



International Civil Aviation Organization

**Middle East Air Navigation Planning and
Implementation Regional Group**

Fifteenth Meeting (MIDANPIRG/15)
(Bahrain, 8 – 11 June 2015)

Agenda Item 5.2.1: MID Region air navigation priorities and target (ASBU Implementation)

GROUND-GROUND INTEGRATION IN THE MID REGION (B0-FICE)

(Presented by the Secretariat)

<p style="text-align: center;">SUMMARY</p> <p>This paper presents the status of implementation of AMHS and the B0-FICE elements in the MID Region.</p> <p>Action by the meeting is at paragraph 3.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">REFERENCES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- ANSIG/1 Report- MIDAMC STG/2 Report- MSG/4 Report

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The MID Region Air Navigation Strategy was endorsed by the Fourth meeting of the MIDANPIRG Steering Group (MSG/4, Cairo, Egypt, 24-26 November 2014) as the framework identifying the regional air navigation priorities, performance indicators and targets. The Strategy includes Tables for all twelve priority 1 ASBU Modules along with their associated elements, applicability, performance Indicators, supporting Metrics and performance Targets.

1.2 The First Meeting of the Air Navigation Systems Implementation Group (ANSIG/1) (Cairo, Egypt, 10-12 February 2015). The meeting was attended by a total of thirty two (32) participants from seven (7) States (Bahrain, Egypt, Iran, Kuwait, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates) and two (2) Organizations/Industries (IATA and MIDRMA).

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 The meeting may wish to note that three (3) elements have been included in the MID Region Air Navigation Strategy under B0-FICE, as follows:

2.2 **AMHS Capability:** The AMHS is already implemented in: Bahrain, Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan and UAE.

2.3 **AMHS Implementation/interconnection:** The AMHS is already implemented and interconnected in Six (6) States (Egypt, Jordan, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and UAE). It is to be highlighted that the 20% gap with the agreed performance target, is expected to be achieved as soon as Bahrain, Kuwait and Sudan complete the interconnection.

2.4 **Implementation of AIDC/OLDI between adjacent ACCs:** The meeting may wish to note that the status of implementation of AIDC/OLDI is far below the agreed target. The meeting may wish to recall that the ICAO MID Regional Office conducted a Seminar in March 2014 to assist States in implementing AIDC/OLDI (Ground-Ground Integration) and the MSG/4 meeting endorsed the MID Region Strategy for the implementation of AIDC/OLDI, which is a comprehensive package to support implementation.

2.5 The ANSIG/1 meeting agreed that in order to achieve the target, States need to follow the steps in MID Region Strategy for the implementation of AIDC/OLDI. Accordingly, the ANSIG/1 meeting urged States to work closely with the focal points to expedite the implementation and provide the ICAO MID Regional Office with regular progress reports. It was also highlighted that bilateral meetings/workshops could also expedite the implementation, since most of the States have the necessary capabilities in their systems.

2.6 The ANSIG/1 meeting reviewed and updated the status of implementation of the B0-FICE as at **Appendix A** and agreed to include it in Volume III of the MID eANP. It was highlighted that the CNS SG is the main Regional monitoring body for the collection of data related to the B0-FICE implementation in the MID Region.

2.7 The ANSIG/1 meeting reviewed and updated the status of implementation of the different elements of the ASBU Module B0-FICE included in the MID Air Navigation Strategy, as reflected in **Appendix B**.

2.8 The ANSIG/1 meeting noted with appreciation that in addition to the implementation of AIDC/OLDI between ACCs, the following States (Qatar, Saudi Arabia and UAE) have implemented AIDC/OLDI between ACCs and Approaches. The meeting encouraged States to continue this type of implementation, since the transfer of communication in a data link environment improves efficiency and reduces ATC workload

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) urged States, that have not interconnected AMHS to do so;
- b) review and update the Status of the B0-FICE implementation in **Appendix A**;
- c) encourage States to conduct bilateral workshops/meetings to expedite B0-FICE implementation;
- d) encourage States for local AIDC/OLDI implementation in order to gain experience and enhance efficiency; and
- e) urges States that have not assigned focal points to do so.

TABLE B0-FICE

EXPLANATION OF THE TABLE

Column

- 1 Name of the State
- 2, 3, 4 Status of AMHS Capability and Interconnection and AIDC/OLDI Capability, where:
Y – Fully Implemented
N – Partially Implemented
- 5 Status of AIDC/OLDI Implementation, where:
FI – Fully Implemented
PI – Partially Implemented
NI – Not Implemented
- 6 Action plan — short description of the State's Action Plan with regard to the implementation of B0-FICE.
- 7 Remarks

State	AMHS Capability	AMHS Interconnection	AIDC/OLDI Capability	AIDC/OLDI Implementation	Action Plan	Remarks
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>
Bahrain	Y	N	Y	NI	Sep 2015 for AMHS Int.	
Egypt	Y	Y	Y	PI		
Iran	N	N	Y	NI		Contract signed for AMHS
Iraq	N	N	N	NI		
Jordan	Y	Y	Y	NI		
Kuwait	Y	N	Y	NI	Dec 2015 for AMHS Int.	
Lebanon	Y	N	Y	PI		
Libya	Y	N	Y	NI		
Oman	Y	Y	Y	NI		
Qatar	Y	Y	Y	PI		local implementation
Saudi Arabia	Y	Y	Y	PI		
Sudan	Y	Y	Y	NI	AMHS Int. Feb 2015	
Syria	N	N	N	NI		
UAE	Y	Y	Y	PI		Local implementation
Yemen	N	N	N	NI	Dec 2015 for AMHS	Contract signed for AMHS
Total Percentage						

Monitoring and reporting the status of Implementation of AIDC/OLDI between Adjacent ACCs

State	Location of AIDC/OLDI system	Adjacent ACCs	Implementation Status (YES/NO)	Report for MID AN Strategy
1	2	3	4	5
Bahrain	Bahrain ACC	Jeddah ACC	NO	NO
		Riyadh ACC	NO	
		Kuwait ACC	NO	
		SZC Abu Dhabi ACC	NO	
		Tehran ACC	NO	
Egypt	Cairo ACC	Athens ACC	YES	YES
		Jeddah ACC	NO	
		Khartoum ACC	NO	
		Tripoli ACC	NO	
		Nicosia ACC	NO	
		Amman ACC	NO	
Iran	Tehran ACC	Bahrain ACC	NO	NO
		SZC Abu Dhabi ACC	NO	
		Ankara ACC	NO	
		Kabul ACC	NO	
		Kuwait ACC	NO	
		Baghdad ACC	NO	
		Turkmenistan ACC	NO	
Iraq	Baghdad ACC	Kuwait ACC	NO	NO
		Tehran ACC	NO	
		Amman ACC	NO	
		Ankara ACC	NO	
Jordan	Amman ACC	Baghdad ACC	NO	NO
		Damascus ACC	NO	
		Cairo ACC	NO	
		Jeddah ACC	NO	
Kuwait	Kuwait ACC	Bahrain ACC	NO	NO
		Jeddah ACC	NO	
		Tehran ACC	NO	
		Damascus ACC	NO	
		Nicosia ACC	NO	
Lebanon	Beirut ACC	Nicosia ACC	NO	NO
		Damascus ACC	NO	
Libya	Tripoli ACC	Tunis ACC	NO	NO
		Malta ACC	NO	
		Cairo ACC	NO	
		Khartoum ACC	NO	

A-3

State	Location of AIDC/OLDI system	Adjacent ACCs	Implementation Status (YES/NO)	Report for MID AN Strategy
1	2	3	4	5
		N'Djamena ACC	NO	
Oman	Muscat ACC	SZC Abu Dhabi ACC	NO	NO
		Jeddah ACC	NO	
		Mumbai ACC	NO	
		Bahrain ACC	NO	
		Sanaa ACC	NO	
Saudi Arabia	Jeddah ACC	Bahrain ACC	NO	YES
		Cairo ACC	NO	
		Amman ACC	NO	
		SZC Abu Dhabi ACC	NO	
		Muscat	NO	
		Khartoum ACC	NO	
		Sanaa ACC	NO	
		Riyadh ACC	YES	
	Riyadh ACC	Jeddah ACC	YES	
		Bahrain ACC	NO	
			NO	
Sudan	Khartoum ACC	Cairo ACC	NO	YES
		Jeddah ACC	NO	
		N'Djamena ACC	YES	
		Kigali ACC	YES	
		Tripoli ACC	NO	
Syria	Damascus ACC	Beirut ACC	NO	NO
		Amman ACC	NO	
		Baghdad ACC	NO	
UAE	SZC Abu Dhabi ACC	Bahrain ACC	NO	NO
		Jeddah ACC	NO	
		Tehran ACC	NO	
		Muscat ACC	NO	
Yemen	Sanaa ACC	Jeddah ACC	NO	NO
		Muscat ACC	NO	
		Djibouti ACC	NO	
		Mogadishu ACC	NO	

APPENDIX B

Status of implementation of B0-FICE elements included in the MID Air Navigation Strategy

<i>Elements</i>	<i>Applicability</i>	<i>Performance Indicators/Supporting Metrics</i>	<i>Targets</i>	<i>Status</i>
AMHS capability	<i>All States</i>	Indicator: % of States with AMHS capability Supporting metric: Number of States with AMHS capability	70% of States with AMHS capability by Dec. 2017	60% (9 States)
AMHS implementation /interconnection	<i>All States</i>	Indicator: % of States with AMHS implemented (interconnected with other States AMHS) Supporting metric: Number of States with AMHS implemented (interconnections with other States AMHS)	60% of States with AMHS interconnected by Dec. 2017	40% (6 States)
Implementation of AIDC/OLDI between adjacent ACCs	<i>All ACCs</i>	Indicator: % of FIRs within which all applicable ACCs have implemented at least one interface to use AIDC/OLDI with neighboring ACCs Supporting metric: Number of AIDC/OLDI interconnections implemented between adjacent ACCs	70% by Dec. 2017	29% (4 FIRs out of 14 FIRs)

- END -