ICAO International Civil Aviation Organization
North American, Central American and Caribbean Office

# NAM/CAR Air Traffic Services Inter-facility Data Communication (AIDC) and North American Interface Control Document (NAM/IDC) Implementation Follow-up Meeting

## AIDC/NAM/ICD

## Final Report

Mexico City, Mexico, from 8 to 11 April 2019

Prepared by the Secretariat

June 2019

# List of Contents

| Contents | Page |
|---|---|
| **Index** | i-1 |
| **Historical** | ii-1 |
| **ii.1** Place and Date of the Meeting | ii-1 |
| **ii.2** Opening Ceremony | ii-1 |
| **ii.3** Officers of the Meeting | ii-1 |
| **ii.4** Working Languages | ii-1 |
| **ii.5** Schedule and Working Arrangements | ii-1 |
| **ii.6** Agenda | ii-2 |
| **ii.7** Attendance | ii-2 |
| **ii.8** List of Decisions and Draft Conclusions | ii-3 |
| **ii.9** List of Working and Information Papers and Presentations | ii-3 |
| **List of Participants** | iii-1 |
| Contact Information | iv-1 |
| **Agenda Item 1** ***Automatized Protocol Implementation Status*** | *1-1* |
| **Agenda Item 2** ***Pending NAM/CAR Regions AIDC Implementation Process*** | *2-1* |
| **Agenda Item 3** ***Configuration and Database Maintenance Process in the ATC Systems*** | *3-1* |
| **Agenda Item 4** ***NAM/CAR/SAM Availability and Plan Flight Errors Analysis*** | *4-1* |
| **Agenda Item 5** ***Updating Process and Maintenance of the Aeronautical Addressing of the AMHS System*** | *5-1* |
| **Agenda Item 6** ***Updating Processes of the AIDC Task Force Activities*** | *6-1* |
| **Agenda Item 7** ***Other Business*** | *7-1* |

# HISTORICAL

## ii.1 Place and Date of the Meeting

The NAM/CAR Air Traffic Services Inter-facility Data Communication (AIDC) and North American Interface Control Document (NAM/IDC) Implementation Follow-up Meeting was held in the ICAO NACC Regional Office in Mexico City, Mexico, from 8 to 11 April 2019.

## ii.2 Opening Ceremony

Mr. Julio Siu, Deputy Regional Director of the North American, Central American and Caribbean (NACC) Office of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) welcomed the participants, highlighting the importance of the AIDC implementation and the operational benefits of its implementation, as well as the achievements of the ICAO Aviation System Block Upgrade (ASBU). Mr. Fernando Cassó, Rapporteur of the AIDC Task Force of the ANI/WG, thanked the support of the TF members in the development of the AIDC implementation and officially opened the meeting.

## ii.3 Officers of the Meeting

The AIDC/NAM/ICD Meeting was chaired by the AIDC TF Rapporteur, Fernando Cassó from Dominican Republic. Mrs. Mayda Ávila, Regional Officer, Communications, Navigation and Surveillance, of the ICAO NACC Regional Office served as Secretary of the Meeting.

## ii.4 Working Languages

The working languages of the Meeting were English and Spanish. The working papers, information papers and report of the meeting were available to participants in both languages. The presentations are only available in the language they were presented.

## ii.5 Schedule and Working Arrangements

It was agreed that the working hours for the sessions of the meeting would be from 9:00 to 16:00 hours daily with adequate breaks.

**ii.6 Agenda**

**Agenda item 1:** Status of Implementation of Automated Protocols

**Agenda item 2:** Implementation Process of the Pending AIDC in the NAM/CAR Regions

**Agenda item 3:** Air Traffic Control (ATC) Systems Database Configuration and Maintenance Process

**Agenda item 4:** Analysis of the Availability and Errors of Flight Plans in the NAM/CAR/SAM Regions

**Agenda item 5:** Update and maintenance process of Aeronautical Addressing of AMHS (Aeronautical Message Handling System) Systems

**Agenda item 6:** AIDC Task Force Update Process

**Agenda item 7:** Other Business

**ii.7 Attendance**

The Meeting was attended by 12 States/Territories from the NAM/CAR Regions, two International Organizations, and diverse Industry representatives totalling 42 delegates as indicated in the list of participants.

**ii.8 List of Decisions and Conclusion projects**

ii.8.1 The Meeting discussed the most important factors that the States must take into account to achieve a successful implementation of the automatized protocols, and the way to face issues related to implementation and operation of the protocols (NAM/ICD and AIDC) presented by the States that have been working in the implementation in the last years.

ii.8.2 In this regard, it was recommended that the States take into account the lessons learnt information and the knowledge generated by the States with wider experience in the implementation, and the recommendations of the industry when developing the terms of reference of their systems. The States were also invited to work more closely with adjacent States to promote standardization and make the connection of its automated channels in shorter times.

ii.8.3 The Meeting also agreed a series of decisions/conclusion projects that have been included in the activities of the Air Traffic Services Inter-facility Data Communication /Flight Plan Task Force, as well as conclusions that will be presented in the ANI/WG Meeting in May 2019, with the objective to be discussed in this plenary and count with the support of other working groups as PBN, SURV and AIM.


| Number | Title | Page |
|---|---|---|
| AIDC/NAM/ICD/D/01 | ***TECHNICAL/OPERATIVE TRAINING PROFILE FOR THE USE OF THE AIDC*** | 2-1 |
| AIDC/NAM/ICD/D/02 | ***SENDING SPECIFIC TASKS TO THE NACC AIM AND PBN TASKS FORCES*** | 3-2 |
| AIDC/NAM/ICD/D/03 | ***TO EXPOSE THE PROBLEM OF THE LACK OF AVAILABILITY OF THE PERFORMANCE DATA OF AIRCRAFT TYPES FOR UPDATING ATC SYSTEMS DATABASES.*** | 3-3 |
| AIDC/NAM/ICD/C/01 | ***MECHANISMS TO UPDATE ATC SYSTEMS DATABASES*** | 3-3 |
| AIDC/NAM/ICD/C/02 | ***REGISTRY OF THE FUNCTIONALITIES OF THE FLIGHT PLAN TREATMENT SYSTEMS*** | 4-2 |
| AIDC/NAM/ICD/C/03 | ***REPORT TO THE AIM TASK FORCE CASES OF DIFFERENCES IN THE INTERPRETATION OF ICAO DOCUMENTS FOR THE FLIGHT PLANS PROCESSING*** | 4-2 |


## ii.9 List of Working and Information Papers and Presentations

***Refer to the Meeting web page:***
https://www.icao.int/NACC/Pages/meetings-2019-aidcnam.aspx

**WORKING PAPERS**

| Number | Agenda Item | Title | Date | Prepared and Presented by |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| WP/01 | --- | APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND SCHEDULE OF THE MEETING | 25/02/19 | Secretariat |
| WP/02 | 1 | FOLLOW UP TO THE LAST AIDC MEETING CONCLUSIONS AND DECISIONS | 05/03/19 | Secretariat |
| WP/03 | 1 | AIDC WORKING GROUP ACTIVITIES FOLLOW-UP | Pending | Rapporteur |
| WP/04 | 2 | SURVEILLANCE DATA SHARING PROCESS AMONG STATES | 04/04/19 | Secretariat |

**WORKING PAPERS**

| Number | Agenda Item | Title | Date | Prepared and Presented by |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| WP/05 | 3 | NECESSITY OF THE STATES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS TO ACCESS UPDATED AIRCRAFT TYPE DATABASES | 13/03/19 | Cuba |
| WP/06 | 4 | ANALYSIS OF THE MOST COMMON FLIGHT PLANS ERRORS RECEIVED IN HAVANA FIR | 14/03/19 | Cuba |
| WP/07 | 5 | NAM/CAR/SAM REGIONS | 13/03/19 | Cuba |
| WP/08 | 6 | FORCE TASK UPDATING PROCESS | Pending | Rapporteur |
| WP/09 | 1 | USING FLIGHT PLANNING AUTOMATION TO RESPOND TO FILED FLIGHT PLANS TO ACHIEVE QUALITY CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS IN THE NORTH AMERICAN, CENTRAL AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN REGION | 25/03/19 | United States |
| WP/10 | 1 | THE UNITED STATES AUTOMATED DATA EXCHANGE INTERFACE AND HAND OFF CAPABILITY WITHIN THE NORTH AMERICAN, CENTRAL AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN (NACC) REGION – 2019 UPDATE | 25/03/19 | United States |

**INFORMATION PAPERS**

| Number | Agenda Item | Title | Date | Prepared and Presented by |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| IP/01 | ---- | LIST OF WORKING, INFORMATION PAPERS AND PRESENTATIONS | 05/04/19 | Secretariat |

**PRESENTATIONS**

| Number | Agenda Item | Title | Presented by |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | Considerations for AIDC and NAM/ICD Implementation according with ICAO SARPs | Secretariat |
| 2 | 2 | Operational Benefits for AIDC Implementation | Secretariat |
| 3 | 2 | AIDC Implementation Experiences | Thales |
| 4 | 1 | Automation Interface and Radar Handoff Update | United States |
| 5 | 3 | FPL Monitoring Group 2019 Data Collection | Dominican Republic |
| 6 | 3 | Conceptualización de un sistema de gestión de tránsito aéreo automatizado | INDRA |
| 7 | 3 | Air Traffic Management portfolio | Leonardo |
| 8 | 3 | FDP Overview | THALES |

**INFORMATION PAPERS**

| Number | Agenda Item | Title | Date | Prepared and Presented by |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | 3 | AIDC/NAM coordination data base | | COCESNA |
| 10 | 4 | FAA Coordination With EUR AMHS Process & Documentation | | United States |
| 11 | 5 | Overview about the AMHS documentation used in EUR/NAT Region | | EUROCONTROL |
| 12 | 5 | ATS Messaging Management Manual (EUR Doc 021) Base Document For Global AMHS Management | | EUROCONTROL |
| 13 | 4 | ATS Messaging Management Centre (AMC) External COM Centre Operators Briefing | | EUROCONTROL |
| 14 | 4 | Sistema AMHS | | COCESNA |
| 15 | 1 | Acknowledgement and Rejection Response Messages | | United States |
| 16 | 5 | Proceso de actualización y mantenimiento del direccionamiento aeronáutico de los sistemas AMHS | | Cuba |
| 17 | -- | Comentarios de México | | Mexico |

# LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**BELIZE/BELICE**

Gilberto Orlando Torres

**COSTA RICA**

Asdrubal Sanders Varela

**CUBA**

Abel González Palmero
Victor M. Machado Sánchez
Yamilaine M. Trujillo Fonseca
Layla Rodriguez Vidal
Susana de los Ángeles Orta

**CURACAO/CURAZAO**

Josef Nicolaas
Jean Getrouw

**DOMINICAN REPUBLIC/REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA**

Fernando A. Cassó Rodríguez

**HAITI/HAITÍ**

Ernso Edmond
Emmanuel Joseph Jacques

**HONDURAS**

Samuel Isaí Palma Canales

**JAMAICA**

Courtney Malcolm
Peter Spence
Charles Wright
Nicoli Gabbidon
Fabian Taylor
Claudia Matheson

**MEXICO/MEXICO**

Ernesto Trujillo Hernández
Oscar Vargas Antonio
Miguel A. Reyes Rodríguez
Rafael Castro Castro
Daniel C. Castañeda Cruz
Ricardo Sánchez Gutiérrez

**NICARAGUA**

Hugo Ricardo Cano Flores
Jimmy Moreira
Luis Rodolfo Mahmud Tapia

**TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO**

Dayanand Rajnath
Kent Ramnarace-Singh
Ricky Bissessar
Andrew Ramkissoon

**UNITED STATES**

Joe Knecht
Dan Eaves

**COCESNA**

Luis Coello
Jenny Lee

**INDUSTRY**

Guillermo Roselló
Rodrigo San Martín Muñoz
Julie Riquier
Pedro Velasco
Govind Vekaria
Kolja Wabra
Simon Piromallo Di Montebello
Jean Getrouw
Fabio Faneschi
Jozef Nicolaas

**ICAO**

Julio Siu
Mayda Ávila
Eddian Méndez

## CONTACT INFORMATION

| Name / Position<br>Nombre / Puesto | Administration / Organization<br>Administración / Organización | Telephone / E-mail<br>Teléfono / Correo-e |
|---|---|---|
| **Belize/Belice** | | |
| **Gilberto Orlando Torres**<br>Deputy Director of Civil Aviation | Belize Department of Civil Aviation | Tel. +501-225-2014<br>E-mail gilberto.torres@civilaviation.gov.bz |
| **Costa Rica** | | |
| **Asdrubal Sanders Varela**<br>Supervisor Centro de Control Radar | Dirección General de Aviación Civil | Tel. +50684602828<br>E-mail asandersv@yahoo.c om |
| **Warren Quirós Castillo**<br>Gestor de Comunicación, Navegación y Vigilancia | Dirección General de Aviación Civil | Tel. +50684027381<br>E-mail wquiros@hotmail.com |
| **Cuba** | | |
| **Abel González Palmero** | Ministerio del Interior | Tel.<br>E-mail |
| **Victor Manuel Machado Sánchez**<br>Especialista en Gestión de Tránsito Aéreo | CACSA | Tel. +537 266 4013<br>E-mail victor.machado@aeronav.avianet.cu |
| **Yamilaine Mercedes Trujillo Fonseca**<br>Especialista ATS | IACC | Tel. 58274397<br>E-mail yamilaine.trujillo@iacc.avianet.cu |
| **Layla Rodriguez Vidal**<br>Especialista y Desarrollo del Sistema AMHS | ECASA | Tel. +537 649 7066<br>E-mail layla.rodriguez@aeronav.ecasa.avianet.cu |
| **Susana de los Ángeles Orta Alvarez**<br>Supervisor Técnico Operacional | CACSA | Tel. +537 8307619<br>E-mail susana.orta@cacsa.avianet.cu |
| **Curacao/Curazao** | | |
| **Jozef Nicolaas**<br>Supervisor ARO | DC-ANSP | Tel. 5999-839-3553<br>E-mail j.nicolaas@dc-ansp.org |
| **Jean Getrouw**<br>Gerente CNS | DC-ANSP | Tel. +5999-8393515<br>E-mail j.getrouw@dc-ansp.org |
| **Haiti/Haití** | | |
| **Ernso Edmond**<br>AIS Supervisor | Office National de l'Aviation Civile (OFNAC) | Tel. 50931486822<br>E-mail ernsoedmond15@gmail.com |

| Name / Position<br>Nombre / Puesto | Administration / Organization<br>Administración / Organización | Telephone / E-mail<br>Teléfono / Correo-e |
|---|---|---|
| **Emmanuel Joseph Jacques**<br>CNS Engineer | Office National de l'Aviation Civile (OFNAC) | Tel. +509 4620 6540<br>E-mail emmanueljacques@gmail.com |
| **Honduras** | | |
| **Samuel Isaí Palma Canales**<br>Supervisor de Comunicaciones, navegación y vigilancia | Agencia Hondureña de Aeronautica Civil | Tel. +504 9466 1204/2234 2510<br>E-mail splama@ahac.gob.hn |
| **Jamaica** | | |
| **Courtney Malcolm**<br>Unit Manager | Jamaica Civil Aviation Authority | Tel. +1 876 960 3948<br>E-mail courtney.malcolm@jcaa.gov.jm |
| **Peter Spence**<br>Assistant Operations Manager | Aeronautical Telecommunications Limited (AEROTEL) | Tel. +1 876 819-7620<br>E-mail pspence@aerotel-jm.com |
| **Charles Wright**<br>Radar Specialist | Jamaica Civil Aviation Authority | Tel. +1 876 960 3948<br>E-mail charles.wright@jcaa.gov.jm |
| **Nicoli Gabbidon**<br>Quality Assurance Officer | Jamaica Civil Aviation Authority | Tel. +1 876 960 3948<br>E-mail nicoli.gabbidon@jcaa.gov.jm |
| **Fabian Taylor**<br>Chief Communication, Navitation and Surveillance | Jamaica Civil Aviation Authority | Tel. +1 876-960-3948<br>E-mail fabian.taylor@jcaa.gov.jm |
| **Claudia Matheson**<br>Flight Data Processor | Jamaica Civil Aviation Authority | Tel. 876 960 3948<br>E-mail claudia.matheson@jcaa.gov.jm |
| **Mexico/México** | | |
| **Ernesto Trujillo Hernández**<br>Mazatlán ACC Supervisor | SENEAM | Tel. +52 01 669 982 2488<br>E-mail ernesto.trujillo@live.com |
| **Oscar Vargas Antonio**<br>Subdirector de Área | Dirección General de Aeronáutica Civil (DGAC) | Tel. + 52 57239300 Ext. 18074<br>E-mail ovargasa@sct.gob.mx |
| **Miguel Angel Reyes Rodríguez**<br>Técnico en sistemas aeronáuticos | SENEAM | Tel. +52 1 9999461329<br>E-mail mrkings61@gmail.com |
| **Rafael Castro Castro**<br>Jefe de Desarrollo de Telecomunicaciones Aeronáuticas | SENEAM | Tel. +52 55 57 86 55 34<br>E-mail rcastroc@sct.gob.mx |

| Name / Position<br>Nombre / Puesto | Administration / Organization<br>Administración / Organización | Telephone / E-mail<br>Teléfono / Correo-e |
|---|---|---|
| **Daniel Conrado Castañeda Cruz**<br>Inspector Verificador Aeronáutico | Dirección General de Aeronáutica Civil | Tel. + 52 55 5723 9300 x.18071<br>E-mail dcastane@sct.gob.mx |
| **Ricardo Sánchez Gutiérrez**<br>Jefe de Datos Aeronáuticos | SENEAM | Tel. +52 81 83690846<br>E-mail ricardo.sanchez@coctam.org.mx ; risangu@icloud.com |
| **Nicaragua** | | |
| **Hugo Ricardo Cano Flores**<br>Inspector Navegación Aeréa | INAC | Tel. +502 227 68580 Ext. 1550<br>E-mail capacitacion@inac.gob.ni; osuprad@inac.gob.ni; hrcf2010@hotmail.com |
| **Jimmy Moreira**<br>Controlador Aéreo | INAC | Tel. 505 85713049<br>E-mail jimmyleo6771@gmail.com |
| **Luis Rodolfo Mahmud Tapia**<br>Operador Radar | INAC | Tel. +505 227 68580 Ext. 1550<br>E-mail capacitación@inac.gob.ni; luismahmud20@hotmail.com; aeronav2@inac.gob.ni |
| **Dominican Republic/República Dominicana** | | |
| **Fernando A. Cassó Rodríguez**<br>Encargado División Sistemas Radar | Instituto Dominicano de Aviación Civil | Tel. +1-809-274-4322<br>E-mail fernando.casso@idac.gov.do |
| **Trinidad and Tobago/Trinidad y Tobago** | | |
| **Dayanand Rajnath**<br>Unit Chief ACC/APP | Trinidad and Tobago Civil Aviation Authority | Tel. +1 (868) 669 4806<br>E-mail drajnath@caa.gov.tt |
| **Kent Ramnarace-Singh**<br>Unit Chief Planning and Technical Evaluation | Trinidad and Tobago Civil Aviation Authority | Tel. +1 868 668 8222 Ext 2532<br>E-mail krsingh@caa.gov.tt |
| **Ricky Bissessar**<br>Unit Chief, AIM Operations | Trinidad and Tobago Civil Aviation Authority | Tel. + 1-868-669-4128<br>E-mail rbissessar@caa.gov.tt |
| **Andrew Ramkissoon**<br>Communication Navigation Surveillance Engineer | Trinidad and Tobago Civil Aviation Authority | Tel. 1 868 668 8222 Ext. 2520<br>E-mail aramkissoon@caa.gov.tt |
| **United States/Estados Unidos** | | |
| **Joe Knecht**<br>IT Specialist | Federal Aviation Administration | Tel. +1 609 485 5077<br>E-mail joe.knecht@faa.gov |
| **Dan Eaves**<br>Air Traffic Control Specialist | Federal Aviation Administration | Tel. +1 202 385 8492<br>E-mail dan.eaves@faa.gov |

| Name / Position<br>Nombre / Puesto | Administration / Organization<br>Administración / Organización | Telephone / E-mail<br>Teléfono / Correo-e |
|---|---|---|
| **COCESNA** | | |
| **Luis Coello**<br>ingeniero MACC | COCESNA | Tel. +504 2275 7090 Ext. 1724<br>E-mail luis.coello@cocesna.og |
| **Jenny Lee**<br>Coordinadora AIM | COCESNA | Tel. +504 2275 7090 Ext. 1561<br>E-mail jenny.lee@cocesna.org |
| **Industry/Industria** | | |
| **Kolja Wabra**<br>Freelance Consultant | EUROCONTROL | Tel. +49 151 17658936<br>E-mail kwa@pulsar.be |
| **Guillermo Roselló**<br>Responsable de Tráfico Aéreo | INDRA | Tel. 5591261243<br>E-mail grosello@indracompany.com |
| **Rodrigo San Martín Muñoz**<br>Gerente ATM | INDRA | Tel. +56 996 433 686<br>E-mail rasan@indracompany.com |
| **Simon Piromallo Di Montebello**<br>Sales Manager | Leonardo | Tel. +3906641505569<br>E-mail simonjamespeter.piromallo@leonardocompany.com |
| **Fabio Faneschi**<br>ATM Technical Authority | Leonardo | Tel. +390641503051<br>E-mail fabio.faneschi@leonardocompany.com |
| **Julie Riquier**<br>Business Development | Thales | Tel. +5255-2122-2890<br>E-mail julie.riquier@thalesgroup.com |
| **Pedro Velasco**<br>ATM Project Manager | Thales | Tel. +5255-2122-2890<br>E-mail pedro.velasco@thalesgroup.com |
| **Govind Vekaria**<br>Design Authority and Safety Manager | Thales | Tel. +44 1293 589 736<br>E-mail Govind.vekaria@uk.thalesgroup.com |
| **ICAO/OACI** | | |
| **Julio Siu**<br>Deputy Regional Director | ICAO NACC Regional Office | Tel. +5255 5250 3211<br>E-mail jsiu@icao.int |
| **Mayda Ávila**<br>Regional Officer Communications, Navigation and Surveillance | ICAO NACC Regional Office | Tel. +5255 5250 3211<br>E-mail mavila@icao.int |
| **Eddian Méndez**<br>ATM Regional Officer | ICAO NACC Reginal Officer | Tel. +5255 5250 3211<br>E-mail emendez@icao.int |

**Agenda Item 1 Status of implementation of automated protocols**

1.1 In the WP/02, the Secretariat provided a summary of the pending work of the Task Force and the States, result of the previous agreements. It was highlighted data radar sharing for assistance to reduce the Large height deviation (LHD) in the region.

1.2 It was mentioned taking into account the recommendations of the manufacturers collected during last year's NAM/CAR/SAM AIDC implementation meeting, which can be found in the meeting final report webpage: https://www.icao.int/SAM/Documents/2018-AIDC/AIDCNAMCARSAM%20Final%20Report.pdf.

1.3 GREPECAS project C tasks were also mentioned, with a brief explanation of GREPECAS role to put in context the relevance of the tasks.

1.4 A list was presented to the States to provide, during the meeting, the contact information of the responsible personnel of the Aeronautical message handling system (AMHS) maintenance and management.

1.5 Under WP/03 the AIDC Task Force Rapporteur presented a chart that summarizes the defined interfaces defined in the region and their implementation status. In this summary 39 operational and 19 planned interfaces, among others that are being tested, implemented or in a starting point that sums a total of 8 were indicated. States that are already in the implementation process or in the planning process were mentioned.

1.6 The States were encouraged to further participate more in the activities of the Task Force and to provide the feedback required from them. They were also urged to be realistic in the implementation outcomes, and to update the implementation status during the meeting.

1.7 On the other hand, the Rapporteur acknowledged the lack of timely coordination in the last teleconferences, and undertook to carry out the coordination in time to avoid technical setbacks.

1.8 The Rapporteur mentioned the metrics, which have not been used, and asked to use them, due to the fact that what is not measured is not enhanced.

1.9 As goals indicated by the Task Force, the Rapporteur proposed to aligned the goals for the group to the regional goals, taking into account that the regional goals will be reviewed in the next Air Navigation Implementation (ANI) Working Group Meeting in May with special attention to align them with the new GANP; an AIDC short-term implementation for the States with already a development in this subject and to determine the most accurate way the implementation dates for the rest of the interfaces.

1.10 Under the P/04, United States presented the development of the radar handoff through Class 3 North American Interface Control Document (NAM/IDC). The requirement of a direct connection without delays was discussed. In this regard, the MEVA III telecommunications network suitability for this purpose was questioned. The Secretariat reminded that the next modernization of the MEVA network to enhance aspects such as redundancy.

**Agenda Item 2 Implementation Process of the pending AIDC in the NAM / CAR Regions**

2.1 Under WP/04, the Secretariat presented its considerations on radar data sharing. Important requirements were discussed to be considered when two States are willing to share data of their surveillance systems. In the Appendix to the paper an agreement model among States on data sharing was presented, and Dominican Republic, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago were designated to review the document and make comments on it by 20 May 2019. The Secretariat informed that the model will be also sent to the Surveillance Task Force to receive opinions. The document will be presented as a proposal in the next ANI Working Group Meeting.

2.2 Under P/01 the Secretariat presented considerations to be taken into account when implementing AIDC. It emphasized the need to establish the AIDC operational concept and to identify the benefits of its implementation. The Secretariat reminded the three regional objectives to be established for the region: performance-based navigation (PBN) implementation, reduction of longitudinal separation and of CO2, and the AIM/System wide information management (SWIM). The need to ensure radar coverage in the AIDC coordination area was also discussed.

2.3 An important issue that emerged was training. The Rapporteur commented that there is no conceptual training in AIDC in the region outside of what manufacturers offer to customers when implementing. COCESNA stressed out that the paradigm shift for ATCO personnel is one of the important barriers to implementation. The Meeting agreed to develop a training profile for both operational and technical personnel prior to AIDC implementation, task which was assigned to Cuba and COCESNA.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">DECISION<br>AIDC/NAM/ICD/D/01 TECHNICAL/OPERATIVE TRAINING PROFILE FOR THE USE OF THE AIDC</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">What:<br>That, to respond to the need that technical and operative personnel who participate in the implementation of the automatized protocols have the suitable knowledge for leading in a better way its implementation and operation was identified, Cuba and COCESNA develop a training profile that covers this matter, by 30 August 2019.</td><td>Expected impact:<br>☐ Political / Global<br>☒ Inter-regional<br>☐ Economic<br>☐ Environmental<br>☒ Operational/Technical</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Why:<br>It will have an impact in future implementations. It will support the Region for the States that are already working in the implementation of these protocols can learn of the experience of other States.</td></tr>
<tr><td>When: 30 August 2019</td><td colspan="2">Status: ☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed</td></tr>
<tr><td>Who: ☒ States ☐ ICAO ☐ Other:</td><td colspan="2">Cuba and COCESNA</td></tr>
</table>

**Agenda Item 3 Air traffic control (ATC) systems database configuration and maintenance process**

3.1 Under P/03, Thales summarized its experiences on AIDC implementation. The most important issues that have affected the implementation have been the lack of clarity of the standards, very general specifications from the client, in which all the necessary parameters and functionalities are not included, and the lack of a test environment, which significantly facilitates the implementation process. Thales exhorted to work closely with the Air Navigation Service Providers (ANSP), and the Rapporteur proposed teleconferencing with suppliers to address issues related to standards, so that the problems and their solutions are discussed at once.

3.2 Under P/09, COCESNA presented the issues they have faced due to limitations and inconsistencies in the databases. Several examples were provided. It came out that their system does not have the same capacity of Belize and Costa Rica, and therefore has more restrictive limits than these States. However, COCESNA has a project with INDRA to homologate all the databases of all the control centres of their Member States.

3.3 COCESNA noted that there is usually no person dedicated to the maintenance of the databases. Likewise, in the factory tests, flight plan experts are not sent to do in-depth tests of flight plans treatment in the systems.

3.4 Another significant problem was the difference between the names of the standard instrument departure (SID) and the standard instrument arrival (STAR) in the flight plans, specifically the use of 7-character naming from the ANSP, in contrast to the 6 characters used by the airlines. It was proposed that the ANSP use 6 characters, provided that the ICAO documentation indicates that they are maximum 7 characters and not exactly 7 characters. This proposal will be passed on to the AIM Task Force for their opinion.

3.5 Coincidence in point names also produces errors when evaluating the route in flight plans and the CPL. The ICAO ATM Officer described the procedure used to assign point names, indicating that its goal is to eliminate duplication. According to the explanation, the name is verified in different sources before being assigned to avoid coincidence. He urged States to be flexible in the allocation of names, since opting for another name may be the simple solution to avoid this problem in the future.

3.6 The types of aircraft represent an important part of the databases. Data such as minimum and maximum cruise speed and standard rate of climb and descent are not always available. This affects the ability of systems to predict more accurately the trajectory of aircraft, and perform additional validations. The Secretariat informed that this issue has been reported to ICAO Headquarters in Montreal, which requested a working paper describing the problem and proposing the solution, to be discussed at the next Assembly. This working paper will have a regional focus and will be seen as a case of safety. Cuba, United States and COCESNA agreed to develop the working paper requested by ICAO.

3.7 Likewise, the intention of including performance data for aircraft types was also mentioned in Doc 8643 - *Aircraft type designators*.

3.8 The aforementioned described problems and other elements cause the lack of homogeneous databases in the different control centres, due to the absence of established mechanisms to carry out this activity in the different States.

3.9 The lack of mechanisms to update the information of databases in their systems is the source of failures in the automatized protocols and, additionally, it reduces safety when creating failures in the coordination. The Meeting discussed the importance of developing mechanisms to ensure that these systems have updated and same data.

3.10 The industry made presentations regarding their products, where they emphasized the facilities they offer in terms of their databases. In the case of Indra, they recommended taking interoperability into account when considering third-party systems that will interact with the systems that are acquired, citing cybersecurity. It was indicated that needs should be foreseen as much as possible, since changing the system after implementation is more difficult, and it noted that States are not always aware of all the needs until they have the system operating. States were urged not to acquire systems but solutions.

3.11 Leonardo also presented the details of its system, explaining the characteristics of the databases it uses.

3.12 Thales also presented their system, and at the end urged the States when requesting the protocol version to be used, that it was even more important to request the messages (including functionalities and options) to be used.

3.13 Because of the aforementioned, the following decisions and draft conclusion were agreed.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">DECISION<br>AIDC/NAM/ICD/D/02 PROPOSAL OF A REGIONAL AGREEMENT FOR 6 CHARACTERS IN SID AND STAR NAMES</td></tr>
<tr><td>What:<br>That the AIDC Task Force will prepare a proposal on a regional agreement for NAM/CAR States to apply 6 characters for SID and STAR designators, in coordination with the AIM Task Force for opinions and comments, for its presentation in the ANI/WG meeting.</td><td>Expected impact:<br>☐ Political / Global<br>☒ Inter-regional<br>☐ Economic<br>☐ Environmental<br>☒ Operational/Technical</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Why:<br>Because for avionics limitations, airline operators cannot use SID and STAR designators of more than 6 characters, causing conflicts with States' databases that use 7 characters. Furthermore, to facilitate the configuration of the ATC Systems configuration, harmonizing only one name for each procedure.</td></tr>
</table>

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **When:** | ANI/WG Meeting, May 2019 | **Status:** | ☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed |
| **Who:** | ☐ States ☐ ICAO ☒ Other: | AIDC Task Force | |

**DECISION**
**AIDC/NAM/ICD/D/03** **PROBLEM OF THE LACK OF AVAILABILITY OF THE PERFORMANCE DATA OF AIRCRAFT TYPES FOR UPDATING ATC SYSTEMS DATABASES**

| **What:** | **Expected impact:** |
|---|---|
| That, in order that the States have at their disposal the performance data of the types of aircraft and that these be kept updated in the databases of their systems, Cuba, United States and COCESNA prepare a working paper that explains the risks that produces this situation and proposes solutions to it, to be presented in the next ANI/WG Meeting for its possible presentation by a Member State in the next ICAO Assembly. | ☐ Political / Global<br>☐ Inter-regional<br>☐ Economic<br>☐ Environmental<br>☐ Operational/Technical |

**Why:**

Because the lack of updated aircraft performance data represents a safety risk, since the systems cannot accurately project the trajectories of aircraft without this data.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **When:** | ANI/WG Meeting | **Status:** | ☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed |
| **Who:** | ☒ States ☐ ICAO ☐ Other: | Cuba, the United States and COCESNA | |

**DRAFT CONCLUSION**
**AIDC/NAM/ICD/C/01** **MECHANISMS TO UPDATE ATC SYSTEMS DATABASES**

| **What:** | **Expected impact:** |
|---|---|
| That States ensure, in the short-term, the review of their ATC databases and the updating of the information of the different elements with the objective of having the latest information in force and to ensure the homogeneity of the information in the different control centres. | ☐ Political / Global<br>☒ Inter-regional<br>☐ Economic<br>☐ Environmental<br>☒ Operational/Technical |

**Why:**

The lack of a correct updating of the information in the databases creates failures in the automatization, diminishing safety.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **When:** | No later than December 2019. | **Status:** | ☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed |
| **Who:** | ☒ States ☐ ICAO ☐ Other: | | |

**Agenda Item 4 Analysis of the availability and errors of flight plans in the NAM/CAR/SAM Regions**

4.1 In the WP/06, Cuba presented an analysis of the errors detected in its (flight information region) FIR and recommendations for their solution. Some conditions that have caused errors were discussed, such as the placement of consecutive points en route without intermediate element (e. g. DCT), and the omission of the alternate aerodrome. Cuba recommended consulting ICAO Doc 4444 to avoid ambiguities, although there are still points opened to misinterpretation.

4.2 Differences between how to validate flight plans can lead to errors. Examples were presented such as the use of consecutive mandatory points without intermediate elements (e.g. DCT), and the placement of alternate aerodrome. ICAO documents are not always clear to solve these cases. To this end, the Secretariat proposed making a survey of the functionalities of the systems to identify at which points these conflicts may occur. It was also proposed to pass cases of ambiguities in the interpretation of ICAO documentation to the AIM Task force for assistance.

4.3 Under P/15, United States explained details of the flight plans rejection and acknowledgment messages, rejected (REJ) and acknowledged (ACK) respectively, and showed examples of their use. They indicated that their system has the capacity to respond to additional addresses to the originator of the flight plan, and that as a security measure only the originator of the flight plan can send ATS messages modifying it.

4.4 In order to keep users aware of the changes and thus contribute to mitigate the errors, monthly teleconferences are held with the users, in which they are informed of changes in systems, procedures, and any other useful information.

4.5 The case of a flight plan originated in Central America to Atlanta was presented, in which the arrival procedure (STAR) at the departure aerodrome was eliminated, due to differences in the database that did not allow registering the flight plan otherwise. This change was propagated via CPL to the destination, where it caused a risk situation, hence, the importance of maintaining integral flight plans information.

4.6 Under P/05, the Rapporteur showed the results of data collection made by the FPL Monitoring Group in March 2019. He explained the methodology and presented some statistics of the collection of the current year and a comparison with last year. The reflected change was little considered, therefore measures with a greater impact must be implemented. The Rapporteur indicated that the increase in cases of inconsistencies in the ATS route could have been caused by last changes to the routes, since databases could have remained outdated.

4.7 The data collection information is useful for the States, and the data was requested to be available to the States for the subsequent application of mitigation measures.

4.8 The Secretariat proposed to take 10 specific error cases each month and work on them, and also to send the information to the AIM group, since these staff has a great incidence in mitigating these errors.

4.9 In view of the aforementioned the Meeting adopted the following:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">CONCLUSION PROJECT<br>AIDC/NAM/ICD/C/02 REGISTRY OF THE FUNCTIONALITIES OF THE FLIGHT PLAN TREATMENT SYSTEMS</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">What:<br>That,<br>a) the States report to the AIDC Task Force Rapporteur which functionalities have their flight plan treatment systems, which functions they have, how is the parameter processing operator with the new plan format in order to identify operational incompatibilities and weaknesses in the standardization of coordination by 30 November 2019; and,<br>b) the Group Rapporteur prepare an analysis of the provided information by 10 January 2019.</td><td>Expected impact:<br>☐ Political / Global<br>☐ Inter-regional<br>☐ Economic<br>☐ Environmental<br>☐ Operational/Technical</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Why:<br>The difference with which the systems process and validate the flight plan data can produce rejections of the same, producing situations of safety risk.</td></tr>
<tr><td>When:</td><td>Data gathering no later than 30 November 2019; results presentation by 10 January 2020.</td><td>Status: ☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed</td></tr>
<tr><td>Who:</td><td>☒ States ☐ ICAO ☒ Other:</td><td>Rapporteur</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">DRAFT CONCLUSION<br>AIDC/NAM/ICD/C/03 CASES OF DIFFERENCES IN THE INTERPRETATION OF ICAO DOCUMENTS FOR THE FLIGHT PLANS PROCESSING</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">What:<br>That the States consult the AIM Task Force cases where the interpretation of ICAO documents related to flight plans that are not sufficiently explicit and clear in order to solve flight plan processing problems, by 30 November 2019..</td><td>Expected impact:<br>☐ Political / Global<br>☒ Inter-regional<br>☐ Economic<br>☐ Environmental<br>☒ Operational/Technical</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Why:<br>There are errors in flight plans produced because systems process them differently, based on interpretations of ICAO documents, and therefore require clarification.</td></tr>
</table>

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **When:** | November 2019 | **Status:** | ☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed |
| **Who:** | ☒ States ☒ ICAO ☐ Other: | | |

**Agenda Item 5** **Update and maintenance process of Aeronautical addressing of AMHS Systems (Aeronautical message handling system)**

5.1 Under P/16, Cuba showed some examples of errors in AMHS addressing, which can be caused by outdated address databases. Addressing errors can result in non-delivery of the message, and, in the case of AIDC coordination, they have a significant negative impact on operations.

5.2 The importance of maintaining updated databases through the AMC was stressed, in order to avoid these problems. It was also mentioned that the ATC Messaging Management Centre (AMC) webpage specifies a point of contact for each communications centre, which is useful in the case of having to contact another State in relation to addressing problems.

5.3 UnderP/11 by Eurocontrol, the documents related to AMHS used in the EUR/NAT region were described. They represent a large number of documents that include a general manual, tests, aeronautical telecommunication network (ATN) directory service, etc.

5.4 The documents used to test the systems were highlighted, which can be used as a reference for the States that intend to implement AMHS.

5.5 With P/14, COCESNA described their AMHS system, which has a master system and a slave system as a contingency. The contingency system does not have data validation applications, however it is enabled to carry out the functions of the AIM system in case of disaster.

5.6 In P/12, Eurocontrol showed details of the messaging management manual (Eurocontrol Messaging Management Manual). It describes the procedures for using the AMC for tasks such as accreditation of external COM operators, introduction of addresses and user capabilities. The schedule for the introduction of information, which follows the Aeronautical information regulation and control (AIRAC) cycle, was described.

5.7 United States, under P/10, explained the use of EUROCONTROL test documentation in AMHS tests with adjacent FIRs. They rated the Eurocontrol documentation as very good and, therefore, did not see the need to start from scratch to develop a test protocol. They have customized the document for their needs, and offered to give an example of this test documentation to States that plan to implement AMHS in the short term, so that it serves as a guide for the specifications with the supplier.

5.8 EUROCONTROL exposed, through P/13, details on the use of the AMC Web platform, as well as the explanation of important concepts such as administration domains, XF and CAAS addressing, among others. They described some windows that will be presented to the user, and made a live demonstration of the Network Inventory function.

5.9 For information support in IWXXM format it was reported that the EUR Region issued a letter to interested parties to update user capabilities.

5.10 A detailed explanation of the routing was also presented, including a live demonstration of the application of this functionality.

5.11 The relationship between the AMC and the European Directory Service (EDS) was shown, and it was noted that several countries have a local directory service.

5.12 Finally, the functionality of "Path" was shown, showing the calculated routing between chosen origin and destination addresses. Two examples were shown, one in which it originates from an AFTN address and converted to AMHS to the destination; and another in which AFTN originates, is converted to AMHS and then converted back to AFTN. It was emphasized in the latter case that it is important to know these changes to ensure that the content of the message can be correctly handled at each point of the journey to the destination.

5.13 The Secretariat indicated that is necessary to update the Points of contact (PoC) of the AMHS administrators of each State and that the States than do not have the necessary PoC to carry out coordination with the AMC (Eurocontrol) send their request to the ICAO NACC Regional Office to start the necessary coordination with Eurocontrol

**Agenda Item 6 AIDC Task Force update process**

6.1 The Meeting discussed the work programme presented under WP/08, and updates were made Only tasks related to the AIDC Task Group were considered due that the work programme also covers the FPL monitoring Ad hoc group.

6.2 Some of the tasks are related to conclusions and decisions adopted during this meeting, with deadlines and responsible designated. Within the updated tasks the AIDC interface implementation is included, which are summarized in the following chart. After the number updating related to the quantity and status of the interfaces mentioned in paragraph 1.5 to this report, they were modified as follows:

| Interface Status | Quantity |
|---|---|
| Implementing | 3 |
| No planned | 2 |
| Operational | 39 |
| Planned | 14 |
| In test | 12 |

6.3 Likewise, the States that attended the meeting and that have already updated their FPL system, have removed the mention of the converter in their systems for the FPL processing with the 2012 format.

6.4 Tasks related with identifying training opportunities have been replied with the assigned tasks specified in paragraph 2.3 to this Report.

| Interface | Interface Class | Interface Status | Implementation Date | Bilateral Agreement or ICD | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Albuquerque-Mazatlán | Class I | Operational | 2005 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| Albuquerque-Monterrey | Class I | Operational | 2005 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| Anchorage-Edmonton | Class II | Operational | 0 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| Anchorage-Vancouver | Class II | Operational | 0 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| Barranquilla-Kingston | | Testing | | | |
| Belize-CENAMER | N/A | Testing | 2020 | PAC ICD | |
| Belize-Guatemala | N/A | Planned | | PAC ICD | |
| Belize-Merida | Class I | Implementing | 2020 | NAM-ICD Version D | Planning tests |
| Bogota-CENAMER | N/A | Testing | 2018 | PAC ICD | |
| Boston-Moncton | Class II | Operational | 0 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| Boston-Montreal | Class II | Operational | 0 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| Boston-Toronto | Class II | Operational | 0 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| CENAMER-Costa Rica | N/A | Testing | 2020 | PAC ICD | |
| CENAMER-El Salvador | N/A | Operational | October 2015 | PAC ICD | |
| CENAMER-Guatemala | N/A | Operational | December 2015 | PAC ICD | |
| CENAMER-Guayaquil | N/A | Testing | TBD | PAC ICD | |
| CENAMER-Havana | Class I | Operational | q4 2019 | NAM-ICD Version E | Planned tests q4 class II |
| CENAMER-Kingston | N/A | Planned | TBD | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| CENAMER-Mazatlán | Class I | Planned | TBD | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| CENAMER-Merida | N/A | Operational | jul-1905 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| CENAMER-Nicaragua | N/A | Operational | September 2015 | PAC ICD | |
| CENAMER-Panama | N/A | Operational | 2016 | PAC ICD | |
| Cleveland-Montreal | Class II | Operational | 0 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| Cleveland-Toronto | Class II | Operational | 0 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| Costa Rica-Nicaragua | N/A | Planned | 2020 | PAC ICD | |
| Curacao-Kingston | N/A | Planned | TBD | NAM-ICD Version D | |
| Curacao-Kingston | N/A | Planned | TBD | PAN | |
| Curacao-Maiquetia | N/A | Planned | 0 | 0 | |
| Curacao-Santo Domingo | N/A | Planned | 2020 | PAN ICD V.1 | Start testing v2 - v1 |
| Edmonton-Reykjavik | N/A | Operational | 0 | NAT ICD | |
| Edmonton-Salt Lake City | Class II | Operational | 0 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| Edmonton-Seattle | Class II | Operational | 0 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| El Salvador-Guatemala | N/A | Planned | jun-2016 | PAC ICD | |
| El Salvador-Nicaragua | N/A | Planned | mar-2020 | PAC ICD | |
| French Guyanne-PIARCO | N/A | Planned | 2021 | PAC ICD | |
| Gander-New York | N/A | Operational | 0 | NAT ICD | |
| Gander-Prestwick | N/A | Operational | 0 | NAT ICD | |
| Gander-Reykjavik | N/A | Operational | 0 | NAT ICD | |
| Gander-Santa Maria | N/A | Operational | 0 | NAT ICD | |
| Havana-Kingston | Class I | Testing | q4 2019 | NAM-ICD Version E | Class 1 + LRM |
| Havana-Merida | Class I | Operational | March 9, 2012 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| Havana-Miami | Class I | Operational | q4 2019 | NAM-ICD Version E | Planned tests q4 class II |
| Havana-Port au Prince | N/A | Not planned | TBD | 0 | |
| Houston-Merida | Class I | Operational | 0 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| Houston-Monterrey | Class I | Operational | 2005 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| Kingston-Panama | N/A | Testing | TBD | PAN ICD V.1 | To be moved to operational system, but will not be main means of coordination yet |
| Los Angeles-Mazatlan | Class I | Operational | 0 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| Maiquetia-PIARCO | N/A | Planned | TBD | 0 | |
| Mazatlan-México | Class I | Operational | 2005 | LOA | |
| Mazatlán-Monterrey | Class I | Operational | 2005 | LOA | |
| Mazatlán-Oakland | N/A | Operational | March 2015 | PAN ICD V.1 | Voice confirmation |
| Mérida-México | Class I | Operational | 2005 | LOA | |
| Mérida-Monterrey | Class I | Operational | 2005 | LOA | |
| México-Monterrey | Class I | Operational | 2005 | LOA | |
| Miami-Nassau | N/A | Planned | TBD | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| Miami-Santo Domingo | Class I | Implementing | Q3 2019 | NAM-ICD Version E | Class 1 + LRM |
| Minneapolis-Toronto | Class II | Operational | 0 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| Minneapolis-Winnipeg | Class II | Operational | 0 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| Moncton-New York | Class II | Testing | Q4 2019 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| New York-PIARCO | N/A | Testing | 2020 | PAC ICD | |
| Nicaragua-San José | N/A | Planned | 2020 | PAC ICD | |
| Oakland-Vancouver | Class II | Operational | 0 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| Panama-San José | N/A | Testing | 2020 | PAC ICD | |
| PIARCO-SAL | Class I | Testing | 2020 | NAM-ICD Version D | |
| PIARCO-San Juan/Miami | Class I | Testing | 2020 | NAM-ICD Version D | |
| Port au Prince-Santo Domingo | N/A | Not planned | TBD | 0 | |
| Salt Lake City-Vancouver | Class II | Operational | 0 | NAM-ICD Version E | |
| Salt Lake City-Winnipeg | Class II | Operational | 0 | NAM-ICD Version E | |

## Agenda Item 7 Other businesses

### 7.1 Venue and dates for the next meeting

7.1.1 The Meeting agreed that the next meeting will be held in April 2020 and it was consulted with the participant States the option to host this event. Cuba indicated that would consult the possibility with the appropriate authorities to be the host State of this important meeting on regional implementation.

7.1.2 The increasing need of data sharing and to use more information identified in the need of sharing radar data for the AIDC implementation, the use of aeronautical information, the AIM/SWIM implementation, require the region to start working in that direction.

7.1.3 As a result of Cuban intervention and of the knowledge shown in the AMHS implementation, its ATC control centres, among others, support was requested to Mrs. Layla Rodríguez Vidal, AMHS System Developer Specialist of Cuban Airport and Air Services Enterprise (ECASA), tointegrate the MEVA Task Force that has activities on the SWIM (formats) trial trough the MEVA communications network. The Secretariat will send this request to Cuba.