



**The Twentieth First Meeting of the Informal South Pacific ATS
Coordinating Group
(ISPACG/21)**

Auckland New Zealand March 06 to March 08 2007

Agenda Item 3:
Report on Planning Team Activities

Report of the ISPACG Planning Team

(Presented by the ISPACG Planning Team Chairman)

SUMMARY

The ISPACG Planning Team subgroup was formed and has been addressing multiple issues of interest to the ISPACG.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The ISPACG Planning Team was commissioned at ISPACG/20 to prioritize and develop action plans for multiple issues that were not actively being addressed by the full ISPACG.

2. DISCUSSION

- 2.1 The team met for the first time in August 2006 (ISPACG/PT-1). At this meeting, the team
- Ratified terms of reference,
 - Developed a prioritization mechanism,
 - Discussed and prioritized the issues delegated to the group at ISPACG/20
 - Created action plans for issues identified as *Imminent*
- 2.2 The group has subsequently met via telephone conference several times to status items in the Integrated Action Plan and develop additional action plans for issues identified as *Near Term*.

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 The meeting is asked to provide additional inputs or status to work items in the *Integrated Action Plan*, and where appropriate, identify additional working items to be addressed by the Planning Team

**Summary First Meeting of the Informal South Pacific Air Traffic Services Coordinating Group – Planning
Team Subgroup (ISPACG-PT/1)**

Attachment: ISPACG Planning Team Integrated Action Plan – February Update

**Summary of Discussions of the
First Meeting
of the
Informal South Pacific Air Traffic Services Coordinating Group – Planning Team
Subgroup
(ISPACG-PT/1)
Auckland, NZ
30 – 31 August, 2006**

1. Background

- 1.1. The first meeting of the ISPACG Planning Team was held on 30 and 31 August in Auckland New Zealand. The meeting was hosted by Airways New Zealand (Airways) at the Heritage Hotel.
- 1.2. The meeting was hosted by Mr. Geoff de Bazin, Operations Manager – Oceanic, Airways New Zealand. The meeting was chaired by Mr. Kevin Chamness, Oceanic Service Improvements Manager, FAA. Ms. Joanne Kendall of Airways New Zealand provided Secretariat support for the meeting.
- 1.3. The meeting was attended by the following representatives:

Airways NZ	Geoff de Bazin (ISPACG Co-Chair) Paul Radford Allan London Joanne Kendall (Minutes)
Airservices	Adam Watkin
ARINC	Mike Ostapiej
FAA	Kevin Chamness (Facilitator) David Maynard (ISPACG Co-Chair)
IATA	Gary Dennison
IFALPA	Stu Julian
IFATCA	Duncan Kennedy
SASL Fiji	Joe Vatu
SEAC Tahiti	Jean-Pierre Faubladiet
SITA	Kathy Kearns

- 1.4. Geoff de Bazin, ISPACG Co-Chair, welcomed everyone on behalf of Airways NZ to the 1st ISPACG Working Group meeting, in particular Jean-Pierre Faubladiet from SEAC Tahiti to his inaugural ISPACG meeting.
- 1.5. David Maynard, Co-Chair of ISPACG and IPACG, welcomed everyone and reminded the meeting that the reason behind this Working Group was to progress important ISPACG issues before ISPACG/21 in February 2007.
- 1.6. Geoff de Bazin turned facilitation duties over to Kevin Chamness. Kevin reviewed the action items from ISPACG/20 that led to the creation of the Planning Team:

Summary First Meeting of the Informal South Pacific Air Traffic Services Coordinating Group – Planning Team Subgroup (ISPACG-PT/1)

Action Item 20-6 Establish A Planning Team To Establish Working Groups To Progress Future Work.

Action Pending: The planning team will prioritise future work and initiate working groups to progress the work. Arrangement for working groups will be advised to all ISPACG/20 representatives.

Action Item 20-5 Address Problems with SATCOM

Action Pending: Arrangements for the working group will be advised to ISPACG/20 representatives. Report progress to ISPACG/21.

Adoption of the ISPACG Planning Team Terms of Reference

1.7. Discussion took place around what authorities and responsibilities would be delegated to members of the working group and how these would be communicated back to various ISPACG members.

1.8. The meeting agreed that:

- *membership should reflect representation at ISPACG and that customers would be represented by IATA;*
- *wherever possible the group must ensure that they are prepared to make commitments on behalf of their organisations;*
- *items for discussion have arisen from ISPACG/20 and any new items are documented and presented at ISPACG/21;*
- *they would attempt to meet once yearly between ISPACG meetings and would hold telecoms in lieu of meetings when necessary.*

1.9. The meeting adopted the Terms of Reference. (ISPACG-PT1/WP2)

Review and Adoption of the Work Program

1.10. Kevin Chamness introduced the Work Program stating that the issues from the work program were from the ISPACG/20 breakout session.

1.11. At the request of Stu Julian, the convergence of FANS 1A to ATN Message Set was added to the Work Program.

1.12. The meeting agreed to adopt the Work Program. (ISPACG-PT/WP1)

Review and Adoption of the Issue Prioritization Level

1.13. The meeting agreed that prioritization was the principle requirement for this meeting and would be based on timeliness and a need to progress work for ISPACG/21. The following proposed Prioritization Levels were agreed to:

- **Imminent** - Items prioritized as *Imminent* require expeditious action. The team will produce a recommended plan to address this item without delay and if necessary, recommend immediate formation of an action team to address this issue.
- **Near-Term** – Items prioritized as *Near-Term*, though not requiring imminent action, require significant progress prior to the next full ISPACG session. The team should produce a recommended plan to accomplish this, and if necessary recommend formation of an action team capable of progressing this work prior to the next full ISPACG session.
- **Mid-Term** – Items prioritized as *Mid-Term* may involve some activity prior to the next full ISPACG session, however the majority of the work and planning is expected to progress at or after the full ISPACG session. The Planning Team may choose to recommend an action plan to take advantage of opportunities to progress work on this item if circumstances allow. The Planning Team may choose to recommend these actions to a work team or subgroup, however this allocation will likely take place at or after the next full ISPACG session.
- **Long-Term** – Items prioritized as *Long-Term* entail little or no activity that the Planning Team will recommend progress prior to the next full ISPACG session. The team may choose to recommend an action plan or work allocation, however the team's recommendation is for this work to progress at or after the next full ISPACG session.

1.14. The meeting agreed that issues or items prioritized as *Imminent* or *Near-Term* require that a recommended action plan be developed by the Planning Team, whereas *Mid-Term* and *Long-Term* items may or may not have an action plan recommendation subject to the discretion of the team. In all cases, a recommended action plan should contain proposed task allocation and completion dates.

2. Communications Service Provider and IATA Updates

SITA

2.1. Kathy Kearns gave an update on SITA and the SATCOM performance over the past year. The 1st upgrade had been completed Oct/Nov 2005, with the 2nd upgrade of data channel programmes currently being progressed. Old channel units had been shipped from Aussaguel to Perth to provide additional spares and increase channels, with work on this scheduled for 4-20 October 2006. There was a continuing need for the Global Capacity Planning Group and a telecom with INMARSAT, Boeing and SITA was scheduled for 5 September to move things forward. SITA would recommend that INMARSAT lead the group however nothing official to this affect has been documented yet. Kathy asked that each regional participant attending this meeting work together to provide SITA with traffic forecasts and plans so that accurate information was available for SITA to work with.

Summary First Meeting of the Informal South Pacific Air Traffic Services Coordinating Group – Planning Team Subgroup (ISPACG-PT/1)

- 2.2. David Maynard said that activities at Aussaguel had caused several unplanned outages and asked what was being done to avoid this in Perth. He asked if any performance comparisons of transit times before and after the upgrades had been completed at Aussaguel. He stated that this was a major issue within the FAA FIR and that unless a reliable service was able to be provided the FAA would not be able to expand its use of 30/30. He asked if any reports could be generated that they could share. Kathy advised since 26 June 2006 no further outages had occurred at Aussaguel and that the only variable was traffic between the two locations. She also advised that there is a much higher volume of traffic in Perth than Aussaguel, saying that 30/30 could double reporting forecasts, therefore her request for enhanced traffic forecast information was important. Downlink delays if due to congestion were not GES failures as Airservices were reporting different problems from the FAA.
- 2.3. Paul Radford said that Airways had seen an improvement however service was still below that of current FOM requirements. SATCOM traffic delays greater than 3 minutes through Santa Paula and Perth are roughly equivalent which may indicate other issues besides capacity. Kathy responded that the net capacity will be the same today as when the upgrade occurs which was based on traffic forecasts. The 20 October Perth upgrade will see improved reliability but not capacity. She asked if more aircraft could be moved to high speed channels and said it may be helpful to look at the avionics side of things as well.

ARINC

- 2.4. Mike Ostapiej gave an update on ARINC stating that the HF DL update had not occurred yet which was a concern and that HF Voice in Fiji still had issues. ARINC were attempting to get an antenna into Thailand however the Thai government would not let them use the frequencies so this was still being worked on.
- 2.5. Paul Radford said that SITA had put a lot of investment into Perth and asked what ARINC had planned for Santa Paula. He said delayed messages were the same between Santa Paula and Perth which indicated to him that this was not necessarily a service issue. Mike assured that group that ARINC's equipment didn't have to be updated however David Maynard said that the FAA had been focusing on SITA as the reason for the increase in data-link transit times. However, the FAA had recently begun scrutinizing the transit times associated with Santa Paula and found that they appear worse than those associated with Perth. Therefore the issue does need looking into.

IATA - Gary

- 2.6. Gary Dennison reported that IATA were currently downsizing and that he now replaces Neil Jonasson as the IATA representative at all ISPACG and Working Group meetings. He said IATA's main issue was the lack of backup between GES with the loss of Yamaguchi. SITA use Perth and ARINC use Santa Paula but there is no redundancy. There should be another attempt for interoperability. Yamaguchi used to be used as backup to Perth and Santa Paula. These are the issues the airlines want focus put on.

3. Data Link Issues

- 3.1. The meeting agreed that the Work Program item *Satcom Issues* should be renamed to *Datalink Issues*.
- 3.2. With reference to item 6. “Review and Establish Terms of Reference for Working Groups/Task Forces” from the ISPACG/20 Minutes, the meeting agreed to form an ISPACG Data Link Working Group to deal with Data Link issues and give feedback to ISPACG/21 as requested by participants at ISPACG/20. The group will be responsible for the creation of the end to end data link architecture.
- 3.3. The meeting drafted a Terms of Reference document for the ISPACG Data Link Working Group. (Appendix A).
- 3.4. Paul Radford was nominated to chair the Data Link Working Group. The Data Link Working Group will report back to the ISPACG Planning Team.
- 3.5. Dispensation of Datalink and other communications issues from the Work Program was as follows:
 - 1) GES - *Delegated to data link work group.*
 - 2) Capacity - *Delegated to data link work group.*
 - 3) Redundancy - *Delegated to data link work group.*
 - 4) HFDL - *Delegated to data link work group.*
 - 5) FANS1/A to ATN convergence - *Delegated to data link work group.*
 - 6) HF issues - *Working party already exists for this topic.*
 - 7) Required Communications Performance (RCP) - Moved to the COMM group for discussion. - *Delegated to data link work group.*
 - 8) Defining common service provisions and specifications – Common performance requirements for Comm Service Providers and the ATSU's. – *Delegated to data link work group.*
 - 9) Study the usefulness of alternative data link systems such as Iridium for the future; - *Delegated to data link work group.*
 - 10) Review the user demand for SATCOM service voice and data link services; - It is the recommendation of the Planning Team that an ongoing action be created for ISPACG asking data link users to present data link demand forecast information to the ISPACG. This is intended to enable better capacity planning. **Priority: Near-term.**
 - For action plan – Creation of format and requirements for the data link demand forecast. SITA has taken an action to draft requirements.

4. Flight Management Issues

- 4.1. Dispensation of Flight Management Issues from the Work Program was as follows:
- 4.2. **Consistent application of separation standards and procedures** – Commonality in the availability of standards and the application of these standards.

Summary First Meeting of the Informal South Pacific Air Traffic Services Coordinating Group – Planning Team Subgroup (ISPACG-PT/1)

- 4.2.1. Allan London reported that common ground was being found in the Pacific with the aim to get ATS units on board to have the same rules within the FIRs, commonality, availability of standards and how they are applied. This would make it a seamless operation for pilots.
- 4.2.2. The group did not feel that the assignment of a priority or creation of a work program was appropriate. This issue was not prioritized as the work is ongoing within each ATSU. Planning dates are documented with ISPACG capacity tables. The application of ADS-C reporting rates is an ATSU and customer issue, however as ATSU's add 30/30, they must be aware that higher reporting rates potentially include incurrence of cost and network capacity issues. ***Ongoing Activity – Priority: Not assigned***
- 4.3. **DARP expansion** The group agreed that expansion of DARP in the South Pacific was an imminent priority and required an action plan. Refer to DARP expansion action plan (Appendix B). – ***Priority: Imminent.***
- 4.4. **In-Trail separation reductions using ADS** – The meeting agreed that ADS-B based ITP and ADS-C based ITP should be prioritized separately.
- 4.4.1. Kevin Chamness presented “ADS-C Oceanic In-Trail Climb or Descent Procedure” in which he advised that the FAA were actively assessing an ADS-C based procedure. After discussion, the meeting agreed that an ADS-C based ITP had merit, but significant analysis was required prior to any implementation.
- 4.4.2. Geoff de Bazin stated that Airways would be interested to participate and despite the workload involved would be prepared to make some resources available.
- 4.4.3. ***ADS-B ITP Priority: Long-Term,***
- 4.4.4. ***ADS-C ITP Priority: Near-Term***
- For action plan: Identify the steps required to define, analyze and implement the procedure. Add the concept to the agenda for SASP. – FAA to pursue.
- 4.5. **User Preferred Routes (UPR)** – Expansion of UPR programs into areas where they do not currently exist, or exist in limited application.
- 4.5.1. After status discussion on UPRs it was determined that:
- 4.5.1.1. AirServices were looking at trials for UPRs on the SYD/HNL route and that planning for UPRs on the Tasman although not yet completed are progressing.
- 4.5.1.2. FIJI FIR will accept UPRs for FANS/1A aircraft.
- 4.5.1.3. Tahiti FIR is uncertain of the status of accepting UPRs. Jean-Pierre Faubladier will investigate.
- 4.5.1.4. Oakland FIR has no restrictions on the use of UPRs in the South Pacific. That Oakland ARTCC is looking into the feasibility of expanding the use of UPRs to other areas of the Oakland FIR
- 4.5.2. The group agreed that expansion of UPR programs was an imminent priority and required an action plan. Refer to UPR Action Plan (Appendix C). ***Priority: Imminent***

Summary First Meeting of the Informal South Pacific Air Traffic Services Coordinating Group – Planning Team Subgroup (ISPACG-PT/1)

- 4.6. **Pre-Departure Clearance** – Ongoing ISPACG item of interest for gate-to-gate operations, however primarily a domestic issue for individual ATSU's. **Priority: Not Assigned**
- 4.7. **Multi-service level environments** – Unclear to the planning team what was intended. This issue is tabled by the group. **Priority: Not Assigned**
- 4.8. **Harmonization of non-normal oceanic activity** – The group concluded that this issue was principally in reference to lost comm. and other contingency procedure harmonization. The group agreed that this is an ongoing activity, and did not require specific action plan. **Ongoing Issue. Priority: Not Assigned**
- 4.9. **Collaborative decision making (CDM)** – This topic is considered too broad for a work program. Individual CDM initiatives should be addressed to ISPACG as necessary. **Priority: Not Assigned**
- 4.10. **Tailored Arrivals** – This is an area of interest to ensure that individual approaches by ATSU's are communicated to the ISPACG. – The Planning Team concluded that although the development of a Tailored Arrivals Program is mainly a domestic application, there are potential oceanic ramifications. Consideration should be taken that a Tailored Arrivals program may result in more extensive use of Required Time of Arrival requirements. The Team also recommends that Tailored Arrivals Programs should be added to the ISPACG Capacity Enhancement Tables. **Priority: Long-Term**
- 4.11. **Terminal transition** – The group agreed that *Terminal Transition* in this regard was in reference to *Tailored Arrivals Programs* and is covered under the *Tailored Arrivals* work item. **Priority: Not Assigned**
- 4.12. **Gate to Gate operations** - This topic is considered too broad for a work program. Individual *Gate to Gate* initiatives should be addressed to ISPACG as necessary. **Priority: Not Assigned**
- 4.13. **Realignment of ATS Routes from Honolulu to South Pacific cities** – David Maynard presented an “ATS Route Realignment Proposal” (FAA Great Circle Tracks) PowerPoint and asked that this be added to the Work Program since it affected all existing routes in the Oakland FIR. Oakland is proposing the creation of great circle based ATS routes to replace the existing fixed ATS route structure from Honolulu to Sydney, Nadi, Pago Pago, Auckland and Tahiti. The proposal would go through the ICAO process. **Priority: Mid-Term**

5. Technology and Standards Development Issues

- 5.1. Dispensation of Technology and Standards Development Issues from the Work Program was as follows:

- 5.2. **Airborne separation systems applications** - This topic is considered too broad for a work program. Individual Airborne separation systems applications initiatives should be addressed to ISPACG as necessary. *Priority: Not Assigned*
- 5.3. **AIDC Implementation and Improvement** – Implementation of version 2 and version 2.1. Refer to AIDC action plan (Appendix D) *Priority: Imminent*
- 5.4. **Sharing of operational data – Sharing of analysis and reporting data.** The Team concluded that there is current data being shared, and there is a need to incorporate additional data sharing into ISPACG. Work needs to be done to catalog what data is currently shared and identify what additional data should be shared in the future. The action plan should focus on cataloging what information is being shared today. *Priority: Near-Term*
- For action plan – How and when the cataloging of data that is currently shared will occur.
- 5.5. **Minimize delays due to cross-boundary coordination requirements.** Auckland and Oakland are to consider a reduction or elimination of prior approval for changes to previously coordinated data. The group recommends that ISPACG consider a long-term work program to address this issue. *Priority: Long-Term*
- 5.6. **Sharing of control and surveillance information.** Auckland and Oakland to consider a reduction or elimination of prior approval for changes to previously coordinated data. *Priority: Long-Term*
- 5.7. **Improvement of wind and trajectory models** – The meeting agreed that an Action Plan be developed to assess the value and purpose of the current reporting of wind data to MET in accordance with ICAO requirements. The ATSUs will be asked to contact the Met service to determine the value and purpose of reporting. If it is found that the data is not being used, then a plan will be developed giving suggestions on how to best use the information. Adam Watkin will take an Action Plan to ISPACG/21. *Priority: Near-Term*
- Action plan will request that the ATSU's contact MET services and determine the value and purpose of reporting. Additionally, if the data is not being used, the plan should include suggestions on how to use the data.

6. Administrative Issues

- 6.1. **ICAO Standardization** – This is an ongoing issue that ISPACG needs to address however it is not specific to this Working Group. It was suggested the group start communicating with the ICAO Task Force and try to ensure ICAO representation at ISPACG. *Ongoing Activity. Priority Not Assigned.*

7. Meeting Conclusion

- 7.1. Kevin Chamness thanked everyone for their input and Airways NZ for hosting the two day working group.

Summary First Meeting of the Informal South Pacific Air Traffic Services Coordinating Group – Planning Team Subgroup (ISPACG-PT/1)

- 7.2. Geoff de Bazin thanked Kevin, for the work done in preparation for, and during the meeting, and also the participants for their efforts, and said he felt that it had been a worthwhile 2 days and would benefit ISPACG.
- 7.3. David Maynard closed by saying that he was sure the value of the group would be recognised at ISPACG and that in the space of two days we had progressed well. He thanked everyone for their commitment and participation.

ISPACG Data link Working Group
Terms of Reference

At the behest of the ISPACG/20, the ISPACG-Planning Team has chartered the creation of an ISPACG Data Link Working Group. This group is created to address imminent and future issues associated with the provision and use of Data Link.

The following issues require imminent attention of the Data Link Working Group:

- I. The Data link Working Group shall oversee the creation of a document that clearly defines the end-to-end data link environment today, to include system constraints, performance limitations and applicable standards; **IMMINENT**
- II. Urgently examine the reasons for data link communications services not meeting performance requirements. Consider alternatives for performance improvements. Determine the timeframe for performance improvements; **IMMINENT**
- III. Review the FOM performance standards to confirm or make recommendations for changes to the standards. This review should include consideration of the RCP standards; **IMMINENT**
- IV. Review the current performance of HFDDL and issues in the unexpected application of HFDDL. Consider the application of HFDDL as a tertiary communications means and develop guidelines for this application. **IMMINENT**
- V. Study the satellite, GES and inter-network upgrades being carried out and planned by service providers and report on the effect of these upgrades on the planned use by aircraft; **IMMINENT**
- VI. Identify the priority being awarded by data link service providers and avionics to ATS data link communications in the Pacific; **IMMINENT**

The following are for consideration in future work planning for the Data Link Working Group:

- I. Review the current ICAO Annex 10, Volume III, aeronautical mobile satellite service (AMSS) standards and recommendations for applicability to the use of INMARSAT for ATC services. Particularly considering the reliability requirements for ATM; **MID TERM**
- II. Study the usefulness of alternative data link systems such as Iridium for the future;
- III. Study the new INMARSAT SATVOICE and SATRADIO service;
- IV. Assess the progress and need for ISPACG involvement in the development of Required Surveillance Performance (RSP) parameters.

Participants shall be invited from:

- AirServices Australia
- Airways New Zealand
- Federal Aviation Administration
- SASL Fiji
- SEAC Tahiti
- International Air Transport Association (IATA)
- International Federation of Air Line Pilots' Associations (IFALPA)
- International Federation of Air Traffic Controllers' Associations (IFATCA)
- ARINC
- SITA

The group shall provide periodic updates on progress of the specified work program to the ISPACG Planning Team.

The group shall report back to the ISPACG Planning Team on the specified work program by 1 February, 2007.

Action Plan for ISSUE VI, A-2: Expansion of DARP

What can be accomplished prior to the next ISPACG?

1. Dissemination of information on DARP programs to AOC's and Pilots. – Working paper to ISPACG/21 detailing what is being done between Oakland and Auckland. **Target Date: ISPACG/21 – Action to FAA**
2. Training of DARP procedures to AOC's and Pilots. – Create a training briefing for AOC's and pilots that outlines the DARP procedures. – **Target Date: ISPACG/21. – Action to Airways NZ**
3. Establish a mechanism for user feedback on issues encountered during DARP. This feedback should be received from AOC's on a periodic basis. Develop a pro-forma draft and distribute to AOC's. **Target Date: September – Action to IATA**
4. Establish a mechanism for user feedback on benefits from executed DARP routes. **Target Date: September – Action to IATA**
5. Extension of DARP into additional airspace volumes.
 - a. Can Fiji or Tahiti accept a new route delivered via ABI? Could Fiji and Tahiti accept that ABI, and pass it on to the next FIR? **Target Date: September – Action to Tahiti and Fiji**
 - b. AIDC testing between Oakland and NADI on or around mid Sept. This testing should include DARP testing. Potential to develop AIDC MOU. **Target Date: September – Action to FAA and Fiji.**
 - c. AIDC testing between Oakland and Tahiti at a date TBD, based on resource requirements. **Target Date: November – Action to FAA and Tahiti**
 - d. Wesbound-Eastbound DARP bench test between Auckland and Brisbane ACC's. **Target Date: October – Action to Airways NZ and AirServices Australia.**
 - e. Review the procedures for DARP in the FOM to ensure that they continue to meet intended need. – **Target Date: Post-Expansion into Tahiti and NADI – Action to TBD**
6. Truncation of ABI's. How extensive is the problem? **Target Date: ISPAC/21 – Action to Airways NZ**
7. Examine uses of alternative route uplink messages (i.e. UL80) **Target Date: ISPACG/21 – Action to Airways NZ**

Action Plan for ISSUE VI, A-4: Expansion of UPR Programs

Status Items:

1. New Zealand-Australia UPR expansion within the Southern Tasman
 - a. Dependent on implementation of TAAATS Conflict Probe. ***Outlook Date: Late 2007.***
 - b. Guidelines are currently being created for the use of UPR's in the Tasman. ***Outlook Date: Mid 2007.***
 - c. Monitor HF congestion and accuracy issues in the South Pacific associated with Tasman UPR implementation. ***Outlook Date: Post implementation***
2. NADI is currently accepting UPRs on all city pairs for FANS aircraft only due to HF congestion considerations.

What can be accomplished prior to the next ISPACG?

1. UPR expansion on city pairs into the Western Pacific.
 - a. Trial UPR flight plans for analysis on desired city pairs. ***Target Date: October - Action to Air Services.***
2. Information exchange with Air New Zealand to discuss what additional city pair routes make sense for UPR expansion. ***Target Date: October - Action to Airways NZ***
3. Trials for UPR gateways closer to Auckland destinations. ***Target Date: December - Action to Airways NZ***
4. Honolulu to Sydney UPR's – For FANS aircraft only. Provision to include the filing of FIR boundaries. Define UPR gateways on the Honolulu airspace boundary. ***Target Date: October - Action to FAA.***

Action Plan for ISSUE VII, A-3:

AIDC Implementation and Improvement – Implementation of and enhancement to version2

Status Items:

1. Auckland – Fully AIDC v.2 ICD compliant.
 - a. With Oakland: ABI, CDN and CPL message exchange with no voice backup requirement.
 - b. With Brisbane: ABI and EST. Partial CDN. Block levels planned for end of 2006.
 - c. With NADI: ABI and EST. Outlook for expansion to block levels and weather deviations is TBD.
 - d. With Tahiti: ABI and EST (No ICD header). Outlook for expansion is Early 2008.
 - e. Santiago: ABI, Block level and Weather Deviation (manual process from Santiago to Auckland). No outlook for expansion.
2. NADI – Partial AIDC v.2 ICD compliant. (Optional fields not currently supported).
 - a. With Oakland: No AIDC. Planned testing September
 - b. With Auckland: ABI and EST. Outlook for expansion to block levels and weather deviations is TBD.
 - c. With Brisbane: ABI and EST. Outlook for expansion to block levels and weather deviations is TBD. Outlook: Block levels – December.
3. Tahiti – Partial AIDC v.2 ICD compliant.
 - a. With Auckland: ABI and EST (No ICD header). Outlook for expansion is Early 2008.
 - b. With Oakland: Testing to begin Outlook: September
4. Oakland – Fully AIDC v.2 ICD compliant.
 - a. With Auckland: ABI, CDN and CPL message exchange with no voice backup requirement.
 - b. With NADI: No AIDC. Planned testing September
 - c. With Tahiti: Testing to begin Outlook: November
 - d. With Fukuoka: Partial AIDC v.2 ICD compliant. Outlook for full AIDC v.2 is 2008.
 - e. With Anchorage: Partial AIDC v.2 ICD compliant. Outlook for full AIDC v.2 is November
 - f. With Brisbane: ABI and EST only. Outlook: Block levels – December.
5. Brisbane – Partial AIDC v.2 ICD compliant.
 - a. With Auckland: ABI and EST. Partial CDN. Outlook: Block levels – December.
 - b. With NADI: ABI and EST. Outlook for expansion to block levels and weather deviations is TBD. Outlook: Block levels – December.
 - c. With Oakland: ABI and EST only. Outlook: Block levels – December.

What can be accomplished prior to the next ISPACG?

1. Brisbane will test and implement the exchange of Block Levels with Auckland, NADI and Oakland. ***Target Date: December – Action to Air Services Australia.***

2. Testing of AIDC message exchange will begin between Oakland and NADI. ***Target Date: September – Action to FAA and NADI***
3. Testing of AIDC message exchange will begin between Oakland and Tahiti. ***Target Date: November – Action to FAA and Tahiti***
4. Work is underway in the completion outstanding tasks and error correction for the AIDC v.2 ICD. Target ***Date: December – Action to Air Services, Airways NZ and FAA.***