



**Guidelines for the annotation of data not compliant with Commission
Regulation (EU) No 73/2010 (ADQ).
(Edition 0.3)**

Part Edition No.	Part Edition Issue Date	Part Author	Reason for Change
0.1	11/01/2011	M.Rodrigues	First Edition
0.2	15/01/2011	M.Unterreiner	Introduction of alternatives
0.3	05/04/2011	M.Rodrigues	Internal Review

INTRODUCTION

Commission Regulation (EU) 73/2010 (ADQ) Article 7(2) requires that '*Aeronautical information service providers shall ensure that aeronautical data and aeronautical information items published in their AIPs are annotated to indicate those that do not meet the data quality requirements of this regulation*'.

This Regulation shall be applied as from 1st July 2013 for all the aeronautical data and information published or modified after this date [Article 15(1)]. However, the Regulation also provides a transitional provision which allows an extended period, until the 30th June 2017, to bring in line the aeronautical data and information published before the 1st July 2013 [Article 14(2)].

Why to annotate?

It is because of this transitional period that AISP shall include an annotation in all data and aeronautical information items which are not yet published according to the data quality requirements as defined by ADQ. The sheer aim of such an annotation is to notify the users that specific quality requirements are not met and may, therefore, compel limitations in the operational use of the relevant data.

NEED FOR A HARMONISED APPROACH

It is obvious that a common, harmonized method is required which needs to be supported by guidelines. A number of different options were elaborated and the third meeting of the AI Operations Subgroup (AI Operations/3, 24-25 November 2010) concluded that the AIP GEN 1.7 section appeared to be the best compromise to notify those non compliant data items.

This solution appeared to have the following advantages:

- it is simple;
- it meets the purpose in a basic form;
- it can be implemented right away without additional significant system changes;
- it is adequate for the temporary need for these annotations;

However, there were also some disadvantages seen and the AI Operations requested that further alternatives based on the GEN 1.7 solution should be defined, which are indicated below.

GUIDELINES

The following principles apply:

- the solution shall be applied for both the eAIP and paper AIP;
- the use of the 'asterisk' shall be avoided because it is already used for WGS-84 issues;
- the procedure of annotation will be required for a limited term period only, namely for data item deficiencies between 1 July 2013 until full compliance to ADQ which shall be achieved latest by 30th June 2017;
- the incompliance shall cover all parts of the AIP, i.e. textual data and charts.

- non-compliant data items shall be individually and explicitly identified and the use of any general statement with the intention to cover a range of data items shall be avoided.
- AIP section GEN 1.7 shall be used to identify non compliant data items. A new sub-header shall be introduced at the end of the current section named: “Data incompliant with European Commission Regulation (EU) No 73/2010 (ADQ)”.

Note: The current GEN 1.7 section header “GEN 1.7 Differences from ICAO Standards, recommended practices and procedures” is considered adequate and renaming of this section is not foreseen.

It is assumed that the processes applied to create the above ‘quoted products’ need to be adjusted so that inconsistent data items, if any, can be clearly identified and traced inside a given operational environment or system.

In AIP GEN 1.7 the following two alternatives are possible. The choice of which depends on national practicalities being either based on the amount of annotations to be published or individual existing operational or technical constraints.

Alternative 1:

The AIP section GEN 1.7, following the ICAO Differences, should indicate a new sub-header: “Data not fully compliant with data quality requirements of Commission Regulation (EU) 73/2010 (ADQ)”.

Alternative 1 is recommended if the number of inconsistencies is not more than 2 AIP pages.

The relevant incompliant data items shall be listed in a table including as a minimum:

- the specific data item;
- AIP section(s) concerned;
- the reason for incompliance;
- Notes/remarks.

The proposed table format is given below:

Data Item	AIP section	Reason for Incompliance	Notes/remarks

Alternative 2:

The AIP section GEN 1.7, following the ICAO Differences, should indicate a new sub-header: “Data not fully compliant with data quality requirements of Commission Regulation (EU) 73/2010 (ADQ)”.

It would then contain a general statement to indicate: “Several data are not compliant with the given regulation – details can be accessed online via x [link].

This link shall direct the user to the external list which must meet following requirements:

- be accessible online.
Note: The indication of ‘available on request’ or similar, is clearly insufficient.
- kept up to date and synchronized with the AIP update cycles, as relevant.

This external list shall carry similar data (table) as indicated under alternative 1 but it will be made available to users external to the AIP.

Alternative 2 is recommended if the number of inconsistencies is more than 2 AIP pages.

FURTHER OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

It should be noted that any of the above alternatives assume the general principle that the ADQ non compliant data items need to be identified in some manner in the database and flagged accordingly. Procedural and operational processes will have to be defined.

The EAD is currently investigating to use the “SDO Data Completeness process” to facilitate the annotation of non-compliant data items. All fully migrated EAD clients are eligible to use this process. The flag of the annotated data items could be re-used to output the table with the list of the ADQ non compliant data items in the format agreed and to produce:

- a paper list/table to be included in AIP GEN 1.7 section; or
- an electronic report to be provided via selected online media

Consideration is also given to the possibility to use the EAD channels to publish this table. These proposals will be reviewed and validated involving the members of the AI Operations Sub-Group.

The main benefit of using the SDO Data Completeness process would be a reduction in effort and cost as SDO data completeness and ADQ annotation require similar process steps.

To try to achieve maximum harmonization possible it is recommended that, independently of the solution adopted, the table with the list of the ADQ non compliant data items would follow a common format and again the alternative 1 above would serve as the “master” in this case.

- end -