INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

Third Meeting of APIRG Infrastructure and Information Management Sub Group (IIM/SG/3)
(Virtual Meeting, 12-14 October 2020)

Agenda Item 3: Review of the outcome of the APIRG/22nd   meeting

Conclusions/Decisions of the APIRG/22nd meeting in the area of Aeronautical Information Management (AIM)

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY
This paper presents the outcome of the APIRG/22 & RASG AFI/5 meetings in the area Aeronautical Information Management (**AIM**) **Action by the meeting is at paragraph 3**
REFERENCE(S): ▪ Report of the APIRG 22 & RASG AFI 5 meetings
Related ICAO Strategic Objective (s): A Safety, B Capacity & Efficiency **Related ASBU KPIs & B0 Modules:** all KPIs applicable to AIM domain

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1   The Twenty-second Meeting of the AFI Planning and Implementation Group (APIRG/22) was held in conjunction with the Fifth Meeting of the AFI Regional Aviation Safety Group (RASG - AFI/5) at the Movempick Ambassador Hotel in Accra, Ghana, from 29 July to 2 August 2019.

1.2   The meetings were attended by 217 participants from AFI States, Regional / International Organizations and Industry;

2. DISCUSSION

2.1   Under its Agenda Item 3, *Regional Activities related to APIRG, RASG-AFI and AFI PLAN*, the joint APIRG/22 & RASG AFI/5 meeting was informed that the 22nd meeting of the AFI Plan Steering Committee (Kampala, Uganda, 15 May 2019) approved an AIM Project to support States in the implementation of quality management system (QMS) in a digital/electronic AIM environment through the establishment of an "AIM Go-Team for the AFI Region''.

2.2   The project was developed based on an analysis of selected USOAP Protocol Questions (PQs) for the African Region showing that the effective implementation of properly organized QMS as applied to AIS processes was only 33%. An important pre-requisite for States to effectively transition from AIS to AIM is to ensure that quality measures are in place.

2.3   The primary objective of the AIM Go-Team Concept is to bring States to a good implementation stage through a standard process which includes:
        a) engagement with the AFI States receiving assistance;
        b) in-depth analysis of their bottlenecks with implementation;
        c) provision of tailored guidance to address those challenges;

d) identification of follow-up actions; and
e) monitoring the execution of those follow-up actions through specific Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).

2.4   The Go-team will be composed of ICAO Headquarters Technical Officers and relevant Regional Officers, recipient States Focal Points; and Partner organizations/States.

2.5   In consideration of the above the meeting formulated the following conclusion:

APIRG/22 & RASG-AFI/5 Conclusion 1/05:   Implementation of AFI Plan AIM Project

That AFI States/ANSPs should:
1. *Take advantage and/or support the AFI Plan project on the establishment of an AIM Go-Team in order to ensure effective implementation of properly organized quality management systems (QMS) in the AFI Region; and*
2. *Develop detailed and time-bound AIM Implementation Action Plans, based on the AIM Go-Team recommendations, and facilitate the follow-up activities to be conducted by the Go-Team.*

2.6   The project document is currently under review in order to be submitted to the AFI Plan Steering Committee for further consideration.

2.7   APIRG/22 meeting under its agenda item 3 discussed the outcome of the APIRG IIM SG /2 meeting and noted a lack of coordination of some IIM projects including AIM Project 3 with its Project Team to be coordinated by Nigeria. The meeting in order to urge relevant Administrations to confirm to the APCC with copy to the Secretariat their commitment to effectively lead the respective projects teams they volunteered to coordinate, formulated the following conclusion:

APIRG/22 Conclusion 22/23:   Effective coordination of IIM COM Project 2, AIM Project 3, Spectrum Project and MET Project 2

That;
As a matter of urgency:
a) *Nigeria (coordinator of AIM Project 3 and COM Project 2), Senegal (coordinator of MET Project 2) and Uganda (coordinator of Spectrum Project 1) confirm to the APCC with copy to the Secretariat, their commitment to effectively lead the respective projects teams they were volunteer to coordinate;*
b) *States willing to coordinate the above projects express their interest to the Secretariat in case the current nominated States may not be willing to continue the coordination.*

2.8   For the implementation of the above the Secretariat issued State Letter T 17/6.11 (C)-0726 dated 05 December 2019 to concerned Administrations. Effective actions were taken by Senegal and Uganda, while Nigeria reacted 3 weeks ago.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1   The meeting is invited to:

a) Take note of the information given above.
b) Note the challenges encountered in the coordination of AIM Project 3 and identify any possible solutions
c) Agree on a proposal to nominate an alternative Administration for the coordination of the Project

3.2   **Draft Decision 3/xxxx**: *Effective coordination of IIM AIM Project 3,*

That;

a)   [State] is appointed as volunteer to coordinate the Team of the IIM *AIM Project 3: Implementation of the provision of electronic terrain and obstacle data (e-TOD) in the AFI Region* express formally his willingness by a letter to the APCC

b)   The Secretariat after approval of the APCC inform Administration/Organizations on the details of the new Project Team Coordinator.

…………………………..

--END---