International Civil Aviation Organization

AIDC Review Task Force Meeting

Brisbane, Australia, 27-28 March 2003

Agenda Item 3: **Develop an updated version of the Asia/Pacific ICD for AIDC**

CLARIFICATION OF "EXPECTED APPLICATION RESPONSE" IN THE AIDC ICD

SUMMARY

This working paper attempts to clarify the requirements for re-transmission of an AIDC message.

(Presented by Australia)

1.   Background

1.1   Appendix D, paragraph 2.3.1.3 of the AIDC ICD refers to an "expected application response". It is not explicitly clear what this response actually is.

2.   Discussion

2.1   The "expected application response" in paragraph 2.3.1.3 could be interpreted simply as a LAM (as this would be the most commonly *expected* response). If this was the case however, the resultant action (retransmission of the original message with the original message identification number), would result in the transmission of an error message (as per Appendix D paragraph 2.2.2). Further investigation indicates that the meaning of "expected application response" is intended to refer to *any* application response – ie either an acknowledgement or rejection message.

2.2   In view of this interpretation, the amendment as described below in paragraph 3.1 is proposed.

3.   Proposed amendment

3.1   Amend paragraph 2.3.1.3 as follows:

"2.3.1.3   Failure to receive an expected application response (ie an LAM or LRM) within T_r seconds (T_{alarm}) shall result in a re-transmission (up to a maximum number N_R) of the original message, using the same information contained in optional data fields 2 and 3 found in the original message header. The timeout timer T_r shall be reset upon re-transmission. Failure to receive an application response within T_{alarm} seconds from the original transmission of the message shall result in a warning being issued"."

4.   Recommendation

4.1   AIDC task force member are requested to discuss the interpretation described above, and as necessary adopt the proposed amendment.