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**

Standardisation of expressions within the AIDC ICD

(Presented by Australia)

SUMMARY

This discussion paper presents a number of issues regarding standardisation within the AIDC ICD. A number of errors have also been identified.

1.   Background

1.1   Within the AIDC ICD, different abbreviations or formats have occasionally been used in referring to the same item. This paper lists a number of these inconsistencies, and discussion is sought to reach agreement on a common expression or abbreviation.

1.2   There are also a number of relatively minor (textual) errors that also need to be corrected. Rather than raise a new working paper for each one, they have simply been listed in this paper for further discussion.

2.   Inconsistencies identified

2.1   Inconsistencies identified within the AIDC ICD are described below.

2.2   Different expressions have been used for "air traffic services unit". Different usage observed includes:

- ATS Unit; and
- ATSU.

A common term needs to be agreed upon, and used consistently throughout the document.

2.3   Different expressions have been used to identify "Asia Pacific". Terms seen include:

- "Asia Pacific"; and
- "ASIA/PAC"; and
- "A/P".

A common term needs to be agreed upon, and used consistently throughout the document.

2.4   Different abbreviations have been used to refer to the International Alphabet printable character set. Abbreviations observed include:

- "IA 5"; and
- "IA-5"

These should be replaced with "IA5"

3.   Errors identified

3.1   Text errors identified within the AIDC ICD are described below:

3.2   Appendix A-8, paragraph 2.4.2.1 describes the method in which an AIDC MIS message may be addressed to a functional address rather than to a specific flight. The technique to do this involves "preceding the address with an oblique stroke (\)". Examples of MIS messages are provided in Appendix A-9, paragraph 2.4.2.3. However the example using a functional address is preceded by a backslash (/), rather than an oblique stroke (\).

3.3   In the Table of Contents, under Appendix A, 2.5.1 the "LAM" is described as a "**Local** Acknowledgement Message", rather than a "**Logical** Acknowledgement Message"

3.4   Throughout the document, the hyphenated "Inter-facility" is used rather than the ICAO term "Interfacility".

3.5   Throughout the document, AIDC is referred to as "ATS Inter-facility Ground/Ground Data Communications" rather than the ICAO term "ATS Interfacility Data Communications".

3.6   The format of the AIDC MAC message is described in Appendix A-5, paragraph 2.2.4.2. In this description, Fields 16 and 22 have been duplicated as allowable fields of this message.

4.   Recommendation

4.1   Task Force members are invited to discuss the inconsistencies and errors raised in this discussion paper. If common agreement can be reached on a solution for each issue, the agreed item should be considered for inclusion in the updated AIDC ICD.

*   *   *