



WORKING PAPER

Meeting of the Chairpersons on the Regional Priorities and Targets

(Hong Kong, China, 16-17 January 2014)

Agenda Item 4: Data collection and Targets

CONSIDERATIONS IN SETTING REGIONAL TARGETS

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY

This paper discusses matters that might be considered in formulating regional Air Navigation Services (ANS) targets.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 APANPIRG/24 (held in June 2013) developed the following Conclusion.

Conclusion 24/2 — Establishing Regional Priorities and Targets

That, following the PIRG - RASG Global Coordination meeting held in March 2013 APANPIRG/24 invited the Chairpersons of ATM, RASMAG, CNS, and MET sub groups to establish regional priorities and targets for the APAC Region in alignment with the GANP and APAC Seamless ATM Plan by December 2013 in order to facilitate submission to ICAO by May 2014.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 A key to any effective implementation is to reduce complexity to ensure the maximum understanding and involvement by all concerned parties. In the case of the ASBU/Seamless ATM planning, a number of States and Administrations have expressed concern about the need to minimise the burden of data gathering and reporting. This is a concern not just for administrations and States, but also for the Regional Office to manage, especially with the Regional Dashboard creating another layer of results to consider on top of the regional targets/metrics.

2.2 The 42 elements in the Seamless ATM Plan are arguably already targets in themselves. They express an expectation of a future state, and the Phase dates detail the time by which there is an expected outcome. In addition, the seven draft Air Navigation Reporting Forms (ANRF) that were chosen as for initial priority contain a number of extra milestones which can also be considered as targets.

2.3 The draft ANRF targets are summarised as follows in order of Phase.

November 2015 (Seamless ATM Plan Phase I):

1. PBN Terminal: All high density international aerodromes implement CCO and CDO operations where States have assessed it applicable (the target is to implement 100% of procedures where it has been assessed as beneficial).
2. PBN Terminal: All international high density aerodromes should have RNAV 1 (ATS surveillance environment) or RNP 1 (ATS surveillance and non-ATS surveillance environments) SID/STAR.
3. Network Operations: All high density aerodromes should implement Airport CDM.
4. Network Operations: All high density aerodromes should implement AMAN/DMAN.
5. Network Operations: All High Density FIRs supporting the busiest Asia/Pacific traffic flows and high density aerodromes should implement ATFM incorporating CDM using operational ATFM platform/s.
6. Aeronautical Information Management: All States should implement provisions of Annex 15 Amendment 36 and Annex 15 Amendment 37.
7. System Wide Information Management: All States between ATC units where transfers of control are conducted have implemented the messages ABI, EST, ACP, TOC, AOC) as far as practicable.
8. System Wide Information Management: All States are interconnected on the ATN/AMHS network and communications between States is migrated to the regional network.
9. Civil/Military- Enhanced En-Route Trajectories: All States should ensure that SUA are regularly reviewed by the appropriate Airspace Authority to assess the effect on civil air traffic and the activities affecting the airspace.
10. Civil/Military- Enhanced En-Route Trajectories: All States should ensure that a national civil/military body coordinating strategic civil-military activities and a formal civil-military liaison for tactical responses are established.
11. Ground Surveillance: All FIRs within which ACCs utilise ADS-B, SSR or MLAT provide coverage within all category S airspace.
12. Ground Surveillance: All high density airports implement ATS surveillance, using ADS-B, SSR and/or MLAT.
13. Ground Surveillance: All ATC systems operated for the purpose of Category S and Category T airspace surveillance have ASUR data integrated into the ATC system situation display.
14. Trajectory-Based Operations-Data Link En-Route: All FIRs utilise ADS-C to provide service within all category R airspace.
15. Trajectory-Based Operations-Data Link En-Route: All FIRs utilise CPDLC to provide service within all category R airspace.

November 2018 (Seamless ATM Plan Phase II):

16. Network Operations: Declared airport terminal and runway capacity for all high density aerodromes.
17. Network Operations: ATFM incorporating CDM in all FIRs supporting Major Traffic Flows.

18. Network Operations: All States should implement linked intra-and inter-Regional ATFM networks serving all FIRs supporting airspace defined in the Regional Framework for Collaborative ATFM as requiring ATFM.
19. Aeronautical Information Management: All States implement the provisions of Annex 15 Amendment 38
20. System Wide Information Management: All States should implement full AIDC messaging, or alternate communication standard.
21. Ground Surveillance: All States should share ATS surveillance data, particularly ADS-B data, with all neighbouring ATC units.

2.4 The Regional Office has been making some positive progress with the proposal for an electronic web-based regime that may be put in place eventually to monitor the progress of Seamless implementation. Even if it is not possible to implement this before May 2014, the manual equivalent using Excel would still provide a means of tracking progress based on the Seamless ATM Reporting Form responses. This was intended to be an active monitoring process that delivered some form of graphical and perhaps percentage data output that could be used by ICAOHQ, the Regional Office, Regional Sub-Office, and even the States themselves to identify where implementation was going well, and where it was not.

2.5 There are two possible objectives for setting targets. The first is to encourage the actors to progress in accordance with a specified timeline. The second is to take considered actions regarding the implementation progress to the ultimate goal. It is considered by the Regional Office that the comprehensive Seamless ATM monitoring process described would be a much better way of considering such actions than trying to determine some sort of percentage or incremental ‘targets’ like... 30% of States to have ATFM by... or ...a doubling of PBN procedures... because such targets:

- were difficult to effectively formulate meaningfully, unless based on large datasets;
- were coarse incremental steps compared to the ability to monitor ‘daily’ progress against the expected final goal and fine-tune responses as and when it is necessary (note the draft ANRF have milestones of completed actions, not partially completed actions);
- can send out the wrong signal in terms of a percentage completion being OK, rather than the message that we are expecting all applicable States to complete as soon as possible;
- can mask poor performance with the better achieving States hiding the poor States with an average that says everything is OK – it may be OK overall but perhaps there is a sub-region that is doing particularly badly, which can be seen on the graphical process Frederic is trying to configure.

2.6 It is likely that there will be extra items to consider for targets such as Search and Rescue but as the new performance monitoring regime will be iterative, changing and evolving year by year, there is no need to include all elements immediately in 2014. This is consistent with the step-by-step process being used by ICAOHQ to develop the Regional Dashboards.

2.7 There is also some confusion about the use of the terms ‘targets’ and ‘metrics’ used almost interchangeably in our communications with States and Administrations. It is possible that the use of one consistent term would assist the process instead of arguing the semantics of whether each objective is a target/metric or something else, and not gaining anything for such effort.

Summary

2.8 The creation of a number of new ‘targets’ plucked out of the air even by experts without data to support the choice is not desirable. The number of targets and the complexity of data collection and reporting to support them within the ASBU/Seamless process should be minimised to ensure State buy-in and understanding, as well as add additional workload to States concerned. The targets should leverage off already established work if possible – the Seamless ATM reporting system and associated ANRF.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to discuss the following suggested course of the action for the key regional targets:

- a) discuss whether the Seamless ATM reporting and monitoring process, and the draft ANRF for the seven priority elements were sufficient to monitor Seamless ATM implementation progress; and
- b) discuss the key 21 targets resulting from the draft ANRF.

— END —