



International Civil Aviation Organization
Second Meeting of the Surveillance Task Force (SUR/TF2) of the
CNS Committee of the Caribbean / South American Regional Planning and
Implementation Group (GREPECAS) ATM/CNS Subgroup
Lima, Peru, 9-10 May 2008

**Agenda Item 1 Development of a strategy for the evolution of aeronautical surveillance in
the CAR/SAM Region**

**COMMENTARY FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE ICAO ASP PANEL AT THE CAR/SAM
STRATEGY FOR THE EVOLUTION OF AERONAUTICAL SURVEILLANCE IN THE
CAR/SAM REGION**

(Presented by the Surveillance Task force Coordinator)

Summary

This Working Paper presents the commentary of the ICAO Aeronautical Surveillance Panel on the Strategy for the evolution of aeronautical surveillance in the CAR/SAM Region.

1 Introduction

1.1 During the First Surveillance Task force Meeting (Piarco Trinidad&Tobago 20 to 21 July Of 2007) a Decision CNS/SUR/TF 1/4 (*Draft strategy for the CAR/SAM regions for the evolutionary implementation of aeronautical surveillance systems*) was elaborate In this Decision the meeting assigned to the Delegate of Brazil the elaboration of the draft strategy mentioned.

1.2 The Draft Strategy was elaborate and distribute to all member of the Surveillance Task Force Strategy for its commentary.

1.3 The secretary of the Aeronautical Surveillance Panel revised the document above mentioned and made the following commentaries.

2 Analysis

2.1 TIS-B is a service and not a surveillance system. It should be deleted from the list showing various surveillance systems;

2.2 Elementary and Enhance Surveillance are terms that have been created by Eurocontrol and have special meanings in Europe. They are not standard ICAO terms and quite frankly, I fail to see why they are being proposed for implementation in CAR/SAM because they are not needed there and moreover, they are quite complex. Apart from EUR, no other part of the world is embarking on such schemes simply because nobody else has the same kind of problems (high traffic, capacity and delay). The enforcing of elementary and enhanced surveillance in EUR has been very difficult and cumbersome, even with all the mandates and resources that they have. In my opinion, it is absolutely false to even mention such schemes for CAR/SAM. I am not even sure the promotion of Mode S by itself is a good idea for CAR/SAM, again due to relatively low level of traffic. It would be wiser to maintain SSR Mode A/C and gradually introduce MLAT and ADS-B until such time when radars are no longer required (though some will be kept as backup);

2.3 ADS-C is and will be used only in a certain type of airspace (mainly oceanic or remote continental) where the provision of ground stations is not feasible or economical. We also have to mention the system used for ADS-C in CAR/SAM (i.e. FANS-1/A or ATN, the former is the most likely one);

2.4 I suggest it is too early to draw definite timelines for this and that surveillance milestone. Perhaps all those charts could be reduced to a single one which is quite tentative. Moreover, the FAA's plan to introduce ADS-B (as per the recently released notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM)) will have significant effects on CAR/SAM and should at least be mentioned in the document

3 Actions suggested

3.1 The meeting is invited to analyze this commentary in order to study possible amendments in the strategy for the evolution of aeronautical surveillance in the CAR/SAM Region.

- END -