



*International Civil Aviation Organization*

**RASG-MID Steering Committee**

**Fourth Meeting (RSC/4)**  
*(Cairo, Egypt, 15 – 17 December 2015)*

---

**Agenda Item 2: Global Developments related to Aviation Safety**

**REVIEW OF THE RASG-MID/4 REPORT BY THE ANC**

*(Presented by the Secretariat)*

**SUMMARY**

This paper presents the action taken by the Air Navigation Commission (ANC) on the Report of the RASG-MID/4 meeting.

Action by the meeting is at paragraph 3.

**REFERENCES**

- AN-WP/8984
- Minutes of the ANC Fourth Meeting, 200<sup>th</sup> Session
- RASG-MID/4 Report

**1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 The ANC Working Group of the Whole for Strategic Review and Planning (AN-WG/SRP) reviewed the Report of the RASG-MID/4 meeting (Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, 30 March-1 April 2015) on 23 September 2015. The AN-WG/SRP presented its review of the Report to the ANC during its Fourth Meeting (200<sup>th</sup> Session) on 1 October 2015 through AN-WP/8984 as at **Appendix A** which includes the analysis of the Conclusions and Decisions, and the recommendations of the WG/SRP to the ANC.

1.2 The ANC approved the actions recommended in the Report as proposed in the Appendix to AN-WP/8984. The Minutes of the ANC meeting is at **Appendix B**.

**2. DISCUSSION**

2.1 A general observation was made that the RASG-MID/4 meeting Report indicated that the RASG-MID had made great progress since its last meeting and had achieved some very important milestones in terms of cooperation, analysis, reporting and the development of guidance material appropriate to its Region.

2.2 The ANC commended the RASG-MID for the quality and publication of the Third MID Region Annual Safety Report.

2.3 The ANC commended the RASG-MID for the issuance of the MID Region Safety Strategy.

2.4 It was highlighted that the work on Low Airspeed Alerting Provisions was excellent material. Accordingly, the ANC referred this work to the Airworthiness Panel (AIRP) for further review.

2.5 It was suggested that the regional emerging risks identified for the MID Region be considered for inclusion in the Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP). Accordingly, the subject will be further reviewed taking into consideration the feedback from other RASGs in order to identify areas that contributed to the global picture.

2.6 It was agreed that the development of additional runway safety provisions (RASG-MID Conclusion 4/8 refers), will be included in the Work Programme and that a requirement to establish runway safety teams to be applicable in the next edition of the PANS AERO.

2.7 With respect to RASG-MID Conclusion 4/14, regarding the IATA Operational Safety Audit (IOSA) Programme, it was felt that the use of the term “acceptable means of compliance” was not appropriate and that the wording of conclusions may be misleading. The IOSA compliance does not replace a State’s oversight activities but rather provided complementary information. Therefore, IOSA is not an acceptable means of complying with State’s oversight obligations.

### **3. ACTION BY THE MEETING**

3.1 The meeting is invited to note the actions taken by the ANC on the RASG-MID/4 Report; and take action, as appropriate.

-----



International Civil Aviation Organization

AN-WP/8984  
28/09/15**WORKING PAPER****AIR NAVIGATION COMMISSION**

**REVIEW OF THE REPORT OF THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL AVIATION  
SAFETY GROUP FOR MIDDLE EAST (RASG-MID/4)  
(Item 20027)**

(Presented by the Chairperson of the ANC Working Group of the Whole for  
Strategic Review and Planning)

<b>SUMMARY</b>
The ANC Working Group of the Whole for Strategic Review and Planning hereby presents its review of the report of the RASG-MID/4 Meeting.
Action by the Air Navigation Commission is in paragraph 3.
<b>WORK PROGRAMME ELEMENTS</b>
N/A
<b>COORDINATION</b>
Related ANB Sections, MID Regional Office
<b>REFERENCES</b>
*RASG-MID/4 Report
*Principal references

**1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 The Air Navigation Commission referred the report of the fourth meeting of the Middle East regional aviation safety group (RASG-MID/4), held in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, from 30 March to 1 April 2015, to its working group of the Whole for Strategic Review and Planning (WG/SRP) for review. The meeting was attended by ten States and eight international organizations/industries, totalling 49 participants.

1.2 The WG/SRP reviewed the report on 23 September 2015. Appendix to this working paper presents the analysis of the conclusions and decisions, including action to be taken by the Commission on selected conclusions and decisions. All other follow-up action will be taken by the Secretary General in accordance with established practice.

## 2. DISCUSSION

2.1 Prior to commencement of the review, an update was provided to the WG/SRP by the Chair of the ad-hoc working group on PIRG and RASG Reviews. The group has met four times and met with the Regional Directors once. It is recommending that the reports have a short executive summary and be presented by the Regional Director and PIRG/RASG Chair to the ANC SRP. The proposals are currently being consulted on with the ANB HQ, the Regional Directors and the PIRG/RASG Chairs. It is tentatively planned to conduct a trial in the second half of the current session. Full details on the progress of the work can be reviewed on the ANC portal.

2.2 The WG/SRP made a general observation that the report indicated that the RASG-MID had made great progress since its last meeting and had achieved some very important milestones in terms of cooperation, analysis, reporting and the development of guidance material appropriate to its region. In particular, it was highlighted that the work on Low Airspeed Alerting provisions was excellent material and the ANC should consider referring this work to the AIRP for further review. It was also suggested that the regional emerging risks identified in paragraph 3.5 be considered for inclusion in the Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP).

2.3 In relation to safety performance indicators discussed under agenda item 2.1 the WG/SRP queried the development of the safety performance indicators listed and expressed concern that some may require further development as they may have an unintentional negative impact in their current format. The DD/Aviation Safety highlighted they were introduced in an information paper at the high Level Safety Conference and that the HLSC 2015 concluded that ICAO should improve and harmonize the defined safety performance indicators taking into account those currently in use. It was also highlighted that they will be included in the next revision of the GASP.

2.4 It was highlighted, as per conclusion 4/1, that the third MID Region Annual Safety Report has been made public as recommended by the ANC in the review of the last RASG-MID report. It is available to the public on the regional website. The WG/SRP noted that the report provides excellent information and that the RASG should be commended for their good work.

2.5 On Decision 4/5 the WG/SRP queried how the Accident and Incident Analysis Group (AIA WG) will coordinate its work with that of the ICAO Safety Indicators Study Group which currently performs the global analysis each year. This will be necessary to ensure consistent analysis and agreement of safety performance indicator values. The C/IMP-SAF confirmed with the Regional Office that ANB and SISG are fully aware of the AIA WG and the Secretariat will ensure there is no duplication nor contradiction between the two groups. The AIA WG could be a first step towards the possible future creation of a regional accident and incident investigation organization (RAIO).

2.6 In relation to Conclusion 4/7 d) clarity was sought on the intent of this action. The C/IMP-SAF clarified the intent was to review whether the Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), produced by the aircraft manufacturers, are being properly adhered to by airlines.

2.7 The WG/SRP sought clarity on Conclusion 4/8 which calls for the development of additional runway safety provisions. The C/IMP-SAF clarified it is a request for the development of SARPs to require the establishment of runway safety teams. The Chair SRP will seek confirmation that this task is in the work programme and be applicable in the next edition of PANS-AERO.

2.8 The WG/SRP noted and commended the work underway to establish a regional safety oversight organisation (RSOO). The C/IMP-SAF advised that the region has made further positive progress and that the DGs of nine States have now signed a letter of intent to establish this RSOO.

2.9 The WG/SRP noted the conclusion 4/14 and queried the use of the term ‘acceptable means of compliance’. It was felt the paragraph 3.95 provided clarity on how the IATA-IOSA may be used by a State to complement its oversight obligations, however, it is not an acceptable means of complying with these oversight obligations.

### 3. ACTION BY THE AIR NAVIGATION COMMISSION

3.1 The Air Navigation Commission is invited to:

- a) note the RASG-MID/4 Report and the report of the ANC WG/SRP thereon, as contained in this paper;
- b) approve the actions recommended in this report as proposed in Appendix hereto;
- c) request the Secretary General to provide appropriate feedback of the ANC’s review of the RASG-MID/4;
- d) refer Conclusion 4/8 to the Aerodromes Panel for consideration; and
- e) refer the work of the RASG-MID on Low Airspeed Alerting provisions as outlined in paragraph 3.41 of the RASG-MID/4 meeting report to the AIRP panel for further review.

-----

**APPENDIX**

**LIST OF DECISIONS AND CONCLUSIONS (ACTION ITEMS)**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>WG/SRP Recommendation to ANC</b>
Conclusion 4/1:	Third Mid Region Annual Safety Report	That the ANC commend the RASG for the quality and publication of the report
Conclusion 4/2:	Mandatory And Voluntary Reporting Systems	To note
Decision 4/3:	Study On The Establishment Of A Mid Region Safety Database	To note
Conclusion 4/4:	Flight Data Exchange (FDX) RASG-MID Safety Advisory	To note
Decision 4/5:	Accident And Incident Analysis Working Group (AIA WG)	To note
Conclusion 4/ 6:	Additional RGS SEIS	To note
Conclusion 4/7:	Reduction Of Un-Stabilized Approach Risk	To note
Conclusion 4/8:	Development Of Additional Runway Safety Provisions	That the ANC confirm it is included in the current work programme
Conclusion 4/9:	Runway Safety Team (RST) And Runway Safety Go-Team	To note
Conclusion 4/10	Guidance Material Related To Call Sign Similarity	To note
Conclusion 4/11:	Mid Region Safety Strategy	That the ANC commend the RASG for the issuance of the MID Region Safety Strategy
Conclusion 4/12:	Tracking SSP Implementation Via The Gap Analysis Tool On ISTARs	To note
Conclusion 4/13:	RASG-MID Engagement Strategy	To note
Conclusion 4/14:	IATA-IOSA Programme	To note
Decision 4/15:	RASG-MID Chairmanship	To note

-----

THESE ARE DRAFT MINUTES AND MAY NOT YET BE APPROVED BY THE ANC



International Civil Aviation Organization

**DRAFT MINUTES**

DRAFT  
AN Min. 200-4  
19/10/15

## AIR NAVIGATION COMMISSION

### 200TH SESSION

#### Minutes of the Fourth Meeting

(ANC Chamber, Thursday, 1 October 2015, at 1000 hours)

**PRESIDENT:** Mr. F. Zizi

**SECRETARY:** Mr. S. Creamer, D/ANB

**COMMISSIONERS:**

Mr. J. Bollard  
Mr. R. Carboni  
Mr. A.M.F. Crespo  
Mr. M.G. Fernando  
Mr. D. Fitzpatrick  
Mr. M. Halidou  
Mr. E.Ö. Héðinsson  
Mr. C. Hurley  
Mr. A.A. Korsakov  
Mr. J. Metwalli  
Mr. R. Monning  
Mr. I. Pacheco Serrano  
Ms. K.L. Riensema  
Mr. F. Tai  
Mr. W. Voss  
Mr. H. Yoshimura  
Mr. K. Yu

**OBSERVERS:**

Mr. D. Gamper – ACI  
Mr. F. Hofmann – IAOPA  
Mr. M.T. Comber – IATA  
Mr. V. Galotti – ICCAIA  
Mr. M.F. Jackson – IFALPA  
Dr. R. Stilwell – IFATCA

**OBSERVERS (cont'd):**

Mr. M.E. Vidal Arriagada – Chile  
Mr. S. Dutta – India  
Mr. C. Chávez Cateriano – Peru  
Dr. K. Yillikçi – Turkey  
Mr. C. Flores Álvarez – Venezuela

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Mr. R. Peters – EUROCONTROL

**SECRETARIAT:**

Mr. M.B.T. Smaoui – Deputy RD, MID  
Mr. Y. Wang – C/AOI  
Mr. A. Capretti – TO/AOI  
Mr. L. Jonasson – TO/AOI  
Mr. S. Da Silva – C/IMP-AN  
Mr. G. De Leon – RPO, IMP-AN  
Mr. M. Vreedenburgh – C/IMP-SAF  
Mr. A. Zavala – Consultant/IMP-SAF  
Mrs. D. Cooper – PO/PW  
Ms. M. Barry – Précis Writer

**Approval of minutes**

1. Consideration of the minutes of the third meeting was *deferred*.

**20040 Review of the report of the first meeting of the Frequency Spectrum Management Panel (FSMP/1)  
AN-WP/8997**

2. The Chairperson of the Working Group on Strategic Review and Planning (AN-WG/SRP) introduced AN-WP/8997 which presented the outcome of the group's review of the report of the first meeting of the Frequency Spectrum Management Panel (FSMP/1). He mentioned that the dates indicated in the job cards appended to the working paper had been added after AN-WG/SRP had considered the FSMP/1 Report and therefore had not been reviewed by the working group.

3. The Chairperson explained that the AN-WG/SRP had discussed the composition of panel membership. It was highlighted that the FSMP was quite unique in that it needed to balance between providing an independent expert opinion in the best interest of aviation and ensuring that the positions adopted would be politically acceptable outside the aviation community. The AN-WP/SRP recommended that the ANC pay particular attention to the composition and working arrangements of the FSMP during the forthcoming quadrennial cycle. This was *agreed*.

4. The clarification of the panel's work structure and feedback received on the structure of the FSMP/1 were appreciated by the Commission. However, concern was expressed regarding administrative aspects surrounding some experts' participation in all activities of the panel. It was explained that some States might not understand "informal meetings", which might create difficulties for the experts in getting clearance to attend and should be taken into account.

5. Concern was expressed regarding the FSMP's tentative work schedule for 2016 to 2019, in particular the lack of a panel meeting in 2017 or 2018. It was requested that, in the absence of a formal report, the Secretariat debrief the ANC on the progress of the panel's work at least once during the two year period. Recalling that formal meetings of a panel need not be convened at Headquarters, TO/AOI suggested that one of the four planned meetings of the FSMP working group be held as a panel meeting, which would result in a panel report. He added that the first of the four planned meetings would be finalizing the draft ICAO position on frequency spectrum which would be submitted to the Commission and the Council, and updates to the frequency spectrum strategy, so would be delivered to the ANC. It was *agreed* that the Commission would measure the progress of the FSMP's work, either through a formal report or a debriefing, following the next meeting of the group.

6. In response to a query, TO/AOI confirmed that concise reports of every meeting of the FSMP, including working group meetings, were available on the panel's website. Should an off-site meeting of the panel develop output to the Commission, he would debrief the ANC upon his return. More generally, it was recognized that feedback to the ANC in the form of panel debriefs was important for both the Commission and a panel. It was pointed out, however, that the time might otherwise be essential for a panel to complete a task and that there should be some flexibility in when a panel reported to the Commission.

7. In response to a request for clarification of the ICAO position for WRC-15 regarding ADS-B, TO/AOI referred to the State letter (State letter E 3/5.15-15/52) published after the Council approved the position in June 2015. He elaborated on the ICAO position that an earth-to-space AMSRS allocation was required to facilitate the reception of the ADS-B signals that were being transmitted and that such an allocation should not constrain existing services.

8. Concluding its consideration of AN-WP/8997, the Commission:

- a) *noted* the FSMP/1 Report and the report of the AN-WG/SRP thereon, as contained in AN-WP/8997; and
- b) *approved* the job cards as contained in Appendix A to AN-WP/8997.

**20025 Review of the report of the first meeting of the Navigation Systems Panel (NSP/1)  
AN-WP/8982**

9. The AN-WG/SRP Chairperson introduced AN-WP/8982 which presented the outcome of the group's review of the report of the first meeting of the Navigation Systems Panel (NSP/1). He corrected the title of the paper to read "Navigation Systems Panel" rather than "Navigation Surveillance Panel". He pointed out that, on the job cards, text on the expected benefit would be developed by the Chairperson in coordination with the NSP Secretary.

10. The President, speaking as a Commissioner, questioned whether the delay in the validation of new SARPs for CAT II/III GBAS, referred to in paragraph 2.5, implied some technical difficulties. TO/AOI advised that there were some technical difficulties in terms of the ionosphere and additional technical challenges with the behaviour of the troposphere which required further work. The work was underway involving all the relevant parties in industry, including airframe manufacturers, manufacturers of ground equipment and manufacturers of avionics. He stated that he would be able to report on progress after the NSP/2 meeting which was scheduled for December 2015.

11. The President recalled that in 2008 the ANC had considered a proposal for a Standard that prescribed that critical and sensitive areas (CSA) shall be defined, but that the proposal had been rejected following consultations with States. Bearing in mind the need to protect those sensitive areas, he wondered whether issuing the CSA material as guidance material in the form of an attachment to the Annex would be sufficient.

12. TO/AOI advised that the material really was guidance on how to meet the Standard regarding the tolerance on the ILS signals. He explained that additional intensive work was underway in simulations on the ILS signal which had led to smaller restricted areas, and that intensive coordination and groundwork had led to the refinement of the CSA and the development of a better proposal. Considerable effort had been expended to explain and promote the proposal, and the extent to which it applied had been clarified. He explained that the guidance material had been developed on the basis of sample situations (e.g. size of runways, conditions) and therefore could not be universally applicable. However, caveats were being provided to the effect that, should better guidance or guidance more suitable to the individual operational environment exist, that guidance should prevail, with the underlying recognition that it is the ILS signal tolerance Standard that must be met. TO/AOI added that the proposal would be finalized at the next meeting of the NSP and that a specific briefing on the issue could be provided at that time. The offer of a briefing was *accepted* by the Commission.

13. The Observer of ACI supported the comments of the Secretariat and expressed the view that the guidance was sufficient. Any problems reported by pilots regarding loss of ILS signal on approach indicated a problem at a particular airport, which should be addressed with simulations. ACI was happy with the guidance material because, while it contained tables that indicated particular sizes of critical and sensitive areas, it was clear that the tables were only indicative and that each airport was unique with its own interference obstacles, so it was not a "one size fits all" approach.

14. The Observer of IATA pointed out that the manual mentioned measuring signals and asked whether, during the NSP's discussions, the addition of material on testing of radio navigation aids had been considered for that specific purpose. TO/AOI did not believe this was the case.

15. Referring to the AN-WG/SRP's conclusions in paragraphs 2.8 and 2.9 of the paper, the Commission *noted* the need for coordination between the NSP and the Performance-based Navigation Study Group (PBNSG) and between the NSP and the FSMP on the frequency management, in particular the whole VHF spectrum and the strategic approach to it.

16. Concluding its consideration of AN-WP/8982, the Commission:

- a) *noted* the NSP/1 Report and the report of the AN-WG/SRP thereon, as contained in AN-WP/8982; and
- b) *approved* the job cards as contained in Appendix A to AN-WP/8982.

**20016 Final review of proposed amendments to Annex 10, Volume I  
AN-WP/8974 and Blue Rider, Add. No. 1 and DP No. 1**

17. TO/AOI introduced AN-WP/8974 AND Add. No. 1 which presented the results of a consultation (State letter AN 7/1.3.103-15/18) with States and international organization on a proposal to amend Annex 10, Volume 1 concerning global navigation satellite systems (GNSS), instrument landing system (ILS) and the rationalization of conventional navigation aids. He explained that the Blue Rider replaced Appendix A with the full list of the international organizations to whom the proposal had been circulated, rather than the initial short list of organizations that had replied to the State letter.

18. The Principal of Commission Group 1 (CG-1) introduced DP No. 1, which presented the results of the working group's review of AN-WP/8974.

19. On page B-3, Chapter 3, 3.1.2.1 c) which related to ILS basic components, the Principal of CG-3 explained that CG-3 wanted to emphasize the need for an appropriate means to enable glide path verification checks and therefore suggested that "a means" be replaced by "an appropriate means", which was *agreed*. In response to a CG-3 request that the Instrument Flight Procedure Panel (IFPP) be appropriately consulted on the matter, TO/AOI informed the Commission that the IFPP was meeting in Montreal and would be briefed.

20. Turning to Chapter 3, paragraph 3.1.7 (VHF marker beacons), on page B-4, a perceived contradiction between Annex 10, paragraph 3.1.7.1, General, sub-paragraph a), which stated that marker beacons were mandatory, and the intent of the proposed note, which was based the reply from EUROCONTROL, was questioned. Discussion followed on whether to amend the note or delete it altogether. Viewpoints raised were: the possibility that 3.1.7.1 could be misinterpreted as a requirement to install marker beacons; the possibility of using alternative means which could be made clear through a reference to paragraph 3.1.7.6.5; and the need to avoid multiple cross-references which could be confusing. Others did not see a contradiction between 3.1.7.1 and the proposed note. They saw 3.1.7 as providing a framework for when marker beacons were installed and not as a requirement for installation.

21. Based on the discussion, it was *agreed* that the note under paragraph 3.1.7 would be inserted, as proposed by the Secretariat, but would be amended to remove the reference "(see 3.1.3.1.2)" as proposed by CG-3 on page A-3 of DP No. 1. If further explanation was needed, Commissioners were invited to contact TO/AOI.

22. The Principal of CG-3 introduced the group's suggestion to insert, on page B-9, Attachment H, 3.4.1, the words "an adequate" before "DME infrastructure". As a general comment, the Secretary cautioned the Commission to be careful when adding modifiers such as "adequate" or "appropriate", as such terms could not be audited. In this instance, the material was guidance and the insertion of "an adequate" was *agreed*.

23. The Principal of CG-3 reported that the group had accepted the Secretariat's Action Proposed with respect to, on page B-12, Attachment H, 4.1 d). However, CG-3 had not supported the Secretariat's associated addition to 4.1 f) of the clause “, taking into account specific regional requirements and constraints”, as a planning and implementation regional group (PIRG) would automatically take those into consideration. The views of CG-3 were supported by the Secretariat. The Commission *agreed* with the CG-3 recommended deletion of the added clause.

24. In Appendix B, the proposal for amendment to Chapter 3, Table 3.7.2.4-1, on page B-7 was *agreed* with the changes recommended by CG-3 on page A-3 of DP No. 1. All other proposals in Appendix B were *agreed* without change.

25. Concluding its consideration of AN-WP/8974 Blue Rider, Add. No. 1 and DP No. 1, the Commission:

- a) *noted* the summary of replies in Appendix A and Add. No. 1 to AN-WP/8974;
- b) *considered* the material in Appendix B and DP No. 1 to AN-WP/8974 and *decided* on the action to be taken on all matters raised therein;
- c) *agreed* that the proposed amendment to Annex 10, Volume I, as contained in the attachments to State letter AN 7/1.3.103-15/18, and as modified by action taken under b) above, be consolidated with other amendment proposals for inclusion in Amendment 90 to Annex 10, Volume I;
- d) *agreed* that the proposed amendment to Annex 10, Volume I should become applicable on 10 November 2016; and
- e) *instructed* the Secretary regarding the preparation of the draft report to Council.

**20027 Review of the report of the fourth meeting of the Regional Aviation Safety Group for Middle East (RASG-MID/4)  
AN-WP/8984**

26. The AN-WG/SRP Chairperson introduced AN-WP/8984 which presented the outcome of the group's review of the report of the fourth meeting of the (RASG-MID/4).

27. Attention was drawn to paragraph 2.2 of the working paper wherein the AN-WG/SRP recommended that the ANC consider referring work on low airspeed alerting provisions to the Airworthiness Panel (AIRP) for further review. The AN-WG/SRP had also suggested that regional emerging risks identified in paragraph 3.5 of the RASG-MID/4 Report be considered for inclusion in the Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP).

28. The AN-WG/SRP Chairperson, speaking as a Commissioner and mindful of not prejudging the ANC's discussions on the GASP scheduled for the following week, felt that there might be scope in the current GASP to make reference to emerging issues. He also noted that different priority issues might evolve for the 2019 GASP. It was suggested that, rather than focus on this one issue in particular, a more holistic approach to what should be in the next GASP be taken as other regions might also have issues to incorporate into the plan. The President suggested that the ANC, when reviewing RASG reports, identify areas that contributed to the global picture.

29. Referring to paragraph 2.3 of the working paper, the Chairman of the AN-WG/SRP reminded the ANC that the safety performance indicators (SPIs) would be part of the GASP discussion the following week. He recalled that HLSC 2010 had recommended that a methodology to develop SPIs be developed, but that had not been done.

30. Moving to paragraph 2.4, the President questioned whether it was common practice by various RASGs or good initiative on the part of RASG-MID to make the regional Annual Safety Report available to the public on the regional website. C/IMP-SAF responded that making the reports public was becoming the general trend; while most RASGs did post the report, one did not and another had not published it yet.

31. With reference to paragraph 2.6, clarification was sought regarding Conclusion 4/7 (Reduction of Un-stabilized Approach Risk) and whether it was calling for operators to review their standard operating procedures (SOPs) or if the wording implied that the RASG had wanted to review the SOP itself. It was pointed out that, in the context of the entirety of Conclusion 4.7, including subparagraphs a) to d), it was clear that States were being urged to review the SOPs.

32. With regard to paragraph 2.7, the AN-WG/SRP Chair confirmed that the intent was for a requirement to establish runway safety teams to be applicable in the next edition of the PANS-AERO, but there remained a question on where it was reflected in the work programme and which group of experts would undertake the work. The Secretariat was *requested* to revert to the ANC with this information.

33. Regarding paragraph 2.8, the President commented on the need for a discussion in the future on ICAO interaction with RSOOs.

34. Referring to paragraph 2.9 regarding the IATA Operational Safety Audit (IOSA) programme, it was felt that the use of the term “acceptable means of compliance” was not appropriate and that the wording of conclusions may be misleading. The Observer of IATA clarified that the intent was to provide information from the IOSA report that would assist States in their oversight activities. Some States made use of the information, for example, as a requirement for an operator to fly into the State or for code sharing. In response to a query, he confirmed that IOSA results were available upon request of a State and with the approval of the airline. He added that IOSA was available to all airlines, even non-members of IATA.

35. The President remarked that IOSA compliance did not replace a State’s oversight activities but rather provided complementary information. This was reiterated by others who saw IOSA as a way to increase safety which was in line with the safety information exchange referred to Annex 19 — *Safety Management*. It was remarked, however, that the exchange of such information should be handled with care and that operator participation in the programme should not be mandatory without further discussion.

36. Concluding its consideration of AN-WP/8984, the Commission:

- a) *noted* the RASG-MID/4 Report and the report of the AN-WG/SRP thereon, as contained in AN-WP/8984;
- b) *approved* the actions recommended in the report as proposed in the appendix to AN-WP/8984;
- c) *requested* the Secretary General to provide appropriate feedback on the ANC’s review of the RASG-MID/4 Report;
- d) *agreed* that the development of a requirement for the establishment of runway safety teams (Conclusion 4/8 refers) be referred to the appropriate group of experts; and
- e) *agreed* to refer the work of the RASG-MID on low airspeed alerting provisions, as outlined in paragraph 3.41 of the RASG-MID/4 Report, to the Airworthiness Panel (AIRP) for further review.

**20028 Review of the report of the fifteenth meeting of the Middle East Air Navigation Planning and Implementation Regional Group (MIDANPIRG/15)  
AN-WP/8985**

37. The AN-WG/SRP Chairperson introduced AN-WP/8985 which presented the outcome of the group's review of the report of the fifteenth meeting of the (MIDANPIRG/15).

38. MIDANPIRG was congratulated on producing a very thorough report that contained a lot of information on the region.

39. Regarding paragraph 2.1 which referred to call sign similarity and confusion, in response to the question whether any deconfliction was undertaken as part of the process of allocating 3-letter designators into telephony call signs, C/IMP-AN admitted that some confusion had entered into the process but that the problem went beyond 3-letter designators. He recommended that, after Secretariat discussion on the matter, the task be assigned to a group of experts to determine whether it was a problem at a global level and, if so, how to address it through the provisions available in the PANS-ATM.

40. It was suggested that the subject be examined to determine whether other regions had issues with similar call signs and, as an amendment to the flight plan format might be required, the ATMOPSP was suggested as the appropriate body. The AN-WG/SRP Chairman pointed out that call sign similarity was only an issue in regions with a certain level of traffic, adding that telephony designators also contributed to the confusion and should be revisited. Based on the discussion, the Secretariat was *requested* to look into the matter and then brief the ANC. The President also recalled that a Secretariat briefing on five-letter and three-letter name codes was still outstanding.

41. In relation to paragraph 2.5 regarding the use of the on-line data interchange (OLDI) dataset, C/IMP-AN confirmed that the MID Region primarily used the OLDI dataset both within the region itself and for its interface with Europe while it used ATS interfacility data communications (AIDC) for interface with APAC States.

42. Regarding paragraph 2.6, noting that the performance indicators could feed the Global Air Navigation Plan (GANP) process by reporting via the regional dashboards, the President remarked that this would feed the discussion on the development of performance metrics in the various regions.

43. In relation to paragraph 2.7 regarding regional ATM contingency plans, C/IMP-AN explained that the main objective of a contingency plan was to have appropriate measures in place to ensure the continuance of safety of air traffic should unusual circumstances such as conflict, airspace closures or inclement weather necessitate a change in planned air routes that may increase the traffic in neighbouring FIRs. Responding to an associated query on whether airspace closures were coordinated with RASGs, C/IMP-SAF confirmed that, while safety assessments were conducted by airlines and States, the matter of conflict zones fell within the purview of PIRGs. He added that the RASGs were kept fully informed in a report from the PIRG to the RASG.

44. The importance of paragraph 2.9, regarding implementation of some SARPs, was emphasized. It was suggested that data from USOAP CMA and other areas be analysed to determine which SARPs were difficult for States to implement so that problematic SARPs could be addressed. The President *recalled* that DD/SAF had mentioned the availability of a new iSTARS tool that would be extremely useful in this regard. D/ANB confirmed that it would be available in the coming weeks.

45. Regarding paragraph 2.11, the need to determine whether particular safety risks were specific to certain regions was emphasized. C/IMP-SAF informed the ANC that information on emerging risks was already being shared between regions through the RASG coordination mechanism, and that the matter would be revisited in the next proposed revision to the GASP. The President noted that an analysis

of which risks were regional and which were potentially global would be discussed during the review of the annual consolidated report on PIRGs and RASGs.

46. Focusing on the list of decisions and conclusions at the appendix to AN-WP/8995, the meaning of the AN-WG/SRP's recommended action "to note" was questioned. The President explained that these were items on which the Commission did not have to take any specific action or that pertained to regional processes on which the ANC had no influence. The AN-WG/SRP Chairman added that any items that required specific action by the Council or feedback to the region were included in paragraph 3 (Action by the Air Navigation Commission).

47. TO/IMP-AN assured the Commission that the result of the ANC's review of a PIRG or RASG report was relayed back to the respective regional group, along with the AN-WP and AN minutes (or Council working paper and minutes, if appropriate). A summary of the activities of all PIRGs and RASGs was also circulated to all PIRGs and RASGs, respectively and, prior to each PIRG meeting, the regional office consolidated the information with the ANC's analysis, which was then presented to the PIRG meeting.

48. Concluding its consideration of AN-WP/8985, the Commission:

- a) *noted* the MIDANPIRG/15 Report and the report of the AN-WG/SRP thereon, as contained in AN-WP/8985;
- b) *approved* the actions recommended in the report as proposed in the appendix to AN-WP/8985;
- c) *requested* the Secretary General to provide appropriate feedback on the ANC's review of the MIDANPIRG/15 Report to the region; and
- d) *considered* the need to develop global provisions and/or guidance material to reduce the risk associated with call sign similarity and confusion, including possible amendment to the ICAO FPL format.

49. The meeting *adjourned* at 1225 hours.

-END-