



AIR NAVIGATION COMMISSION

Programme No. 9 Aerodrome Safety

PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF PROCEDURES FOR AIR NAVIGATION SERVICES (PANS)- AERODROMES AND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ANNEX 14, VOLUME I (ITEM 19103)

(Presented by the Principal of CT5)

Discussion Paper No.1

1 The members of Champion team five (CT5) and other interested commissioners reviewed AN-WP/8669 on 19, 23, 25 October 2012. This discussion paper is the summary of CT5 discussion prepared for the PDP meeting.

The attendance of the Secretariat at the CT meetings was restricted and the items in the following paragraphs marked with (*) indicates that the CT discussion took place without their participation.

2 The summary of the discussion of CT5 meetings

2.1 General

2.1.1 CT5 was informed that PANS-AGA drafted by PASG was duly circulated in AP members and got an agreement.

2.1.2 A significant concern was raised regarding the scope of the PANS-AGA.

While it's not obviously declared in Annex 14, it looks appropriate to consider that the Annex is a design document and the provisions in the Annex are applicable for designing a new airport or for the major infrastructure improvement of the existing airport. Nevertheless, the PANS-AGA, inter alia the 'Chapter 4 Aerodrome Compatibility', provides a way out for the airport which doesn't fully comply with the Annex by overcoming those shortcomings of an airport '*design*' with an airport '*operation*'. In this regard, PANS-AGA does deal with an operational aspect of the airport which goes most likely beyond the

scope of the current Annex, and consequently, PANS-AGA might no longer be considered as a complementary document to the Annex 14.

To address this, Annex 14 amendment is also proposed which introduces a new paragraph 1.8. This paragraph should be very carefully examined from the standpoint that this small paragraph could change the whole nature of the Annex.

2.1.3 In relation to 2.1.2 above, a significant concern was voiced regarding the protection of Annex 14 provisions.

PANS-AGA would give an airport operation solution for the airport which doesn't fully comply with the Annex. Nevertheless, it can't be emphasized enough that meeting the design requirements in the Annex should be the right way, and making an easy compromise to take refuge in an airport operation solution described in PANS-AGA should hardly be accepted. Therefore, proposed paragraph 1.8 of the Annex, along with paragraph 2.3 of the 'Foreword' of PANS-AGA, should be fully scrutinized from the standpoint that PANS-AGA should not undermine the design requirements in the Annex.

2.1.4* CT5 couldn't be convinced that the usage of word "shall", "should" and "must" in each PANS-AGA provision was assessed and sorted out properly. Moreover, the provisions without these words impede the interpretation of their compulsion. Thus, CT5 recommends asking the Secretariat to sort out the usage of these words in each provision all across the PANS-AGA.

2.1.5* In relation to 2.1.4 above, there was a concern that PANS-AGA includes the provisions, checklists or tables which would be more appropriately placed in the Manual than in PANS. CT5 recommends asking the Secretariat to confirm the right document to place for each provision, after finishing the whole review in 2.1.4.

2.2 PANS-Aerodromes (Appendix A to the WP)

2.2.1 Cover pages

(For page 1) The text "Approved by the Secretary General and published under his authority" is not correct and should be deleted. The year of the publication should be 'xxxx' instead of '2012'.

(For page 2) All PANS except PANS-ABC doesn't have this page. CT5 asked the secretariat to confirm if this page is necessary as a common practice.

2.2.2 FOREWORD (page viii)

2.2.2.1 Regarding 1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND (page viii)

Regarding para.1.2, there was a view that AHWG is just an expedient group and should not be referred to in PANS. Furthermore, the proposed para.1.2 might give an impression that an aerodrome operation measures can easily be adopted as an alternative to Annex14 design specification. In all cases, this complicated matter should be deliberately stated as discussed in 2.1 above.

To avoid all these discussion, CT5 suggests keeping the text very simple for this paragraph.

1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Air Navigation Commission, during the 7th meeting of its 180th session on 26 February 2009, agreed to develop PANS-Aerodrome to complement Annex14.

2.2.2.2 Regarding 2. SCOPE AND PURPOSE (page viii)

There was an intensive discussion on para.2.3 of the section as discussed in 2.1 above.

2.2.2.2.1 CT5 recommends deleting “, that will permit unrestricted operations” (2nd sentence), taking account that the full compliance with the Annex 14 doesn’t necessarily mean an unrestricted aircraft operations.

2.2.2.2.2 There was a view that the PANS-AGA is not aimed at developing ‘mitigating measures’, but at ‘addressing’ the infrastructure shortfalls of a particular existing airport. CT5 suggests changing the third sentence to;

“The contents of PANS-Aerodromes are designed ... and to address those issues develop mitigation measures to ensure the continued safety of ground operations.”

2.2.2.2.3 Editorial comment on the fifth line of para.2.4 to read, “... the term “aeroplane” throughout the document...”

2.2.2.3 As for the description of section 3 to 5, CT5 noticed that they mostly follow the text in other PANS and has no comment. Also, CT5 doesn’t have any comment on section 6, which gives narratives for each Chapters of the PANS-AGA. (page ix to x)

2.2.3 ACRONYMS (page xii)

2.2.3.1 CT5 noticed that the acronyms of organizations, e.g. AdP, AENA, ECAC etc, appears only in Attachment A to Chapter 3 and recommends moving these acronyms to the footnote of the attachment.

2.2.3.2 CT5 noticed that “QFU” is an acronym of the term in French and should be adjusted accordingly, and also, the “ATS” should be spelled out in the right column. The typo in “World Geodetic System” should be corrected.

2.2.4 Chapter 1 DEFINITIONS (page1-1)

2.2.4.1 To be consistent with other PANS, CT5 recommends replacing the statement just beneath the title by;

“When the following terms are used in this document, they have the following meanings.”

2.2.4.2 Regarding ‘*Applicable regulation*’ (page1-1)

CT5 recommends deleting “which are in force at the aerodrome location”, for it duplicates the word “applicable” of that sentence.

2.2.4.3 Regarding ‘*Compatibility Study*’ (page1-1)

2.2.4.3.1 In reviewing this definition, CT5 visited para.4.1.2 and 4.1.4 of PANS (on page 4-1 of the PANS) and recommends keeping the definition simple by removing the duplication with those provisions.

Compatibility Study. A collaborative study undertaken by the aerodrome operator to produce recommendations for actions, the result of which should enable decisions to be undertaken by the aerodrome operator and its stakeholders to individually, or in combination, mitigate address the impact of introducing a new aeroplane type/model new to the aerodrome. A compatibility study may include one or several safety assessments.

2.2.4.3.2 A concern was raised if the definition has to define the responsibility of conducting the Study. CT5 didn’t come to the consensus, but was of view that the final responsibility should be stated either the definition or relevant provisions.

2.2.4.4 Regarding ‘*Critical aeroplane*’ (page1-1)

Taking account that the most demanding aeroplane is determined from the group of aircraft types intended to be used at the planning phase, CT5 recommends modifying the definition as below.

Critical aeroplane. The type of aeroplane which is attached as a condition to the aerodrome certificate the characteristics of which are the most demanding for the relevant elements of the physical infrastructure and the facilities for which the aerodrome is intended the aeroplane can normally accommodate.

2.2.4.5 Regarding ‘*On-site verification*’ (page1-1)

In response to a view that the on-site verification would not be limited to the initial certification process, the secretariat informed that it is limited to the initial certification process in the drafted PANS-AGA, while allowing States to take the opportunities to conduct some sort of on-site activities if needed. CT5 recommends editorial change to add “process” at the very end of the sentence for clarification.

2.2.4.6 Regarding 'Runway/taxiway excursion' (page1-2)

CT5 recommends deleting the word "unintentionally", for it isn't an element for determining the occurrence of incursion. In addition, CT5 suggests that the definition of 'excursion' should be better if it could be parallel to the definition of 'incursion' which is already contained in the Manual (Doc9870).

Runway/taxiway excursion. Any occurrence at an aerodrome involving the departure, wholly or partly, of an aircraft from the runway/taxiway in use during take-off, a landing run, taxiing or manoeuvring.

2.2.5* Chapter2 CERTIFICATION OF AERODROMES

2.2.5.1*Regarding 2.1.2.2 a) (page2-1)

CT5 recommends adding some words for clarity.

a) the compliance of the aerodrome infrastructure to the applicable regulations for the operations...

2.2.5.2*Regarding 2.1.2.2 b) (page2-1 to 2-2)

CT5 found the items listed from 1) to 17) would not be exhaustive and recommends modifying the text of b) to reflect this.

2.2.5.2.1* Regarding 2.1.2.2 b) 1)

The real meaning of "reporting" should be clarified, e.g. what to report / to whom to report, etc.

2.2.5.2.2* Regarding 2.1.2.2 b) 17)

It should be clarified that 'with what' the SMS should comply.

2.2.5.3*Regarding Notes under 2.2.1.1 (page2-2 to 2-3)

At the last part of the text of Note 1, CT5 noticed that the *safety* to be ensured should not be limited to that of *aeroplane operations* and agreed to modifying the text.

Note 1. — When considered...to perform their duties adequately and not impair the safety of aeroplane operations.

In addition, CT5 agreed to make a small change to the text of Note 2.

Note 2. — The term...and all other areas within the aerodrome perimeter.

2.2.5.4*Regarding 2.2.1.2.2 (page2-3)

At the last part of the text of Note 1, CT5 noticed that the *restrictions* should not be limited to those of *aerodrome availability* and agreed to modify the text.

2.2.1.2.2 The aerodrome manual contains... , and any restrictions in place on aerodrome availability.

2.2.5.5*Regarding 2.2.1.4.1 (page2-3)

CT5 agreed to make the text easier to understand by replacing the words “the certificate holder” by “the aerodrome operator”.

2.2.5.6*Regarding 2.2.1.4.3 (page2-3)

CT5 came to consensus that all the contents described in this paragraph should ideally be contained in the aerodrome manual, and cross reference to other publications should be avoided, apart from SMS manual, to the extent practical. CT5 recommends asking Secretariat to amend the text to indicate this effect.

2.2.5.7*Regarding 2.2.2.1 f) 2) (page 2-4)

The category of operation is not limited to *visual*, *instrument* and *precision*. CT5 agreed to ask the Secretariat to change the text to reflect this.

2.2.5.8*Regarding 2.2.3.1 (page2-5)

CT5 agreed to replace the word “accuracy” by “relevancy” to make the text precise.

2.2.5.9*Regarding 2.3 INITIAL CERTIFICATION (page2-5)

Serious discussion took place regarding the whole procedure of initial certification. The main point of discussion was the whole picture of the relationship between *technical inspection* and *on-site verification*.

The definition of *technical inspection* (page1-2) includes “visual verification”, which normally interpreted as an activity done ‘on-site’. Note 2 under paragraph 2.3.1.2 states that *technical inspection* comes before *on-site verification*. Therefore the definite distinction between these two on-site activities is necessary. Nevertheless, CT5 couldn’t be convinced that draft PANS-AGA gives a complete understanding of this difference. Rather CT5 noticed that the play with words ‘on-site’ or ‘visual’, ‘inspection’ or ‘verification’ may impedes the accurate understanding of the audience. CT5 recommends asking the Secretariat to sort out all of this uneasiness.

2.2.5.10* Regarding 2.3.2.7

It refers to the safety assessment which might be undertaken by the airport operator after running through the checklist. Nevertheless, in case of the airport where SMS is fully operational, this safety assessment should be completed under day-to-day SMS function theoretically. CT5 recommends asking the Secretariat to look into this and amend the text properly.

2.2.5.11* Regarding Note 2 under 2.3.2.8 (page2-7)

CT5 supports in principle to make a technical inspection rely on a self-declaration and to omit the on-site checks for smaller airport. But, CT5 was of view that such a self-declaration should be accompanied by the check list gone through. CT5 recommends asking the Secretariat to amend the text to reflect this. Furthermore, CT5 find a need to clarify the conditions to be a '*smaller aerodrome*' in the context of this Note.

2.2.5.12* Regarding 2.3.3, 2.3.3.1 (page 2-7)

CT5 agreed to change the heading to "2.3.3 Acceptance of ~~safety relevant parts of~~ the aerodrome manual". CT5 also agreed to delete the word "operator" in paragraph 2.3.3.1.

2.2.5.13* Regarding 2.3.4.3, 2.3.4.4 (page 2-7)

While these paragraphs stipulate the need of conducting on-site verification of the SMS, CT5 sees no need to "*verify*" the SMS in case where the airport has a fully operational SMS. The verification of the approved SMS is redundant and should be omitted. CT5 recommends asking the Secretariat to reflect on this and to amend the text as appropriate.