



ICAO

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

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

(AIDC/NAM/ICD/3)

Report

Mexico City, Mexico, from 25 to 28 February 2020

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of ICAO concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

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-2
ii.5 Schedule and Working Arrangements.....	ii-2
ii.6 Agenda	ii-2
ii.7 Attendance	ii-3
ii.8 List of Decisions.....	ii-3
ii.9 List of Working and Information Papers and Presentations	ii-4
List of Participants	iii-1
Contact Information	iv-1
Agenda Item 1	1-1
<i>Adoption of the Provisional Agenda and Schedule</i>	
Agenda Item 2	2-1
<i>Joint Meeting with the ANI/WG AIM Task Force</i>	
Agenda Item 3	3-1
<i>NAM/CAR Pending AIDC Implementation Process</i>	
Agenda Item 4	4-1
<i>NACC Strategic Objectives</i>	
Agenda Item 5	5-1
<i>AIDC Implementation Objectives with Respect to the New Version of the Global Air Navigation Plan (GANP)</i>	
Agenda Item 6	6-1
<i>ANI/WG AIDC Task Force Regional Work Plan Update</i>	
Agenda Item 7	7-1
<i>Other Business</i>	

HISTORICAL

ii.1 Place and Date of the Meeting

The Third NAM/CAR Air Traffic Services Inter-facility Data Communication (AIDC) and North American Interface Control Document (NAM/ICD) Implementation Follow-up Meeting (AIDC/NAM/ICD/3) was held in the ICAO NACC Regional Office in Mexico City, Mexico, from 25 to 28 February 2020.

ii.2 Opening Ceremony

Mr. Julio Siu, Deputy Regional Director of the North American, Central American and Caribbean (NACC) Regional Office of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) welcomed the participants, highlighting the importance of the AIDC and NAM/ICD and the operational benefits of its implementation.

Mr. Siu indicated last year's results of the 40th Session of the ICAO Assembly on the approval of the Sixth edition of the Global Air navigation Plan (GANP), introducing the evolution of the global air navigation system, support implementation, Basic Building Block (BBB) Aviation System Block Upgrade (ASBU) Global framework, web-based application reports, performance-based approach, performance-based decision making method for defining implementation strategies and the Key Performance Indicator (KPI) Catalogue.

Mr. Siu also stressed the importance of the activities carried out by the NAM/CAR Air Navigation Implementation Working Group AIDC Task Force since the automated protocols NAM/ICD and Air Traffic Services Inter-facility Data Communication (AIDC)/PAC are implementations that support efficiency and increase the capacity of operations in the region, raising situational awareness and operational safety.

Mr. Siu invited all the participants to take an active approach on this implementation, committing to its success and demanding from ICAO all the support and necessary actions for the benefit and positive impact for the States and the region.

Mr. Fernando Cassó, Rapporteur of the AIDC Task Force thanked the support of the TF members for the development of the AIDC implementation and officially opened the meeting.

ii.3 Officers of the Meeting

The AIDC/NAM/ICD/3 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 language of the Meeting was English. The working papers, information papers and report of the meeting were available to participants in English. The presentations were 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: Adoption of the Provisional Agenda and Schedule

Agenda Item 2: Joint Meeting with the ANI/WG AIM Task Force

Agenda Item 3: NAM/CAR Pending AIDC Implementation Process

Agenda Item 4: NACC Strategic Objectives

Agenda Item 5: AIDC Implementation Objectives with Respect to the New Version of the Global Air Navigation Plan (GANP)

Agenda Item 6: ANI/WG AIDC Task Force Regional Work Plan Update

Agenda Item 7: Other Business

ii.7 Attendance

The Meeting was attended by 11 States/Territories from the NAM/CAR/SAM Regions, 2 International Organizations and 2 companies from the industry, totalling 30 delegates as indicated in the list of participants.

ii.8 List of Draft Conclusions/Decisions

The Meeting recorded its activities as Draft Conclusions and Decisions as follows:

DRAFT

CONCLUSIONS: Activities requiring endorsement by the NAM/CAR Air Navigation Implementation Working Group (ANI/WG).

DRAFT

DECISIONS: Internal activities requiring endorsement by the NAM/CAR Air Navigation Implementation Working Group (ANI/WG).

Number	Title	Page
Draft Decision AIDC/NAM/ICD/3/1	COORDINATE TELECONFERENCES BETWEEN AIRSPACE USERS AND STATE PERSONNEL FOR DISCUSSING AND CORRECTING FLIGHT PLAN ERRORS	2-2
Draft Conclusion AIDC/NAM/ICD/3/2	DEVELOP A WEB PAGE UNDER THE ICAO WEB PAGE DEDICATED TO INFORMATION RELATIVE TO AIDC IMPLEMENTATION	3-1
Draft Decision AIDC/NAM/ICD/3/3	OBTAIN A LIST OF CONTACTS OF THE RESPONSIBLE ENTITIES FOR AIDC PROTOCOL DEVELOPMENT	3-2
Draft Conclusion AIDC/NAM/ICD/3/4	STATES' AND INDUSTRY AIDC SUBJECT MATTER EXPERTS CONTACT LIST	3-3
Draft Decision AIDC/NAM/ICD/3/5	DEVELOPMENT OF AN AIDC TRAINING PROFILE FOR THE NACC REGION	3-4
Draft Conclusion AIDC/NAM/ICD/3/6	IDENTIFICATION OF ATC AND FLIGHT PLAN SYSTEMS' DIFFICULTIES FOR DATABASE UPDATES	6-1

ii.9 List of Working and Information Papers and Presentations

Refer to the Meeting web page:

<https://www.icao.int/NACC/Pages/meetings-2020-aidc.aspx>

LIST OF WORKING AND PRESENTATIONS

WORKING PAPERS				
Number	Agenda Item	Title	Date	Prepared and Presented by
WP/01	1	Provisional Agenda and Schedule	24/02/20	Secretariat
WP/02	2	FPL Monitoring Group Data Collection Analysis, 2019-2	24/02/20	FPL Monitoring Group Rapporteur
WP/03	2	Flight Plan Errors due to human factors	24/02/20	Secretariat.
WP/04	3	AIDC Regional Plan Review	24/02/20	AIDC Task Force Rapporteur
WP/05	6	AIDC Work Programme Review	24/02/20	AIDC Task Force Rapporteur
WP/06	2	Abstract on the effectiveness of Flight Plans in the MUFH FIR	24/02/20	Cuba
WP/07	2	Validation of the Flight Plan Format in the ATC System	24/02/20	Secretariat
WP/08	3	Flight Planning Quality Improvement Initiative in the North American, Central American and Caribbean Region	25/02/20	United States
WP/09	3	The United States Automated Data Exchange Interface and Cross Border Hand Off within the North American, Central American and Caribbean (NACC) Region – 2020 Update	26/02/20	Cuba
WP/10	3	AIDC Implementation Process	26/02/20	Secretariat

PRESENTATIONS				
Number	Agenda Item	Title	Presented by	
1	7	ATM automation and integration	INDRA	
2	7	FDP Overview	Thales	
3	3	Dominican Republic AIDC Implementation Status	Dominican Republic	
4	3	Flight Planning Quality Improvement Initiative in the North American, Central American and Caribbean Region - Problem Analysis and Resolution of Automated Data Exchange Flight Plan Disparities at Miami ARTCC	United States	

PRESENTATIONS			
Number	Agenda Item	Title	Presented by
5	3	North American Common Coordination Interface Control Document (NAM ICD) Update - United States Automated Data Exchange Interface and Cross Border Handoff – 2020	United States
6	3	AIDC Implementation Experiences	Thales
7	3	AIDC/NAM Coordination status	COCESNA
8	3	Action Plan for AIDC implementation	Trinidad and Tobago
9	4	Global Air Navigation Plan ASBU Framework	Secretariat
10	5	ASBU Elements - CNS Technology and Other Services	Secretariat

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

COSTA RICA

1. Jeffrey Ríos Córdoba
2. Asdrubal Sanders Varela
3. Warren Quirós Castillo
4. Asdrubal Sanders Varela

CUBA

5. Yamilaine Mercedes Trujillo Fonseca
6. Susana de los Ángeles Orta Alvarez

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

7. Fernando A. Cassó Rodríguez

EL SALVADOR

8. Luis Roberto Reyes

HAITI

9. Jean-Claude Pierre
10. Ernsó Edmond
11. Emmanuel Jacques
12. Reginald Guignard

HONDURAS

13. Samuel Palma

JAMAICA

14. Omar Edwards
15. Courtney Malcolm

MEXICO

16. Daniel Conrado Castañeda Cruz
17. Oscar Vargas Antonio
18. Margarita Rangel

NICARAGUA

19. Martha Hernández Reyes

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

20. Kent Ramnarace-Singh
21. Andrew Ramkissoon

UNITED STATES

22. Rudolph Lawrence
23. Dan Eaves

COCESNA

24. Jesús Sevilla
25. Reybin Sanabria

INDRA

26. Rodrigo San Martín Muñoz
27. Guillermo Roselló Massa

THALES

28. Govind Vekaria
29. Pedro Velasco

ICAO

30. Mayda Ávila

CONTACT INFORMATION

Name / Position	Administration / Organization	Telephone / E-mail
Costa Rica		
Jeffrey Ríos Córdoba Jefe Centro de Control de Radar AIJS	DGAC	Tel. +506 21069090 E-mail jrrios@dgac.go.cr
Warren Quirós Castillo Gestor CNS	Dirección General de Aviación Civil	Tel. +1 506 8402-7381 E-mail wquiros@hotmail.com
Asdrubal Sanders Varela Supervisor Centro de Control Radar	Dirección General de Aviación Civil	Tel. +50684602828 E-mail asanders@yahoo.c om
Asdrubal Sanders Varela Supervisor Centro de Control Radar	Dirección General de Aviación Civil	Tel. +50684602828 E-mail asanders@yahoo.c om
Cuba		
Susana de los Ángeles Orta Alvarez Supervisora Técnica Operacional - Especialista Principal	CACSA	Tel. +537 8307619 E-mail susana.orta@cacsa.avianet.cu
Yamilaine Mercedes Trujillo Fonseca Especialista ATS	IACC	Tel. 58274397 E-mail yamilaine.trujillo@iacc.avianet.c u
El Salvador		
Luis Roberto Reyes Inspector CNS	Autoridad de Aviación Civil	Tel. +1 503 2565-4502 E-mail lreyes@aac.gov.sv
Dominican Republic		
Fernando A. Cassó Rodríguez Encargado División Sistemas Radar	Instituto Dominicano de Aviación Civil	Tel. +1-809-274-4322 E-mail fernando.casso@idac.gov.do
Haiti		
Ernso Edmond AIS Officer	Office National de l'Aviation Civile (OFNAC)	Tel. 50931486822 E-mail ernsoedmond15@gmail.com
Emmanuel Jacques CNS Engineer	National Office of Civil Aviation, OFNAC	Tel. 509 4620 6540 E-mail emmanueljacques@gmail.com

AIDC/NAM/ICD/3
List of Participants – Contact Information

iv – 2

Name / Position	Administration / Organization	Telephone / E-mail
Reginald Guignard Assistan Director of Air Navigation Services	OFNAC	Tel. 509 344856665 E-mail reginald.guignard@ofnac.gouv.ht
Jean-Claude Pierre AIM Unit Chief	OFNAC	Tel. +50944944334 E-mail jeanclaud.pierre@ofnac.gouv.ht
Honduras		
Samuel Palma Supervisor Nacional CNS	AHAC	Tel. +50422342510 E-mail spalma@ahac.gob.hn
Jamaica		
Omar Edwards Air Traffice Controller	Jamaica Civil Aviation Authority	Tel. 876 837 6280 E-mail omar.edwards@jcaa.gov.jm
Courtney Malcolm Unit Manager	Jamaica Civil Aviation Authority	Tel. +876 960 4640 E-mail courtney.malcolm@jcaa.gov.jm
Mexico		
Oscar Vargas Antonio Subdirector de Comunicaciones Navegación y Vigilancia	AFAC	Tel. 5557239300 EXT 18071 E-mail ovargasa@sct.gob.mx
Margarita Rangel Oficial de operaciones/meteorología	SENEAM	Tel. +52 55 5786-5514 E-mail magosrangel@hotmail.com
Daniel Conrado Castañeda Cruz Inspector Verificador Aeronáutico	AFAC	Tel. + 52 55 5723 9300 x.18071 E-mail dcastane@sct.gob.mx
Nicaragua		
Martha Hernández Reyes Inspectora ATM y MET	INAC	Tel. 505-22768580 Ext. 1580 E-mail ats@inac.gob.ni
Trinidad and Tobago		
Andrew Ramkissoon Communication Navigation Surveillance Engineer	Trinidad and Tobago Civil Aviation Authority	Tel. 1-868-774-4234 E-mail aramkissoon@caa.gov.tt
Kent Ramnarace-Singh Unit Chief Planning and Technical Evaluation	Trinidad and Tobago Civil Aviation Authority	Tel. +1 868 668 8222 Ext 2532 E-mail krsingh@caa.gov.tt
United States		
Dan Eaves Air Traffic Control Specialist	Federal Aviation Administration	Tel. +1 202 385 8492 E-mail dan.eaves@faa.gov

AIDC/NAM/ICD/3
List of Participants – Contact Information

iv – 3

Name / Position	Administration / Organization	Telephone / E-mail	
Rudolph Lawrence Air Traffic Control Specialist	Federal Aviation Administration	Tel. +202 267 0116 E-mail rudolph.lawrence@faa.gov	
COCESNA			
Reybin Sanabria Tecnico Mantenimiento ACC	COCESNA	Tel. 504 22757090 E-mail reybin.sanabria@cocesna.org	
Jesús Sevilla Gestor de Automatizacion ATS	COCESNA	Tel. 50422434057 E-mail juan.sevilla@cocesna.org	
INDRA			
Rodrigo San Martín Muñoz Gerente ATM Internacional	INDRA	Tel. +56 996 433 686 E-mail rasan@indracompany.com	
Guillermo Roselló Massa Director ATM	INDRA	Tel. +52 1 5514482474 E-mail grosello@indracompany.com	
Thales			
Pedro Velasco ATM Project Manager	Thales	Tel. +5255-2122-2890 E-mail pedro.velasco@thalesgroup.com	
Govind Vekaria Design Authority and Safety Manager	Thales	Tel. +44 0 1293 589 736 E-mail Govind.vekaria@uk.thalesgroup.com	
ICAO			
Mayda Ávila Regional Officer Communications, Navigation and Surveillance	ICAO NACC Regional Office	Tel. +5255 5250 3211 E-mail mavila@icao.int	

Agenda Item 1 Adoption of the Provisional Agenda and Schedule

1.1 The Secretariat presented WP/01 with the draft agenda and schedule of the Third 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/3) and the Chairperson invited the participants of the Meeting to approve them. The participants of the Meeting approved the agenda as presented in the historical section of this report and the schedule as presented in WP/01.

Agenda Item 2 Joint Meeting with the ANI/WG AIM Task Force

2.1 At the beginning of the Meeting, Mexico mentioned that most of the activities done by the Flight Plan (FPL) Monitoring Group are oriented to solve errors for international flights. Local flights are also taken into account. In addition, consequences for those that generate errors in flight plans should be considered. A final suggestion of presenting some examples for the upcoming ICAO NACC Flight plan error mitigation workshop closed the comments of Mexico's representatives, which were all considered positive.

2.2 Under WP/02, the FPL Monitoring Group rapporteur presented statistics from the most recent data gathering, carried out in October 2019. The methodology of how the collection was carried out was explained, and each of the presented graphics was reviewed. Among the conclusions extracted from the information was the significant percentage of errors originated from airspace users, probably because of the increasing practice of States of receiving electronic FPL messages directly from them; also because there is a great need from States to establish communication channels in order to offer errors feedback to the airspace users.

2.3 Another observation was the great number of cases originated by general aviation. United States commented that there are cases when general aviation pilots use third party systems, mostly web-based, to file flight plans with the sole intention of obtaining information such as weather conditions, but without the intention of actually flying.

2.4 Under WP/03, the Secretariat presented information regarding the human factors aspect of flight plan error occurrence. Different flight plan fields were mentioned, along with references to ICAO documents that regulate the syntax and content of the fields. Training was mentioned as a key activity to correct the generation of flight plan inconsistencies due to human error.

2.5 Under WP/07, the Secretariat mentioned several factors that cause flight plan errors, and pointed out that the lack of updating of Aeronautical Message Handling System (AMHS)/flight plan processing systems with data from the Aeronautical information Publication (AIP) or Air traffic services messaging management centre (AMC) can cause problems, as also the lack of updating the Air Traffic Control (ATC) systems' databases and manual management of flight plans. It was also mentioned that flight plan errors have been approached locally by Flight Information Regions (FIRs), but not regionally.

2.6 Under WP/06, Cuba presented statistics of flight plan errors in its FIR, indicating that its main cause of error is the non-compliance with the 2012 flight plan format. It was also mentioned the agreement to a homogenous regional procedure for flight plan processing, and low training as an obstacle to mitigate this issue.

2.7 Cuba offered several suggestions that apply to the different stakeholders: operators, service providers, industry and civil aviation authorities.

2.8 One of the suggestions, the establishment of a specific unit watching or monitoring the service provider dedicated to flight plan validation, spurred an interesting discussion on the requirement of having such a unit. Several documents were mentioned that indicated this responsibility belonging to the Air traffic service Reporting Office (ARO). The fact that the practice of submitting the electronic flight plan message by the airspace users corresponds to the action of submitting a flight plan form, which must be received by the ARO as detailed in Chapter 4 of Doc 4444 was also mentioned.

2.9 United States in P/04 showed how the personnel in Miami Control Centre analysed and solved a significant number of AIDC flight plan related disparities. The project was successful due to, among other things, the commitment of the facility. The issues that were occurring between Miami and Cuba had brought the problem to attention.

2.10 Ineffective practices, such as informing flight crew of errors, were mentioned. Throughout the aforementioned presentation the effective practices were pointed out, summarized as follows:

1. To have the right contacts for each airspace user.
2. Build good professional relationships with the airspace users.
3. Willingness to be persistent and escalate issues in the airspace users' hierarchy.
4. Involvement of upper management of the ATS unit.
5. Continuous and close, short-term monitoring quality control.

2.11 The FPL rapporteur proposed to use the group to begin implementing the practices, creating this momentum in the group and involving the necessary personnel, through teleconferences with the users and national Air Navigation Services Provider (ANSP) and Civil Aviation Authorities as required. The following decision was made to that end:

DRAFT DECISION	
AIDC/NAM/ICD/3/1	COORDINATE TELECONFERENCES BETWEEN AIRSPACE USERS AND STATE PERSONNEL FOR DISCUSSING AND CORRECTING FLIGHT PLAN ERRORS.
What: That the FPL Monitoring Group coordinate teleconferences with the airspace users, with the presence of any local personnel considered pertinent (AIM manager, ATM manager, CAA, etc.), in order to establish a communication channel with the users for the purpose of correcting flight plan errors.	Expected impact: <input type="checkbox"/> Political / Global <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inter-regional <input type="checkbox"/> Economic <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational/Technical
Why: Because feedback with the user has proven effective in the reduction of flight plan errors.	
When: Determined from teleconference with group.	Status: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Valid / <input type="checkbox"/> Superseded / <input type="checkbox"/> Completed
Who: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> States <input type="checkbox"/> ICAO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other:	FPL Monitoring Group and States

3.5 ICAO suggested that ASIA PAC ICD messages be included into the NAM ICD to allow States to implement just that one hybrid protocol which represents a cost reduction to them. United States considers changing protocols as they are prohibitive in terms of cost and capability to their current AIDC project investments already operational and in development.

3.6 ICAO will provide information on AIDC handoff messages and how they work to United States for their consideration and analysis regarding the previous paragraph.

3.7 The issue of vendors updating their systems to include version F was also commented. Thales suggested that States should only request compliance to newer versions of ICD to the suppliers when the ICD are completed and stable. The rapporteur commented that versions should be made backwards compatible as possible, so as not to force States to upgrade new versions as released.

3.8 Under P/06, Thales presented information regarding its experience on AIDC implementation, pointing out issues that it has encountered in the region. In that sense, referring to the upgrading of its software to include NAM, Thales informed that in the process there were doubts on the interpretation of the NAM ICD, but it did not know who to consult on the matter, as it had no points of contact defined for this. This issue is represented in the following decision:

DRAFT DECISION	
AIDC/NAM/ICD/3/3	OBTAIN A LIST OF CONTACTS OF THE RESPONSIBLE ENTITIES FOR AIDC PROTOCOL DEVELOPMENT
What: That in view that is important to obtain a list of contacts for the entity responsible of developing the AIDC protocols (ASIA PAC, NAM) used in the region, a) the AIDC Task Force to obtain the point of contact of the different NAM/CAR States by 30 May, 2020; and. b) ICAO to update and put this information available by 30 June 2020.	Expected impact: <input type="checkbox"/> Political / Global <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inter-regional <input type="checkbox"/> Economic <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational/Technical
Why: To allow industry and States to consult any doubts in the interpretation of the ICDs, and be notified of any updates or changes in these protocols.	
When: June 30, 2020	Status: <input type="checkbox"/> Valid / <input type="checkbox"/> Superseded / <input type="checkbox"/> Completed
Who: <input type="checkbox"/> States <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ICAO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other:	AIDC Task Force and ICAO NACC

3.9 Thales commented that inclusions of optional messages in an ICD are interpreted differently by suppliers and the States. ICAO considered ATC Service Provider (Industry) could have available the onsite software configuration to give the opportunity to States to personalize messages according with their needs. There should be an agreement between vendors and States on this matter.

4.0 United States commented that PIARCO has reached out to knowledgeable people in their State to do desktop practices before the implementation to see the interoperability issues beforehand. It is imperative to know about the interactions between systems that will take place during the implementation. It would be valuable for each State that has successfully implemented AIDC to be available their lessons learned to those States that are in the process of setting up an interface, could use those information. For this purpose the following decision was agreed:

DRAFT CONCLUSION	
AIDC/NAM/ICD/3/4	STATES' AND INDUSTRY AIDC SUBJECT MATTER EXPERTS CONTACT LIST
What: Who? to obtain a list of subject matter experts' contacts from States that have successfully implemented AIDC, as well as industry, and have this published in the AIDC Task Force website.	Expected impact: <input type="checkbox"/> Political / Global <input type="checkbox"/> Inter-regional <input type="checkbox"/> Economic <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental <input type="checkbox"/> Operational/Technical
Why: This will allow States that are implementing AIDC to discuss the necessary topics to take into account for developing the specifications for their systems, as well as to assist with the implementation process.	
When: June 30, 2020	Status: <input type="checkbox"/> Valid / <input type="checkbox"/> Superseded / <input type="checkbox"/> Completed
Who: <input type="checkbox"/> States <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ICAO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other:	AIDC Task Force and ICAO NACC

4.1 The interface update implementation status is under **Appendix A** to this report.

4.2 In addition, and in support of the other suggestions in WP/10, the AIDC Task Force Rapporteur considered that these experts could also provide information for the training profile mentioned in that working paper. Hence, the following decision was made:

DRAFT DECISION	
AIDC/NAM/ICD/3/5	DEVELOPMENT OF AN AIDC TRAINING PROFILE FOR THE NACC REGION
What: That AIDC subject matter experts from the States that have implemented AIDC submit suggestions on a non-system specific AIDC training profile to the AIDC Task Force Rapporteur, based on their experience of implementation; this proposed profile to be presented to the NACC Working Group meeting in September 2020.	Expected impact: <input type="checkbox"/> Political / Global <input type="checkbox"/> Inter-regional <input type="checkbox"/> Economic <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational/Technical
Why: Because AIDC training, apart from specific system training, is scarce in the region, and the lack of training is an important factor affecting AIDC implementation.	

AIDC/NAM/ICD/3
Report on Agenda Item 3

3-4

When: August 7, 2020	Status: <input type="checkbox"/> Valid / <input type="checkbox"/> Superseded / <input type="checkbox"/> Completed
Who: <input type="checkbox"/> States <input type="checkbox"/> ICAO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other:	AIDC Task Force

Agenda Item 4 NACC Strategic Objectives

4.1 Under WP/09, the Secretariat provided a quick overview of the 6th edition of the Global Air Navigation Plan (GANP), approved during the last ICAO Assembly held in Montreal, Canada, from 24 September to 4 October 2019. The layered structure was explained, and the GANP portal was displayed to the Meeting for acquaintance.

4.2 The important concept of the Basic Building Blocks (BBB) was explained and presented to the Meeting through the GANP portal, representing the baseline for States subsequent improvement.

4.3 The ASBU framework was explained afterwards, including the main concepts (block, thread, module, element and enabler), the new thread structure, and the relationship between them. The GANP portal was further examined, showing examples of the information regarding some ASBU elements.

4.4 The AIDC Task Force Rapporteur added some explanations regarding the six-step method, and showed participants the AN-SPA tool.

**Agenda Item 5 AIDC Implementation Objectives with Respect to the New Version of the
Global Air Navigation Plan (GANP)**

5.1 Under P/10, the Secretariat offered details of the CNS and technology services thread of the ASBU framework. The modules and elements of each thread were presented in a general view. The correspondence of these modules to the current and projected Task Forces was also reviewed.

5.2 The fact that Increased Interoperability, Efficiency and Capacity through Ground-Ground Integration (FICE), the module that is projected to be developed by the AIDC Task Force, does not have any elements for Block 1, but only AIDC implementation for Block 0 was reviewed. Therefore there are no additional tasks in the short term for the Task Force.

Agenda Item 6 ANI/WG AIDC Task Force Regional Work Plan Update

6.1 Under WP/05, the AIDC Task Force Rapporteur displayed the current work programme, notifying the Meeting that despite the changes in regional objectives expected after analysis and consideration by the upcoming NACC Working Group meeting, for the time being there was no necessary change in the work programme.

6.2 Each item in the work programme was considered, and the decisions and conclusions of other meetings pertaining to the AIDC Task Force were also evaluated. The task of updating the ATC systems' databases was an item referred earlier by the Secretariat. Therefore, in order to go forward with the requirement a decision was reached for States to identify the factors that affect updating ATC systems databases and report them to the Rapporteur in order to address them.

DRAFT CONCLUSION	
AIDC/NAM/ICD/3/6	IDENTIFICATION OF ATC AND FLIGHT PLAN SYSTEMS' DIFFICULTIES FOR DATABASE UPDATES
<p>What:</p> <p>That States identify and submit to the AIDC Task Force Rapporteur any difficulties encountered with updating the databases of their ATC and flight plan processing systems, in order to evaluate the possible solutions to these difficulties.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each State to provide this information with the actual problems by 30 June 2020. 2. Every time that States find information about it, it will be addressed to the AIDC Task Force. 	<p>Expected impact:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Political / Global</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inter-regional</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Economic</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Environmental</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational/Technical</p>
<p>Why:</p> <p>Because differences in ATC and flight plan processing systems are a source of errors that impact AIDC operation.</p>	
<p>When: June 30, 2020</p>	<p>Status: <input type="checkbox"/> Valid / <input type="checkbox"/> Superseded / <input type="checkbox"/> Completed</p>
<p>Who: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> States <input type="checkbox"/> ICAO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other:</p>	<p>States and AIDC Task Force</p>

6.3 The AIDC Task Force Work Programme is under **Appendix B** to this Report.

Agenda Item 7 Other Businesses

7.1 Under P/01, Indra presented its product portfolio, including details of its flight data processor, with respect to flight plan error mitigation, explaining the development of automation, the status of ASBU development, as well as the example of ITEC, a very interesting project of collaboration between entities for the development of automations solutions.

7.2 The different protocols as offered by Indra were presented, as well as challenges and issues encountered by the company, especially the case of optional messages. It was also mentioned that States contract systems without the critical supporting systems, such as connectivity with the adjacent FIR. In this aspect the Task Force rapporteur reminded the Meeting of the ASBU element enablers for the FICE-B0/1 module, and suggested assigning an order of priority to these to avoid these situations.

7.3 COCESNA referred to several situations that occurred during the implementation of its systems and explained lesson learned. The AIDC Task Force Rapporteur suggested that, in line with the decision of having subject matter experts in different FIRs, the test protocols of these FIRs that include representative examples of the flight plans to be expected from them be available for Factory Acceptance Test (FAT) and On site Acceptance Test (SAT) of the systems under implementation, so that these situations may be detected early on in the implementation process.

7.4 Under P/02, Thales presented details of its Flight Data Processor (FDP), providing an overview of the different functions available relevant to AIDC and flight plan processing. Several new functions have been introduced into its software, which were identified. A sample of the different checks done in terms of flight plan validation was viewed.

7.5 Under its presentation, items to take into account for correct operation of the system were offered, in terms of avoiding errors and keeping data up to date.

7.6 Venue and dates for the next meeting will be discussed and agreed by 1 August 2020.

APPENDIX A

Interface Update Implementation

State/Organization	System	Point of contact	Network Bandwidth	Comments	Milestones/Obstacles
Bahamas	INDRA AIRCON 2100*	-	-	-	
Belize	INDRA AIRCON 2100	Gilberto Torres	AMHS: 64 Kbps	Has class 2 and 3	December – meeting in COCESNA January – Training
Canada	CAATS GAATS+ (Gander Oceanic)	Troy Wilton Manager, ATM and ACC Automation (613) 248 6915 wiltont@navcanada.ca	-	-	
COCESNA	INDRA Aircon 2100 Renovado	Reybin Sanabria (reybin.sanabria@cocesna.org) Jesus Sevilla (juan.sevilla@cocesna.org)	N/A (the current AFTN circuit speed is 1.2 kbps internally and 9.6 kbps the internationals). COCESNA planned to change her AFTN network for a new AMHS network in September 2016	-	Class 2 next year waiting for Cuba Update of system – waiting for Cuba
Costa Rica	No - FDP Server must upgrade – Q1 2017	Warren Quirós navegacionaerea.cns@dgac.go.cr +50622314924	AMHS: 64 Kbps	Has class 2 and 3	December – meeting in COCESNA January – Training
Cuba	yes - Oracle Version 9 modified by LITA-CUBA	Joao Vázquez Estrada, email: joao.vazquez@aeronav.avianet.cu	AMHS: 64 Kbps*	We received many mistakes from the users in the FPL, in almost all fields. We have detected changes in the FPL forwarded by ACC's or ANSP offices related to FPL's presented by operators	Class 2. Work in progress

State/Organization	System	Point of contact	Network Bandwidth	Comments	Milestones/Obstacles
Curacao	-	Jacques Lasten, ATS Manager, DC-ANSP, j.lasten@dc-ansp.org	AMHS: 64 Kbps	-	
Dominican Republic	Yes TopSky-ATC, Thales ATM	Julio Cesar Mejia A. Enc. ATM, jmejia@idac.gov.do, 809 274-4322. Ext. 2103 + Fernando Casso, fernando.casso@idac.gov.do	AMHS: 64 Kbps	-	Signing of phase change agreement - october 2017 Installation of test bed and update operation - September 2018
El Salvador	INDRA Aircon 2100 Renovado	Danilo Ramirez danilo.ramirez@cepa.gob.sv	AMHS: 64 Kbps	-	
Guatemala	INDRA Aircon 2100 Renovado	Sergio Raul Enrique senriquez@gmail.com David Ascoli davidascoli@gmail.com	AMHS: 64 Kbps	-	
Haiti	-	Nadia Leopold nleopold@hotmail.com	-	-	
Jamaica	Thales Topsky In installation	Carl Gaynair – Carl.gaynair@jcaa.gov.jm	64k	85% implementation	Training. Verify if NAM is implemented and how. If classes are as should be. Thales Australia
Mexico	Yes- FDP=Topsky, Producer= THALES ATM, INFO= Four Control Centres, all Mexico covered	Oscar Vargas Antonio ovargasa@sct.gob.mx	19200 bps	Mexico already counts with the implementation of CPL/LAM information exchange between: MZT ≤ ≥ LAX, MZT ≤ ≥ ABQ, MTY ≤ ≥ ABQ, MTY ≤ ≥ HOU, MID ≤ ≥ HOU, MID ≤ ≥ HAB	Class 2 not planned in near future
Nicaragua	INDRA Aircon 2100 Renovado	Jorge Saballos jsaballos@eaai.com.ni	AMHS: 64 Kbps	Has class 2 and 3	December – meeting in COCESNA January – Training
Trinidad and Tobago	SELEX ATM System	Veronica Ramdath vramdath@caa.gov.tt	64k		Approval phase for upgrade Upgrade will be next year. Continue testing phase afterwards.

State/Organization	System	Point of contact	Network Bandwidth	Comments	Milestones/Obstacles
United States	Yes - Host Automation / En Route Automation Modernization(ERAM) systems. Lockheed-Martin (LMCO) is the prime contractor for the Host/ERAM system. Ocean21 provides its own FDP processing in the oceanic environment. LMCO is also the contractor for Ocean21.	Dan Eaves, Federal Aviation Administration Air Traffic Control Specialist, Dan.Eaves@FAA.gov, 202-385-8492	US- Mexico: NADIN/AFTN 64 kbps X.25 US- Cuba : MEVA III 19.2 kbps connection to NADIN	The domestic FDP is integrated into The Host Automation / En Route Automation Modernization (ERAM) systems.. The flight data function of The San Juan Combined Center / Radar Approach Control (CERAP) is integrated into The Miami Air Route Traffic Control Center (ARTCC) Host/ERAM.	Working Class 3 2020 estimated.

APPENDIX B

AIDC Task Force Work Program

Updated 07/03/2020

Task Description	Due Date	Status	
Update Database Information			
	1.1 Update ATC systems	To be updated	Valid
	1.2 Update messaging systems	To be updated	Valid
2 FPL errors			
2.1 Implement homogeneous procedure			
	2.1.1 Develop procedure		Complete
	2.1.2 send a survey to airlines to determine flight plan processing systems capabilities		Complete
	2.1.3 send a survey to ANSPs to determine flight plan processing systems capabilities		Complete
	2.1.4 discuss and agree on the use of ATS messages, in the light of the capabilities of the systems		Complete
	2.1.5 carry out trials as proof of concept of the regional procedure, by means of bilateral agreements	By State	Valid
	2.1.6 review and publish the addresses to which airspace users should send flight plans, taking into account the capabilities of their systems and in accordance with the regional procedure	By State	Valid
	2.1.7 propose the resulting procedure for flight plan processing, based on the discussed procedure and considering the results of items c) and d) of this decision, to be the regional procedure, and request its publication in Doc 7030 - Regional Supplementary Procedures	To be determined	Valid
2.2 Improve feedback between airlines and ATS units			
	2.2.1 update the contact list for the 3, in which to include Aeronautical Fixed Telecommunication Network (AFTN)/Aeronautical Message Handling System (AMHS) addresses, e-mail addresses and/or phone numbers for the entity responsible for handling flight plan errors, for uploading to the ANI/WG AIDC Task Force web page (https://www.icao.int/NACC/Pages/regional-group-AIDC.aspx)		On-going – to be considered integrated into future task force web page

Task Description		Due Date	Status
	2.2.2 create an ANSPs contact list for, in which to include AFTN/AMHS addresses, email addresses and/or phone numbers for the entity responsible for handling flight plan errors, for uploading to the AIDC Task Force web page, and also update the Aeronautical Information Publication (AIPs) of each State accordingly		Valid– to be considered integrated into future task force web page
	2.2.3 review and recommend the use of the reference of the Rejection Message (REJ/ACK) guidance from Cuba, United States and COCESNA, and for future updates and implementation of flight plan processing systems	To be updated	Valid
	2.2.4 create a guidance document for determining which circumstances require a rejection of flight plans and which does not	To be updated	Valid
	2.2.5 consider and carry out user teleconferences with the participation of air navigation personnel as deemed necessary		Superseded by AIDC/NAM/ICD/3 decision
	2.2.6 promote and carry out regional user teleconferences to follow up on pertinent issues		Superseded by AIDC/NAM/ICD/3 decision
2.3 Maintenance of aircraft type database			
	2.3.1 update aircraft type data	To be updated	Valid
	2.3.2 develop a procedure to allow timely update of this data	To be updated	Valid
3 Implement ATS automated message exchanges as required (FPL, CPL, CNL, DLA, etc.)			
	3.1 AIDC implementation class 1-2	On-going	Valid
4 Implement automated radar handoffs where possible			
	4.1 AIDC implementation class 3	Beginning in 2021	Valid
5 Improve training			
	5.1 Identify and inform of training needs for the application and implementation of ATS system automation		Superseded by AIDC/NAM/ICD/3 decision
	5.2 Enhance the training infrastructure of the region and the training programs related to surveillance and automated systems		Superseded by AIDC/NAM/ICD/3 decision
6. Decisions and Conclusions			

Task Description		Due Date	Status
CONCLUSION PROJECTAIDC/NAM/ICD/ C/02	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, b)the Group Rapporteur prepare an analysis of the provided information by 10 January 2019.	To be updated	Valid
DECISIONAIDC/NAM/ICD/ D/02	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.	NACC WG Meeting September 2020	Valid
DRAFT CONCLUSIONAIDC/NAM/ ICD/C/01	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.		Superseded – identification of problems in databases
DRAFT CONCLUSIONAIDC/NAM/ ICD/C/03	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..	To coordinate with AIM Task Force	Valid
DECISION ANI/WG/5/10	UPDATING OF THE ANI/WG TASK FORCES REGIONAL PLANS		Superseded – will be determined by the results of the regional objectives analysis to be presented in NACC WG meeting in September 2020
DECISIONANI/WG/5/11	ASSESSMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE FREE ROUTE AIRSPACE (FRA) IMPLEMENTATION		Superseded – will be determined by the results of the regional objectives analysis to be presented in NACC WG meeting in September 2020

Task Description		Due Date	Status
AIDC/NAM/ICD/3	COORDINATE TELECONFERENCES BETWEEN AIRSPACE USERS AND STATE PERSONNEL FOR DISCUSSING AND CORRECTING FLIGHT PLAN ERRORS Determined from teleconference with group.	Determined from teleconference with group.	Valid
AIDC/NAM/ICD/3	DEVELOP A WEB PAGE UNDER THE ICAO WEB PAGE DEDICATED TO INFORMATION RELATIVE TO AIDC IMPLEMENTATION	March 13 to send the design of web page. Comments received till March 18.	Valid
AIDC/NAM/ICD/3	OBTAIN A LIST OF CONTACTS OF THE RESPONSIBLE ENTITIES FOR AIDC PROTOCOL DEVELOPMENT	June 30, 2020	Valid
AIDC/NAM/ICD/3	STATES' AND INDUSTRY AIDC SUBJECT MATTER EXPERTS CONTACT LIST	May 30, 2020	Valid
AIDC/NAM/ICD/3	DEVELOPMENT OF AN AIDC TRAINING PROFILE FOR THE NACC REGION	August 7, 2020	Valid
AIDC/NAM/ICD/3	IDENTIFICATION OF ATC AND FLIGHT PLAN SYSTEMS' DIFFICULTIES FOR DATABASE UPDATES	May 30, 2020	Valid
AIDC/NAM/ICD/3	Discuss and agree on next meeting date and venue	August 1, 2020	Valid