

AERONAUTICAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS NETWORK PANEL
(ATNP)

JWG/2 – JOINT WORKING GROUPS – 2ND MEETING

Honolulu, 6th March 2001

Report of ATNP JWG2 meeting

Presented by B Cardwell

(Prepared by M J A Asbury)

Summary

This document is the agreed ATNP JWG/2 meeting report.

REPORT OF THE JOINT ATNP WG A & B MEETING, ILIKAI WAIKIKI HOTEL, HONOLULU, HI., 6 – 7 MARCH 2001.

0. INTRODUCTION

0.1 Jim Lenz welcomed the members to the meeting, on behalf of FAA, the host. He then handed over the chairmanship of the meeting to Jean Yves Piram and Brian Cardwell. The meeting was attended by some 40 members from 7 States, and 4 International organisations. A list of attendees is attached at Appendix A

1. AGENDA ITEM 1 - MEETING ORGANISATIONAL ISSUES

1.1 Brian Cardwell gave an overview of the work of the meeting, and the WPs available. There will be an archive with all Guidance material (Doc 9739 Ed 2), and all SARPs. A limited number of hard copies were available. Soft Copy of WPs 4, 5, 6 and 7 are available for reference. All papers will be available on CD by evening of the 7th March.

1.2 Jean Yves Piram introduced the Communiqué produced from WG A concerning inter-Panel co-operation and material stability. This was approved by the JWG for attachment as Appendix B to this report

2. AGENDA ITEM 2 - APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

2.1 The Agenda was approved.

3. AGENDA ITEM 3 - STATUS OF CAMAL MATERIAL

3.1 Introducing this Agenda Item, Jean Yves Piram said that all the current GM would be available in a special archive on the CD available at the end of this meeting.

3.2 Changes to the GM resulting from PDR activity, amendments to SARPs and SG work should be posted to the Rapporteurs of the appropriate WG no later than 30th June 2001, and the updated material would be available on the CENA server from that date at the latest. Any comments on the material should be made before 31st August 2001, after which date any uncommented material would be deemed as accepted. Any unresolved comments would have to be discussed at the next round of WG meetings, leading to a delay in the publishing of the Material.

3.3 In order to facilitate review of the GM by States and Organisations, the current material could be reviewed, and Rapporteurs would post the references of the changed sections on the server. It was expected that less than 5% of material would have to be changed from that which was currently available. However, about 10% of the material placed on the server would be new material, which would have to be reviewed in depth.

3.4 Brian Cardwell agreed to publish a Status Paper on the GM Edition 2 archive on the CENA server, which would review the status of all the material outstanding for each SV GM. This would be updated as each batch of revised material was posted. All SV GM would be complete by 30th June 2001. Masoud Paydar noted that for GM we were under no constraint – when he got a completed package from the Rapporteurs or Chairman of the CCB he would publish it. He said there was no deadline for GM as far as ICAO was concerned.

3.5 The current status of the GM was as follows

SV 1- No GM applicable

SV 2 – Mike Asbury reported that the Edition 2 GM is in the form of changes from Edition 1 GM in red-line, two column format. Changes from Edition 1 relate to application of Security and the CM-server concept in CM, Security, revised Emergency/Urgency operation and parameter changes in ADS, virtually nothing in ARF, Security, range and resolution and message changes in CPDLC, and wholesale changes to ATIS and the introduction of METAR in FIS. Change material will be available by the due date.

The current SV 2 GM was accepted by the JWG.

SV 3 – Jean Yves Piram noted that changes to the current material in AIDC are minimal, resulting from two PDRs. He said that In respect of AMHS, the modifications are due to the introduction of the Extended ATS Message Service, development of the CIDIN/AMHS gateway, new PDRs and the application of Security.

The current SV 3 GM was accepted by the JWG

SV 4 – Tony Kerr reported that the SV 4 GM is still in two parts – the early material has now been properly formatted, and has been well reviewed. The second part, including Security, is still being worked on, and should be complete by the end of the meeting (9/3/01). This is new material, which has yet to be seen by WG B. It will go onto the Server for comments. The meeting agreed that this new material should be reviewed by the appropriate SGs before being made available for general comment. There was a plea for more support for this work, certainly until the material had been fully commented on after being posted.

The material would be approved electronically by the members after being posted on the server – as was the procedure in ICAO matters, no comment would be taken as meaning approval.

SV 5 - Brian Cardwell noted that the creation of this material was complete, and that it had been reviewed by SG B! and WG B. However, it was still in single column format, and it was an editing task to convert it into two-column, redline format. New material will be prepared by Ron Jones and Christine Ricci and Brian Cardwell will publish a completed version by the end of March 2001. For the record, the technical content of the current material was correct, even if the material was incorrectly formatted.

The current SV 5 GM was accepted by the JWG.

SV 6 – Tony Kerr reported that the System Management GM came in two parts – the CONOPS and the GM related to SV 6. The CONOPS has been updated, is in the correct WordPerfect Format, but is only in single column format. When preparing this material, ICAO had changed the numbering (Doc 9739 part II Chapter 5, but it should have been Chapter 3). ICAO should probably be responsible for the renumbering, but Tony Kerr offered to do the job, an offer all to readily accepted by Masoud Paydar. (Masoud said that if ICAO had had to do it, incorrect material could have been on the web site for a very long time.) With regard to the GM, this had not changed since its review at the Berlin meeting.

The current SV 6 CONOPS and GM was accepted by the JWG.

SV 7 – Jim Moulton said that the CONOPS and GM for the Directory Services was available, and would be on the CD available at the end of this meeting. The material for both was reviewed at a joint SG meeting last week, and had now been converted to the WordPerfect version. Comments on the material have been received – this will lead to some revisions, and the updated material would be available by May 2001. Regarding the CONOPS, Jim would have to check that the numbering was correct – it would then be ready for the final round of comments and editing. The material had been posted in a Word version for about the last two weeks. He would prepare a list of changed pages to be posted on the server and forward this to the Rapporteur of WG B.

The current SV 7 GM and CONOPS material was accepted by the JWG.

SV 8 – Mike Bigelow confirmed that the guidance for the Security SV also took the two-part format – CONOPS and GM for the SV. He confirmed that the CONOPS numbering was correct (Part II, Chapter 2). The GM, being new material, would go in Part V Chapter 4. The recent meeting of the SG B3 made a first pass through the near completed material. The CONOPS had been updated from the Berlin meeting, with new background and operational scenario material, and had grown from 20 to 40 pages. Tom McParland still had some work to do in tying in the cross-referencing between the CONOPS and the SV 8 GM, and the inclusion of the figures was a problem – the two column format is not helpful in this respect. Mike expected the work on the CONOPS to be consolidated by the end of March – both it and the GM will be distributed in April, and will be reviewed by a SG B3 meeting in mid-May. It would be updated and posted for comment by the end of June. The material was currently substantially complete, but severe editing/reformatting was required. The CONOPS needed a complete conversion to WordPerfect, although the SV8 GM was all in WordPerfect, and mostly in two column format. The material which was available now would go on the end-of-meeting CD

The material would be approved electronically by the members after being posted on the server – as was the procedure in ICAO matters, no comment would be taken as meaning approval.

SV 9 – The Register SV, running to about four pages, is perceived as being its own truth, and needeth no guidance

GM Part V Introduction - The Guidance Material relating to SV's 6, 7 and 8 is new material, and will appear in Part V of the CAMAL. Jim Moulton was in the process of preparing introductory material, a draft of which would be available at the end of the meeting.

P/OICS – Mike Asbury reported that Masoud had agreed that the GM for the POICS could be included in the CAMAL provided it was prepared in WordPerfect, which would be done. The PICS/OICS themselves, in the version currently available at this meeting, would be posted on the ICAO ATNP web-site in PDF format - as an unchangeable reference. A working Excel version would be posted on the CENA server, to allow profiles to be developed using the material. Masoud had offered to host the Excel version on the ICAO site, but Mike Asbury said that it would be better if ICAO held the reference version.

3.6 Ed Adelson asked about comments and publishing. It was agreed that comments posted would be discussed electronically, with the editors making any resulting amendments. Masoud said that although the publishing of the material was at the whim of the ICAO priority list, as soon as he got a Rapporteur-approved set of GM he would post it on the web. There would actually be minimum delay in making the material available to the implementers after it had been approved by the members.

4. AGENDA ITEM 4 - COMMUNIQUEÉS FROM AMCP

4.1 There were three working papers related to exchanges of communiqués with and from the AMCP.

4.2 The first was an AMCP response confirming that they would take ATN security provisions into account when considering any security applications in the SARPs for which they were responsible. The JWG gratefully acknowledged the response.

4.3 The second related to the Frame-mode Sndcf. WG B had responded to their reply, and had sent three communiqués back on related problems.

4.4 The third Communiqué from the AMCP related to entries concerning AMSS and VDL columns in the Annex 10 Table of priorities. The response seemed to go far beyond the level of reply expected, and proposed changes in already approved material. The JWG did not feel the need to respond to these

proposals – this could best be achieved through inter-secretariat co-ordination. The JWG agreed that they would limit action on the AMCP response to proposed new material. After a very long and esoteric discussion between ATNP and AMCP experts, it was ultimately agreed that, noting the appropriate AMCP comments, the entries in the VDL Mode 3 and 4 columns in the rows at ATNP network 5 priority and below would be amended to read ‘not allowed’. Also, Note 7 would be amended, indicating VDL Mode 4 use for Surveillance applications, and giving ADS as an example.

4.5 The final version of the table is attached at Appendix C: the Panel Secretary is requested to make best efforts to get this table included into the Amendment 76 to Annex 10, or, failing that, Amendment 77. A PDR will be raised against SV1 of Doc 9705 Edition 3.

5. AGENDA ITEM 5 - SARPS AND DOC 9705 ED 3 ISSUES

5.1 Steve van Trees gave a verbal CCB report. The CCB had the responsibility to review all material proposing changes to both SARPs and GM. To date there had been 261 suggestions since configuration control had been instigated. The first session of the CCB/13 had been held the previous day, leading to a general updating of the second edition of Doc 9705, and the first edition of Doc 9739. There were some major PDRs, and the CCB had struggled with the need to change ATIS Version 1 ASN.1 to Version 2, still calling it version 1, on the basis that no-one had yet started work on the existing ‘Version 1’ material. Other areas of concern relate to Upper Layers security – the PDR may have to held over pending further validation – and likewise there were real problems in implementing proposed changes in the description of the Frequency parameter in CPDLC – there were significant knock-on effects which would make the application backwardly incompatible. Also a significant inclusion of Extensibility Markers in CPDLC were proposed – this would facilitate changes in CPDLC in the future. There was a PDR relating to Frame mode SNDCF in SV 5, and on SV 8, cleaning up editorials and deleting the SAN facility.

5.2 There was a deal of outstanding work – he was not sure that all the PDRs would be cleared at the second part of the CCB/13, to be held tomorrow. He was also somewhat concerned that the CCB was being asked to look at ‘enhancements’, rather than just defects. He would prefer to see enhancements deferred to the SGs and the normal SG path. Nevertheless he could see the attraction of ‘repair and

5.3 Finally, he expressed concern that at this stage there were still ten open PDRs – he would hope to end up with no more than two after tomorrow’s meeting.

5.4 Ed Adelson raised a policy issue – would the CCB having to deal with enhancements significantly increase its workload? He would recommend that the CCB stayed out of the enhancement business – but then that raised the point of what was done with enhancement PDRs. Jim Lenz had proposed that using the CCB as a route to minor enhancements might still be appropriate. Steve van Trees noted that we have a ‘Forwarded’ status for PDRs, but this was not a bit-bucket – we had to see some movement/solution to the problems raised. He recognised the temptation to use the CCB as a shortcut to enhancement implementation, and noted that the CCB would treat each PDR on its own merits.

5.5 Jean Yves Piram sought confirmation that any change pages in the SARPs resulting from the PDRs would be forwarded to Masoud, by the end of March. Steve said that he would expect that at least some of the PDRs would result in changes. He would take the responsibility of getting a completed, updated, correctly formatted hard and soft copy of Doc 9705, Edition 3, to Masoud, by 31st March, which would allow ICAO to publish the material for distribution concurrently with Amendment 76 to Annex 10.

6. AGENDA ITEM 6 - DATE AND LOCATION OF FUTURE MEETING OF WG A & B.

6.1 Arnaud Dedryvere graciously offered, on behalf of the French administration, to host the next meeting of the ATNP Working and Subgroups at STNA in Toulouse, during the two-week period 24th

September to 5th October 2001. Masoud could not be present, due to an ICAO Assembly Meeting, but agreed that the WG meetings could proceed without his attendance.

6.2 Brian Cardwell gratefully accepted Arnaud's invitation. The details of the individual meetings would be worked out later, and circulated to members as soon as possible.

7. AGENDA ITEM 7 – AOB

7.1 Mike Bigelow raised a point concerning the future Work Programme of SG B3, regarding the recommendation of an appropriate sunseting date for non-secure applications. He urged members to think about this, and to bring material to the next meeting.

7.2 There being no further business, the meeting closed at 1615.

End.

WG A+B Meeting Attendance

6th march 2001, Honolulu, USA

NAME	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Adelson, Ed	ARINC	3 Harbour Heights Dr, Annapolis, MD 21401, USA	+1-410-266 5194 +1-410-266 2147	eadeldson@alum.mit.edu
AFIF, Ghada	SITA	770 Sherbrooke West, Suite 1500, Montreal, Quebec, H3A 1G1, CANADA	+1-514-847 3331 +1-514-847 3350	ghada.afif@sita.int
AL-GHAMDI, Saleh H	PCA, Airways Engineering	SED/AEB PO Box 15441, Jeddah 21444, SAUDI ARABIA	+966 2671 7717 +966 2671 9041	dc97sha@hotmail.com
ALOMARI, Ahmed O	PCA, ATS Comms	PO Box 929 Jeddah 21421, SAUDI ARABIA	+966 2640 3888 x 5564 +966 2640 1477	alomari_abubander@yahoo.com
Asbury, Michael	NATS / AMA Consulting	19 Easterton lane, Pewsey, Wiltshire, UK, SN9 5BP	+44-1672-562617 +44-1672-562617	MikeAsbury@aol.com
Banphawatthanarak, Chonlawit	AEROTHAI	102 Ngamduplee, Tung Mahamek, sathorn Bangkok 10120, THAILAND	662-285-9577	chonlawit.ba@aerothai.or.th
Bigelow, Michael	ARINC	MS-4213 2551 Riva Rd. Annapolis, MD 21401 USA	1-410-266-4378 1-410-266-4499	mpb@arinc.com
Boboga, Flavia	ITT/FAA AOP-600	901 D St. SW, Washington, DC 20024, USA	+1-202-314 5926	flavia.CTR.boboga@faa.gov
Brown, Mark	Oki Electric Industry Co., Ltd	4-10-3 Shibaura, Minato-ku, Tokyo 108-8551, JAPAN	+81-3-3454-2111 +81-3-3798 7623	mark667@oki.co.jp
Cardwell, Brian	NATS	Spectrum House, Gatwick Road, Gatwick Airport South, West Sussex, UK RH6 0LG	44-1293-576 401 44-1293-576 381	brian.cardwell@nats.co.uk
Dedryvere, Arnaud	DNA/France	50 rue H. Farman, 75720 Paris, CEDEX, FRANCE	+33-1-58 09 47 35 +33-1-58 09 36 09	dedryvere_arnaud@dna.dgac.fr
Hatakenaka, Masami	NEC Corp.	7-1 SHIBA 5, Minato-Ku, Tokyo 108-8001, JAPAN	81-3-3798-6636 81-3-3798-6227	m-hatakenaka@bc.jp.nec.com
Hauf, Klauspeter	DFS	Kaiserleistr. 29-35 63067 Offenbach am Main, Germany	+49-69 8054 2430 +49-69 8054 2495	Klauspeter.Hauf@dfs.de
Head, Craig,	Airservices Australia	GPO Box 367, Canberra 2601,	+61-2-6268-4510	craig.head@airservices.gov.au

		A.C.T, Australia	+61-2-6268-5950	
Hennig, Paul	Staff Engineer IATA (United)	United Airlines WHQK 1200 Algonquin Rd Elk Grove IL 60007	1-847-700-4312 1-847-700-5033	paulhennig@aol.com
HORIKOSHI, Takayuki	OKI Electric Industry Co.	4-10-3, Shibaura, Minato-ku, Tokyo, JAPAN	81-3-3452-2111 81-3-3798-7623	horikoshi133@oki.co.jp
Jones, Ron	FAA	ASD-140 800 Independence Ave. SW Washington, DC 20591 USA	1-202-358-5345 1-202-358-5386	ronnie.jones@faa.gov
Kerr, Tony	CIVAL Consulting Ltd.	Conifers, Longhill Rd, Ascot, Berkshire, SL5 8RE, UK	+44 1252 724386 +44 1252 724384	tony.kerr@cival.co.uk
LeClerc, Claude	Eurocontrol	DIS/COM, Rue de la Fusee 96, 1130 Brussels, Belgium	+32-2-729 3355 +32-2-729 3511	claud.leclerc@eurocontrol.be
Lenz, Jim	FAA	800 Independence Ave. SW Washington, DC 20591 USA	+1-202-366 4034 +1-202-366 1389	jim.lenz@faa.gov
McCONNELL, Jack	FAA/ITT Industries	Washington DC, 20024, USA	+1 202 863 7327 +1 202 3.4.7419	jack.j.mcconnell@itt.com
McParland, Tom	BCI/FAA	BCI 6712 Washington Ave, Suite 101 Egg Harbor Twp, NJ 08234 USA	+1 609-485-5929 or +1 609-641-9698 +1 609-641-0203	tmcparland@bcisse.com
MITTAUX-BIRON, Gerard	CENA	7, Av. E. BELIN - BP4005, f-31055 Toulouse CEDEX FRANCE	+33 5 62 25 96 36 +33 5 62 25 95 99	gerard.mittaux-biron@cena.fr
MOULTON, Jim	ONS/FAA	22636 Glenn Drive Sterling, VA 20164 USA	+1.703.481.9590 +1.703.481.9509	moulton@ons.com

NAME	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Paydar, Masoud	ICAO	999 University St. Montreal, QC, Canada H3C 5H7	1-514-954-8219 ext. 8210 1-514-954-6759	mpaydar@icao.int
PICARD, Frederic	STNA	1 Avenue du Dr M Grynfogel - BP 1084, 31035, Toulouse Cedex, FRANCE	33-5-62-14-55-33 33-5-62-14-54-01	PICARD_Frederic@stna.dgac.fr
PIRAM, Jean-Yves	STNA Subdivision Messagerie Ops	1 Avenue du Dr M Grynfogel - BP 1084, 31035, Toulouse Cedex, FRANCE	33-5-62-14-54-70 33-5-62-14-54-01	Piram_Jean-Yves@stna.dgac.fr
Ricci, Christine	STNA	1 Av Dr M Grynfogel B.P.1084 31035 Toulouse, Cedex, FRANCE	+33 5 62 14 54 82 +33 5 62 14 54 02	ricci_christine@stna.dgac.fr
Rongthong, Somnuk	Aerothai	102 Ngamduplee, Tung Mahamek, sathorn Bangkok 10120, THAILAND	662-285-9904	somnuk@aerothai.or.th
Rupp, Jay	FAA, AOP-600	800 Independence Av, Washington DC, USA	+1-202-493 5909 +1-202-	jay.rupp@faa.gov
SACCONI, Greg	ONS/FAA	22636 Glenn Drive, Sterling, VA 20164 USA	+1 604-681-5829 +1 604-681-5820	gsacconi@ons.com
SAKAUE, Naoto	Mitsubishi Electric	Kamimachiya 325, Kamakura, Kanagawa JAPAN	+81-467-41-3531 +81-467-41-3508	sakaue@siden.cow.melco.co.jp
Sayadian, Leon	FAA/ASD-140	800 Independence Av, Washington DC 20591, USA	+1-202-358 5316 +1-202-	leon.sayadian@faa.gov
Sayadian, Ed	FAA/ITT	901 O St. SW, Washington DC 20024, USA	+1-202-314 5929	ed.ctr.sayadian@faa.gov
SUPANUNDHA, Nuttawat	Aeronautical Radio of Thailand	102 Ngamduplee, Tung Mahamek, sathorn Bangkok 10120, THAILAND	662-285-9246 662-285-9253	nuttawat@aerothai.or.th
Vabre, Pierre	STNA	1 Avenue du Dr M Grynfogel - BP 1084, 31035, Toulouse Cedex, FRANCE	+33 5 62 14 57 61 +33 5 62 14	vabre_pierre@stna.dgac.fr
VACHER, Jean-Marc	ON-X Consulting	57, Boulevard de l'Embouchure 31200 Toulouse, FRANCE	33-5-62-14-54-74 33-5-62-14-54-01	jmvacher@on-x.com
Vabre, Pierre	STNA	1 Avenue du Dr M Grynfogel - BP 1084, 31035, Toulouse Cedex, FRANCE	+33 5 62 14 57 61 +33 5 62 14	vabre_pierre@stna.dgac.fr
VACHER, Jean-Marc	ON-X Consulting	57, Boulevard de l'Embouchure 31200 Toulouse, FRANCE	33-5-62-14-54-74 33-5-62-14-54-01	jmvacher@on-x.com
Van den Boogaard, Kors	IATA	800 Place Victoria, PO BOX 113, Montreal, QC, Canada, H42 1M1	+1-514-874 0202 +1-514-874 2661	kors@iata.org
Van Trees, Stephen	FAA	AIR-130	+1 202-267-9567	stephen.vantrees@faa.gov

		800 Independence Ave. SW Washington, DC 20591 USA	+1 202-493-5173	

AERONAUTICAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS NETWORK PANEL(ATNP)

WORKING GROUP A – APPLICATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION

Honolulu (USA),

2nd March – 7th March 2001,

2nd Meeting

Agenda Item 4

Communiqué to other Panels

Presented by Klauspeter Hauf

Summary

This Flimsy summarises the concerns of the Working Group that the high rate of modifications to the ATN SARPS and Guidance Material caused by the continuing revision of existing requirements and adding new requirements from other ICAO bodies will slow down or hinder the implementation of the ATN. It further suggest the establishment of an up-front consulting process between ICAO bodies to rate the consequences of proposed modifications.

Introduction

The 4th meeting of the ATNP Working Group of the Whole held in Berlin, Germany from 28 to 30 August 2000 reviewed and approved the Third Edition of Doc 9705 and the Second Edition of the Comprehensive ATN Manual (Doc 9739) and forwarded it for publication.

Since then there have been several updates identified to the documents often caused by a change in requirements from other ICAO bodies.

It has been brought to the attention of the Working Group that States and industry are hesitating to start the implementation of ATN based systems while the ATN specification is still being frequently updated.

This fact threatens to slow down the implementation of ATN in its support of the highly demanded improvements to the ATM/CNS system. There is a growing concern within the Working Group that the instability of the requirements might even hinder the implementation of the ATN.

Discussion

Throughout the course of the development for ATN provisions there have been numerous occasions where work of other ICAO bodies, e.g. the METLINK Study Group, the OPLINK Panel and the AMCP have caused significant changes to the ATN technical specifications.

States and industry bodies involved in the development and implementation of the ATN have clearly indicated, that this continued update of the ATN material (both operational and technical) stops them from implementing the ATN services. There is an increasing demand among the implementers, e.g. airframe and avionics manufacturers, aeronautical communication service providers, airlines and air navigation service providers to freeze the ATN requirements as soon as possible in order to allow an efficient, effective and consistent implementation on board the aircraft and on the ground.

The ATNP would therefore appreciate if a consulting process could be established prior to the approval/submission of proposed changes by other ICAO bodies to identify the potential impact of such modifications to the ATN material. This process should not stop other bodies from improving their specification, but is intended to allow them to consider the consequences to the ATN systems implementation and development caused by such proposals and to co-ordinate the changes between panels.

The ATNP would further suggest, that new or modified requirements will not be get implemented into the ATN material for a to be specified period of time, e.g. 3 to 5 years in order to allow for a quick and efficient implementation of ATN systems.

The ATNP would invite other ICAO bodies to comment and support the principle of this proposal for the establishment of an up-front consultant process and would welcome any response.

Recommendation

The working group is invited to comment and complement, if required, the proposed communiqué, and to endorse it for forwarding to the concerned ICAO bodies.

Appendix C

ATNP Joint Working Group Meeting Honolulu, Hawaii March 6, 2001

ATNP WG-A/B Position on WP11: “Liaison statement from AMCP Working Group M to ATNP WG A”

The text of the AMCP WG-M Communiqué is provided below along with the ATNP position (in BOLD) on the issues raised by WG-M.

AMCP WG M considered during its meeting from 12 - 19 December 2000 in Malmo, Sweden, the proposals for a ATN subnetwork priority mapping for VDL Modes 3 and 4.

AMCP Working Group M wishes to make the following comments on the proposed table:

- a. The table includes the term AMSS-1 to refer to the first generation Aeronautical Mobile Satellite Service.

This note is confusing since it would imply that there are other generation aeronautical mobile satellite services referenced in the SARPs. This is not the case. The note should be deleted and the reference to AMSS-1 needs to be amended into AMSS.

ATNP WG Position: Do not agree to revise priority table as this has already been subject to State coordination and has been approved by the ANC for amendment to Annex 10.

- b. The note "restricted" (Note 6) has been used in the table to identify message categories of which the use of particular sub-networks may not be allowed in certain States and/or regions based on ITU frequency allocation. Both the note and its usage are erroneous and based upon a wrong interpretation of the relevant ITU provisions. In this context it should be noted that also Note 3 ("not allowed") is unclear to what it is referencing. Assumed is that this note refers to regulations in the SARPs that restrict the use of the mobile subnetworks. These are contained (with the exception of the AMSS) in Annex 10, Volume II. Similar provisions are also included in the ITU Radio Regulations as indicated in Note 7. It might be useful to align the two notes.

ATNP WG Position: Do not agree to revise Note 6. This was previously coordinated with AMCP, in the context of VDL Mode 2, and the term “restricted” was selected based on AMCP inputs that there are a few exceptions to the ITU prohibition of allowing

anything other than communications related to safety and regularity of flight from being provided on the VHF comm. band.

Note 7 gives the suggestion that ITU frequency allocations (assumed is here that the ATNP means "ITU Radio Regulations" as the priority of communications in the aeronautical mobile service is not part of the table of frequency allocation but is regulated in chapter S VIII of the Radio Regulations. This chapter is dealing with aeronautical services) regulate on a regional or national basis the use of UN-charter communications (ITU priority 7, ATN network priority 3), State/Government communications (not clear is the difference between State and government communications, the ITU Radio Regulations only refer to "Government messages for which priority has been expressly requested; the ITU priority for these messages is 8 and the ATN priority 2). Normal priority communications is not a category that is included in the Radio Regulations; however, the ITU refers to a category "service communications relating to the working of the telecommunication service or to communications previously exchanged". Finally, the ITU Radio Regulations provide for the category "other communications" in category 10, which includes public correspondence. Please note that Aeronautical administrative messages are not part of the ITU provisions and fall in the category "public correspondence" for the use of the air-ground sub-network.

The terms "urgent-priority administrative communications", "high-priority administrative communications", "normal-priority communications" and "low-priority communications" do not appear in the Radio Regulations. As such, these categories should be removed from the table since also Annex 10 (Volume II, Chapter 3, on the Aeronautical Mobile Service does not include these messages. These types of messages, as well as public correspondence (or the so-called aeronautical passenger communications) are not allowed in ANY band allocated to the aeronautical mobile service and therefore the table 1-3 should read "not allowed" against VDL Mode 2, VDL Mode 3, VDL Mode 4 and HF DL for these categories. Further, it is not clear where Annex 10 distinguishes between normal and high-priority communications in the air-ground communications.

The Radio Regulations explicitly do not allow for public correspondence in the bands allocated to the aeronautical mobile service. However, there are not such provisions for the categories 7 - 9. Therefore, these categories have to be accommodated in the air-ground sub-networks.

The table is unclear on the category "airline administrative messages"
Airline administrative messages are not allowed on the air-ground network, however, ICAO and ITU have made provisions for Flight Regularity or Aeronautical Operational Control (AOC) communications and these should be referenced in the table

ATNP WG Position: Do not agree to consider changes to the definition of ATN priority levels. These priority levels have previously been the subject of extensive coordination with AMCP and are already included in Annex 10. The defined ATN priority levels are for the ATN internet which must serve both mobile and fixed service communications. The ATN priority levels are generally a superset of the ITU defined priority levels for mobile communications. It is up to the mobile subnetwork SARPs to comply with the ITU radio regulations for use of the r.f. channel (i.e., define a compliant link layer priority scheme). The ATN internet priority levels as currently defined in Annex 10 are sufficient to allowing use of mobile subnetworks that provide a

link layer priority scheme compliant with the ITU radio regulations. However, the ATN WG did agree to accept the AMCP input related to VDL Mode 3 and VDL Mode 4 and to change the priority table to reflect these subnetworks are “Not Allowed” to carry the message categories associated with ATN network priority levels 0 through 5. The ATNP WG noted that the draft VDL Mode 3 Technical Manual indicates that ATN network priority level 6 (i.e., Network/systems administration) is not related to safety and regularity of flight communications. This is incorrect.

c. Note 7 is indicating that the VDL Mode 4 sub-network has only been specified to support surveillance applications (e.g. ADS).

It is felt that this information is inappropriate in the ATN part of Annex 10. Annex 10 already specifies that VDL Mode 4 SARPs apply to surveillance applications (e.g. ADS-B and ADS-C) and it is undesirable to repeat typical VDL SARPs and related material in the ATN section of Annex 10 or the ATN Manual.

ATNP WG Position: Agree to reword note 7 to read: VDL Mode 4 provides mobile subnetwork support for surveillance applications (e.g., ADS)

d. Finally, it is observed that SSR Mode S is making use of spectrum that has been allocated by the ITU to the Aeronautical Radionavigation Service. Therefore, the Radio Regulations do not allow this system to be used for mobile communications and, in principle, the whole of column "SSR Mode S" should, with the exception of the reference to ADS-C. However, in practice, the provisions of the Radio Regulations seem to be ignored by aviation in this case. No opinion is expressed here about this practice.

ATNP WG Position: No change required.

ATTACHMENT

Revised ATN Network Priority to Mobile Subnetwork Priority Table

Message categories	ATN network layer priority	Corresponding mobile subnetwork priority (see Note 5)					
		AMSS-1 (see Note 4)	VDL Mode 2	<u>VDL Mode 3</u>	<u>VDL Mode 4</u>	SSR Mode S	HFDL
Network/systems management	14	14	see Note 1	<u>3</u>	<u>high see Note 7</u>	high	14
Distress communications	13	14	see Note 1	<u>2</u>	<u>high see Note 7</u>	high	14
Urgent communications	12	14	see Note 1	<u>2</u>	<u>high see Note 7</u>	high	14
High-priority flight safety messages	11	11	see Note 1	<u>2</u>	<u>high see Note 7</u>	high	11
Normal-priority flight safety messages	10	11	see Note 1	<u>2</u>	<u>high see Note 7</u>	high	11
Meteorological communications	9	8	see Note 1	<u>1</u>	<u>medium see Note 7</u>	low	8
Flight regularity communications	8	7	see Note 1	<u>1</u>	<u>medium see Note 7</u>	low	7
Aeronautical information service messages	7	6	see Note 1	<u>0</u>	<u>medium see Note 7</u>	low	6
Network/systems administration	6	5	see Note 1	<u>0</u>	<u>medium see Note 7</u>	low	5
Aeronautical administrative messages	5	4	restricted - see Note 1	<u>not allowed</u>	<u>not allowed</u>	not allowed	4 restricted
<unassigned>	4	not assigned	not assigned - see Note 1	<u>not allowed</u>	<u>not allowed</u>	not allowed	not assigned
Urgent-priority administrative and U.N. Charter communications	3	3	restricted - see Note 1	<u>not allowed</u>	<u>not allowed</u>	not allowed	3 restricted
High-priority administrative and State/Government communications	2	2	restricted - see Note 1	<u>not allowed</u>	<u>not allowed</u>	not allowed	2 restricted
Normal-priority administrative communications	1	1	restricted - see Note 1	<u>not allowed</u>	<u>not allowed</u>	not allowed	1 restricted
Low-priority administrative communications & Aeronautical Passenger Communications	0	0	restricted - see Note 1	<u>not allowed</u>	<u>not allowed</u>	not allowed	0 restricted

Note 1.— VDL Mode 2 has no specific subnetwork priority mechanisms.

Note 2.— The AMSS SARPs specify mapping of message categories to subnetwork priority without explicitly referencing ATN network layer priority.

Note 3.— The term “not allowed” means that only communications related to safety and regularity of flight are authorized to pass over this subnetwork as defined in the subnetwork SARPs.

Note 4. — The term AMSS-1 refers to the first generation Aeronautical Mobile Satellite Service.

Note 5. — Only those mobile subnetworks are listed for which subnetwork SARPs exist and for which explicit support is provided by the ATN Boundary Intermediate System technical provisions.

Note 6. — The term “restricted” means for this message category the use of this subnetwork may not be allowed in certain States and/or regions based on ITU radio frequency spectrum allocation.

Note 7.—VDL Mode 4 provides mobile subnetwork support for surveillance applications (e.g., ADS).

