

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL
AVIATION ORGANIZATION



HIGH-LEVEL SAFETY CONFERENCE 2010

Montréal, 29 March – 1 April 2010

REPORT

Approved by the Conference and
published by authority of the Secretary General

MONTRÉAL

2010

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL
AVIATION ORGANIZATION



HIGH-LEVEL SAFETY CONFERENCE 2010

Montréal, 29 March – 1 April 2010

REPORT

Approved by the Conference and
published by authority of the Secretary General

MONTRÉAL

2010

Published in separate English, Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian
and Spanish editions by the
INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION
999 University Street, Montréal, Quebec, Canada H3C 5H7

For ordering information and for a complete listing of sales agents
and booksellers, please go to the ICAO website at www.icao.int

Doc 9935, *Report of the High-Level Safety Conference 2010*

Order Number: 9935
ISBN 978-92-9231-497-2

© ICAO 2010

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a
retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, without prior
permission in writing from the International Civil Aviation Organization.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

To: The President of the ICAO Council

From: The Chairman, High-level Safety Conference 2010

I have the honour to submit the report of the High-level Safety Conference 2010, which was held in Montréal from 29 March to 1 April 2010.

Radu Mircea Berceanu
Chairman

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Radu Mircea Berceanu".

Montréal, 1 April 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
HISTORY OF THE MEETING	
1. Duration	ii-1
2. Representation.....	ii-1
3. Officers	ii-1
4. Secretariat	ii-1
5. Adoption of the agenda.....	ii-2
6. Working arrangements.....	ii-2
7. Opening remarks by the President of the Council.....	ii-2
8. Closing remarks by the Secretary General	ii-5
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	iii-1
AGENDA AND EXPLANATORY NOTES OF THE MEETING	iv-1
SCHEDULE OF THE MEETING	v-1
SUMMARIES OF DISCUSSIONS	1-1
DECLARATION	2-1
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	3-1

HISTORY OF THE MEETING

1. DURATION

1.1 The High-level Safety Conference 2010 (HLSC/2010) was opened by the President of the Council, Mr. Roberto Kobeh González, at 1230 hours on 29 March 2010 in the Assembly Hall of the Headquarters of the International Civil Aviation Organization in Montréal.

2. REPRESENTATION

2.1 The HLSC was attended by 551 participants from 117 Contracting States and Observers representing 32 international organizations.

3. OFFICERS

3.1 The Chairman of the Conference, Mr. Radu Mircea Berceanu, was elected following the opening of the Conference. On the proposal of the Chief Delegate of the United Arab Emirates, seconded by the Chief Delegate of Brazil, Dr. Harold Olusegun Demuren was elected Vice-Chairman of the Conference by acclamation.

4. SECRETARIAT

4.1 The Secretary of the Conference was Ms. Nancy J. Graham, Director of the Air Navigation Bureau. The advisers to the Secretary of the Conference were Mr. Vincent Galotti, Deputy Director, Air Navigation Bureau and Mr. Paul Lamy, Consultant, Air Navigation Bureau. The Assistant Secretaries were: Messers. Marcus Costa, Henry Defalque, Mitchell Fox, Henry Gourdji, John Illson, Richard Macfarlane, Marco Merens, Miguel Ramos and Thormodur Thormodsson.

4.2 The general administrative arrangements for the Conference were under the direction of Dr. F. Liu, Director, Bureau of Administration and Services. Language services were provided under the supervision of Mr. L. Cherif, Chief, Language and Publications Branch, assisted by Mr. V.A. Samochkine, Chief, Interpretation Section; Mrs. Nancy Shewan (English and Publications Section); Mr. P.J. Butler (French Section); Mr. A. Fedorchenko (Russian Section); Mrs. A. de Cuadra-Lindstrom (Spanish Section); Mr. G.M. Elbushra (Arabic Section); and Mr. K. Li (Chinese Section).

4.3 The physical arrangements for the Conference were made by Ms. L. Dery, Acting Chief, Conference and Office Services Section; Mrs. R. Zagoritis, Associate Conference Service Officer; Mrs. D. Rahmani, Supervisor, Documentation Control Unit; Mr. J.D. Daoust, Chief, Reproduction, Sales and External Distribution Services; and Mr. G. Beaudet, Supervisor, Internal Distribution Unit. Other specialist officers of the ICAO Secretariat provided advice to the Conference as required.

5. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

5.1 The agenda transmitted to the Conference by the Council was adopted at the first meeting.

6. WORKING ARRANGEMENTS

6.1 The working schedule submitted to States in advance of the Conference, was accepted at the opening meeting.

6.2 A coordinating group was established in accordance with the *Directives to Divisional-type Air Navigation Meetings and Rules of Procedure for their Conduct* (Doc 8143) and met throughout the Conference. The members were the Secretary of the Conference, the Assistant Secretaries and representatives of various Secretariat services catering to the Conference. The group was able to coordinate the activities of the Conference using the services and accommodations available.

7. OPENING REMARKS

7.1 President of the Council

I am delighted to welcome all of you to this High-level Safety Conference.

I view this Conference as the third in a series of ground-breaking meetings to fundamentally overhaul the way in which we manage safety issues globally.

The first was the Directors General of Civil Aviation Conference of 1997 which established USOAP – ICAO’s mandatory Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP). The creation of USOAP was a paradigm shift in attitudes and policies; for the first time, sovereign States authorized a United Nations agency to assess their respective capabilities to oversee the implementation of agreed-upon international Standards on their territory.

The second was the 2006 DGCA Conference when participants agreed to post USOAP results on ICAO’s public website. This was tacit recognition that transparency and sharing of information are fundamental to a safe air transport system. It was not an easy decision, but it was certainly the right thing to do.

The focus of this week’s Conference is the sharing of safety information – an essential element in our global safety strategy. We must build on the concept of transparency and demonstrate our capability to work together as never before, to achieve additional improvements in safety where they are most needed.

It begins with taking stock of the current situation. While the number of fatal accidents and associated fatalities has consistently dropped over the past decade or so, despite an increase in traffic, the gap in safety results has widened between certain States and regions.

Our task now is to develop and implement more flexible and effective strategies to help States with specific challenges in reducing their accident rates and contribute to an even safer global air transport system, while reinforcing safety in others.

This means agreeing on new strategies for managing safety and complementing our traditional prescriptive-based methodology with a proactive, performance-based approach better equipped to reduce accident rates from their present levels.

This new way of doing business will allow proactive identification and response to emerging safety issues before they result in accidents or incidents.

Worldwide, Safety Management Systems and newly-created State Safety Programmes are being implemented. ICAO programmes have adapted. A Continuous Monitoring Approach for USOAP encourages a more effective and efficient use of resources in assessing State compliance with ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices. These innovations and trends are fundamental building blocks of ICAO's evolving safety strategy and will provide increasing benefits as they continue to mature.

Yes, ICAO has irrevocably embraced the risk-based approach, at the same time recognizing that this requires an equivalent commitment to risk-management. At an organizational level, for ICAO, for States and for aviation organizations, we must all adjust the way in which we respond to risk through our respective safety management processes.

By definition, proactive safety strategies to avert potential accidents cannot be based on simply reacting to serious events. We also need to fully understand the risks associated with the many facets of today's complex aviation system. And while vast amounts of data are regularly collected, the problem is that this information is not effectively shared. The time has come to ensure that all critical safety-related information is disseminated throughout the international aviation community and processed using globally harmonized analysis methods.

To that end, ICAO is currently developing an internal integrated safety trend analysis and reporting system that will eventually have the capability to analyze various types of data, thereby creating a multidimensional assessment of emerging safety issues.

The success of these efforts, however, will ultimately rest on policy decisions that facilitate the free exchange of information. Simply stated, the sharing of valuable safety information must become the norm, rather than an exceptional practice among States and concerned aviation stakeholders.

Obviously there are risks involved in the sharing of information. And so, it is essential that we establish an environment where the exchange of critical safety information can be encouraged and facilitated without jeopardizing information sources. Without such a protective environment, a proactive approach to safety will not be possible.

Another critical element of a sound proactive safety strategy is having the competencies needed for an effective safety oversight system. With State Safety Programmes at varying levels of maturity, we must be more creative and flexible in finding solutions tailored to each State's needs.

One option remains the tried-and-tested concept of Regional Safety Oversight Organizations which have demonstrated their ability to overcome many of the obstacles faced by States. Other alternatives include bilateral agreements or external service providers conducting technical work related to safety oversight. Whichever solution provides the best fit, in all cases States retain responsibility for safety oversight.

As you can see, there are a number of options to be considered as we continue to develop a global safety strategy. Nonetheless, we must always be cognizant of the fact that, despite our tireless efforts, a certain degree of risk is inherent to aviation operations. While all accidents are tragic, we must recognize the need for continued development of safety initiatives that prevent their recurrence.

These are just some of the issues that we will cover, not only in the next few days but also in the years to come. As was the case in 1997 and 2006, the time has come to take bold and difficult decisions, because it is the right thing to do for the aviation community.

In concrete terms, this is what I expect from the High-level Safety Conference:

1. Support for the transition in the near-term to the Continuous Monitoring Approach to safety oversight.

This will require your commitment to providing ICAO with accurate and complete information in a timely manner.

I also ask you to reaffirm your commitment to the transparency of USOAP audit results and to agree that this principle be applied to the issuance of significant safety concerns.

2. Support for the integration of State safety information through the harmonization of key safety metrics and the coordination of safety analysis methods.

In addition, the sharing of information from State safety analyses is essential to the success of a global safety strategy and I ask that when possible you make the required expertise available.

3. Affirmation of the role of Regional Safety Oversight Organizations.

These can help States in need to leverage limited resources and to obtain aggregate data for meaningful safety analyses.

4. Agreement on the development of a global organizational framework to protect the providers of sensitive safety data used for future information sharing initiatives.

Without this protective framework, essential information will remain unavailable to ICAO and to other organizations involved in the analysis and resolution of global safety issues.

Finally, I ask the Conference to consider the need for a dedicated Safety Management Annex.

This will require resources and therefore deserves careful consideration; however, a dedicated safety management Annex will highlight safety as ICAO's primary focus, relevant to all aviation professionals, regardless of their operational expertise. It will facilitate a coordinated approach for the promulgation of the practices necessary to assure the highest levels of safety throughout the international aviation system.

In closing, ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank you for taking the time to attend this High-level Safety Conference. I believe it can rank as another milestone in our successful drive to provide the citizens of all Member States of ICAO, the people you represent, with the safest national, regional and global air transport systems possible. And we must achieve this, as we have always done, through our collective resolve to honour our commitments and to take all necessary action to ensure the continued successful evolution of a global safety strategy.

7.2 Opening remarks were also given by Representatives of Japan, Arab Civil Aviation Commission (ACAC), African Civil Aviation Commission (AFCAC), Latin American Civil Aviation Commission (LACAC), European Union (EU) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The remarks are available on the HLSC official website at <http://www2.icao.int/en/HLSC/default.aspx>.

8. CLOSING REMARK

8.1 Secretary General

Ladies and gentlemen, we have come to the end of a very successful Conference.

The Conference began with a status report on the safety targets contained in the Global Aviation Safety Plan. As you may recall, we've made good progress in achieving some of the GASP targets, but not all. While the number of fatal accidents and related fatalities has decreased over the past ten years, the overall accident rate has remained steady. Of significant concern is the variation in accident rates among States as well as regions.

Which brings us to the central theme of this Conference: to work collaboratively – sharing information with the objective of responding to risks before they result in accidents or serious incidents.

Earlier in the Conference, we made a good start toward information sharing when ICAO, the Federal Aviation Administration of the United States, the Commission of the European Union and the International Air Transport Association signed a Declaration of Intent on the Development of a Global Safety Information Exchange Agreement.

These are bold steps that we are taking together. Based on the discussions of this Conference, it is clear that ICAO must play a central role in the sharing of information, and I can assure you that we will make the most effective use of our resources to make meaningful contributions.

During his opening remarks, President Kobeh called upon this High Level Safety Conference to address five specific areas, and I'd like to review the outcomes of those deliberations, as well as their implications for a future safety strategy.

First, the Conference's decision to endorse the transition to a continuous monitoring approach will provide ICAO with valuable safety information to be shared with the international community. As a supplement to the robust USOAP audit data, continuous monitoring will create a steady flow of information allowing for more timely identification and mitigation of emerging safety issues. Based on your deliberations, ICAO will continue to work in a transparent manner, assuring that information learned through the continuous monitoring process is used to promote aviation safety, and not used for the purpose of retribution or economic advantage.

Second, the Conference has provided the guidance needed for the aviation community to implement a truly international information sharing initiative. ICAO will convene groups of experts to make safety information sharing a reality through development of common safety metrics, harmonized analysis methods as well as the required technical capabilities. The willingness to share sensitive safety information is a essential step toward a more proactive approach to managing the risks inherent to a complex and dynamic operating environment. Nonetheless, this type of collaboration is essential to influence strategic safety decisions through the predictive analysis of accurate and comprehensive information, rather than primarily basing such decisions in response to tragic accidents.

The third item referred to this Conference by the President was to affirm the role of regional safety oversight organizations. As you may recall from the briefing delivered at the beginning of the Conference by Nancy Graham, States have safety oversight systems in varying levels of maturity, and many lack the necessary resources to implement complex safety programmes on their own. Therefore, we must ensure that alternative solutions are available and regional safety oversight organizations can play a strategic role.

Fourth, the Conference endorsed the safety framework as proposed by ICAO – a necessary step to ensure that the many components of our respective safety programmes are implemented in a strategic and coordinated manner. ICAO will continue to develop its internal processes to ensure that realistic objectives are set and realized through sound business practices. Beyond the commitment to improve our internal processes, ICAO will take measures to make all safety-related documents available in the six official ICAO languages.

Finally, the Conference has taken an important step in endorsing the creation of a dedicated Safety Annex; only the fourth new Annex since the early years of ICAO and the first in over 25 years. A new Annex will require a significant investment of resources but it is an investment that will pay dividends in the better management and alignment of ICAO's Standards and Recommended Practices. Also, safety professionals in the international community will have a clearer understanding of what is expected of them.

But no matter how robust our shared information and predictive safety analyses, we will still learn difficult lessons from accidents although, hopefully, they will be few and far between. And so, the Conference has re-affirmed that all accidents need to be thoroughly investigated in order to ensure that lessons are learned and integrated into the safety framework. As a result, ICAO will review Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) and guidance material to ensure that the data necessary to support accident investigations is available. This review will include provisions for the recovery of data and information from flight recorders. ICAO will also assess changes which may be necessary to improve surveillance, flight monitoring and communications in oceanic airspace or in remote areas, including timely and adequate search and rescue services. In addition, ICAO will review existing provisions and guidance material regarding flight deck activities in order to assess whether further action on this issue is required.

Yes, this has been a very productive Conference, but there is a substantial amount of work to follow. It is critical for ICAO to do this work, but we will need to prioritize our efforts and determine which tasks can be accomplished in the short, medium and long term. Of critical importance is your support to ensure that we have the resources to achieve the ambitious goals established by this Conference.

As you are aware, we are establishing a budget for the next triennium and the Council and the Assembly will have to provide the necessary resources to achieve the ambitious goals that you

have identified. In this context, I am more than grateful to the United Arab Emirates for their generous contribution of \$200,000 in support of our safety efforts. Also, I would like to publically acknowledge the Republic of Korea for their contribution a few months ago of \$100,000. Finally, I want to express my continued appreciation for the numerous Member States who provide ongoing assistance to ICAO through secondments of talented aviation professionals and with other resources.

Your success in achieving the objectives of this Conference in such a short time frame is indeed remarkable and for this, we are indebted to the Chairman of the Conference, Mr. Radu Mircea Berceanu, who has displayed strong management skills in taking us through the agenda. As Secretary General I wish to acknowledge Nancy Graham for her leadership and to recognize the tremendous work done behind the scenes by her exceptional team in the Air Navigation Bureau and also by the staff of other Bureaux who have helped this event run smoothly.

Let me also mention the good media attention that the Conference has received and my thanks to the Delegations for helping to get the message out on what we have accomplished at this ICAO High-level Safety Conference.

—————

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

CD	—	Chief Delegate	ADV	—	Adviser
ACD	—	Alternate Chief Delegate	COBS	—	Chief Observer
D	—	Delegate	OBS	—	Observer
ICM	—	ICAO Council Member	ANC	—	Air Navigation Commissioner
AICM	—	Alternate ICAO Council Member	IR	—	ICAO Representative

CONTRACTING STATES

State	Family Name	First Name	Position in Delegation
--------------	--------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------

AFGHANISTAN

ALAMI	R.M.	D
DORES	K.L.	ADV
IRWIN	S.	ADV
KORHONEN	J.O.	ADV

ARGENTINA

DÁVILA	L.R.	CD
SINGH	M. A.	ICM
PRADO	S.	AICM
GONZÁLEZ	S.A.	ANC
GELSO	J.	D

AUSTRALIA

MCCORMICK	J.	CD
FARQUARSON	T.	ACD
TIEDE	A.H.R.	ANC
ALECK	J.	D
BOYD	P.	D
BROOKS	L.	D
DOHERTY	J.	D
EVANS	P.K.	D
MACAULEY	K.	D

AUSTRIA

BIALONCZYK	M.	CD
KRZIWANEK	K.	ACD
SCHLEIFER	C.	ANC
NIRSCHL	F.	D

BAHRAIN

ABDULRAHIM	A.	CD
MOHAMED	M.	D
YOUNES	K.	D

BANGLADESH

MEHDI ALAM	S.	CD
KHAN MAJIS	S.I.	ACD
AHMED	A.	D
SHAIDUR RAHMAN	M.	D

BARBADOS

ARCHER	E.	CD
LAKE	O.E.	D

BELGIUM

DURINCKX	F.	CD
ROBERT	G.	ADV

BENIN

DE SOUZA	M.	D
----------	----	---

BOLIVIA

PARDO	J.	D
-------	----	---

BOTSWANA

BELAYNEH	M.	CD
EBINENG	J.	D

BRAZIL

CARDOSO	R.	ACD
SIMAO	C.P.	ACD
MAGNO	R.	CD
ROMERA	A.	D
ALVES	J.L.F.	ANC
BASTOS	L.C.	D
CAMPOS	D.B.	D
COSTA	D.	D
IANELLI	C.	D
NASCIMENTO	L.	D
PELLEGRINO	C.E.	D
POMPEU	J.	D

SENRA DE OLIVEIRA SILVA	R. A.	D D
----------------------------	----------	--------

BRUNEI DARUSSALEM

JAAFAR LATIF YOUSSOF	O. J. A.	CD D D
----------------------------	----------------	--------------

BURKINA FASO

DIEGUIMDE	M.	CD
-----------	----	----

CAMBODIA

EAT	S.	CD
-----	----	----

CAMEROON

AZOH-MBI TANKAM ZOA ETUNDI BEKOLO ESSIMI MBOTTO EDIMO MELOM MENDOUGA OWONA ASSOUNOU	S. P. E. E. L. F. P. P.A. T.	CD CD ICM D D D D D D
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------

CANADA

GREGOIRE MCDONALD DUPUIS DESHAIES BOURGEOIS CHAMBERS CLITSOME GIRARD MCNAIR SHERRITT STANFIELD TADROS DIAMANT BOUSTEAD LACHANCE SAYFI KNAAPEN LANGLOIS MARTEL	M. G. L.A. M. G. S. M. N. D.J. D. S. W. J. L. R. L. M E	CD ACD ICM ANC D D D D D D D ADV ADV ADV OBS OBS OBS
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

CHAD

ALI MAHAMAT ZENE	W	CD
MAHAMAT SEID	A	D
NGAKO	B	D

CHILE

HUEPE	J	CD
SEPULVEDA	L	ACD
GALAN	I	D
CANTILLANO GALVEZ	M	ADV
HADAD	N	ADV

CHINA

LI	J	CD
MA	T.	ICM
TAI	F.	ANC
FANG	J	D
JIANG	H	D
LI	J.C	D
LI	T.C	D
LIU	C.Y	D
LO	V.T	D
LO	S.M	D
NG	C.O	D
PUN	S	D
SHUM	A.	D
WANG	Z	D
WONG	C	D
YANG	J	D
YUEN	S.K	D

COLOMBIA

RUEDA	G	CD
BEJARANO	C	D
CAMACHO	M	D
GONZALEZ	L.	D
PARIS	S	D

COMOROS

ATTOUMANI	M	CD
OUBEIDI	H	ACD

CONGO

DBOTA	S.F	CD
-------	-----	----

COSTA RICA

FERNÁNDEZ	J.	D
LIZAMA HERNÁNDEZ	C.	D
PADILLA	S.	D

COTE D'IVOIRE

ABOUNOUAN	J.K.	CD
ALLA	A.J.	D

CUBA

OJEDA VIVES	A.	CD
COLMENERO	P.L.	ACD
LAUREDO CALDERÍN	D.	D
CRESPO FRASQUIERI	M.M.	D
PÉREZ ANDINO	C. R.	D

CZECH REPUBLIC

SCHAUTOVA	D.	CD
STOLC	J.	ACD
KLAS	J.	D
MIKA	L.	D

DENMARK

LARSEN	K.L.	CD
VEINGBERG	P.	D
CHRISTENSEN	F.	ADV
STRANDDORF	J.	ADV

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

RODRÍGUEZ ARIZA	L.P.	CD
VERAS	C.A.	ICM
BOLIVAR LEÓN	F.	D
MÉNDEZ	E.	D
ROSA	S.	D
VALDEZ	J.	D

ECUADOR

BERNAL	G.	CD
GUITARRA	F.	CD
GUERRERO	F.	ACD
LASCANO	I.A.	ICM

EGYPT

EL HEFNY	S.	CD
ELZANATY	M.T.	ICM
SHERIF	M.	D
SOLIMAN	M.	D

EL SALVADOR

APARICIO BORJAS	J.A.	ICM
-----------------	------	-----

ETHIOPIA

TADEGE	M.	CD
--------	----	----

FIJI ISLANDS

WAQA	N.	D
------	----	---

FINLAND

SALONEN	K.	CD
HENTTU	P.	D
VUOKILA	S.	ALT

FRANCE

GANDIL	P.	CD
ROUSSE	F.	ACD
WACHENHEIM	M.	ICM
THEBAULT	B.	ANC
BERARD	E.	D
EYDALEINE	G.	D
GUIVARC'H	P.	D
LAPENE	L.	D
TROADEC	J.-P.	D
WELTERLIN	G.	D
ZIZI	F.	D

GABON

MINTSA-MI-OWONO	E.R.	CD
-----------------	------	----

GERMANY

REICHLE	G.	CD
BURLAGE	T.	ACD
MENDEL	J.	ICM
MONNING	R.	ANC

GHANA

MAMPHEY	V.	CD
ALLOTEY	S.	ICM
AKATUE	E.	D
KALMONI	S.	D

GREECE

MANESSIS	C.	CD
KATSANEVAKI	M.	D
KIOROGLOU	A.	D

HAITI

PIERRE	J.-L.	CD
--------	-------	----

HUNGARY

GARDUS	T.	CD
--------	----	----

ICELAND

HEDINSSON	E.O.	CD
SIGURDSSON	H.	ICM

INDIA

ZAIDI	N.	CD
MISHRA	A.	ICM
BAKHSHISH	S.	OBS
SAMANT	H.	D
KATHPALIA	A.	ADV

INDONESIA

BAKTI	H.	CD
BARATA	B.	D
HASIBUAN	Y.	D
IDRUS	I.	D
MULYANTO	B.	D
SIRINGORINGO	S.	D
SUBEKTI	A.	D
SUPRASETYO	F.	D
SUTARMADJI	B.	D
WIDJAJA	P.	D
WISNU	D.	D

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

SHAHBAZILAR	H.	IR
-------------	----	----

IRELAND

MURPHY	J.	CD
FITZPATRICK	D.	D
HUMPHREYS	K.	D
RYAN	S.	D

ITALY

PICHECA	G.	CD
SCIACCHITANO	S.	CD
CARRABBA	G.D.	D
EMINENTE	C.	D
MARASA	B.	D
BARDARO	A.	D

JAMAICA

DERBY	O.L.	CD
-------	------	----

JAPAN

ISHIDU	H.	ACD
BABA	S.	ICM
UMEZAWA	D.	ANC
ISHIDA	S.	D
KAJIWARA	A.	D
KITAZAWA	A.	D
MORI	H.	D
SUZUKI	K.	D
UMEZAWA	D.	OBS

KAZAKHSTAN

KUSSAINOV	A.	CD
AYABOV	R.	ACD
ADIMOLDA	R.	D
KHAIRGA-LIYEVA	G.	D
LASTAYEV	T.	D

KENYA

KINYUA	G.	D
KIOKO	H.K.	D
WAKAHIA	P.	D

KUWAIT

ALFARAH	F.	CD
ALMAHROUS	S.	ACD
ALGHANIM	S.	D

KYRGYZTAN

DZHUNUSHALIEV	B.	ACD
---------------	----	-----

LEBANON

CHAOUK	H.	CD
EID	S.	ACD

LIBYA

AHRIR	B.	CD
-------	----	----

LITHUANIA

DANILEVICIUS	V.	D
--------------	----	---

LUXEMBOURG

DELVAL	J-M.	D
--------	------	---

MADAGASCAR

DOUAN	C.	CD
RAKOTO	B.M.	D
RAZAFINDRAZATO		

MALAYSIA

ABDUL RAHMAN	A.	CD
CHON	K.S.	ICM

MALI

SANOGO	T.	CD
THIAM DIALLO	A.	D

MALTA

BORG MARKS	G.	CD
------------	----	----

MAURITIUS

GUNGAH	A.	CD
--------	----	----

MEXICO

GONZÁLEZ	H.	CD
MÉNDEZ	D.	ACD
JIMÉNEZ	D.	D

MONACO

BAYOL	H.P.	CD
-------	------	----

MONTENEGRO

BRKANOVIC	E.	CD
-----------	----	----

MOROCCO

MANAR	A.	CD
-------	----	----

MOZAMBIQUE

PINTO	A.	CD
-------	----	----

NAMIBIA

MUJETENGA	B.T.	ICM
-----------	------	-----

NEPAL

LAL SUMAN	R.C.	CD
ACHARYA	S.	D
GAUTAM	S.	D

NETHERLANDS

BIEN	E.	CD
BLAAUW	F.	ACD
WILBRINK	J.	D

NEW ZEALAND

CLEGG	S.	CD
KAY	J.	D

NICARAGUA

BONILLA	C.	D
---------	----	---

NIGER

HASSANE	O.	CD
HALIDOU	M.	ANC

NIGERIA

DEMUREN	H.	CD
ODUSELU	S.	ACD
ALIU	O.B.	ICM
ADEDYOYIN	T.A.	D
AUYO	I.U.	D
EKUNWE	P.	D
ONYEGIRI	J.	D

NORWAY

LAURITZEN	T.	
RICHARDSEN	H.	CD
ECKERBERT	B.	ANC
HERREDSVELA	T.	D
SCHSOLBERG	E.	D
SLYNGSTAD	E.	D

PAKISTAN

RAUHULLAH	M.	ADV
-----------	----	-----

PANAMA

GORDAY	V.	D
MCDONALD POSSO	A.	D

PHILIPPINES

KAPUNAN	E.	CD
LERUM	J.	D
WEISS	P.	ADV

POLAND

KRUSZYNSKI	G.	CD
GLUSZKIEWICZ	D.	ACD
KEDZIERSKI	K.	ADV
ZIELLINSKI	R.	ADV

PORTUGAL

FONSECA DE ALMEIDA	L.	CD
ABREU GUERRA	A.M.	D
CUNHA	J.	D
INFANTE DE LA CERDA	J.C.	D
SANTOS	A.	D

QATAR

AL NOAIMI	A.	CD
ALHARAM	A.	D

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

YOO	H.J.	AICM
CHUNG	I.Y.	CD
KIM	C.	ICM
CHANG	M.H.	ANC
CHOI	H.	D
KU	Y.	D
PARK	H.G.	D

ROMANIA

BERCEANU	R.	CD
COTRUT	C.	ICM
KALMUTCHI	P.	ANC
BRUTARU	R.	D
CIORANU	A.	D
CIUCA	M.	D
DOGARU	R.	D
DONCIU	C.	D
DONCIU	B.	D
POP	S.	D
POSTELNICU	T.	D
RADU	C.	D
VIRLAN	C.	D
CICEO	D.	ADV
DOBROVOLSCHI	E.	ADV
MUNTEANU	D.	ADV
OPRIS	A.	ADV

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

NERADKO	A.	CD
NOVGORODOV	A.A.	ICM
KORSAKOV	A.A.	ANC
KORSAKOV	A.	D
SHNYREV	A.	D
KOROVKIN	V.	ADV

SAUDI ARABIA

KABLI	T.M.B.	ICM
ALHARTHY	A.A.	ANC
ATTIAH	K.	D
BUKHARI	A.	D
ALMAKRAM	I.	ADV

SENEGAL

BESSANE	M.	CD
DIAGNE	N.	D
MBENGUE	P.I.	D

SERBIA

MILJKOVIC	M.	CD
STARCEVIC	N.	D

SINGAPORE

FERNANDO	M.G.	P/ANC
YAP	O.H.	CD
PIN	B. K.	ICM
FOO	A.	D
FOONG	L.H.	D
LOO	C.B.	D
LOOI	H.S.	D
PANG	M.L.	D
POH	E.	D
SIM	V.	D
TOFT	M.	D
WONG	C.W.	D

SLOVAKIA

BREJA	J.	CD
BRUNA	P.	D
KLUS	A.	D
NEMECEK	M.	D
VALICKOVA	R.	D

SLOVENIA

JAKOMIN	I.	CD
KUNSTELJ	T.	CD
KOMAC	M.	ACD
BOSCAROL	I.	D
DOLINSEK	S.	D
HRIBAR	T.	D
JANSA	S.	D
KOCJAN	S.	D
KOSTANJSEK	T.	D
KOVACEC	L.	D
KRAPEZ	A.	D
LESNIK	S.	D
MEZNARSIC	J.	D

ZUPANIC	F.Z.	D
---------	------	---

SOMALIA

MOHAMED	M.	CD
---------	----	----

SOUTH AFRICA

PEEGE	T.	CD
MABASO	L.	ACD
JORDAAN	C.F.	D
MASEKO	Z.F.	D
MOLEBATSI	L.H.	D
SETSHOGOE	K.T.	D
STOLS	L.	D

SPAIN

GUTIERREZ DEL CASTILLO	C.	CD
AGUADO	V.M.	ICM
HERRERO	J.	ANC
AMERIJEIRAS VALES	M.	D
HERNANDEZ- CORONADO QUINTERO	P.	D
IBARZ DEL OLMO	C.	D
MAESTRE MORENO	M.I.	D
NOGALES	J.	D
RODRÍGUEZ	L.	D
ROSAS	J.	D
BAIXERAS LLANO	E.	ADV
VERA PALMES	M.P.	ADV

SRI LANKA

DISSANAYAKE	D.M.P.	CD
JAYAWARDENE	K.V.N.	D

ST. LUCIA

MCPHAIL	D.	D
---------	----	---

SUDAN

ABDEL AZIZ AHMED	M.	CD
HADDAD	W.	ADV

SWEDEN

BYSTROM MELLER	L.	CD
WIDLERT	S.	ACD

ECKERBERT	B.	D
CHRISTANSSON	S.T.	ADV
EDEN	K-A.	ADV
LJUNGBERG	G.	ADV

SWITZERLAND

MULLER	P.	CD
RUHIER	D.	ICM
HUNNINIGHAUS	R.	ADV

THAILAND

HOMASAVIN	N.	COBS
-----------	----	------

TIMOR-LESTE

HENRIQUES	S.	CD
DE OLIVEIRA LEONE	J.	D

TOGO

LATTA	D.G.	CD
DOBOU	K.	D

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

LUTCHMEDIAL	R.	ACD
BLACKMAN	C.	ALT

TUNISA

BENKHELIFA	H.	CD
SASSI	I.	ICM

TURKEY

YALCIN	H.	CD
AYGUN	C.	IR
EROL	U.	ADV
ERTURK	D.	ADV
KABAKCI	O.	ADV
TURKER	O.	ADV

UGANDA

MAKUZA	R.	CD
TWIJUKE	J.W.K.	ICM
MUNEEZA	S.	D

UKRAINE

OSTASH

I.

CD

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

AL SUWAIDI	S.M.	CD
AL HAMILI	A.	ICM
AL KAABI	R.	D
AL KHANJARI	A.	D
ALBALOOOSHI	I.	D
DAY	B.	D
PIERA	A.	D
ALNAQBI	A.	ADV
CHAPMAN	D.	ADV

UNITED KINGDOM

MOOR	J.	CD
ROSSELL	M.	ICM
FLEMING	P. D.	ANC
ALCOTT	B.F.	D
CRONIN	G.	D
ELDER	H.A.	D
HAMILTON	S.	D
ROBERTS	S.R.	D
SMETHERS	M.	D
SMITH	R.	D

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

MUNYAGI	M.T.	CD
NUNDU	O.R.	ANC
SULEIMEN	S.S.	D
NJAWA	J.M.	ADV

UNITED STATES

BABBITT	R.	CD
GILLIGAN	M.	ACD
MACINTOSH	R.	ACD
BEHRENS	D.C.	ANC
CREAMER	S.	D
FAZIO	T.	D
HERSMAN	D.	D
HUNTER	C.	D
REIMOLD	D.	D
SCHRECKENGAST	S.	D
ALLEN	J.	ADV
BAKER	D.	ADV
BARABAGALLO	J.	ADV

BURY	M.	ADV
DONOGHUE	J.A.	ADV
HAUETER	T.	ADV
JENNISON	M.	ADV
JONES	D.	ADV
LORING	C.	ADV
TIMMONS	W.	ADV
WEBSTER	J.	ADV
WESTOVER	M.	ADV
YOUNOSSI	A.	ADV
ZOELLER	T.	ADV

URUGUAY

IGLESIAS	J.	ACD
VILARDO	J.L.	ICM

VENEZUELA

BLANCO	D.	CD
CARRERO	D.B.	ICM
GAMBOA	C.	D
URDANETA	F.	D

VIET NAM

PHAM QUY	T.	CD
LUU VAN	D.	D
BUI VAN	V.	D
DINH VIET	S.	D
DO QUANG	T.	D
HO MINH	T.	D
LAI XUAN	T.	ACD
NGUYEN VAN	T.	D
PHAN LE	Q.	D
TRAN THUY	M.	D

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

ACAC

EL ALJ	M.	OBS
EL KADY	M.I.	OBS

ACI

GAMPER	D.	OBS
GITTERS	A.	OBS

ACVFG

EPHRAIMSON-ABT	H.	OBS
----------------	----	-----

AFCAC

WAKO	C.	COBS
DJIBO	B.	OBS
FIKRU	M.	OBS
KABALIKA	C.	OBS
ONYEYIRI	F.C.	OBS

ANAC

BA	O.M.	OBS
----	------	-----

ASECNA

COURBIN	J.	COBS
MARCELLIN	A.P.	OBS
MBELLA MBELLA	S.P.	OBS
SAMAKE	W.	OBS
VEILLARD	A.	OBS

CANSO

DAVID	J.	OBS
HOEVEN	E.	OBS

COCESNA

VARGAS	J.	OBS
--------	----	-----

COSCAP

CORMIER	L.	OBS
---------	----	-----

COSPAS-SARSAT

BERTOIA	C.	OBS
LEVESQUE	D.	OBS

EAC-CASSOA

MAUGO	M.O.	COBS
-------	------	------

EASA

GOUDOU	P.	COBS
VINCENT	J.	OBS

EC

DE VOS	K.	OBS
HOLOLEI	H.	OBS
KAZATSAY	Z.	OBS
RATAJCZYK	M.	OBS

ECAC

AUER	A.	OBS
JONKER	J.	OBS
KIRK	P.	OBS

ECCAS

LIBEBELE	J-P.	COBS
----------	------	------

EU-ISIS

THORSEN	P.	OBS
---------	----	-----

EUROCONTROL

BAYRAKTATAR	D.	OBS
BLAIZE	M.	OBS
LICU	A.	OBS
MCMILLAN	D.	OBS
MORSCHECK	H-J.	OBS
VAZQUEZ SANZ	J.	OBS

FSF

VOSS	W.	COBS
FRANCIS	R.	OBS

IAC

MOROZOV	A.	COBS
DOROFEEV	V.	OBS
FILATOV	A.	OBS

IAOPA

SHEEHAN	J.	COBS
---------	----	------

IATA

COMBER	M.	OBS
GLAESER	C.	OBS
MATSCHINGG	G.	OBS
SAYYED	R.	OBS
TREE	J.	OBS

IBAC

SPRUSTON	D.	COBS
CARR	D.	OBS
INGLETON	P.	OBS

ICCAIA

AALDERS	L.	COBS
SCHMITT	C.	COBS
HEIJL	M.	OBS
JETTE	H.	OBS
KIHM	D.	OBS
MCVENES	T.	OBS
YOUNG	R.	OBS

IFALPA

LIMÓN	C.	COBS
MCCARTHY	P.	IR
ADAMUS	D.	OBS
COUCHMAN	C.	OBS
SALAS	C.	OBS

IFATCA

BEADLE	A.	OBS
--------	----	-----

IFATSEA

OUELLETTE	Y.	OBS
-----------	----	-----

IFHA

YORK	D.	COBS
------	----	------

LACAC

OSPINAS	M.	COBS
---------	----	------

UN

DIVOUNGUY

S.D.

CD

UN DFS

PETRUNOV

E.

OBS

UN WFP

ARROYO

C.

COBS

UN WORLD BANK

SCHLUMBERGER

C.

COBS

ICAO STAFF

ABEYRATNE	Ruwantissa	ICAO Staff
ALBERNY	Thierry	ICAO Staff
AWAN	Mokhtar	ICAO Staff
BARRETTE	Nicole	ICAO Staff
BARTON	Mike	ICAO Staff
BEGIN	John	ICAO Staff
BERNAL	Guillermo	ICAO Staff
CARY	Leslie	ICAO Staff
COLLINS	CJ	ICAO Staff
COOPER	Diana	ICAO Staff
COUTU	Alain	ICAO Staff
DE KOCK	André	ICAO Staff
DE LEÓN	Gustavo	ICAO Staff
DIALLO	Daniela	ICAO Staff
EKOTO	Romain	ICAO Staff
EUSSNER	Ansgar	ICAO Staff
EVANS	Anthony	ICAO Staff
EVANS DEMARIA	David	ICAO Staff
GALLEGO	Ruben	ICAO Staff
GARDILCIC	Drazen	ICAO Staff
GUERRERO	Fernando	ICAO Staff
GUITARRA	Fidel	ICAO Staff
HEFTBERGER	RoseMarie	ICAO Staff
HOHM	Michael	ICAO Staff
HOUMMADY	Mostafa	ICAO Staff
HUANG	Jiefang	ICAO Staff
JUN	Soo-ho	ICAO Staff
LAMOSA	Juan	ICAO Staff
LEPAGE	Andre	ICAO Staff
LEWTAS	David	ICAO Staff
LOW	Remington	ICAO Staff
LUONG	Quang Tan	ICAO Staff

MAIOLLA	Vaughn	ICAO Staff
MARTÍNEZ RODRÍGUEZ	Diego	ICAO Staff
MERENS	Marco	ICAO Staff
MILLAR	Michelle	ICAO Staff
MIR	Yahya	ICAO Staff
ORTIZ	Edward	ICAO Staff
PRETORIUS	Herman	ICAO Staff
SANDER-FISCHER	Wolfgang	ICAO Staff
STRATHDEE	James	ICAO Staff
SUÁREZ	Sofia	ICAO Staff
SUDARSHAN	Hindupur	ICAO Staff
TEO	Gim Thong	ICAO Staff
THORNE	Linnel	ICAO Staff
VERNHES	Cécile	ICAO Staff
WAFFO	Jean Claude	ICAO Staff
WANG	Yong	ICAO Staff
WANG	Yuanzheng	ICAO Staff
SÁNCHEZ GUTIERREZ	Abelardo	Consultant

CONFERENCE ORGANIZERS

KOBEH GONZÁLEZ	R.	President of the Council
BENJAMIN	R.	Secretary General
BONILLA	Adriana	ICAO Staff
CHOUHA	Fabiola R.	ICAO Staff
COOPER	Diana	ICAO Staff
COOPER	Denise	ICAO Staff
COSTA	Marcus	ICAO Staff
DEFALQUE	Henry	ICAO Staff
FATTAH	Yuri	ICAO Staff
FOX	Mitchell	ICAO Staff
GALOTTI	Vince	ICAO Staff
GNEHM	Elizabeth	ICAO Staff
GORUDJI	Henry	ICAO Staff
GRAHAM	Nancy	ICAO Staff
GUIANG	Arlene	ICAO Staff
ILLSON	John	ICAO Staff
LANE	Donna	ICAO Staff
MACFARLANE	Richard	ICAO Staff
MARIN	Miguel	ICAO Staff
MERENS	Marco	ICAO Staff
MORIN	Sharron	ICAO Staff
RAMOS	Miguel	ICAO Staff
THORMODSSON	Thormodur	ICAO Staff
WILKINSON	David	ICAO Staff
LAMY	Paul	Consultant

AGENDA AND EXPLANATORY NOTES OF THE MEETING

General. Theme 1 is of an informative nature, intended to provide the broader safety context for the Conference. Themes 2 and 3 are of an executive nature, intended to seek commitments and generate recommendations deemed necessary for the effective and efficient progress of key activities underway by ICAO, States and industry.

THEME 1: THE FOUNDATIONS FOR GLOBAL AVIATION SAFETY

International civil aviation remains the safest mode of mass transportation, and one of the safest production systems in the history of industrial systems. Levels of safety have been achieved that bring increased pressure on aviation and its organizations to sustain and improve such levels. This dictates the imperative for new approaches to the management of safety, as well as for a review of the processes aviation organizations must develop to implement such new approaches. This combination of new approaches and revised organizational processes for the management of safety are the foundations to improve the high levels of safety achieved by international civil aviation.

Topic 1.1 The ICAO safety framework

ICAO has embarked upon a significant review of its internal processes aimed at supporting safety and sustainability of international civil aviation. The development of an internal process for safety decision making, based on a systems perspective, sustained by aggregate safety data, and monitored through performance metrics, is nearing completion. This is an attempt by ICAO to lead by example and engage in safety management practices similar to those that are being required from States and industry. Under this agenda topic, an overview of the ICAO safety framework, including the relative roles and inter-relationships among the framework and ongoing initiatives such as the Global Aviation Safety Plan, the Global Aviation Safety Roadmap and the Regional Aviation Safety Groups, and the evolving Internal Safety Management Process (ISMP) of ICAO will be presented, and endorsement for the framework and its supporting ISMP will be sought from the Conference.

Topic 1.2 The evolution of the safety oversight audit process by ICAO

The objective of the ICAO Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (ICAO USOAP) is to promote global aviation safety through auditing Contracting States, on a regular basis, to determine States' capability for safety oversight. Under the Comprehensive Systems Approach (CSA), the ICAO USOAP employs essentially compliance-based audits. In its continuation beyond 2010, under the Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA), the ICAO USOAP would broaden compliance assessment to incorporate a safety risk management-based approach. The Conference will be presented with a report on the evolution of the safety oversight audit process by ICAO, highlighting the transition from periodic compliance audits to safety risk-based continuous monitoring, and will include a discussion on how the transition to a CMA would work in practice.

THEME 2: TOWARDS THE PROACTIVE MANAGEMENT OF SAFETY

Compliance with Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) has been, and will continue to be, a cornerstone of international civil aviation safety. Nevertheless, the levels of safety achieved make it increasingly difficult for international civil aviation to sustain an approach to the management of safety exclusively based upon regulatory compliance. It is essential to complement the prescriptive-based approach with a performance-based approach. An initial example of this performance-based approach is the implementation of Safety Management Systems (SMS), aimed at industry. Such an approach has now been extended to States through the State Safety Programme (SSP).

Topic 2.1: Managing the transition to the implementation of an State Safety Programme (SSP) environment

The State Safety Programme (SSP) is a system for the management of safety within a State. The SSP provides an enabling platform for States and civil aviation organizations to apply two basic safety management principles to the discharge of their safety responsibilities: Safety Risk Management (SRM) and Safety Assurance (SA). The SSP is also a structural framework that allows the State and aviation service providers within the State to more effectively interact in the resolution of safety concerns. Under this agenda topic, agreement will be sought from the Conference for a “list” of specific activities by ICAO and States and, as applicable Regional Safety Oversight Organizations, to be implemented as safeguards during the transition to the implementation of an SSP environment.

Topic 2.2 The relationship between SSP and Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA)

The continuous monitoring approach (CMA) to the ICAO Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (ICAO USOAP) is part of one of the most important safety programmes of ICAO. CMA will include the development and implementation of an on-line reporting and data management system that will allow ICAO to monitor the safety oversight capabilities of Contracting States on an ongoing basis with a harmonized and consistent approach oriented towards assessing the safety level of aviation activities and evaluating the safety management capabilities. The underlining safety management principles of SSP support the deployment of proactive activities that will provide some sources of safety information that will be used under the CMA along with other sources of safety data to help maintain a clear, accurate and up-to-date profile of States’ safety oversight systems. Thus, CMA could be envisioned as the means for future oversight of SSP. Although strong relationships exist between SSP and CMA, they are distinct programmes. Under this agenda topic, the developing relationship between SSP and CMA will be discussed and agreement will be sought from the Conference on the direction it should take.

Topic 2.3 Sharing of safety information

Under this agenda topic, the Conference will be presented with a review of safety databases and information systems available to international civil aviation, and asked to review and agree on the nature and scope of the safety data and information to be shared, among whom, the criteria for their selection, together with the need for specific partnerships with industry. The State Safety Programme (SSP) and the Safety Management Systems (SMS) are managerial systems for the management of safety, by States and service providers, respectively. Managerial systems rely on measurement. As such, both SSP and SMS need constant inflow of safety data to measure the extent to which the activities encompassed under Safety Risk Management (SRM) and safety assurance (SA) meet their objectives. Neither SSP nor SMS will function without steady safety data inflow.

Topic 2.4 The protection of sources of safety information

This agenda topic is closely linked to agenda topic 2.3 above. Safety data availability is not an issue in international civil aviation. The issue at stake is ensuring the steady inflow of safety data, by protecting data from safety sources from inappropriate use, as it is essential to maintain steady safety data inflow for the real advancement of safety management in international civil aviation. The basic starting premise should be that protection should be to a level commensurate with the nature of the data each source generates, and that such protection should not interfere with the administration and delivery of States' legal systems. Under this agenda topic, the re-focussing of existing initiatives will be discussed, and the Conference will be asked to agree on specific interventions by ICAO and by States, and when applicable, Regional Safety Oversight Organizations, to address all relevant dimensions of the protection of sources of safety information.

Topic 2.5 Implementing new safety management process

The need to develop a new Annex dedicated to safety processes was first discussed during a Directors General of Civil Aviation Conference on a Global Strategy for Aviation Safety (DGCA/06) held at ICAO in March 2006. Follow-up action by the Council and the Air Navigation Commission led to a conclusion that, at the time, there was insufficient basis for ICAO to justify the development of a new Annex dedicated to safety processes. Recent developments in ICAO, States and industry in safety management-related, performance-oriented activities provide reasonable grounds to consider revisiting the need to develop a new Annex dedicated to safety processes, originally proposed by the DGCA/06. Under this agenda topic, initial internal ICAO activities will be presented, and the need for the development of a new Safety Management Annex with the ICAO SSP framework as the basic contents will be explored.

THEME 3: OTHER SAFETY ISSUES**Topic 3.1 Harmonization of rules and processes to address other safety issues**

The Conference will be called on to make a commitment to actions to reduce the requirements for certificate holders to comply with multiple sets of similar yet different requirements under existing multiple certification rules, thus decreasing the administrative and financial burden for certificate holders, e.g. Approved Maintenance Organizations (AMOs), type certificate holders and Approved Training Organizations (ATOs), while addressing the potential safety consequences created by such a burden.

Topic 3.2: Safety initiatives arising from recent accidents

Under this topic, the Conference will address safety issues arising from recent accidents. This will include improvements to search and rescue, training and recovery of accident data when accidents occur over the sea and other remote or inaccessible areas. The Conference will also address improvements of current practices and procedures associated with flight-deck checklists and aircraft configuration as integral components of safety management.

Topic 3.3 Any other safety related topics

This topic will address any other items as deemed necessary in light of recent operational experience.

WORKING SCHEDULE

SESSION	TIME	MONDAY, 29 MARCH 2010	TUESDAY, 30 MARCH 2010	WEDNESDAY, 31 MARCH 2010	THURSDAY, 1 APRIL 2010
1	9:30 to 10:45	PRE-CONFERENCE SEMINAR 1. ICAO presentation on SMS and SSP 2. ICAO presentation on CMA 3. SMS/SSP experience in States – Presenter TBA	2. Towards the proactive management of safety 2.1: Managing the transition to the implementation of an SSP environment	2.5: Implementing new safety management process	• Approval of conclusions and recommendations
10:45 to 11:15 COFFEE BREAK					
2	11:15 to 12:30	4. SMS/SSP experience in States – Presenter TBA 5. SMS/SSP experience in States – Presenter TBA 6. SMS/SSP experience in States – Presenter TBA	2.2: The relationship between SSP and CMA	3. Other safety issues 3.1 Harmonization of rules and processes to address other safety issues	• Approval of conclusions and recommendations (continued) • Any other business • Closing
12:30 to 14:00 LUNCH BREAK					
3	14:00 to 15:15	HIGH-LEVEL SAFETY CONFERENCE 2010 • Formal opening	2.3: Sharing of safety information	3.2 Safety initiatives arising from recent accidents	
15:15 to 15:45 COFFEE BREAK					
4	15:45 to 17:00	- Presentation of the status of global aviation safety 1. The foundations for global aviation safety 1.1: The ICAO safety framework 1.2: The evolution of the safety oversight audit process by ICAO	2.4: The protection of sources of safety information	3.3 Any other safety related topics	
Evening schedule 18:00 to 20:00		Reception			

— — — — —

SUMMARIES OF DISCUSSIONS

Opening of the Conference

1. Mr. Roberto Kobeh González, the President of the Council of ICAO, as Acting Chairman, declared the Conference open.
2. The President highlighted that Delegates from 110 Contracting States and Observers representing 28 international organizations had thus far registered for the Conference, bringing the total number of participants to 430.

Introduction of the Officers of the ICAO Secretariat

3. Ms. Nancy Graham, Director of the Air Navigation Bureau introduced the Secretary General, Mr. Raymond Benjamin, the other Secretariat Directors, the Regional Directors and the Officers of the ICAO Secretariat who would be assisting in the deliberations of the Conference.

Election of the Chairman of the Conference

4. On the proposal of the Chief Delegate of Australia, seconded by the Chief Delegate of Cameroon, Mr. Radu Mircea Berceanu of Romania was elected as Chairman of the Conference by acclamation.
5. On the proposal of the Chief Delegate of the United Arab Emirates, seconded by the Chief Delegate of Brazil, Dr. Harold Olusegun Demuren of Nigeria was elected Vice-Chairman of the Conference by acclamation.

Adoption of the agenda and approval of the working schedule

6. The Conference adopted the agenda proposed in Appendix A to HLSC 2010-WP/1 Revised.
7. The working schedule set forth in Appendix B to HLSC 2010-WP/1 Revised was accordingly approved by the Conference. The rules for the conduct of the Conference proposed in Appendix C to the paper were duly noted.

Presentation on the Status of Global Aviation Safety by the Director of the Air Navigation Bureau

8. At the request of the Chairman, the Director of the Air Navigation Bureau, gave a presentation on the status of global aviation safety on behalf of ICAO. During the presentation (available on the Conference web site) the Director invited the Conference to:
 - provide guidance for the evolution of the continuous monitoring approach;
 - assist in the transition to a safety management environment;
 - provide advice required to enable the free exchange of safety information; and
 - consider alternatives for States having diverse safety maturity levels.

THEME 1: THE FOUNDATIONS FOR GLOBAL AVIATION SAFETY**Topic 1.1: The ICAO safety framework
HLSC 2010-WPs/2, 16 and 45
HLSC 2010-IP/22**

9. HLSC 2010-WP/2 titled “The ICAO safety framework” was presented for the consideration of the Conference. The subject was also addressed in two working papers (WPs/16 and 45) presented by: Spain, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, by the other States Members of ECAC, and by EUROCONTROL; and IBAC, respectively. One information paper, IP/22, presented by ACI, was also associated with this topic.

10. It was noted that WP/2 presented the revised organizational processes that ICAO is developing for the management of safety and sustainability of international civil aviation. In the ensuing discussion, delegates indicated broad support for the transition of the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme towards the Continuous Monitoring Approach; continued implementation of State Safety Programmes and Safety Management Systems; the development of a Global Safety Information Exchange System; the establishment of Regional Safety Oversight Organizations; and the development of Regional Aviation Safety Groups.

11. Delegates welcomed the move to data driven decision making but noted that the information made available to ICAO through implementation of State Safety Programmes will be critical and that the Global Aviation Safety Plan including its global safety initiatives will need to be reviewed and revised to support that need. It was also emphasized that the first priorities should be on measures that are of a global rather than regional concern.

12. Linking WP/2 with WP/16 in regard to the establishment of a Global Safety Information Exchange System, a delegate pointed out the difficulty in analyzing raw accident/incident data at a global level. It was suggested that it would be more realistic if the analysis of raw data be within the purview of State organizations and that ICAO collect from States information resulting from analysis of such data.

13. In the spirit of exchange of information, delegates supported the need for transparency of information to the travelling public; this was considered very innovative on ICAO’s part and responsive to a moral need for such a public system to be established.

14. During the discussion it was noted that there is a need for integration of the Business Aviation Safety Strategy with the Global Aviation Safety Plan and State Safety Programmes as the business aviation safety initiatives are compatible with the concepts of the proposed safety framework. To incorporate business aviation data, delegates called for recognition of the different types of aviation and that special characteristics would need to be taken into account but that business aviation in particular had mature systems capable of contributing to global safety analysis processes.

15. In summarizing the discussion, the Chairman noted the overall support for the ICAO safety framework focussing on the top level of safety information and initial support for the establishment of a new Annex dedicated to safety processes, to be discussed under Topic 2.5.

**Topic 1.2: The evolution of the safety oversight audit process by ICAO
HLSC 2010-WPs/3, 18, 28, 55, 61 Revised, 76 Revised**

16. HLSC 2010-WP/3 titled “Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme Comprehensive Systems Approach Audit Results and the Evolution of the Programme beyond 2010 using a Continuous Monitoring Approach” was presented for the consideration of the Conference. The subject was also addressed in WP/18 presented by Spain on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, by the other States Members of the European Civil Aviation Conference, and by EUROCONTROL, WP/28 presented by Australia, WP/55 presented by Brazil, WP/61 presented by the African Civil Aviation Commission (AFCAC) and WP/76 Revised presented by the International Air Transport Association (IATA).

17. It was acknowledged that the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) had been a major achievement for aviation safety, and had provided measures to evaluate States’ oversight capabilities and identify areas for improvement. While there was complete support for the implementation of a USOAP continuous monitoring approach (CMA), several delegates voiced the concern that the two-year transition period envisaged by ICAO may not allow States sufficient time to prepare, and appealed for a longer transition period. Other delegates, however, expressed the view that the transition period should not be continuously extended as this may compromise the safety benefits and efficiencies the CMA would provide. Some delegates indicated that as long as the transition allowed for flexibility with respect to States’ capacities to implement the CMA, the two-year time period should be endorsed. It was further stated that the ICAO Council should be provided with progress reports on the development of the CMA and decide if an extension to the transition period becomes necessary.

18. In responding to these comments and concerns, it was clarified that the USOAP had already collected a considerable amount of data during the conduct of Comprehensive Systems Approach (CSA) audits. The implication for States to provide data was simply to update existing State Aviation Activity Questionnaires (SAAQ) and Corrective Action Plans (CAPs), and nominate a National Continuous Monitoring Coordinator (NCMC). It was pointed out that information provided by SSP was not essential to the functioning of the CMA, but would serve to provide a more complete overview of States’ safety oversight capabilities. It was emphasized that under the CMA, activities would be tailored to each State depending on its specific needs, making efficient use of information gathered during previous CSA audits, thus optimizing ICAO and State resources. It was further clarified that during the transition, USOAP would carry out ICAO Coordinated Validation Missions (ICVMs) to validate progress made toward implementing CAPs and that a full range of customized intervention strategies would be developed to address the specific situations in States. CSA audits would resume after the transition, where appropriate and the principle of transparency currently applied under the USOAP-CSA will continue to apply under the USOAP-CMA.

19. Delegates welcomed the clarifications offered, advocating a cautious, informed and flexible approach. In this regard, the need for clear CMA guidance material in all official languages was stressed, as was the need for ICAO to provide additional and more detailed information that would allow States to assess future financial and human resource demands.

20. Support was expressed for the idea that under the CMA, particular existing arrangements in States may require the nomination of more than one NCMC. Delegates also expressed support for regional safety partnerships and initiatives such as COSCAPs. The availability of industry safety monitoring programmes was noted, as was the possibility for States to access such programmes to support their oversight efforts.

21. In summarizing the discussions the Chairman noted the unanimous support for the USOAP CMA. Recalling the concerns expressed regarding the time period for the transition, the Chairman indicated that regular progress reports would be provided to Council. If necessary, additional time would be provided to complete the transition. The Chairman affirmed that safety information gathered from regional and international organizations would be taken into consideration under the CMA and that procedures would allow for the appointment of more than one NCMC where necessary. Referring to comments indicating that more information on the transition was required by States, the Chairman confirmed that ICAO would provide States with detailed information on the CMA transition plan prior to the 37th Session of the Assembly scheduled for September/October 2010.

THEME 2: TOWARDS THE PROACTIVE MANAGEMENT OF SAFETY**Topic 2.1: Managing the transition to the implementation of a State Safety Programme (SSP) environment****HLSC 2010-WPs/4, 14, 19, 46, 48, 51, 56, 59, 63, 64 and 68****HLSC 2010 IPs/2, 3 Revised, 5, 6, 8, 10 Revised, 13 and 18**

22. HLSC 2010-WP/4 titled “Managing the transition to the implementation of a State Safety Programme (SSP) environment” was presented to the Conference. The subject was also addressed in ten working papers (WPs/14, 19, 46, 48, 51, 56, 59, 63, 64 and 68) presented by: China, Spain, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, by the other States Members of ECAC, and by EUROCONTROL; IBAC; China; Chile; Brazil; CANSO; Japan; Canada; and the Republic of Korea, respectively. Eight information papers, IPs/2, 3 Revised, 5, 6, 8, 10 Revised, 13 and 18, presented by Colombia, Spain, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, by the other States Members of ECAC, and by EUROCONTROL; the United States; Australia; ACSA-COCESNA; Indonesia; and the ICAO Secretariat, respectively, were also associated with this topic.

23. Delegates gave general support to the series of activities proposed in paragraph 4.2 of WP/4 in order to manage a phased approach to transition to the SSP environment. Delegates understood that such a transition would require that the traditional prescriptive regulatory approach be complemented by a performance-based approach. One delegate emphasized that SSP introduces considerable changes to existing practices as to how States discharge their safety responsibilities, especially with regard to the development of national regulations for safety management and Safety Performance Indicators (SPIs). Another delegate expressed concern with the difficulties faced by States and service providers in developing SPIs and that such indicators should address their specific safety concerns. In this regard, it was suggested that ICAO should work with States at the national and regional levels in order to obtain a common methodology in developing SPIs.

24. During the course of the discussion, a number of delegates outlined the safety-related problems their States were encountering in implementing their SSP. One delegate addressed the challenges of an effective safety reporting system and underscored the importance of having the necessary enforcement policy to support it. It was generally recognized that in order to collect data, an open reporting culture has to be established. Delegates also expressed the need for detailed guidance material regarding the development of an Acceptable Level of Safety (ALoS) as this would require a significant volume of safety information.

25. A delegate pointed out the particular challenges of having one or more accountable persons for SSP in a decentralized environment; and also the relation of the dual role of States as regulators and service providers. Further analysis from ICAO in this respect was requested.

26. There was general agreement to the phased approach for the implementation of the SSP, especially as it may present a challenge to some States due to the associated workload. On the other hand, the value of shared experiences and lessons learned by States in implementing their SSP was generally recognized.

27. In this respect, ICAO was called to show its leadership in promoting the exchange of available information on the implementation of SMS and SSP and, if possible, to form a study group to develop guidance material for the implementation of SSP. It was also requested to promote, where possible, the use of regional bodies to monitor the progress of implementation of SSPs in those regions.

28. Summarizing the exchange of views, the Chairman observed that States require a phased transition to the implementation of SSP recognizing the value of best practices and standards from industry in developing methodology for the development of safety performance indicators and the acceptable level of safety (ALoS) related to an SSP. He also noted the need to develop further tools and guidance material, as well to share experiences and lessons learned at individual and regional levels, in the development and implementation of SSP.

Topic 2.2: The relationship between SSP and Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA)
HLSC 2010-WPs/5, 31 and 37

29. HLSC 2010-WP/5 titled “The Relationship between the State Safety Programme (SSP) and the Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA)” was presented for consideration by the Conference. The subject was also addressed in WPs/31 and 37 presented by the United States.

30. During the discussions, the mutually beneficial relationship between State safety programmes (SSPs) and the USOAP continuous monitoring approach (CMA) was noted, in particular that safety information derived from one would enhance the other. It was pointed out that the assessment of a State’s safety oversight system under the USOAP CMA should incorporate tools to measure whether effective hazard and risk control mechanisms are in place to facilitate systemic safety management decision making. There was support for the work done by the Safety Management International Collaboration Group to create a framework as the basis for further development of a methodology to define safety performance indicators.

31. In offering a summary of the views expressed, the Chairman asserted that the effective implementation of SSP will require a constant inflow of safety information to support safety risk assessment and management. The Chairman urged States to commit to supporting SSP and the CMA as both evolve and mature over time. Furthermore, the Chairman affirmed the views expressed that the exchange of information generated by SSPs and the CMA would require a set of common safety metrics, and that the sharing of safety information would strengthen these linked and mutually supportive programmes.

Topic 2.3: Sharing of safety information
HLSC 2010-WPs/6, 12, 20 Revised, 21, 29, 41, 47 Revised, 50, 62 Revised, 74 and 78 Revised
HLSC 2010-IPs/7, 21 Revised

32. HLSC 2010-WP/6, titled “A proposal for safety information sharing” and HLSC 2010-WP/12, titled “Improving ICAO transparency policy: sharing and using information in a transparent, consistent and fair manner”, were presented for the consideration of the Conference. These subjects were also addressed in: WPs/20 and 21, presented by Spain on behalf of the European Union and its Member

States, by the other States Members of the European Civil Aviation Conference, and by EUROCONTROL; WP/ 29, presented by Australia; WP/41, presented by the United States; WP/50, presented by Japan; WP/74, presented by Singapore; WP/62, presented by AFCAC on behalf of African States; WP/47, presented by IAOPA; and WP/78, presented by IATA. Two information papers, IP/7 by the United States and IP/21, by New Zealand also related to Topic 2.3.

33. A viewpoint put forward in the working papers and shared by all speakers was that sharing and transparency of safety information was vital. A theme repeated in many of the papers was the need for a free flow of information that could be used to assess safety risks and develop appropriate responses. There was recognition that safety data analysis requires use of common metrics and there was strong support for the establishment of a group of experts by ICAO to develop such metrics. The importance of a common taxonomy was also highlighted. Another point made was that it would be difficult for ICAO to manage the vast amounts of data that would be collected through State safety programmes.

34. A critical factor in relation to information sharing was that there must be a clear understanding of how and to whom safety information would be disseminated and also how such information would be used. Legal aspects of information sharing were recognized as constituting an important area requiring examination. Support was voiced for the concept, in WP/29, of a framework for the collection and dissemination of information and, in WP/62, for a code of conduct that would offer guidance on the proper sharing of information in a fair and equal manner toward the ultimate goal of safety. There was support for the development of a code of conduct.

35. A key consideration in terms of the transparent use of safety information was that it should not be used for inappropriate purposes including for the purpose of gaining economic advantage which, it was recalled, went against Article 44 of the Chicago Convention. Concerns were expressed about a proposal in WP/12 to relate the issuance of three-letter designators to safety conditions in a State as this was seen as being inappropriate; the Conference was not able to arrive at a conclusion on this proposal.

36. The importance of providing assistance to States experiencing safety difficulties was emphasized and technical cooperation projects by States and organizations were seen as having a positive impact.

37. In summarizing the discussion the Chairman outlined key points that had been made:

- a) that ICAO should coordinate the integration of safety information provided by the international community and the dissemination of safety intelligence, as appropriate;
- b) that ICAO should convene a group of experts to address the issue of the definition and harmonization of safety metrics, associated data requirements and analysis processes;
- c) that ICAO, States and all interested parties should ensure that measures they take to improve safety, including those related to foreign operators are based on consistent safety indicators;
- d) that ICAO should develop a code of conduct on the sharing of safety information to ensure that such information is used solely to improve aviation safety and not for inappropriate purposes, including for the purpose of gaining economic advantage;

- e) that ICAO should assess measures to increase transparency including how:
 - 1) Significant Safety Concerns (SSC) could be shared with interested stakeholders such as international organizations, regional safety groups, operators, airports and service providers; and
 - 2) SSC information could be shared with the public in a form that would allow them to make an informed decision about the safety of air transportation.

Topic 2.4: The protection of sources of safety information**HLSC 2010-WPs/7, 22, 30 Revised, 44, 58, 66, 72, 77 Revised and 79****HLSC 2010-IP/21 Revised**

38. HLSC 2010-WP/7 titled “Enhancing safety through the protection of critical safety information” was presented for the consideration of the Conference. Also related to the topic being discussed were WPs/22, 30 Revised, 44, 58, 66, 72, 77 Revised and 79 presented by Spain on behalf of the EU and its Members States, by the other States Members of ECAC, and by EUROCONTROL; Australia; IFALPA; CANSO and IFATCA; IFATCA; Singapore; IATA; and the United States. One information paper, IP/21 Revised, by New Zealand was also associated with this agenda topic.

39. With regard to the importance of information within a safety performance environment, delegates voiced the need for trust in the protection of safety data from inappropriate use by aviation organizations and to distinguish where and when safety data / safety information /safety intelligence needs to be protected from misuse. In order to establish the free flow of information for analysis, delegates recognized that the development of best practices for the protection of safety information is required. It was imperative that voluntary data be offered protection, that the protection be commensurate with the data reported, but it was crucial to have transparency in the analysis of the data. It was further suggested that recommendations from accident and incident investigations be followed up and the effectiveness of their implementation be monitored and confirmed.

40. Delegates called for a review of the provisions in Annex 13, paragraph 5.1.2 and in Attachment E in terms of scope and consistency with an expectation that some elements of Attachment E might be upgraded to SARP status. Delegates noted that the protection mechanisms need to be updated and suggested that the principles outlined in IP/21 might be appropriate. Other delegates noted that it was important to build on past work in considering best practice for data and information protection. In noting that significant input from the judiciary sector is required, a delegate called for interaction between judiciary and safety authorities and called for regional workshops to help develop this guidance. Other delegates emphasized that judiciary needs must be respected by the aviation community and supported the need for judiciary involvement in the deliberations.

41. WP/7 called for the establishment of a multi-disciplinary group which was supported by the working papers on the topic which also provided significant guidance for that group. The establishment of the task force was also supported by many delegates during their interventions from the floor. In support of WP/7, delegates noted that accountability must be maintained and that the judicial process should not be impeded. A delegate pointed out the difficulty of rationalizing just culture with the civil justice process and requested that this aspect be taken into account during deliberations of the multi-disciplinary group. Having regard to both WP/6 and WP/7, and the overlap between the tasks contemplated by paragraph d) of WP/6 and paragraphs b) and c) of WP/7, another delegate suggested that these tasks could be more effectively addressed by a single multi-disciplinary group of experts. The nature of this work was recognized as distinctively different to defining and harmonizing safety metrics,

associated data requirements and analysis processes, which should logically be dealt with by a separate group. The same delegate requested that the terms of reference for the group should be clear and comprehensive, and its composition should be appropriately specified, and that this information should be provided to States in a timely fashion. Another delegate proposed that the concepts provided in WP/44 as a way forward and that the information provided in WP/58 should be included in the terms of reference of the task force.

42. The Chairman, providing a summary of the discussion, noted that the protection of information from all available sources of safety data from improper use is essential to ensure its continued availability and that such safety information should be used only for safety purposes including the prioritization of technical cooperation. He noted the full support for the establishment of a multi disciplinary task force and that when establishing its terms of reference, ICAO should take into account the ideas developed in the working papers on this agenda item and in the ensuing discussion. Furthermore the Secretariat would request States to allow the Secretariat to review the construction of the working groups which will appear as proposals in a subsequent State letter.

Topic 2.5: Implementing new safety management process

HLSC 2010-WPs/8, 17, 23, 39, 52 and 70

HLSC 2010-IPs/1, 19 and 21

43. HLSC 2010-WP/8 titled “A Proposal for a new Annex dedicated to Safety Management Responsibilities and Processes” was presented for the consideration of the Conference. Also related to the topic being discussed were WPs/17 Revised and 23 Revised presented by Spain on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, by the other States Members of the European Civil Aviation Conference, and by EUROCONTROL. The subject was also addressed in WPs/39 Revised, 52 and 70 presented by the United States, the ICCAIA and Singapore, respectively. In addition, IPs/1, 19 and 21 Revised were associated with this topic.

44. There was unanimous support for the establishment of a new Annex to the Convention dedicated to safety management responsibilities and processes. Many delegates concurred that consolidating Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) related to safety management would assist States in developing State Safety Programmes (SSPs) and Safety Management Systems (SMS), and support the safety management framework being developed by ICAO. It was considered that this would provide an opportunity to review and harmonize existing safety management provisions and align the timing of their applicability. It was furthermore pointed out that such a review would eliminate duplication of SARPs in other Annexes and would thereby improve the content of all Annexes. It was put forward that this Annex would address the integrated nature of safety management, which would strengthen safety oversight systems through a link with ICAO’s continuous monitoring approach (CMA). The view was also expressed that such an Annex would not only clarify provisions for SSPs but also give them the prominence they deserve. Several delegates mentioned that issues of transparency should also be addressed and that the new Annex should include provisions for information management, in particular for how safety information should be used.

45. The need for safety management provisions to cover general aviation operations for which safety oversight is also conducted in States was mentioned by several delegates. It was noted that occurrences involving general aviation and light aircraft have an effect on the overall accident rate. It was suggested that synergies be sought for the safety management of general aviation and commercial civil aviation.

46. The matter of guidance material to support the new Annex was raised, particularly that guidance material should clarify the relationship between the SSP and the SMS and their links to the CMA. It was suggested that guidance material outline the advantages of regional safety management systems. In addition, it was suggested that the *Safety Oversight Audit Manual* (Doc 9735) and related material be revised to reflect the transition towards the CMA.

47. The need for greater transparency in the development of all SARPs and PANS received support by many delegates. It was considered that the dissemination of information on the context in which the amendment was developed, on the safety implications and on cost implications would improve understanding, facilitate implementation and reduce the notification of differences. It was indicated that some States require that a safety case or impact assessment be undertaken before new regulations can be implemented. The provision by ICAO of an impact assessment and justification of amendments to Annexes would greatly support this process and reduce cost for States.

48. In offering a summary of the deliberations, the Chairman noted the Conference's endorsement of a new Annex on safety management that would support a State's safety oversight system and safety management regulatory framework. The Chairman confirmed that the views expressed both during the discussion and in the papers presented on this topic would be taken into account during development of the new Annex. The Chairman further stated that ICAO should work to prioritize the development of the new Annex. Furthermore, the Chairman concluded that ICAO should increase the transparency of the rationale for the development of SARPs and PANS, as well as the user-friendliness of ICAO Annexes.

THEME 3: OTHER SAFETY ISSUES

Topic 3.1 Harmonization of rules and processes to address other safety issues **HLSC 2010-WPs/9, 32, 33, 38, 40, 53, 65 and 73** **HLS 2010-IPs/12, 14, 17**

49. HLSC 2010-WP/9 titled "Recognition and validation of approvals and certifications issued by other States" was presented to the Conference. The subject was also addressed in seven other working papers (WPs/32 Revised, 33, 38, 40, 53, 65, and 73) presented by: the United States, ICCAIA, SRVSOP and Singapore. Three information papers, IPs/12, 14 and 17 Revised presented by Indonesia and AFCAC on behalf of African States were also associated with this topic.

50. During the ensuing discussion, Delegates expressed support for the proposal made in WP/9 to harmonize the certification requirements for Air Operator Certificates, and the approval requirements for Approved Training Organizations (ATOs) and for Approved Maintenance Organizations (AMOs); however it was raised that harmonization should be based on data driven requirements. Delegates also supported the need for increased international cooperation in the validation of certificated products and parts between States. One delegate urged global harmonization of the AOC by meeting Annex 6 provisions.

51. Many participants agreed that the multiplicity of requirements increases regulatory burdens for AMOs and ATOs which could potentially divert resources and adversely impact safety critical programmes of States and industry. Delegates indicated that the resource expenditures must be commensurate with the greatest safety benefits to be gained. Different means to reduce the regulatory burden on AMOs were suggested such as: bilateral recognition agreements; joint regulatory audits; and the sharing of safety oversight audit information in respect of AMOs, which could be beneficial as AMOs could expect to be audited by foreign States on a frequent basis. Another means of achieving global harmonization and reduction in the duplication of efforts was through Regional Safety Oversight Organizations.

52. Delegates proposed that ICAO focus its initial efforts on the standardization of the maintenance approval rating system of AMOs and requested ICAO to consider the feasibility of establishing a study group to identify the needs of a validating authority and to develop a proposal that determines the scope of a validation activity for a product or part. Additionally, many delegates endorsed the points raised in WP/38 with the harmonization of SMS requirements.

53. The need for robust Standards and guidance material to support a system of States validation and recognition of certifications, approvals and acceptances issued by other States was emphasized by a number of participants. In the near term an ICAO standardized maintenance approval rating system for AMOs would help States. A number of Delegates pointed out that due diligence was required if States were to recognize and validate the certifications, approvals and acceptances of other States.

54. In offering a summary of the exchange of views, the Chairman noted that unanimous support had been expressed for WP/9 on the need to harmonize rules and process for the approval of maintenance and training organizations. The sharing of information amongst States was essential to maintain trust and facilitate the recognition of the AOCs, AMOs and ATOs of other States. The Conference recognized and supported the use of regional aviation safety groups to reduce administrative and financial burdens to States and industry, for recognition of type certificate holders and approved maintenance or training organization and recommended the establishment of a group to develop the framework of acceptance of the AOCs, AMOs, ATOs, SMS and products.

**Topic 3.2: Safety initiatives arising from recent accidents
HLSC 2010-WPs/10, 13, 15, 24, 25, 26, 43, 57, 69 and 71**

55. HLSC 2010-WP/10, titled “Safety initiatives arising from recent accidents” was presented for the consideration of the Conference. Other papers related to this topic were: WP/13, presented by the United Arab Emirates; WP/15, by the Interstate Aviation Committee; WPs/24, 25 and 26, by Spain on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, by the other States Members of the European Civil Aviation Conference, and by EUROCONTROL; WP/43, by the United States; WP/57, by Brazil; WP/69, by the Republic of Korea; and WP/71, by Singapore.

56. The ICAO Secretariat working paper (WP/10) provided the initial examination of safety initiatives arising from recent accidents. The remaining working papers covered a variety of related subjects: provision of search and rescue (SAR) services; airborne image recorders (AIR); flight data recorders and their recovery; communications over oceanic areas; application of safety management to flight deck activities; and regional airline safety and pilot training, fatigue and professionalism.

57. One of the main topics discussed was the situation regarding accidents that occur over the high seas and a recent accident has highlighted the need to improve availability of recorded on-board data, Search and Rescue as well as communication and surveillance. With regard to flight data recorders, the work already done by ICAO and France was acknowledged and the Conference agreed that the work should continue with high priority. The difficulties and cost of search and rescue (SAR) operations when the accident is far from land was mentioned especially when the location of the accident is not well known. The interest of regional cooperation for SAR activities was stressed. The need to improve the surveillance capability over oceanic areas was also discussed and it was noted that available technology and equipment were not always used to their fullest extent.

58. Based on the proposal contained in one WP, the interest of airborne image recorders (AIR) for the investigation of accidents was mentioned by several participants. One delegate mentioned

that it has been a subject which has been discussed for a number of years and that the issue of protection of the recorded data has been a stumbling block

59. The subject of safety issues relating to flight deck activities was raised, including standard operating procedures and checklist usage. There is a need to review the applicable requirements, taking into account the increased automation in the cockpit and applying threat and error management (TEM) and safety management principles.

60. Noting the various calls for action by ICAO, D/ANB felt it important to mention the Secretariat's limited resources. She remarked that it would be necessary to prioritize the work, determine what ICAO and non-ICAO resources could be drawn upon, and to coordinate related activities were underway in the regions.

61. In summarizing the discussion the Chairman outlined the conclusions reached:

- a) that the Conference re-affirms that all accidents need to be thoroughly investigated in order to ensure that lessons are learned and integrated into the safety framework;
- b) that it is not acceptable that an accident cannot be completely investigated due to the lack of availability of the recorded data. As a result, ICAO should pursue as a matter of high priority a review of SARPs and guidance materials with the aim of proposing to States for consideration any amendment which would be necessary to ensure that the data necessary to support investigation of accidents are available, including provisions for the recovery of data and information from flight recorders;
- c) that ICAO should also assess the changes which might be necessary to improve surveillance, flight monitoring and communications in oceanic/remote areas, including timely and adequate search and rescue services, and review SARPs and guidance material, as necessary;
- d) that ICAO should review with priority existing requirements on flight deck activities, checklist and standard operating procedure design with emphasis on critical phases of flight operations in order to assess, applying safety management principles, further action to be taken; and
- e) that ICAO should provide the most up-to-date information on the subjects above in a briefing at the 37th Session of the Assembly.

Topic 3.3: Any other safety related topics
HLSC 2010-WPs/11, 27, 34, 35, 36, 42, 49, 54, 60, 67 and 75
HLSC 2010-IPs/4, 9, 11, 15, 16 and 20

62. *Regional safety oversight arrangements*

62.1 The Conference agreed with a statement contained in WP/11 that the Regional Safety Oversight Organization (RSOO) is a critical tool for many States to support their efforts to rectify deficiencies found by the ICAO Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) audits and comply with the international Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs). RSOOs play an increasingly important role in supporting States to meet their safety oversight responsibilities. It was therefore considered important that ICAO support the development and sustainability of RSOOs.

62.2 At the same time, it was recognized that not all States were able to become a member of an RSOO and that, in such cases, alternative arrangements for effective oversight needed to be explored. It was also recognized that one of the major challenges facing RSOOs was the development of a funding mechanism that would ensure their long-term sustainability. A case in point was that of the Pacific Safety Aviation Office (PASO) on which a status report was provided in WP/75. There was therefore a need for ICAO to update existing guidance material on Regional Safety Oversight Organizations in ICAO Doc 9734, Safety Oversight Manual, Part B — The Establishment and Management of a Regional Safety Oversight System particularly with respect to guidance on the funding of RSOOs.

63. *The Next Generation of Aviation Professionals and harmonized training proposals*

63.1 Three papers were presented to the Conference on the subject of training. WP/54, presented by the ICAO Secretariat, contained a report on the outcomes of initiatives regarding the Next Generation of Aviation Professionals (NGAP). Work in collaboration with the International Air Transport Association (IATA) eventually resulted in the creation of the NGAP Task Force and a work programme that included deliverables related to a policy on the accreditation/endorsement of training institutions, competences for flight crew and air traffic controllers and a communication strategy. WP/27, presented by Spain on behalf the European Union and its member States and by other State members of the European Civil Aviation Conference and EUROCONTROL, addressed future pilot training requirements. A third paper, WP/36, presented by the United States, contained a proposal for a harmonized training programme for pilots, flight instructors and evaluation personnel.

63.2 The Conference agreed that all efforts should be made to improve the competencies of flight crew and to ensure that training of aviation professionals was enhanced to meet the demands of new procedures and increasingly complex technologies. In this respect, it was essential that States support the work of the NGAP; and endorse the Task Force's recommendations to develop material for inclusion in ICAO SARPs as well as guidance material.

64. *Suspension and revocation of type certificates*

64.1 WP/35, presented by United States, pointed out that although continued operational safety of aircraft was a worldwide responsibility performed by States of Registry, States of Registry relied on the continuing airworthiness instructions given by the State of Design in order to fulfil their responsibilities. For this reason, there needed to be a common understanding of how design related airworthiness instructions should continue to be provided to the State of Registry in the event that the Type Certificate was suspended, surrendered or revoked by the State of Design. It was therefore agreed

that ICAO needed to facilitate the development of a process for assessing State of Design responsibilities when Type Certificates were suspended or revoked.

65. *Improving the safety of approach and landing operations*

65.1 As stated in WP/34, also presented by the United States, approach and landing operations have historically experienced a high number of fatal accidents and that unstable approaches have been identified as a causal factor in 66 per cent of 76 approach and landing accidents or incidents worldwide. Unstable approaches occurred with greatest frequency on approach procedures with no vertical guidance (Non Precision Approach/NPA procedures). In the case of the United States, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) had made major improvements in safety during the approach phase with the introduction of new performance-based navigation (PBN) procedures. In addition, the approval of Enhanced Flight Vision Systems (EFVS) had improved the pilot's ability to make the visual transition during the approach in low visibility flight conditions.

65.2 The Conference therefore recognized that ICAO needed to continue its efforts to support the implementation of initiatives that could improve safety in all phases of flight, such as performance based navigation.

66. *Regional international runway safety summits arrangements*

66.1 In WP/42, the United States emphasized that runway safety continued to be one of aviation's greatest challenges and, as such, every practical effort should be made to stop runway incursions at airports throughout the world. In August 2007, the FAA issued a Call to Action that contained a number of initiatives taken by both the FAA and industry, which ultimately resulted in a decline in the number of serious runway incursions by 82 per cent. One effort that proved to be particularly effective was the holding of an international Runway Safety Summit in 2007. The Conference therefore agreed that regional International Runway Safety Summits should be held with the support and assistance of ICAO, as an important effort at stopping runway incursions.

67. *Availability of ICAO guidance material in the official languages of ICAO*

67.1 WP/49, presented by Cuba and supported by several other States, stressed the importance of ICAO making its guidance material available in all the official languages of the Organization. Reference was made in the paper to several ICAO safety documents, including the new draft of Doc 8335 – Manual of Procedures for Operations Inspection, Certification and Continued Surveillance, that were only available in the English language.

67.2 The Conference agreed on the importance of having the safety documents of ICAO translated into all the languages of the organization, and that ICAO should ensure that funding is provided for this purpose. ICAO needs to prioritize the allocation of its limited translation resources based on the risk for the aviation community. It was also agreed that safety-related documents should have priority on internal documents

68. *Development of guidance material on the conduct of safety management systems audits based on safety performance management*

68.1 China presented WP/67 in which it stressed the need for ICAO to develop guidance material for inclusion in the ICAO Safety Management Manual, on the conduct of safety management systems audits based on safety performance. Several other States supported the proposal. It was

considered that this would make it easier for States to monitor specific outcomes in the implementation of the SMS requirements.

69. *Funding of ICAO safety framework initiative*

69.1 WP/60, which was presented by the African Civil Aviation Commission (AFCAC) on behalf of African States, reminded the Conference that African States were in need of assistance in the development of sustainable levels of aviation safety, and particularly in the development of funding models that would guarantee sustainability in the provision of infrastructure and services. African States still faced funding challenges in the implementation of safety initiatives, especially in respect to the ICAO safety framework and the transition to the Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA). ICAO therefore needed to work with the African States and AFCAC to develop appropriate funding models based on the level of activity within a State to ensure the sustainable provision of infrastructure and services.

Any other business

70. No point was raised under any other business.

Approval of Conclusions and Recommendations

71. The Conference reviewed the conclusions and recommendations presented in HLSC 2010-WPs/80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88 and 89 which were adopted subject to amendment.

THEME 1: THE FOUNDATIONS FOR GLOBAL AVIATION SAFETY

Topic 1.1: **The ICAO safety framework**
HLSC 2010-WP/80

Topic 1.2: **The evolution of the safety oversight audit process by ICAO**
HLSC 2010-WP/81

72. A recommendation was added to Recommendation 1/1, referring to enhanced transparency of civil aviation safety information to the travelling public and a new conclusion was added to 1/2 indicating that transparency would be carried forward from the USOAP Comprehensive Systems Approach (CSA) to the USOAP Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA). An additional conclusion was included in Conclusion 1/2 to reflect that, where necessary, more than one National Continuous Monitoring Coordinator (NCMC) should be accommodated under the CMA.

THEME 2: TOWARDS THE PROACTIVE MANAGEMENT OF SAFETY

Topic 2.1: **Managing the transition to the implementation of a State Safety Programme (SSP) environment**
HLSC 2010-WP/82

Topic 2.2: **The relationship between SSP and Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA)**
HLSC 2010-WP/83

73. Conclusion 2/1, paragraph 1.1 a) 3), Recommendation 2/1, paragraph 2/1 a) 2 and Conclusion paragraph 2/2, paragraph 1.1 d) were aligned to reflect the need for a common methodology for the development of Safety Performance Indicators (SPIs).

**Topic 2.3: Sharing of safety information
HLSC 2010-WP/84**

74. Changes were introduced in Conclusion 2/3, paragraph 1.1 a) 2) and corresponding Recommendation 2/3, paragraphs 2.1 a) 1) and 3) with respect to sharing of safety information. Changes were introduced to Conclusion 2/3, paragraph 1.1 b) 2) and Recommendation 2/3, paragraph 2.1 b) 2 relating to financial and technical support for certain Member States. In addition, a minor change was made to Conclusion 2/3, paragraph 1.1 b) 1).

**Topic 2.4: The protection of sources of safety information
HLSC 2010-WP/85**

75. The words “and the concept of open reporting culture” were inserted at the end of Recommendation 2/4, paragraph 2.1, c) 3). Also, an additional paragraph d) was added regarding safety recommendations issued by accident and incident investigation authorities.

**Topic 2.5: Implementing new safety management process
HLSC 2010-WP/86**

76. Recommendation 2/5 was amended to reflect the need for ICAO to work closely with States during the development of the new Annex on safety management. Furthermore, a new paragraphs was added to paragraph 2.1 a) to reflect that the new Annex should facilitate the provision of State and air carrier safety information to the travelling public and specify the high level safety responsibilities of States. In addition, a paragraph was included at 2.1 b) to indicate that ICAO should ensure wide dissemination of available contextual information associated with the development of SARPs and PANS.

THEME 3: OTHER SAFETY ISSUES**Topic 3.1 Harmonization of rules and processes to address other safety issues
HLSC 2010-WP/87**

77. Changes were made to Recommendation 3/1 were of a minor editorial nature, except for the change to paragraph 2.1 a) which was amended to indicate that information to be shared by States and stakeholders for managing the recognition process of Air Operator Certificates (AOC), Approved Maintenance Organizations (AMO) and Approved Training Organizations (ATO) be of sufficient detail.

**Topic 3.2: Safety initiatives arising from recent accidents
HLSC 2010-WP/88**

78. A minor change was made to Conclusion 3/2, paragraph 1.1 d). In addition, Recommendation 3.2, paragraphs 2.1 b) and c) were amended to reflect the priority with which ICAO should review provisions related to surveillance, flight monitoring and communications of aircraft operating in oceanic/remote areas, the provision of timely and adequate search and rescue services in areas of need and existing requirements on flight deck activities, checklist and standard operating procedure design. Two new paragraphs were inserted under Recommendation 2/3, paragraph 2.1 regarding action to address safety issues arising from accidents which can have an immediate safety benefits, and the utilization of available technology to enable permanent communication and surveillance over oceanic and remote areas.

**Topic 3.3: Any other safety related topics
HLSC 2010-WP/89**

79. A change was introduced to Conclusion 3/3, paragraphs 1.1 a) 4) and 1.1 b) 2) and corresponding Recommendation 3/3, paragraphs 2.1 a) 4) and 2.1 b) 2) to highlight the need for guidance on the sustainable funding of RSOOs and their underlying business models and for pilot training to meet the demand of new procedures and increasingly complex technologies, respectively. Minor changes were made to Conclusion 3/3, paragraphs 1.1 c) 1) and 1.1 g) 1). Similar changes were made to Recommendation 3/3, paragraphs 2.1 c) 1 and 2.1 g) 1 as well as a minor editorial change to 2.1 e) 1).

Declaration

80. The Conference reviewed the draft declaration presented in HLSC 2010-WP/90, which was adopted subject to amendment.

81. A new preambular clause was added relating to the need for improvements in communications over oceanic and remote areas, search and rescue procedures and the revision of cockpit procedures. In addition, minor changes were made to two preambular clauses.

82. Four new resolving clauses were introduced relating to: using shared information in a fair and consistent manner, solely to improve aviation; maintaining the confidence of the public through enhanced transparency of safety information; disseminating appropriate safety information to respond to the increasing demands of the travelling public; and developing improvements in communications over oceanic and remote areas, search and rescue procedures, and the design of cockpit procedures. Minor changes were also introduced in resolving clauses to improve clarity.

Vote of Thanks

83. The Conference, having completed consideration of its conclusions, recommendations and declaration, delegated authority to the Chairman to approve the summaries of discussion.

84. Appreciation was expressed by several Delegates for the leadership and wisdom of the Chairman during the Conference. Thanks were also offered to the Secretary General and the Secretariat for their efforts, including recognition of the many contributions to the Conference provided by the support staff. In addition, thanks were conveyed to the Government of Canada and to the City of Montreal for their warm hospitality.

85. The Chairman thanked the delegates and the Secretariat for their cooperation and assistance during the Conference. He then gave the floor the Secretary General for a closing address (reproduce on page ii-5) before declaring the Conference closed.

—————

DECLARATION

Whereas the *Convention on International Civil Aviation* and its Annexes provide the essential framework required to meet the safety needs of a global aviation system;

Whereas Contracting States have a collective responsibility for international civil aviation safety;

Recognizing that recent accidents have demonstrated the need for improvements in communications over oceanic and remote areas, search and rescue [procedures and the revision of cockpit procedures;

Recognizing that the safety framework must be fully utilized by all stakeholders and that it must continuously evolve to ensure its sustained effectiveness and efficiency in the changing regulatory, economic and technical environment of the 21st century;

Recalling that transparency and sharing of safety information are fundamental tenets of a safe air transportation system and that one of the objectives of sharing information is to ensure a consistent, fact-based and transparent response to safety concerns at the State and at the global levels;

Recalling that mutual trust between States, as well as public confidence in the safety of air transportation, is contingent upon access to adequate safety information;

Recognizing that safety is a shared responsibility, and advancements in global safety can only be possible through a cooperative, collaborative and coordinated effort among all stakeholders, with ICAO's active participation and leadership role;

Recognizing that further improvements in aviation safety within and among States require a cooperative and proactive approach in which safety risks are identified and managed;

Recognizing that the safety data necessary to support an effective safety management process require adequate protection from inappropriate use;

Recognizing the difficulties that many ICAO States have in establishing and operating an efficient safety oversight system and the need for these States to pool resources and work together within Regional Safety Oversight Organizations;

Recognizing that the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme's Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) being established by ICAO will be implemented in stages;

The Directors General of Civil Aviation:

1. *Commit* to reinforce the global aviation safety framework by:

- a) supporting the CMA and providing ICAO with accurate and timely information;
- b) implementing expeditiously the State Safety Programme (SSP) in their own States and ensuring the implementation of safety management systems across the aviation industry;

- c) maintaining the confidence of the public in the safe air transportation system through enhanced transparency of safety information;
- d) developing sustainable safety solutions, including the creation or strengthening of regional and sub-regional safety oversight organizations and initiatives;
- e) sharing appropriate safety-related information among States and all other aviation stakeholders; and
- f) working with ICAO and other stakeholders to identify actions that can be taken to reduce the burden for certificate holders to comply with multiple sets of requirements;

The Conference:

- 2. *Calls upon* States and other stakeholders to enter into agreements with one another for the exchange of safety information;
- 3. *Calls upon* States to use shared information in a fair and consistent manner, solely to improve aviation safety and not for inappropriate purpose including for the purpose of gaining economic advantage;
- 4. *Calls upon* States and other stakeholders to provide ICAO with accurate and timely information in support of the CMA and its transition plan as requested;
- 5. *Calls upon* States to examine their existing legislation and adjust, as necessary, or enact laws and regulations to protect safety information and its sources where the purpose is to improve safety;
- 6. *Calls upon* States, ICAO, industry, and donor organizations to direct resources towards the establishment of sustainable safety oversight solutions;
- 7. *Calls upon* States, ICAO and industry to support the coordinated implementation of safety management principles;
- 8. *Calls upon* ICAO to:
 - a) act as repository and disseminator of safety information provided by the international community;
 - b) develop a new Annex dedicated to safety management processes which would define, among other things, the safety management responsibilities of States under the SSP;
 - c) maintain the confidence of the public in the safe air transportation system through enhanced transparency of safety information;
 - d) disseminate appropriate safety information in order to respond to the increasing demands of the travelling public;
 - e) identify actions which can be taken to reduce the burden for certificate holders to comply with multiple sets of requirements; and

- f) continue to support the establishment of Regional Safety Oversight Organizations (RSOOs) and explore the development of alternative solutions for situations where the establishment of RSOO is not possible;
9. *Calls upon* States to strengthen the political will needed to address aviation safety shortcomings, including the creation, strengthening and, where necessary, participation in RSOOs;
10. *Calls upon* States, ICAO and industry to increase their efforts to further improve the competencies and professionalism of aviation personnel;
11. *Calls upon* States and industry to closely coordinate with ICAO their safety initiatives to ensure optimum benefits to global aviation safety and to reduce duplication in effort;
12. *Calls upon* States and industry to work together to develop improvements in communications over oceanic and remote areas, search and rescue procedures, and the design of cockpit procedures; and
13. *Re-emphasizes* the need for States, ICAO and industry to act effectively and in a timely fashion on lessons learnt from accidents.

In view of the above, the Directors General of Civil Aviation and the Conference have approved conclusions and recommendations to be acted upon by all involved.

— — — — —

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

THEME 1: THE FOUNDATIONS FOR GLOBAL AVIATION SAFETY

Topic 1.1: The ICAO safety framework HLSC 2010-WP/80

1. CONCLUSION 1/1

1.1 The Conference agreed on the following conclusions:

a) *Aviation safety*

- 1) Even though air transport is a very safe mode of transportation, there is a need to achieve a further reduction in the number of accidents and especially fatal accidents to maintain the public confidence in the safety of the global air transport system; and
- 2) States support an ICAO safety framework based on sound safety management principles and processes.

b) *Business Aviation*

- 1) Business aviation safety information needs to be recognized and incorporated into ICAO's safety framework.

2. RECOMMENDATION 1/1

2.1 The Conference agreed on the following recommendations:

a) *Aviation safety*

- 1) Further improvement of aviation safety and the reduction of the number of accidents, fatal accidents and fatalities should continue to be an objective of the highest priority for ICAO, and that States support the ICAO safety framework based on sound safety management principles and processes;
- 2) States should support the ICAO framework based on sound safety management principles and processes by providing safety information and support as required; and
- 3) Responding to a moral need, ICAO should ensure enhanced transparency of civil aviation safety information to the travelling public.

b) *Business Aviation*

- 1) ICAO should incorporate business aviation safety information into its safety framework and work with IBAC and other interested parties to that effect.

**Topic 1.2: The evolution of the safety oversight audit process by ICAO
HLSC 2010-WPs/3, 18, 28, 55, 61 Revised and 76 Revised**

1. **CONCLUSION 1/2**

1.1 The Conference agreed on the following conclusions:

- a) That the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) has been a major achievement for aviation safety, and has provided the ability to evaluate States' oversight capabilities and identify areas for improvement;
- b) The Conference fully supports the evolution of the ICAO Audit Programme toward the Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA);
- c) That Contracting States and regional organizations should support ICAO in the implementation of the CMA, notably by providing ICAO with information in a timely manner;
- d) That the sharing of safety information between ICAO, regional and international entities and organizations under the USOAP-CMA will allow for the optimum use of resources and potentially lead to less duplication of monitoring activities;
- e) That prior to launching the USOAP-CMA, a transition period is required. The duration of this transition period should be flexible, but will initially be set at two years. ICAO Coordinated Validation Missions (ICVMs) will take place throughout the transition period;
- f) As is necessary with any fundamental shift in methodology, the Conference agreed that ICAO should provide States, regional organizations and other stakeholders with ongoing training in the new approach, together with appropriate support tools, procedures and guidance material;
- g) That detailed information regarding the transition plan to USOAP-CMA should be provided to each State prior to the next Assembly via State Letter or Electronic Bulletin;
- h) That the principle of transparency currently applied under the USOAP Comprehensive Systems Approach (CSA) will continue to apply under the USOAP-CMA; and
- i) That USOAP-CMA procedures should allow for the appointment of more than one National Continuous Monitoring Coordinator, where necessary.

2. RECOMMENDATION 1/2

2.1

The Conference agreed on the following recommendations:

- a) States should commit to supporting the CMA, particularly during the transition period, by providing ICAO with relevant safety information;
- b) The Council of ICAO should monitor the progress made during the transition period and adjust its duration if required. The Council should report to the 37th and 38th Sessions of the ICAO Assembly on progress made in transitioning to the CMA; and
- c) ICAO should enter into new agreements and amend existing agreements for the sharing of confidential safety information with international entities and organizations in order to reduce the burden on States caused by repetitive audits or inspections and to decrease the systematic duplication of monitoring activities.

THEME 2: TOWARDS THE PROACTIVE MANAGEMENT OF SAFETY

Topic 2.1: **Managing the transition to the implementation of a State Safety Programme (SSP) environment**
HLSC 2010-WPs/4, 14, 19, 46, 48, 51, 56, 59, 63, 64 and 68
HLSC 2010-IPs/2, 3 Revised, 5, 6, 8, 10 Revised, 13 and 18

1. CONCLUSION 2/1

1.1

The Conference agreed on the following conclusions:

- a) *Managing the transition to an SSP environment*
 - 1) States require a phased transition to the implementation of SSP with the integration of performance-based processes and practices into the prevailing prescriptive environment;
 - 2) The incorporation of performance based processes by States requires effective interaction with industry, recognizing the value of best practices and standards in order to successfully implement an SSP;
 - 3) There is a need for harmonized methodology for the development of Safety Performance Indicators (SPIs) to enable States to develop and establish an Acceptable Level of Safety (ALoS) related to an SSP;
 - 4) There is a need to develop further tools and guidance material, as well as to share experiences and lessons learned at individual and regional level, in the development and implementation of SSP; and

- 5) ICAO should explore alternatives to a single accountable person when the SSP is established in a decentralized environment.

2. RECOMMENDATION 2/1

2.1 The Conference agreed on the following recommendations:

- a) *Managing the transition to an SSP environment*
 - 1) States should undertake the necessary legal and structural adjustments required to manage a phased transition to the implementation of SSP with the integration of safety data management activities and risk reduction strategies;
 - 2) ICAO should work with States and regions in developing a common methodology for the development of Safety Performance Indicators (SPIs); and
 - 3) ICAO should assist States in the implementation of State Safety Programmes through the development of additional guidance material, facilitating the sharing of experiences and other appropriate means.

Topic 2.2: The relationship between SSP and Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA)
HLSC 2010-WPs/5, 31, 37

1. CONCLUSION 2/2

1.1 The Conference agreed on the following conclusions:

- a) That effective implementation of State Safety Programmes (SSPs) requires a constant inflow of safety information from service providers and other source of safety data to support the safety risk management (SRM) and safety assurance (SA) processes;
- b) That the Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) will use safety data generated by States as SSPs evolve over time, in addition to data provided by other recognized entities. This data will be used to enhance the CMA's effectiveness. It is envisioned that the CMA will provide the means for the future oversight of SSP, once both programmes have been deployed and have had time to mature;
- c) That the integrated analysis of data generated by both SSP and CMA will strengthen the SSP/CMA link and will yield significant benefits in the conduct of safety oversight. The realization of such benefits will be dependent upon the free exchange of safety information derived from analysis of common safety metrics as well as the development of advanced analysis capabilities; and
- d) The Conference recognized the need to develop standardized methodologies for the establishment of safety performance indicators (SPIs) in support of the information exchange process.

2. RECOMMENDATION 2/2

2.1 The Conference agreed on the following recommendations:

- a) ICAO should develop a methodology for safety performance measurement, including key safety performance indicators that can facilitate the exchange of safety information among States, service providers and ICAO. The safety data gathered through the application of this methodology could also be used to support the CMA; and
- b) ICAO should continue to participate in the Safety Management International Collaboration Group, and evaluate the safety measurement matrix proposed in WP/37 as an appropriate framework to be used to define safety performance indicators.

Topic 2.3: Sharing of safety information

**HLSC 2010-WPs/6, 12, 20 Revised, 21, 29, 41, 47 Revised, 50, 62 Revised, 74 and 78 Revised
HLSC 2010-IPs/7 and 21 Revised**

1. CONCLUSION 2/3

1.1 The Conference agreed on the following conclusions:

- a) *Sharing of safety information:*
 - 1) That the sharing of safety information is essential to the furtherance of aviation safety and that measures taken to improve safety, including those related to foreign operators, should be based on consistent safety indicators;
 - 2) There is a need to develop principles of confidentiality and transparency to ensure that safety information is used in a fair and consistent manner, solely to improve aviation safety and not for inappropriate purposes including for the purpose of gaining economic advantage. These principles should be developed in a code of conduct;
 - 3) That it is important to define and harmonize safety metrics, associated data requirements and processes in support of integrated safety analyses, which can be best accomplished by an international group of experts;
 - 4) The analysis of State safety data should normally be conducted at the State or regional levels, with the integration of resulting information to be facilitated by ICAO;
- b) *Transparency:*

- 1) That ICAO should also explore measures to increase transparency, including how:
 - SSCs could be shared with interested stakeholders, such as international organizations, regional safety groups, operators, airports and service providers; and
 - SSC information could be shared ultimately with the public in a form which would allow them to make an informed decision about the safety of air transportation; and
- 2) That safety information made available by ICAO should be used by Member States, regional organizations and other donors to prioritize technical and financial assistance, with particular priority given to assisting regional cooperation projects in States whose safety performance is not at an acceptable level and where political willingness exists to improve State safety oversight functions.

2. RECOMMENDATION 2/3

2.1 The Conference agreed on the following recommendations:

- a) *Sharing of safety information:*
 - 1) ICAO should develop a code of conduct on the sharing of safety information, which will state that such information is to be used in a fair and consistent manner, solely to improve aviation safety, and not for inappropriate purposes including for the purpose of gaining economic advantage;
 - 2) ICAO should convene a group of experts to determine harmonized safety metrics, associated data requirements and processes to enable integrated safety analyses and to ensure consistent development of related safety measures; and
 - 3) ICAO should facilitate the integration of safety data and information from various sources as well as the dissemination of related analysis output, with the objective to ensure that such information is disseminated for appropriate purposes.
- b) *Transparency:*
 - 1) ICAO should develop criteria for the sharing of SSCs with interested stakeholders and assess how the information on SSCs could be shared with the public in a form which would allow them to make an informed decision about the safety of air transportation;
 - 2) ICAO should collaborate in the identification of financial and technical support for Member States with unresolved SSCs, or whose safety performance is shown to be at an unacceptable level and/or deteriorating rapidly where the political willingness exists to improve State safety oversight functions; and

- 3) ICAO should develop a framework for the use of safety information to include clearly identified expected actions for both ICAO and Member States.

Topic 2.4: The protection of sources of safety information
HLSC 2010-WPs/7, 22, 30 Revised, 44, 58, 66, 72, 77 Revised and 79
HLSC 2010 IP/21 Revised

1. CONCLUSION 2/4

1.1 The Conference agreed on the following conclusions:

- a) Both the State Safety Programme (SSP) and Safety Management Systems (SMS) need a steady inflow of safety data beyond those related to accidents or serious incidents to function effectively;
- b) To assure the continued inflow of safety data to support development and implementation of SSP and SMS, data relating to hazards identified through routine operations must not be used for retributive purposes against the sources of such data. Nor should the collection and archiving such data, necessary in support of SSP and SMS safety risk management processes create an undue liability for aviation organizations;
- c) The protection of information from all available sources of safety data from improper use is essential to ensure its continued availability;
- d) That safety information should be used only for safety purposes including the prioritization of technical cooperation; and
- e) Recommendations from accident and incident investigations should be followed up and the effectiveness of their implementation monitored and confirmed.

2. RECOMMENDATION 2/4

2.1 The Conference agreed on the following recommendations:

- a) That ICAO establishes a multidisciplinary group to progress activities regarding the protection of safety data and safety information with the view to ensure the availability of safety information required for the management of safety;
- b) States and international organizations should support the multidisciplinary group; and
- c) When establishing the terms of reference for the group, ICAO should take into account the ideas developed in the working papers on this item and should consider:
 - 1) protection of safety data in support of SSP and SMS other than those related to accidents and incidents records;

- 2) protection of certain accident and incident records; and
- 3) interactions between safety and judicial authorities and the concept of open reporting culture; and
- d) States should follow the safety recommendations issued by their accident and incident investigation authorities, ask for the action to be taken, evaluate their effectiveness and record their results.

**Topic 2.5: Implementing new safety management process
HLSC 2010-WP/86**

1. CONCLUSION 2/5

1.1 The Conference agreed on the following conclusions:

- a) *Safety management*
 - 1) Safety management processes under the direct responsibility of Contracting States that are critical to civil aviation safety should be contained in a single Annex. They are contained, in a principled manner, within the ICAO State Safety Programme (SSP) framework, and include the eight critical elements of a safety oversight system;
 - 2) The SMS requirements specific to one area of activities, such as operations, airport or air traffic service should remain in individual Annexes; and
 - 3) The SMS requirements should cover general and business aviation activities.
- b) *SARPs and PANS development*
 - 1) Proposals for new Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) or new Procedures for Air Navigation Services (PANS) should be supported by an ICAO impact statement to assist States in evaluating such proposals and also facilitate the development of associated impact statements by States when integrating ICAO SARPs into their own regulations; and
 - 2) ICAO should consider improving the user friendliness of Annexes and other documents by taking advantage of tools such as hyperlinks in electronic versions.

2. RECOMMENDATION 2/5

2.1 The Conference agreed on the following recommendations:

- a) *Safety management*

- 1) ICAO should develop, in close collaboration with States, international and national organizations, a new Annex dedicated to safety management responsibilities and processes which would address the safety management responsibilities of States framed under the State Safety Programme (SSP); and
 - 2) The new Safety Management Annex should facilitate the provision of State and air carrier safety information to the travelling public, in addition to specifying the high level safety responsibilities of States.
- b) *SARPs and PANS development*
- 1) ICAO should develop a methodology for impact assessment to be used when proposing new SARPs or new PANS; and
 - 2) ICAO should ensure wide dissemination of available contextual information associated with the development of SARPs and PANS using already existing tools and platforms.

THEME 3: OTHER SAFETY ISSUES**Topic 3.1 Harmonization of rules and processes to address other safety issues
HLSC 2010-WP/87****1. CONCLUSION 3/1**

1.1 The Conference agreed on the following conclusions:

- a) There is a need for globally harmonized systems of certification, approval or acceptance by a State. Such systems should be based only on safety requirements taking into account regional initiatives, to facilitate the recognition and validation by other States of certificates, approvals or acceptances regarding Air Operators Certificates, Approved Maintenance Organizations, Approved Training Organizations, Safety Management Systems and products;
- b) Harmonization efforts should be data driven;
- c) Sharing of information among Contracting States is essential to maintain trust and facilitate the recognition of Air Operators Certificates, Approved Maintenance Organizations and Approved Training Organizations of other States; and
- d) The Conference recognized and supported the role of Regional Safety Oversight Organizations in reducing the administrative and financial burdens to industry for the approval of Maintenance Organizations (AMOs) and Training Organizations (ATOs) and for recognition of type certificates.

2. RECOMMENDATION 3/1

2.1 The Conference agreed on the following recommendations:

- a) *State and industry access to information and assistance, transparency and sharing of information*
 - 1) That all Contracting States and concerned stakeholders should cooperate to share sufficient information to properly manage the recognition process of Air Operator Certificates (AOC), Approved Maintenance Organizations (AMO) and Approved Training Organizations (ATO). Contracting States and all civil aviation stakeholders need sufficiently detailed information in order to maintain mutual trust.
- b) *Verification*
 - 1) That States verify that the requirements under which other States approve AMOs and ATOS, and conduct their surveillance responsibilities, are at least equal to applicable ICAO Standards before recognizing and/or validating AMOs and ATOS; and
 - 2) That guidance material should be developed in such a way as to permit joint regulatory audits by States.
- c) *Approval, acceptance and recognition*
 - 1) That ICAO should establish groups of expert to develop the framework and conditions for the recognition of certificates, approvals or acceptance of AOCs, AMOs, ATOS, Safety Management Systems and products; and
 - 2) That, in developing the terms of reference for the groups of experts, ICAO should take into account the ideas developed in the working papers presented under this topic and during the ensuing discussion.

Topic 3.2: Safety initiatives arising from recent accidents HLSC 2010-WP/88

1. CONCLUSION 3/2

1.1 The Conference agreed on the following conclusions:

- a) The Conference re-affirms that all accidents need to be thoroughly investigated in order to ensure that lessons are learnt and integrated into the safety framework;
- b) It is not acceptable that an accident cannot be completely investigated due to the lack of recorded data. As a result, ICAO should pursue as a matter of high priority a review of Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) and guidance material with the aim of proposing to States for consideration any amendment which would be

necessary to ensure that the data necessary to support investigations of accidents are available, including provisions for the recovery of data and information from flight recorders;

- c) ICAO should also assess the changes which might be necessary to improve surveillance, flight monitoring and communications in oceanic/remote areas, including timely and adequate search and rescue services and review SARPs and guidance material as necessary;
- d) ICAO should review existing provisions and guidance material regarding flight deck activities in order to assess further actions to be taken; and
- e) ICAO should provide the most up-to-date information on the subject above at the 37th Session of the Assembly.

2. RECOMMENDATION 3/2

2.1 The Conference agreed on the following recommendations:

- a) ICAO should pursue as a matter of high priority a review of SARPs and guidance material with the aim of ensuring that necessary data to support investigations of accidents and incidents are available to investigators, including provisions for the recovery of flight recorder data;
- b) ICAO should review with priority SARPs and guidance material to improve surveillance, flight monitoring and communications of aircraft operating in oceanic/remote areas and the provision of timely and adequate search and rescue services in areas of need;
- c) ICAO should review with priority existing requirements on flight deck activities, checklist and standard operating procedure design with emphasis on critical phases of flight operations in order to assess, applying safety management principle, further actions to be taken;
- d) ICAO should urge States to take urgent action to address safety issues arising from accidents in particular those actions which can have an immediate safety benefit at a reasonable implementation cost. One example of such action may be the increase of the ULB battery life from 30 to 90 days;
- e) ICAO should urge States, as a priority, to take all the necessary measures to utilize aircraft and ground stations available technology to enable permanent communication and surveillance over oceanic and remote areas, including modification of procedures for alerting key personnel; and
- f) ICAO should provide updated information on the above-mentioned subjects in a report to be presented at the 37th Session of the Assembly.

**Topic 3.3: Any other safety related topics
HLSC 2010-WP/89****1. CONCLUSION 3/3**

1.1 The Conference agreed on the following conclusions:

- a) *Safety oversight collaboration*
 - 1) Regional Safety Oversight Organisations (RSOOs) are having an increasingly important role in supporting States to meet their safety oversight responsibilities;
 - 2) ICAO needs support to foster the development and sustainability of RSOOs;
 - 3) Alternative solutions for States in situations where the establishment of an RSOO is not possible need to be explored; and
 - 4) There is a need to update existing guidance material on RSOOs contained in ICAO Doc 9734, *Safety Oversight Manual*, Part B — *The Establishment and Management of a Regional Safety Oversight System* particularly with respect to guidance on the sustainable funding of RSOOs and their underlying business models.
- b) *The Next Generation of Aviation Professionals and harmonized training proposals*
 - 1) Efforts should be made to further improve the competencies and professionalism of aviation personnel and to ensure that training of aviation professionals is enhanced to meet the demands of new procedures and increasingly complex technologies;
 - 2) States and the industry should support the work of the Next Generation of Aviation Professionals Task Force (NGAP) including work on the enhancement of pilot training to meet the demand of new procedures and increasingly complex technologies; and
 - 3) There is need to support the Task Force's recommendations to develop Competency based requirement for inclusion in ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs), PANS/TRG as well as guidance material as required.
- c) *Surrender, suspension and revocation of type certificates*
 - 1) There is a need for a common international understanding of how design-related airworthiness instructions should be provided to the State of Registry in the event that the Type Certificate is suspended, surrendered or revoked by the State of Design.

- d) *Improving the safety of approach and landing operations*
 - 1) Approach and landing operations have historically experienced a high number of fatal accidents and that unstable approaches have been identified as a causal factor in the majority of approach and landing accidents and incidents. There is a need for a harmonized effort by all parties to address this issue; and
 - 2) Runway safety continues to be one of aviation's greatest challenges and every practical effort should be made to stop runway incursions at airports throughout the world.
- e) *Availability of ICAO guidance material in the official languages of ICAO*
 - 1) The Conference agreed on the importance of having the safety-related documents of ICAO translated into all the languages of the organization.
- f) *Development of guidance material on the conduct of safety management systems audits based on safety performance management*
 - 1) ICAO needs to develop guidance material for inclusion in the ICAO Safety Management Manual, regarding the conduct of safety management systems audits based on safety performance management.
- g) *Funding of ICAO safety framework initiative*
 - 1) Several States and regions of the world including Africa are in need of assistance in the development of sustainable levels of aviation safety, and particularly in the development of funding models that would guarantee sustainability in the provision of infrastructure and services for adequate air transport activity.

2. RECOMMENDATION 3/3

2.1 The Conference agreed on the following recommendations:

- a) *Regional safety oversight arrangements*
 - 1) States should support ICAO in efforts to foster the development and sustainability of Regional Safety Oversight Organisations (RSOOs);
 - 2) States should participate and actively support RSOOs whenever possible;
 - 3) ICAO should explore the development of alternative solutions for situations where the development of an RSOO is not possible; and
 - 4) ICAO should update existing guidance material on RSOOs in ICAO Doc 9734, *Safety Oversight Manual*, Part B — *The Establishment and Management of a Regional Safety Oversight System* including guidance on the sustainable funding of RSOOs and their underlying business models.

- b) *The Next Generation of Aviation Professionals and harmonized training proposals*
 - 1) States should support the work of the Next Generation of Aviation Professionals (NGAP) Task Force including work on the enhancement of pilot training to meet the demand of new procedures and increasingly complex technologies.
- c) *Surrender, suspension and revocation of type certificates*
 - 1) ICAO should consider establishing a group of experts to facilitate the development of a process for assessing State of Design responsibilities when Types Certificates are suspended, surrendered or revoked.
- d) *Improving the safety of approach and landing operations*
 - 1) ICAO should continue its efforts to support the implementation of initiatives that can improve safety in all phases of flight, such as performance based navigation or enhanced flight vision systems; and
 - 2) States should support the proposal to hold regional International Runway Safety Summits with the support and assistance of ICAO.
- e) *Availability of ICAO guidance material in the official languages of ICAO*
 - 1) ICAO should prioritize the allocation of its limited translation resources based on risk for the aviation community. Safety-related documents should have priority over internal documents.
- f) *Development of guidance material on the conduct of safety management systems audits based on safety performance management*
 - 1) ICAO should develop guidance material for inclusion in the ICAO Safety Management Manual, on the conduct of safety management systems audits based on safety performance management.
- g) *Funding of ICAO safety framework initiative*
 - 1) ICAO should work with States and Regional Organizations requiring assistance to develop appropriate funding models to ensure the sustainable provision of infrastructure and services based on the level of activity for adequate air transport activity.

— END —

ISBN 978-92-9231-497-2



9 789292 314972