

AERONAUTICAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS NETWORK PANEL (ATNP)

WORKING GROUP MEETINGS

**October/November 1997
Redondo Beach, California USA**

Schedule for ATNP/3

Presented by Ron Jones

Summary

ATNP/2 suggested that ATNP/3 "should be tentatively scheduled for November 1998. Based on the anticipated progress of the ATNP working groups to develop mature, validated SARPs for the most critical enhancements to the ATN, there may be a benefit in delaying ATNP/3. The working groups of ATNP are requested to provide their inputs to the panel secretary so that ICAO may allocate appropriate dates for ATNP/3.

1. INTRODUCTION

ATNP/2 suggested that ATNP/3 "should be tentatively scheduled for November 1998. This allows two years between panel meeting. This means that, at the very most, the ATNP working groups have 20 months to actually develop the new/revised annex 10 materials. Since 11 months have passed since ATNP/2 only 9 months remain to produce mature/validated materials for the second edition of the ATN SARPs. Based on the progress to date and the anticipated progress of the ATNP working groups to develop mature, validated SARPs for the most critical enhancements to the ATN, there may be a benefit in delaying ATNP/3.

2. DISCUSSION

The initial ATN SARPs (i.e., Package-1), as produced by ATNP/2, was intended to define the basic set of required communications services to support mobile and fixed users as well as to define an initial set of air-ground and ground applications. The working groups of ATNP are now tasked with enhancing the ATN SARPs in a number of areas. Although

this second edition of the ATN SARPs is generally referred to as 'Package-2' it will actually be a collection of enhancements, many of which are unrelated to one another. A requirement was placed on the ATN SARPs developers that the second edition of the ATN SARPs must achieve backward compatibility with the initial ATN SARPs. It is unreasonable to expect that States and organizations implementing ATN capabilities will view the migration as being a single step from the initial ATN configuration to one fully supporting all enhancement embodied in the second edition of the ATN SARPs. Rather, the implementors can be expected to enhance their systems with only the most beneficial new capabilities, either in terms of economics or safety.

In order for the second edition of the ATN SARPs to be a meaningful improvement to the initial ATN SARPs, it must include one or more beneficial near term enhancements that States and organizations will reasonably elect to implement. If we consider the work programme approved at ATNP/2, we can expect the candidate ATN SARPs enhancements to fall into the following general categories:

- a) Technical and/or functional improvements to the initial ATN communication services that improve performance and/or better satisfy evolving operational requirements
- b) Significant new capabilities added to the ATN communication services that will potentially support certain applications and/or application features not practical with the initial ATN SARPs
- c) Technical and/or functional improvements to the initial ATN applications that yield improved performance and/or better satisfy evolving operational requirements
- d) New ATN applications that address newly defined operational requirements
- e) Capabilities required for the successful operation of the ATN, but for which the initial ATN SARPs has not established an international standard.

It is anticipated that there will be interdependencies between certain of the ATN enhancements. For example, a new application may require new functional capabilities from the ATN communication services. However, there are certain of the enhancements that may be independent of many or all of the other enhancements.

If we consider a top down approach to requirements definition, it is evident that many of the envisioned enhancements to the ATN cannot be significantly progressed until new or refined operational requirements are forthcoming from operational bodies, including ADSP. Specifically categories a) through d) above cannot be fully progressed lacking inputs on new or revised operational requirements. Since no new application requirements have been forthcoming from ADSP it now appears that a November 1998 date for ATNP/3 will effectively preclude any new user applications from being proposed at

ATNP/3 for incorporation into the ATN SARPs. This would leave the only new applications as being the 'system' oriented applications associated with X.500 directory services and perhaps some modest enhancements to the initial ATN applications.

Category e) above can be progressed without waiting for new or revised operational requirements. In fact some could argue that this category represents capabilities that should have been in the initial ATN SARPs. A prime example of this category would be systems management. By leaving systems management a local matter for the initial ATN SARPs a risk was created that initial ATN implementations would use incompatible techniques for systems management that could result in lower service availability than anticipated when viewed on a global basis. There is also a risk that differing local implementations for systems management will impede the later implementation of a compatible global standard. It is for these reasons that a strong case can be made for completing the development, validation and approval of SARPs for systems management as soon possible since these standards will probably be applied by most States and organizations to early implementations of the ATN (i.e., Package-1). Activities are now just getting underway within the United States and Europe to support the development and validation of systems management standards. The schedules for these efforts will not lead to validated SARPs for systems management until early to mid 1999 (i.e., after the tentatively planned November 1998 date for ATNP/3). A similar schedule is anticipated for the development and validation of the security enhancements to the ATN as well as the related X.500 directory service application.

3. PROPOSAL

For the reasons discussed above, it now appears very unlikely that the majority, or even the most critical tasks, of the ATNP work programme can be completed in time to support a November 1998 meeting date for ATNP/3. Therefore it is proposed to reconsider the schedule for ATNP/3. Specifically, the ATNP Working Groups are invited to endorse the concerns expressed above and to reflect these concerns in a flimsy submitted to the Working Group of the Whole. Furthermore, the proposed flimsy should request that the WGW inform the panel secretary that a delay in the meeting date for ATNP/3 is necessary in order for the ATNP working groups to sufficiently progress the work programme to the point that would justify a convening of the panel. Specifically, the WGW should be invited to request of the secretary that a two week period be reserved for ATNP/3 in September 1999.

If the above proposal is accepted by WGW then consideration needs to be given to the most appropriate schedule for future working group meetings.