out that many items were not considered appropriate for a PANS and there were a number of outstanding issues that required further review by the study group or the Secretariat. Acknowledging that the development of the PANS-Aerodromes had been a difficult task, the President remarked that the adoption of the PANS-Aerodromes should not be deferred until more work was done because it was a tool that could be used now and would mature over time. He added that the future Chapter 5 on aerodrome operational management would be eagerly awaited.

21. Concluding its consideration of AN-WP/8837 and AN-WP/8837.PDP, the Commission:

- a) noted the summary of replies in Appendix A;
- b) considered the material in Appendices B, C and D and decided on the actions to be taken on all matters raised therein;
- c) agreed that the proposed amendments to Annex 14, Volume I as contained in Attachment B to State letter AN 4/1.1.53-13/81 and as modified by action taken under b) above, be included in Amendment 12 to Annex 14, Volume I;
- d) agreed that the proposed amendments to Annex 14, Volume I become applicable on 12 November 2015;
- e) approved the first edition of the PANS-Aerodromes as contained in Attachment C to State letter AN 4/1.1.53-13/81 and as modified by action taken under b) above;
- f) agreed that the PANS-Aerodromes become applicable on the same day as the associated proposed amendment to Annex 14, Volume I, i.e. 12 November 2015;
- g) *requested* the Secretary to prepare the draft report to Council concerning the proposed amendment to Annex 14, Volume I; and
- h) *requested* the Secretary to prepare a memorandum from the President of the Commission to the President of the Council concerning the first edition of the PANS-Aerodromes.

Other business

Remote air traffic services and remotely operated aerodrome control