Aeronautical Telecommunications Network Panel
(ATNP)

A Meeting of the Systems Planning and Concept
Joint Working Group #4

June 21, 1996

DRAFT MINUTES

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

0. Opening Remarks

0.1 Mr. K. Platz, Chairman of the Joint Working Group opened the meeting and expressed his appreciation to all the experts who had attended. He welcomed all on behalf of DFS Germany. Mr Platz advised the group on the administrative arrangements of the meeting.

0.2 There were 37 experts from 12 countries and 7 International Organizations who attended the meeting. The list of attendees is attached as Appendix A.

1. Approval of Agenda and Distribution of Working Papers

1.1 The draft Agenda was introduced, slight changes were made and the agenda was accepted, which is attached as Appendix C.

1.2 The meeting reviewed the list of Working papers (a total of 7 papers), and all members were issued copies of papers they did not yet have.

2. Report from Secretariat

2.1 *New ATNP Workplan*. WP1 was presented by M. Paydar. The members were asked to ensure that the Appendices were attached (Appendix A through E). Mr. Paydar reviewed Appendix E to the WP which is the new Work program for the panel.

2.2 *Agenda and dates for ATNP/2*. The secretary reviewed the arrangements for the panel meeting to take place in November 1996. Appendix A overviews the agenda for the second meeting. He noted that the term CNS/ATM-1 was not to be used in Annex 10. It will be used in non-formal documents and references to the first package only. Appendix B details the location of the meeting and the logistics for the members attending. Mr. Paydar assured the group that there would be no delays for the meeting due to the construction and the move to the new premises.

2.3 *New ANC guidelines for SARPs*. Appendix D to the WP details the new structure of the SARP material being produced. He introduced the "core part" and the Appendix to the document. Mr.Paydar referenced the material designed by WG1 for the core part. It is the intention that the Appendix would no longer be translated. This would alleviate the lengthy process for defect reporting status.

2.4 The secretary announced that there was a new member to the ATNP, a Brazilian member.

2.5 The secretary stated that he understood the concern that the WG had with respect to the completion of the SARPs and validation activities for the panel meeting. He also stated that there was the plan to have a Working Group of the Whole in Feb-Mar 1997 time frame where these issues would be addressed.

2.6 *Rapporteur pre-briefing before the ATNP second meeting*. This briefing is to occur 15 minutes before the opening of ATNP/2. The rapporteurs expressed their concerns with regards to this information session. It was agreed that this briefing will require more time to review the material that will be presented. The rapporteurs made some suggestions to extend this time which was accepted by M. Paydar to allow 1 hour before the opening of the meeting. It was suggested that an information package be sent to the panel members before the meeting. It was suggested that

the material be sent out 2 weeks after this meeting. If the members have any technical concerns they are welcomed to join in the Working Group meetings in October.

2.7 The Italian member of the ATNP is no longer available, please refrain from sending correspondence .

3. Working Methodology for ATNP/2

3.1 R. Jones commented on the validation work and activities. It was suggested that the group identify the parts that have been validated and those that have not yet been completed. The WGs must clarify these objectives to provide clear goals for the completion of validation work.

3.2 Eurocontrol and the US have several validation activities that are ongoing. It seems highly unlikely that the new software will not be available until the new year. It was decided that the information on validation activities will be addressed at the Working Group of the Whole meeting in the February-March 1997 time frame.

4. Status Reports of the ATN SARPs from Rapporteurs of WG1, WG2 and WG3

4.1 Rapporteur of WG1 report. T. Calow reported on the meeting that occurred during 17-20 June 1996 in Munich, Germany. A total of 19 deliverables will be submitted to the ATNP/2 for acceptance. The following are the WG1 papers that will be submitted as WG1 papers to the ATNP/2:

- WP5-10   core part of ATN SARPs
- WP 5-11   Guidance Material for core part of Chapter 3
- WP 5-12   Sub-Volume 1 SARPs
- WP 5-13   Guidance Material for Sub-Volume 1
- WP 5-14   cover paper for Sub-Volume 1
- WP 5-15   WP for Part1
- WP 5-17   WG1 Rapporteur report
- WP 5-19   cover document for 5-18
- WP 5-21   Lexicon
- WP 5-22a   Addressing Concept cover paper for 5-22
- WP 5-25   AFTN procedures
- WP 5-27   cover paper forWP5-30
- WP 5-28   cover for WP 5-29
- WP 5-31   Institutional Issues

The cover papers will be the only documents translated for the meeting. This is a special provision of the ANC.

4.1.1 A few of the WG1 deliverables still require additional editorial work. The rapporteur had proposed a meeting in July 1996 complete these activities. This proposal was accepted and will occur in Halifax Nova Scotia,

4.2 Rapporteur of WG2 report. A. Sharma reported on the activities that have occurred during WG2 meetings. The WG2 SARPs are considered stable and a detailed editorial review has occurred. The one outstanding issue in the SARPs is the VDL issue. This is related to the AMCP SARPs that have also stated requirements in their current SARPs.

4.2.1 WG2 Guidance Material has not received extensive work and has yet to be reviewed in detail by the Working Group. The WG will review this material during the October meeting in Virginia.

4.2.2 The WG2 validation report will be made available. At the panel meeting we will be able to identify the completed areas and the areas that are deficient.

4.2.3 The papers for WG2 submission to ATNP/2 are as follows:
- Overall WG2 activities
- Introduction to SARPs and Guidance
- Package 2 Internet requirements
- SARPs version 6
- Change maintenance/control methodology
- Approach to package 2 requirements

4.3 Rapporteur of WG3 report. Ron Jones, Rapporteur of WG3, reported on the status of the WG3 activities. The WG3 met in Brisbane (Feb 96) and Brussels (April 96). The main topics that were covered are the validation activities, the completion of SARP material and final WG3 timeline. In general, the material produced at the end of the meeting was editorially and technically sound.

4.3.1 *MHS & ICC (AIDC).* A number of tasks were accomplished since Brussels editorially. Some changes to the services were made and version 1.0z will be reviewed at the WG3 meeting in Munich. MHS is currently undergoing validation activities in the US.

4.3.2 *Air/ground.* These SARPs had an initial baseline in Banff. Editorial changes have been incorporated since. This will provide provisions for the non-use of DSC.

4.3.3 *ULA SARPs.* They are relatively stable.

4.3.4 *Validation of A/G and ULA.* The following are the validation activities that have been recorded:
1. type A gateway implementation that incorporates ULA (US)
2. ULA in support of A/G applications (US)
3. validation of 3 of 4 A/G applications as well as ULA (Eurocontrol)

The General feeling is that:
- ULA will be up and running by ATNP/2
- CM will be validated by ATNP/2
- FIS ATIS has not undergone any activity
- ADS has the potential to be validated by ATNP/2
- CPDLC is unlikely to be validated by ATNP/2

4.3.5 WG3 has proposed several WPs to be submitted at ATNP/2:

        Sub-Volume 2
        1.   Part 1
        2.   Part 2
        3.   Part 3
        4.   Part 4

        Sub-Volume 3
        5.   Part 1
        6.   Part 2

        7.   Sub-Volume 4

8. A WG 3 Rapporteur´s Report, in the form of a working paper for ATNP/2, summarizing the activities and progress of WG3 since ATNP/1 will be submitted by mid-July.

9. A WG3 working paper to ATNP/2 will must be prepared at Munich proposing work program items for ATNP/3.

4.4 It was requested that the list of WPs for ATNP/2 be completed. The WPs from all 3 Rapporteurs to ATNP/2 is attached for review.

4.5 *Guidance Material*. Significant new guidance material will not be prepared by August. It will not have the appropriate review and acceptance by the WGs. A decision must be made by the panel as to whether the guidance material should be attached as green pages, a circular or a manual. The ANC had not discussed the subject in great detail as the current working priority is the completion of the SARPs. An explanation of the 2 methods is as follows:

- Green pages: They are to be reviewed by States at the same time as SARPs. They will be published at the same time as SARPs. It is a concern that it will make Annex 10 too voluminous.

- Manual: This material can be submitted at any time. There are no editorial constraints imposed by ICAO. However, it will take a significant amount of time before it is published.

4.6 **WP5** S. Van Trees presented this paper on matters of style for the SARPs. It was recommended that this version supersede the paper originally introduced at the Brussels WG2 & WG3 meeting. It was suggested that the SARPs that are the outcome of the Munich WG2 & WG3 meeting be converted to WordPerfect and Corel Presentation. There will be no editorial changes permitted after that time. WG2 & WG3 are asked to follow guidelines.

4.7 **WP6** A. Sharma presented this paper which highlights the issues related to the language and the Word Perfect Translation of the ATN SARPs. This paper proposes potential problems that may occur during the translation and conversion of the SARPs. ICAO recognizes these potential problems with the entire conversion process. The ICAO secretary stated that only the panel can make recommendations to ICAO not the JWG. Therefore, we cannot change the process or timeline of translation and conversion. A version of the Word format of the SARPs must be kept and maintained as an unofficial version. ICAO only provides editorial services, the ownership does not belong to organization. Theoretically, they do not become ICAO property until March 1998. The ATNP must refer to them as "draft SARPs" until that time. ICAO does not provide configuration control for the purpose of defect reporting. The update of draft SARPS should occur at the panel level.   The three WGs must take on the responsibility of defect reporting, document control and validation reporting by determining a baseline.

4.7.1 The core part of Chapter 3 will be debated at ATNP/2 and the Appendix will be amended at the WGW in March.

4.7.2 The meeting was reminded that the ATNP was the first panel that was able to deviate from the strict objectives set out by the commission. We were reminded that we are not working in the normal process and must officially identify baseline packages of SARPs.

4.7.3 It was suggested that there be one control document and a responsible person for each of the Sub-Volumes. This would control the unofficial versions of the SARPs.

4.7.4 The group was reminded that the conversion to WP is inevitable all raporteurs are requested to convert all SARPs to Word Perfect by the end of the Munich meeting.

4.8 **WP2** R. Jones presented the proposed format for the ATN SARPs validation report. It highlighted the structure and strategy to be taken for the compilation of all SARP validation results. All material should be presented in the report including system level requirements The paper also proposes a method of handling the defects found during validation activities. The meeting agreed on the method proposed for the validation report strategy. It will be presented to WG2 and WG3 for approval. The document will eventually include a compilation of all results from the validation activities. It must be noted, however, that not all activities will have been completed by the time of ATNP/2 and will therefore not be reported.

4.9 The rapporteurs are to co-ordinate the papers to be submitted to ATNP/2. Co-ordination must also be done for the papers to be presented by individual states.

5. Progress on Validation for all Sub-Volumes

5.1 **WP3** was presented by R.Jones. The paper was presented as information on the paper to be presented by the WG rapporteurs to ATNP/2. There must be a section that proposes a recommendations or an "action by the meeting" section.

6. Future Work Programme

6.1 The 3 WGs would remain in existence to continue with validation coordination and defect reports and resolution.

6.2 It was suggested that a specific coordination vehicle be proposed for the panels to interface with one another. This idea was originally suggested during ATNP/1 and was unsuccessful at creating this coordination. The rapporteurs have all agreed that it would be beneficial as the past ad-hoc meetings with the ADSP have been very successful.   T. Calow has volunteered to draft a paper that will be reviewed in Halifax to summarize these points and make a proposal to ATNP/2.

6.3 **WP4** Al Burgemeister presented this paper on the proposed defect reporting scheme following ATNP/2. The methods proposed are similar to those followed by the Configuration Control Board of WG2. It was agreed that something on this topic must be done and presented by the WGs (2&3) to ATNP/2. IATA has volunteered to submit a paper to clarify the procedures for this endeavor.

7. Other Business

7.1 Flimsy #2 was introduced to the meeting by S. Pearce. It is the introduction to a new system level requirement for inclusion in Sub-Volume 1. This requirement is the proposed system level requirement that states that the ATN can guarantee message delivery. The meeting agreed with the proposal and suggested that an additional note be added. It will have to be proposed for inclusion in Sub-Volume 1 at the Halifax meeting in July, 1996.

7.2 **WP7** was introduced by R. Jones for the validation meeting in October. This meeting is for all 3 WGs from 7 October to 18 October. The arrangements are detailed in the paper.

7.3 K Platz called for interest in hosting the February Joint Working Group meeting.

7.4 The meeting was adjourned at 16:50