ICAO International Civil Aviation Organization
North American, Central American and Caribbean Office

Seventh ATS Interfacility Data Communication (AIDC) and North American Interface Control Document (NAM/ICD) Implementation Follow-Up Meeting for the NAM/CAR Regions (AIDC/NAM/ICD/7)

(On-line, 17 May 2024)

Summary of Discussions

Date	17 May 2024
Location	On-line
Participants	The Workshop was attended by 29 delegates from 10 States/Territories and one representative of the industry from the NAM/CAR Regions. The list of participants is shown in **Attachment A.** The agenda is presented in **Attachment B.**

1. Objectives

1.1 The objective of the meeting was to follow up on regional planning and implementation of ATS Inter Facility Data Communications (AIDC) and the North American Interface Control Document (NAM/ICD) for the NAM/CAR Regions in their different phases and update the regional implementation plan, as well as follow up on the updating of AIDC-related projects.

2. Discussion

2.1 The Meeting began with introducing the new rapporteurs of the NACC/WG/AIDC/TF Task Force, Messrs. Luis Fuentes and Luciano Rojas Almonte.

2.2 Mr. Fuentes indicated he was pleased with the work done and the opportunity to lead this group.

2.3 During the meeting, an update was made on the contact points of the States for the implementation work of the automated channels and to view the implementation status of both protocols was updated. The information can be found in **Attachment C** of this SoD.

2.4 Cuba, through WP/02, illustrated the status of automatic coordination in the Habana Flight Information Region (FIR) (MUFH), the efforts to achieve its implementation with all adjacent areas, and details the workload between MUFH areas. and the Kingston FIR (MKJK).

2.5 Cuba has implemented the Class I NAM/ICD with almost all adjacent FIRs but indicated the importance of putting into operation the automated channel between the Habana FIR and the Kingston FIR. In this SoD, special reference is made to the status of coordination with the MKJK FIR due to the importance this has for both FIRs, with the exchange of flights on the border of the two airspaces being a significant volume of operations, which results in the workload of the controllers of both Habana and Kingston Area Control Centres (ACCs).

2.6 United States, through P/02, presented the new version of the NAM/ICD protocol. This new version, revision G, includes changes for the automation of control transfer messages, in addition to presenting the current state of implementation of the NAM/ICD protocol in the region. United States also indicated the advantages that the new Caribbean Air Navigation Services Network (CANSNET) will provide in the region, especially for the implementation of the NAM/ICD that requires redundant and dedicated channels to carry out the implementation in its phase III.

2.7 United States through the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) continues to work on automation, using Controller-Pilot Data Link Communications (CPDLC) through the 20 United States Air Traffic Control Centres. Additionally, Canada and United States have agreed to link the transfer of data communications to voice communications across the border using the NAM ICD automated handover that combines "non-voice transfer of control" into the automation transaction. As a result of this implementation and the integration of additional systems, the need for Field 18 data in Current Flight Plans (CPLs) becomes very important to operations and airlines.

2.8 The Secretariat reviewed the tasks under the responsibility of the Group, one of these tasks was to establish the mechanism for measuring the implementation of the AIDC and NAM/ICD protocols at the level of the NAM/CAR Region. In this regard, we worked with United States and COCESNA and the following measurement mechanism was established:

- AIDC messages would be taken as 100% implemented as the channel is operational.
- The NAM/ICD protocol messages are established as follows: 30% with Phase I implementation (notification messages), Phase II 40% additional (coordination messages), and finally when Phase III is operating, the 30% remaining.

2.9 **Attachment D** presents the current level of implementation in the NAM/CAR Regions, which shows that the implementation percentage is 48.76%.

2.10 As part of the activities and monitoring of the CAR/SAM Planning and Implementation Regional Group (GREPECAS), the work done to comply with Conclusion GREPECAS/21/13 was shared with the Group:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">CONCLUSIÓN GREPECAS/21/13</td><td colspan="2">ACTIONS TO ADVANCE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE D-ATIS AND THE DCL</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">What:
That the Secretariat to prepare a regional CAR/SAM guidance document, in collaboration with all stakeholders, including guidelines to facilitate cost-benefit analysis, on the implementation of the Automatic Terminal Information Service by Data Link - ATIS digital (D-ATIS) and Departure Clearence by Data Link (DCL) by GREPECAS/22.</td><td>Expected impact:
☐ Politics / Global
☒ Interregional
☒ Economics
☒ Environmental
☒ Technical/Operational</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Why:
To promote the implementation of D-ATIS and DCL services for ATS units at international airports, with a view to obtaining safety barriers that eliminate possible failures in the understanding of critical flight safety information, in pilot-controller communication.</td></tr>
<tr><td>When:</td><td>GREPECAS/22</td><td>Status:</td><td>☒ Valid / ☐ Invalid / ☐ Completed</td></tr>
<tr><td>Who:</td><td colspan="2">☐ States ☒ ICAO ☒ Other:</td><td>Responsible: NACC/WG and SAM/IG</td></tr>
</table>

2.11 The Meeting agreed to form an Ad hoc Group to comply with this request of said GREPECAS Conclusion, led by the Secretariat. The details of this agreement will be coordinated by the Secretariat at a later date.

2.12 It was also decided to support the implementation of the canal between Cuba and Jamaica. Cuba will send the people who will make up the Working Group. ICAO will coordinate with Jamaica and ultimately Thales will support this implementation.

3. Meeting Schedule and Activities

3.1 The meeting documentation, as well as the recording of the event, can be found at the following link: https://www.icao.int/NACC/Pages/meetings-2024-namicd07.aspx

— — — — — —— —— ——

Seventh ATS Interfacility Data Communication (AIDC) and North American Interface Control Document (NAM/ICD) Implementation Follow-Up Meeting for the NAM/CAR Regions
Séptima Reunión de seguimiento de la implantación de Comunicaciones de Datos entre Instalaciones ATS (AIDC) y el Documento de Control de Interfaz de América del Norte (NAM/ICD) para las regiones NAM/CAR (AIDC/NAM/ICD/7)

On-line, 17 May 2024 / En línea, 17 de mayo 2024

ATTACHMENT/ADJUNTO

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

BAHAMAS
1. Earl Rahming
2. Elton Joseph
3. Sheano Dorsett

BARBADOS
4. Deidree Butterfield-Williams
5. Roderick Oliver
6. John Parris

COSTA RICA
7. Warren Quiros

CUBA
8. Orlando Nevot

CURAÇAO/CURAZAO
9. Jacques Lasten

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC/REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA
10. Luciano Rojas Almonte

HONDURAS
11. Reybin Sanabria
12. Arlix venancio ortiz
13. Luis Manuel Coello Flores
14. Alberto Josue Zuniga

MEXICO/MÉXICO
15. Ernesto Trujillo

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO/TRINIDAD Y TABAGO
16. Kent Ramnarace-Singh
17. Naresh Seeparsad
18. Ann Edwards
19. Varun Sookra
20. Rupnarine Baboolal
21. Kevin Brown
22. Ian Gomez
23. Ashley Lalman

UNITED STATES/ESTADOS UNIDOS
24. Alfredo Costa
25. Rudolp Lawrence
26. Keith Dutch
27. Al ONeill

THALES
28. Govind Vekaria

ICAO/OACI
29. Mayda Avila

Seventh NAM/CAR Air Traffic Services Inter-facility Data Communication (AIDC) and North American Interface Control Document (NAM/IDC) Implementation Follow-up Meeting (AIDC/NAM/ICD/7)

Online, 17 May 2024

ATTACHMENT B
PROVISIONAL AGENDA

Agenda Item 1: Adoption of the Provisional Agenda

Agenda Item 2: Review of the Implementation Status of Automated Protocols

Agenda Item 3: Presentation of the Status of the Activities of the NACC/WG/AIDC Task Force

Agenda Item 4: Other Business

PROVISIONAL AGENDA
EXPLANATORY NOTES

Agenda Item 1: Adoption of the Provisional Agenda and Schedule

Under this agenda item, the Meeting will review and adopt the agenda. The objectives and general expectations of the meeting will be presented.

Agenda Item 2: Review of the Implementation Status of Automated Protocols

Each participating State will provide the implementation status of its automated channels and subsequent steps. Additionally, the regional implementation plan will be updated with this information.

Agenda Item 3: Presentation of the Status of the Activities of the NACC/WG/AIDC Task Force

The Group's rapporteurs will present a summary of the activities developed within the Group, in the same way the 2024 action plan of the Task Force will be updated.

Agenda Item 4: Other Business.

Under this agenda item, the Meeting will review other relevant and/or pertinent matters.

— — — — — — — — — — —

Attachment C / Adjunto C

State/ Organization	System	Point of contact	Network Bandwidth	Comments	Milestones/Obstacles
Bahamas	INDRA AIRCON 2100*	•EARL RAHMING CNS DEPUTY DIRECTOR earl.rahming@bansabahamas.com •BRYAN WILSON DEPUTY DIRECTOR AIR TRAFFIC OPERATIONS bryan.wilson@bansabahamas.com •JASON SAUNDERS DEPUTY DIRECTOR AIRSPACE & PROCEDURE jason.saunders@bansabahamas.com •ELTON JOSEPH CNS ELECTRONIC TECHNICIAN elton.joseph@bansabahamas.com	-	-	
Belize	INDRA AIRCON 2100	Gilberto Torres	AMHS: 64 Kbps	Has class 2 and 3	December – meeting in cocesna
Canada	CAATS GAATS+ (Gander Oceanic)	Troy Wilton Manager, ATM and ACC Automation (613) 248 6915 wiltont@navcanada.ca	-	-	
COCESNA	INDRA Aircon 2100 Renovado	Reybin Sanabria	N/A (the current AFTN circuit speed is 1.2 kbps internally and 9.6 kbps the internationals). COCESNA planned to change her AFTN network for a new AMHS network in	-	Class 2 next year waiting for Cuba Update of system – waiting for Cuba
Costa Rica	No - FDP Server must upgrade – Q1 2017	Warren Quirós navegacionaerea.cns@dgac.go.cr +50622314924 Jeffry Rios	AMHS: 64 Kbps	Has class 2 and 3	December – meeting in cocesna January – Training

Cuba	yes - Oracle Version 9 modified by LITA-CUBA	pendiente	AMHS: 64 Kbps*	We received many mistakes from the users in the FPL, in almost all fields. We have detected changes in the FPL forwarded by ACC´s or ANSP	Class 2. Work in progress
Curacao	-	Jacques Lasten, ATS Manager, DC-ANSP, j.lasten@dc-ansp.org Natasha Leonora-Belefanti Jozef Nicolas	AMHS: 64 Kbps	-	
Dominican Rep	Yes TopSky-ATC, Thales ATM	Pendiente	AMHS: 64 Kbps	-	Signing of phase change agreement - october 2017 Installation of test bed and update operation - September
El Salvador	INDRA Aircon 2100 Renovado	Danilo Ramírez danilo.ramirez@cepa.gob.sv	AMHS: 64 Kbps	-	
Guatemala	INDRA Aircon 2100 Renovado	Sergio Raul Enrique senriquez@gmail.com David Ascoli davidascoli@gmail.com	AMHS: 64 Kbps	-	
Haiti	-	Nadia Leopold nleopold@hotmail.com	-	-	
Jamaica	Thales Topsky In installation	Howard Greaves (howard.greaves@jcaa.gov.jm) Kevin Miller	64k	85% implementation	Training. Verify if NAM is implemented and how. If classes are as
Mexico	Yes- FDP=Topsky, Producer= THALES ATM, INFO= Four Control Centres, all Mexico covered	(pendiente de actualizar)	19200 bps 2Mbps (Atlanta/Lago Salado) (compartido con frecuencias)	Mexico already counts with the implementation of CPL/LAM information exchange between: MZT ≤ ≥ LAX, MZT	Class 2 not planned in near future
Nicaragua	INDRA Aircon 2100 Renovado		AMHS: 64 Kbps	Has class 2 and 3	December – meeting in cocesna
Trinidad and To	Leonardo	pendiente de actualizar PoC	64k		Approval phase for upgrade Upgrade will be next year. Continue testing phase

United States	Yes - Host Automation / En Route Automation Modernization(ERAM) systems. Lockheed-Martin (LMCO) is the prime contractor for the Host/ERAM system. Ocean21 provides its own FDP processing in the oceanic environment. LMCO is also the contractor for Ocean21.	they ll provide an update	US- Mexico: NADIN/AFTN 64 kbps X.25 US- Cuba : MEVA III 19.2 kbps connection to NADIN	The domestic FDP is integrated into The Host Automation / En Route Automation Modernization (ERAM) systems.. The flight data function of The San Juan Combined Center / Radar Approach Control (CERAP) is	Working Class 3 2020 estimated.

Attachment D / Adjunto D

No	Interface	State/ Organization	Adjacent State or	Bilateral Agreement or ICD	Status	Notificación	Coordinación	Transferencia	% Implementación
					NAM/ICD	30	40	30	
1	Belize-Merida	Belize	Mexico	NAM-ICD Version D	Implementing	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
2	Boston-Toronto	Canada	United States	NAM-ICD Version F	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
3	Cleveland-Montreal	Canada	United States	NAM-ICD Version F	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
4	Edmonton-Reykjavik	Canada	Iceland	NAT ICD	Operational	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
5	Edmonton-Salt Lake City	Canada	United States	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational/	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
6	Edmonton-Seattle	Canada	United States	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
7	Gander-New York	Canada	United States	NAT ICD	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
8	Gander-Prestwick	Canada	SD	NAT ICD	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
9	Gander-Reykjavik	Canada	Iceland	NAT ICD	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
10	Gander-Santa Maria	Canada	SD	NAT ICD	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
11	Moncton-New York	Canada	United States	NAM-ICD Version E	Testing	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
12	Salt Lake City-Vancouver	Canada	United States	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
13	Belize-CENAMER	COCESNA	Belize	PAC ICD	Testing	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
14	Bogota-CENAMER	COCESNA	Colombia	PAC ICD	Testing	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
15	CENAMER-Costa Rica	COCESNA	Costa Rica	PAC ICD	Testing	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
16	CENAMER-El Salvador	COCESNA	El Salvador	PAC ICD	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
17	CENAMER-Guatemala	COCESNA	Guatemala	PAC ICD	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
18	CENAMER-Guayaquil	COCESNA	Ecuador	PAC ICD	Testing	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
19	CENAMER-Havana	COCESNA	Cuba	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
20	CENAMER-Kingston	COCESNA	Jamaica	NAM-ICD Version E	Planned	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
21	CENAMER-Merida	COCESNA	Mexico	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
22	CENAMER-MAZATLAN	COCESNA	Mexico	NAM-ICD Version E	Planned	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
23	CENAMER-Nicaragua	COCESNA	Nicaragua	PAC ICD	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
24	CENAMER-Panama	COCESNA	Panama	PAC ICD	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
25	Panama-San José	Costa Rica	Panama	PAC ICD	Testing	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
26	Havana-Kingston	Cuba	Jamaica	NAM-ICD Version E	Testing	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
27	Havana-Merida	Cuba	Mexico	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
28	Havana-Miami	Cuba	United States	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
29	Havana-Port au Prince	Cuba	Haiti	0	Not planned	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
30	Curacao-Maiquetia	Curacao	Venezuela	0	Planned	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
31	Santo Domingo	Dominican Republic	Haiti	0	Not planned	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

No	Interface	State/ Organization	Adjacent State or	Bilateral Agreement or ICD	Status	Notificación	Coordinación	Transferencia	% Implementación
					NAM/ICD	30	40	30	
32	El Salvador-Guatemala	El Salvador	Guatemala	PAC ICD	Planned	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
33	El Salvador-Nicaragua	El Salvador	Nicaragua	PAC ICD	Planned	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
34	Belize-Guatemala	Guatemala	Belize	PAC ICD	Planned	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
35	Barranquilla-Kingston	Jamaica	Colombia	PAC ICD	Testing	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
36	Curacao-Kingston	Jamaica	Curacao	PAN	Planned	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
37	Kingston-Panama	Jamaica	Panama	PAN ICD V.1	Testing	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
38	Albuquerque-Mazatlán	Mexico	United States	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
39	Mazatlan-México	Mexico	Mexico	LOA	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
40	Mazatlán-Monterrey	Mexico	Mexico	LOA	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
41	Mazatlán-Oakland	Mexico	United States	PAN ICD V.1	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
42	Mérida-México	Mexico	Mexico	LOA	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
43	Mérida-Monterrey	Mexico	Mexico	LOA	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
44	México-Monterrey	Mexico	Mexico	LOA	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
45	Nicaragua-San José	Nicaragua	Costa Rica	PAC ICD	Planned	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
46	Curacao-Santo Domingo	Republic	Curacao	PAN ICD V.1	Planned	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
47	Maiquetia-PIARCO	Tobago	Venezuela	0	Planned	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
48	New York-PIARCO	Tobago	United States	PAC ICD	Testing	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
49	PIARCO-San Juan/Miami	Trinidad and Tobago	United States	NAM-ICD Version D	Testing	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
50	French Guyanne- PIARCO	Trinidad and Tobago	French Guyanne	PAC ICD	Planned	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
51	Albuquerque-Monterrey	United States	Mexico	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
52	Anchorage-Edmonton	United States	Canada	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
53	Anchorage-Vancouver	United States	Canada	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
54	Boston-Moncton	United States	Canada	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
55	Boston-Montreal	United States	Canada	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
56	Cleveland-Toronto	United States	Canada	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
57	Houston-Merida	United States	Mexico	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
58	Houston-Monterrey	United States	Mexico	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
59	Los Angeles-Mazatlan	United States	Mexico	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%
60	Miami-Nassau	United States	Bahamas	NAM-ICD Version E	Planned	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
61	Miami-Santo Domingo	United States	Republic	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%
62	Minneapolis-Toronto	United States	Canada	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

No	Interface	State/ Organization	Adjacent State or	Bilateral Agreement or ICD	Status	Notificación	Coordinación	Transferencia	% Implementación
					NAM/ICD	30	40	30	
63	Minneapolis-Winnipeg	United States	Canada	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
64	Oakland-Vancouver	United States	Canada	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
65	Salt Lake City-Winnipeg	United States	Canada	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
66	San Juan-Santo Domingo	United States	Republic	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
67	Seattle-Vancouver	United States	Canada	NAM-ICD Version E	Operational	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
									48.76%