



*International Civil Aviation Organization*

**Third Meeting of the RASG-MID Steering Committee  
(RSC/3)**

*(Cairo, Egypt, 9 – 11 December 2014)*

**Agenda Item 3: Regional Performance Framework for Safety**

**REVISED MID REGION SAFETY STRATEGY**

*(Presented by the Secretariat)*

**SUMMARY**

This paper presents the revised MID Region Safety Strategy as endorsed by the High-Level Briefing/Meeting during the Second MID Region Safety Summit. It also provides a progress report on the implementation of the MID Region Safety Strategy (safety indicators vs. safety targets).

Action by the meeting is at paragraph 3.

**REFERENCES**

- RASG-MID/3
- Summary of Discussions of the Second MID Safety Summit

**1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 The DGCA-MID/2 meeting (Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, 20 -22 May 2013) endorsed the MID Region Safety Strategy, which was developed by the First MID Safety Summit (Bahrain, 28-29 April 2013), including the following Safety “Metrics” for the monitoring of safety performance:

- 1) Accidents and serious incidents;
- 2) Runway and Ground Safety (RGS);
- 3) In-Flight Damage (IFD);
- 4) Loss of Control In-Flight (LOC-I);
- 5) Controlled Flight Into Terrain (CFIT);
- 6) Safety Oversight capabilities (USOAP-CMA, IOSA and ISAGO);
- 7) Aerodrome Certification; and
- 8) SSP/SMS Implementation.

1.2 The RASG-MID/3 meeting (Kuwait, 27 - 29 January 2014) a) reviewed and updated the MID Region Safety Strategy. The meeting agreed:

- to use the term “Safety Theme” in the Strategy instead of “Safety Metric”;
- on new safety targets related to RGS and LOC-I;
- to remove IFD from the MID Region Safety Strategy; and
- to use an additional Safety Indicator for the monitoring of SSP implementation “Number of States having completed the SSP Gap Analysis on iSTARS”.

## 2. DISCUSSION

2.1 The RASG-MID is the governing body responsible for the review and update of the Strategy, as deemed necessary.

2.2 The Second MID Region Safety Summit (Muscat, Oman, 27- 29 April 2014) reviewed the MID Region Safety Strategy and developed a draft revised version of the Strategy based on the outcome of the different sessions.

2.3 The revised MID Region Safety Strategy at **Appendix A** was endorsed by The High-Level Briefing/Meeting, which was held on the third day of the Summit.

2.4 The following are the MID Region Safety Themes endorsed for the monitoring of safety performance:

- 1) Accidents;
- 2) Runway Safety (RS);
- 3) Loss of Control In-Flight (LOC-I);
- 4) Controlled Flight Into Terrain (CFIT);
- 5) Safety Oversight capabilities (USOAP-CMA, IOSA and ISAGO);
- 6) Aerodrome Certification; and
- 7) SSP/SMS Implementation.

2.5 Updates on the implementation progress and status to achieve the Regional Safety Targets are at **Appendix B**.

## 3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) review and update as appropriate the safety indicators in **Appendix B**; and
- b) urge States and Stakeholders to provide necessary information/feedback to the ICAO MID Regional Office related to all the Safety Indicators included in the MID Region Safety Strategy.

-----

# Regional Aviation Safety Group-Middle East RASG-MID



## MID Region Safety Strategy

*Revision 1, April 2014*

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
1. Strategic Safety Objective.....	3
2. Safety Objectives.....	3
3. Measuring and Monitoring Safety Performance.....	4
4. Governance.....	8

# MID Region Safety Strategy

## 1. Strategic Safety Objective

1.1 Continuous improvement of aviation safety through a progressive reduction of the number of accidents and related fatalities in the MID Region to be in line with the global average, based on reactive, proactive and predictive safety management practices.

## 2. Safety Objectives

2.1 States and regions must focus on their safety priorities as they continue to foster expansion of their air transport sectors.

2.2 The ICAO Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) establishes targeted safety objectives and initiatives while ensuring the efficient and effective coordination of complementary safety activities between all stakeholders.

2.3 The GASP includes a framework comprised of measurable objectives, supported by Safety Performance Areas and associated safety initiatives.

2.4 One of the strengths of the GASP is that while setting global objectives and priorities, it allows States and Regions to plan and establish their own specific approaches towards meeting these objectives and priorities according to each Member State's safety oversight capabilities, SSPs and safety processes necessary to support the air navigation systems of the future.

2.5 The MID Region safety objectives are in line with the GASP objectives and address specific safety risks identified within the framework of the Regional Aviation Safety Group-Middle East (RASG-MID), based on the analysis of available safety data.



### GASP Objectives

2.6 The enhancement of communication and information exchange between aviation Stakeholders and their active collaboration under the framework of RASG-MID would help achieving the MID Region safety objectives in an expeditious manner.

### **3. Measuring and monitoring Safety Performance:**

3.1 The first version of the MID Region Safety Strategy was developed by the First MID Region Safety Summit (Bahrain, 28-29 April 2013) and endorsed by the DGCA-MID/2 meeting (Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, 20 -22 May 2013).

3.2 The monitoring of safety performance and its enhancement is achieved through identification of relevant Safety Themes and Indicators as well as the adoption and attainment of Safety Targets.

3.3 The following are the MID Region Safety Themes endorsed for the monitoring of safety performance:

- 1) Accidents;
- 2) Runway Safety (RS);
- 3) Loss of Control In-Flight (LOC-I);
- 4) Controlled Flight Into Terrain (CFIT);
- 5) Safety oversight capabilities (USOAP-CMA, IOSA and ISAGO);
- 6) Aerodrome Certification; and
- 7) SSP/SMS Implementation.

3.4 The MID Region Safety Indicators and Targets are detailed in the Table below:

	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Safety Indicator</b>	<b>Safety Target</b>
1	Accidents	Number of accidents per million departures	Reduce the accident rate to be in line with the global average by the end of 2016.
		Number of fatal accidents per million departures	Reduce the rate of fatal accidents to be in line with the global average by the end of 2016.
2	Runway Safety (RS)	Number of Runway Safety related accidents per million departures	Reduce the Runway Safety related accidents to be below the global rate by end of 2016.
			Reduce the Runway Safety related accidents to be less than 1 accident per million departures by end of 2016.
3	Loss of Control In-Flight (LOC-I)	Number of LOC-I related accidents per million departures	Reduce the LOC-I related accidents to be below the global rate by end of 2016.
4	Controlled Flight Into Terrain (CFIT)	Number of CFIT related accidents per million departures	Maintain the CFIT related accidents below the global rate by end of 2016.

	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Safety Indicator</b>	<b>Safety Target</b>
5	Safety oversight capabilities (USOAP-CMA, IOSA and ISAGO)	USOAP-CMA Effective Implementation (EI) results: a. Number of MIDStates with an overall EI over 60%. b. Number of MIDStates with an EI score less than 60% for more than 2 areas (LEG, ORG, PEL, OPS, AIR, AIG, ANS and AGA).	Progressively increase the USOAP-CMA EI scores/results: a. 11 MID States to have at least 60% EI by the end of 2015. b. all the 15 MID States to have at least 60% EI by the end of 2017. c. Max 3 MIDStates with an EI score less than 60% for more than 2 areas by the end of 2015.
		Number of Significant Safety Concerns	a. MID States resolve identified Significant Safety Concerns as a matter of urgency and in any case within 12 months from their identification. b. No significant Safety Concern by end of 2016.
		Use of the IATA Operational Safety Audit (IOSA), to complement safety oversight activities	a. Maintain at least 60% of eligible MID airlines to be certified IATA-IOSA by the end of 2015 at all times. b. All MID States with an EI of at least 60% accept the IATA Operational Safety Audit (IOSA) as an acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC) by 2015 to complement their safety oversight activities.
		Number of Ground Handling service providers in the MID Region having the IATA Safety Audit for Ground Operations (ISAGO) certification, as a percentage of all Ground Handling service providers	a. 75% of the Ground Handling service providers to be certified IATA-ISAGO by the end of 2017. b. The IATA Ground Handling Manual (IGOM) endorsed as a reference for ground handling safety standards by all MID States with an EI above 60% by end of 2017.
6	Aerodrome Certification	Number of certified international aerodrome as a percentage of all international aerodromes in the MID Region	a. 50% of the international aerodromes certified by the end of 2015. b. 75% of the international aerodromes certified by the end of 2017.



	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Safety Indicator</b>	<b>Safety Target</b>
7	SSP/SMS Implementation	Number of MID States with EI>60%, having completed the SSP gap analysis on iSTARS	All MID States with EI>60% by the end of 2014.
		Number of MID States with EI>60%, that have developed an SSP implementation plan	All MID States with EI>60% by end of 2014.
		Number of MID States with EI>60%, having completed implementation of SSP Phase 1.	All MID States with EI>60% to complete phase 1 by the end of 2015.
		Number of MID States with EI>60%, having completed implementation of SSP Phase 2.	All MID States with EI>60% to complete phase 2 by the end of 2016.
		Number of MID States with EI>60%, having completed implementation of SSP Phase 3.	All MID States with EI>60% to complete phase 3 by the end of 2017.
		Number of MID States with EI>60% that have established a process for acceptance of individual service providers' SMS.	a. 30% of MID Stateswith EI>60%by the end of 2015. b. 70% of MID Stateswith EI>60%by the end of 2016. c. 100% of MID Stateswith EI>60%by the end of 2017.

## **4. Governance**

4.1 The MID Region Safety Strategy is to be endorsed by the MID States' Directors General of Civil Aviation.

4.2 The MID Region Safety Strategy will guide the work of RASG-MID and all its member States and partners.

4.3 The RASG-MID will be the governing body responsible for the review and update of the Strategy, as deemed necessary.

4.4 Progress on the implementation of the MID Region Safety Strategy and the achievement of the agreed Safety Targets will be reported to the ICAO Air Navigation Commission (ANC), through the review of the RASG-MID reports; and to the stakeholders in the Region during the MID Region Safety Summits.

-----

## APPENDIX B

## UPDATES ON THE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS AND STATUS TO ACHIEVE THE MID REGION SAFETY TARGETS

Reactive Safety Information					
Theme	Safety Indicator	Safety Target	Global	MID	Remark
Accidents	Number of accidents per million departures	Reduce the accident rate to be in line with the global average by the end of 2016.	Av 2009-2013 <b>(3.72)</b>	Av 2009-2013 <b>(7.28)</b>	The Av MID accident rate is almost twice the global.
	Number of fatal accidents per million departures	Reduce the rate of fatal accidents to be in line with the global average by the end of 2016.	Av 2009-2013 <b>(0.53)</b>	Av 2009-2013 <b>(1.69)</b>	The Av MID accident rate is almost three times the global rate. However, there are no fatal accidents in 2012 and 2013.
Runway Safety (RS)	Number of Runway Safety related accidents per million departures	Reduce the Runway Safety related accidents to be below the global rate by end of 2016.	Av 2009-2013 <b>(1.98)</b>	Av 2009-2013 <b>(3.98)</b>	The Av MID accident rate is almost twice the global rate. However, in 2013 the global and MID rates are exactly the same.
	Number of Runway Safety related accidents per million departures	Reduce the Runway Safety related accidents to be less than 1 accident per million departures by end of 2016.		<b>3.98</b> per million departures	
Loss of Control In-Flight (LOC-I)	Number of LOC-I related accidents per million departures	Reduce the LOC-I related accidents to be below the global rate by end of 2016.	Av 2009-2013 <b>(0.8)</b>	Av 2009-2013 <b>(0.6)</b>	Already below global rate
Controlled Flight Into Terrain (CFIT)	Number of CFIT related accidents per million departures	Maintain the CFIT related accidents below the global rate by end of 2016.	Av 2009-2013 <b>(0.12)</b>	Av 2009-2013 <b>(0.42)</b>	The Av MID accident rate is almost four times the global rate

Proactive Safety Information				
Theme	Safety Indicator	Safety Target	MID	Remark
Safety oversight capabilities (USOAP-CMA, IOSA and ISAGO)	USOAP-CMA Effective Implementation (EI) results: (a) Number of MID States with an overall EI over 60%  (b) Number of MID States with an EI score less than 60% for more than 2 areas (LEG, ORG, PEL, OPS, AIR, AIG, ANS and AGA)	Progressively increase the USOAP-CMA EI scores/results:  a. 11 MID States to have at least 60% EI by the end of 2015. b. all the 15 MID States to have at least 60% EI by the end of 2017. c. Max 3 MID States with an EI score less than 60% for more than 2 areas by the end of 2015.	Currently 9 States out of 13 audited States are with EI>60%.  6 States with an EI score less than 60% for more than 2 areas.	
	Number of Significant Safety Concerns	a. MID States resolve identified Significant Safety Concerns as a matter of urgency and in any case within 12 months from their identification. b. No significant Safety Concern by end of 2016.	1 SSC	
	Use of the IATA Operational Safety Audit (IOSA), to complement safety oversight activities	a. Maintain at least 60% of eligible MID airlines to be certified IATA-IOSA by the end of 2015 at all times. b. All MID States with an EI of at least 60% accept the IATA Operational Safety Audit (IOSA) as an acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC) by 2015 to complement their safety oversight activities.	a. 69% b. TBD	a. This is as of 30 Sep 2014
	Number of Ground Handling service providers in the MID Region having the IATA Safety Audit for Ground Operations (ISAGO) certification, as a percentage of all Ground Handling service providers	a. 75% of the Ground Handling service providers to be certified IATA-ISAGO by the end of 2017. b. The IATA Ground Handling Manual (IGOM) endorsed as a reference for ground handling safety standards by all MID States with an EI above 60% by end of 2017.	a. TBD b. TBD	
Aerodrome Certification	Number of certified international aerodrome as a percentage of all international aerodromes in the MID Region	a. 50% of the international aerodromes certified by the end of 2015. b. 75% of the international aerodromes certified by the end of 2017.	28 out of 71 <b>39%</b>	As per the report of RGS WG/1 meeting (7-9 April 2014)

Predictive Safety Information				
Theme	Safety Indicator	Safety Target	MID	Remark
SSP/SMS Implementation	Number of MID States with EI>60%, having completed the SSP gap analysis on iSTARS	All MID States with EI>60% by the end of 2014.	2 State completed the SSP gap analysis on iSTARS  5 States Started the SSP gap analysis on iSTARS  2 States in progress	Currently 9 States of 13 audited States are with EI>60%  Information is based on:  1- data available on iSTARS and collected from States; and 2- Data collected from States' replies to an SSP Questionnaire (11 States replied so far, 7 of them are with EI>60%.  A follow up is in progress to monitor the achievement.
	Number of MID States with EI>60%, that have developed an SSP implementation plan	All MID States with EI>60% by end of 2014	5 States developed an SSP implementation plan  4 States in progress	
	Number of MID States with EI>60%, having completed implementation of SSP Phase 1.	All MID States with EI>60% to complete phase 1 by the end of 2015.	2 States completed implementation of SSP Phase 1  5 States partially completed implementation of SSP Phase 1	
	Number of MID States with EI>60%, having completed implementation of SSP Phase 2.	All MID States with EI>60% to complete phase 2 by the end of 2016.	1 State completed implementation of SSP Phase 2  7 States partially completed implementation of SSP Phase 2	
	Number of MID States with EI>60%, having completed implementation of SSP Phase 3.	All MID States with EI>60% to complete phase 3 by the end of 2017.	1 State partially completed implementation of SSP Phase 3	
	Number of MID States with EI>60% that have established a process for acceptance of individual service providers' SMS	a. 30% of MID States with EI>60%by the end of 2015 b. 70% of MID States with EI>60%by the end of 2016 c. 100% of MID States with EI>60%by the end of 2017	6 States established a process for acceptance of individual service providers' SMS	