



*International Civil Aviation Organization*

**MID Region ATM Enhancement Programme  
Special Coordination Meeting (MAEP SCM)**

**(Cairo, Egypt, 18-20 February 2014)**

---

**Agenda Item 3: MID Region ATM Enhancement Programme (MAEP) Establishment**

**MAEP ESTABLISHMENT - CANSO PROPOSAL**

*(Presented by CANSO)*

**SUMMARY**

The aim of this paper is to outline CANSO's proposed approach to the structure and roles and responsibilities of the MAEP. It is intended as the basis for further discussion and development at the MAEP-SCM.

**1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 The Middle East remains one of the fastest growing regions in terms of air transport. Investment in developing new and expanding existing airports to meet the demands of the region's fast growing airlines has resulted in airspace capacity challenges that must be addressed at a regional level.

1.2 GCA-MID/2 tasked ICAO MID with establishing a MAEP. The initial meeting of the MAEP-SCM is planned for 18-20 February 2014. ICAO MID has requested that States or other interested stakeholders contribute ideas for developing and implementing a MAEP.

1.2 The need for a single programme or 'vehicle' to coordinate and support the implementation of programmes at a regional (or sub-regional) level was also reinforced at the recent CANSO Middle East conference.

**2. THE NEED FOR A COORDINATED APPROACH TO IMPLEMENTATION**

2.1 ICAO plays an important role in the region in setting and, to some extent, coordinating the implementation of policy and requirements. However, ICAO's role should not be focused on implementation; rather, this should be the responsibility of States supported, as necessary, by their member organisations such as CANSO, IATA, AACO etc.

2.2 The need for better coordination was one of the key conclusions from the CANSO Middle East conference in February 2014. The conference agreed that there was a need to focus on a number of key objectives and to develop and work collectively to a single plan. It is hoped that MAEP could provide the platform necessary to achieve this.

**3. MIDRAR**

3.1 CANSO has been engaged in the region for almost 5 years. During this time, it has been working with its members on a number of initiatives including the Middle East Regional Airspace Review (MIDRAR).

3.2 MIDRAR is a multi-stakeholder programme which aims to identify the key airspace challenges and then develop and implement regional initiatives to progressively address them. The programme was initially planned in 3 phases:

- Phase 1 - Review of the existing situation, identification of high level challenges and outlining a framework to overcome the challenges.
- Phase 2 - Implementation of Phase 1 activities.
- Phase 3 - Strategic plan to prepare the region for future challenges.

3.3 Phase 1 involved stakeholders including ANSPs, the airlines and wider industry and was heavily supported by IATA. The Phase 1 study was completed during 2012. Phase 2 was initiated in 2013; however, despite a good level of initial support from stakeholders, it has not yet been possible to progress to implementation.

3.4 To avoid unnecessary duplication and in the spirit of developing a single programme, CANSO proposes to use the output of MIDRAR Phase 1; our work in developing the implementation plan for Phase 2 and the lessons learned as an input to MAEP. This should be considered along with the input from other studies and plans and in the context of today's agreed priorities.

#### 4. MAEP

4.1 This section outlines the potential scope of MAEP with the intention that it is discussed and further developed at the MAEP-SCM.

4.2 CANSO and its ANSP members strongly believe that MAEP should be focused only on the planning, coordination and implementation of initiatives which meet the requirements defined by ICAO (and States) but which require a regional perspective to ensure that the implementation is most effective. As a minimum, we propose that MAEP's key activities include the following activities.

4.2.1 **Agreeing, prioritising and the on-going review of regional objectives.** It is essential to define, agree and prioritise a number of objectives. These should have the 'buy-in' from all stakeholders (including airspace users) and should be the focus of a MAEP programme plan. It is likely that priorities will change over time; therefore, MAEP shall also be responsible for the on-going review of airspace and ATM/CNS issues and propose changes to the programme plan as necessary.

4.2.2 **Interpreting requirements and agreeing a means of implementation and/or compliance.** Having agreed the regional priorities, MAEP shall be responsible for collectively interpreting the requirements and for identifying and agreeing the most effective approach to compliance (if it is a new policy or requirement) and/or for addressing a particular challenge (such as an airspace hotspot). Again, this is considered an on-going activity as new technologies etc. emerge and airspace user requirements change.

4.2.3 **Developing and implementing a single programme plan.** Having agreed the objectives, MAEP shall develop a programme plan that clearly defines agreed tasks and a timeline to meet one or more of the objectives. The plan must include the commitment of participating stakeholders including accountabilities, roles and responsibilities. This approach will ensure that all stakeholders are working towards the same objective in a structured and coordinated manner. MAEP shall also be responsible for identifying opportunities to exploit and/or leverage additional benefits from projects or initiatives proposed by stakeholders (e.g. States, ANSPs, airspace users etc.) or that require regional collaboration.

*The ASBU roadmap could help define the programme plan; however, the onus should be on meeting the immediate requirements of airspace users and other stakeholders.*

4.2.4 **Programme oversight, management and coordination.** MAEP shall provide governance and be responsible for the oversight and active management of the programme. This should include all normal project management activities; the on-going re-assessment of priorities etc., and, importantly, the coordination of different stakeholders including MIDANPIRG groups to ensure alignment and to take advantage of existing plans and work already completed. It shall manage the interdependencies, risks and issues within the programme and between related initiatives and projects.

4.2.5 **Assessing and measuring the effectiveness of MAEP.** It is essential that MAEP is seen to deliver tangible benefits (especially, if stakeholders are investing in a particular initiative). MAEP shall be responsible for developing appropriate measures of success. These might include an assessment of an initiative's contribution to a particular key performance area such as safety, flight efficiency, cost effectiveness, environment etc. It should also assess the performance of MAEP and the programme plan.

4.2.6 **Providing a focal point for the ATM industry.** In other parts of the world the wider-ATM industry plays a critical role in the development (and to some extent the funding) of operational and technical solutions. This is most prominent in the SESAR and NextGEN programmes. Whilst it is not suggested that MAEP becomes another SESAR, it is possible that relevant industry representatives could participate in MAEP. As a minimum, MAEP should provide a single focal point for the ATM industry and potentially provide a vehicle for industry suppliers to propose solutions etc.

## 5. POTENTIAL STRUCTURE

5.1 Building on lessons learned from MIDRAR, CANSO is proposing a structure that is not overly bureaucratic but is robust enough to provide the necessary governance and active management of MAEP and the programme plan. It is proposed that this is discussed and further developed in the MAEP-SCM.

5.1.1 **MAEP Board:** ICAO has already proposed a MAEP Board reporting to the MIDANPIRG. CANSO supports this approach. The MAEP Board shall provide oversight, strategic advice and direction to the MAEP programme. Members shall comprise representatives from States. It is proposed that organisations such as CANSO, IATA, AACO, ACI and others are also offered the opportunity to participate in the Board. The Chair shall be agreed by the participating States.

5.1.2 **MAEP Implementation Team.** The MAEP Implementation Team shall comprise representatives from Middle East ANSPs (rather than the State's per se), airspace users and other stakeholders. It shall also comprise representatives from CANSO, IATA, AACO, ACI and other relevant stakeholder organisations as appropriate.

5.1.3 **MAEP Programme Management Office.** If agreed by the MAEP Implementation Team and supported by the MAEP Board, MAEP shall also be supported by a Programme Management Office (PMO). It is envisaged that the PMO would be hosted by a MAEP stakeholder and that it would be staffed by secondees from participating stakeholders and/or by fulltime experts from industry as appropriate.

5.2 **Funding.** It is proposed that MAEP Board and Implementation Team members will bear their own costs related to their activities in MAEP. It is envisaged that if any funding is required (e.g. for the PMO), it shall be agreed and shared by the participating members of the MAEP Implementation Team.

## 6. ACTION BY THE MEETING

6.1 The meeting is invited to note the contents of this WP as a basis for further discussion and development at the MAEP-SCM.