

January 15, 2016

## Summary of notes from meeting with CBAACAA – 8th Jan 2016

**Attendees:** Jim Ferrier & Chris DeJager

**To:** John Ainsworth – Air Navigation Data  
Marinus Waterberg – Direct Approach Consulting Inc.  
Ed MacDonald - JetPro

Ed, Marinus and John,

I was very glad to hear from you all that you have seen an improvement in the genuine efforts to improve the processes involved in delivery of approach design requests from customers. NAV CANADA's AIM remains committed to improving the processing of EDO designs, and has doubled the number of dedicated staff to QA activities, with a resulting improvement in addressing the backlog of EDO designs needing publishing. The additional staff and improvements in electronic processing, described below, will help address the increasing inventory of EDO provided designs.

### **STANDARD:**

NAV CANADA has provided access to the TP308 interpretations website to all EDOs with a NAV CANADA Connexion account. This website contains validated interpretations provided by Transport Canada and hosted by NAV CANADA to ensure there is one place where EDOs can find the information. There have been delays based on criteria implementation. The establishment of this review site will help remove some of these delays.

### **FORM SUBMISSION PROCESS:**

NAV CANADA (NC) has initiated a process to improve the form submission processing and in doing so has offered CAIPD members the opportunity to help by repopulating existing submissions in the queue (without loss of priority) and be compensated for this activity. Currently only one CAIPD member has followed up on this offer. Testing of the resulting submission is in progress and this improvement is intended to save 1-2 days of effort in processing during criteria assessment of designs. The EDOs are also asked for feedback on this automated process. Please note that support of submission types cannot be different for each EDO as it is today, or NC risks having a different process for all. The first have been received Jan 11 for testing from an EDO. I encourage you all to participate in what is in affect a BETA test but with compensation for your efforts.

### **SUBMISSION MANUAL & QA CHECKLIST:**

NAV CANADA is considering adding the QA checklist to the Submission Manual in order to show what is being checked and validated by NAV CANADA for each design. Also, CBAACAA and NAV CANADA spoke of the challenges with charts being submitted and that they do not necessarily match the submitted design content. NAV CANADA had offered in the past to train EDOs on the CAP specification.

NAV CANADA will renew this offer with the roll out of the new manual with the provision that charts submitted are for illustration purposes only and do not constitute publishable copyright within the AIP products of Canada. This is current process so it should not impede working together to speed publishing of designs.

#### **FLIGHT CHECK REPORT**

NAV CANADA is considering the allowance of a delayed submission on a flight check report, meaning it is not required upon original submission but will be required before AIRAC of the design. This will improve service to aerodromes and sponsors. This also means that the declaration of flight check will be updated from a signature on a form to the submission of the flight check report. Regulatory audits have recently signaled a desire to review the submitted information by EDOs supporting NAV CANADA's SMS actions in accepting and publishing 3rd party designs. This can be discussed further as there is no intention to require flight check reports to follow a NAV CANADA format, rather an understanding and approval of the existing formats used by EDOs and acceptable to TC.

#### **DATA**

CBAAC commented on Sponsorship of designs by third parties and survey data. NAV CANADA as stipulated by TC can only accept design data that is provided by the aerodrome. So long as the Aerodrome provides a letter saying the sponsor is operating with knowledge of the aerodrome within a specific scope then NAV CANADA can process the information more expeditiously.

NAV CANADA and CBAAC discussed the need to coordinate submissions of aerodrome data as NAV CANADA is implementing a data tolerance policy similar to the FAA. This policy means aerodrome data submitted to NAV CANADA, if within the tolerance, may not be applied immediately to the aerodrome, and therefore not used within the subsequent designs. This will allow for some tolerance on the survey data and speed up acceptance. As an example, a change in a coordinate of 1 ft. would not drive a series of changes across all designs at an aerodrome, as it does today.

This also means that EDOs need to use survey data provided by NAV CANADA as the authoritative source for designs. The practice of conducting a survey, using it for a design, and then submitting both to NAV CANADA will cause challenges for both parties.

For clarity EDOs can provide survey data to NC under the authority of the aerodrome. Once this has been received and integrated into the NC databases, then NC would reissue this data for use as base data for the designs. NC has no desire to do surveys for aerodromes, their only committed support is through COPA for the establishment of Survey Kits that an aerodrome request uses of and we will provide. NC does not actively market this to aerodromes as a service.

So in short the EDOs could still do the survey if required but submit that data to the respective Aerodrome management who would in turn submit that data to NC who would then add it to the NC database.

I think many of us have spent some productive time to sort this out. My overall impression is that the new management in place at AIM has one very focused goal and that is to reduce the delivery time of the designs. They will work with you and need your cooperation to make that happen.

NC has taken numerous steps as a result of your inputs and I now encourage you all to individually contact Jim Ferrier and Chris DeJager for any additional comments and most of all how you can help each other professionally.

Thank you all for creating this opportunity to move forward.

Respectfully yours,



Rudy Toering