



INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

MEETING TO DEVELOP THE AIRPORT-TO-AIRPORT MUTUAL AID PROJECT PLAN

LATIN-AMERICA/CARIBBEAN DISASTER OPERATIONS PLANNING GROUP (LACDOG)

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS

**ICAO NACC REGIONAL OFFICE, MEXICO CITY, MEXICO
28 TO 29 JANUARY 2014**

Meeting to Develop the Airport-to-Airport Mutual Aid Project Plan

Latin-America/Caribbean Disaster Operations Planning Group (LACDOG)

Summary of Discussions

- Date:** 28 to 29 January 2014
- Venue:** ICAO NACC Regional Office, Mexico City, Mexico
- Participants:** The meeting was attended by 19 representatives from Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, United States and ICAO NACC Regional Office.

General Session Discussions:

- Opening the session, the ICAO NACC Regional Director welcomed the group and stressed the importance of the project. She introduced the ICAO Regional Officers and offered ICAO assistance in developing an airport-to-airport mutual aid programme. She stated that such a programme would be used throughout the region and would serve as a model for possible worldwide dissemination.
- The ICAO NACC Deputy Regional Director discussed the critical nature of effective response to natural disasters in the region. He offered an example of an active volcano 70 km from Mexico City's International Airport (MMMX). He further highlighted how important a well-developed airport-to-airport mutual aid programme could be to the region.
- Following an introduction by the ICAO Project Coordinator, the meeting chairman offered a presentation that set out the goals and objectives of the meeting. He followed with a review of the mutual aid concept and the working paper presented by the United States at the C/CAR/DCA/13 Meeting. He discussed the scope of the project and the challenges unique to the cross-border context.
- The NACC Regional Officer, Air Traffic Management and Search and Rescue, gave a presentation on the Convention and ICAO Annexes 11, 12, and 14 in which he discussed the need for agreements between all regional authorities related to search and rescue, air traffic management, and the proposal to develop airport-to-airport mutual aid programmes. He stated that the ICAO goal was a worldwide seamless system achieved only through participative regional involvement and review of all agreements in the region. He offered that the existing Chicago Convention articles and regional agreements could be used as the framework for establishing a regional airport-to-airport mutual aid programme. The chairman tasked the Regional Officer to study the existing documents for relevancy and to report back at the next meeting.
- The Regional Officer, Aerodromes and Ground Aids, provided a presentation on ICAO requirements and standards related to aerodrome emergency planning.
- The chairman offered a review of the essential elements of an-airport-to airport mutual aid programme and discussed the need for formal written agreements.
- The Dominican Republic commented that for this to work it must have senior level support and that each agency involved must be appropriately empowered.

- Jamaica provided a presentation on its emergency management national structure from which several questions arose. The first resulted in a discussion relative to the need to assess capacities and capabilities of States and the relevant airports before this project could move forward. The second generated a discussion on the scope necessary for this airport-to-airport mutual aid concept to work. Finally, a discussion ensued regarding some of the major challenges of this effort.
- The Secretariat reported that ICAO does not have a database of airport emergency effort capabilities in the region. The Secretariat stated that its data was limited to audit findings, which is fundamentally different from what would be needed from individual airports and member States for this project. The Secretariat also discussed the lack of implementation of emergency planning not just in this region but throughout the world. They stated that many airports in the region do not even have an emergency plan, and many do not display effective implementation of aerodrome certification and emergency planning. The discussion then led to expanding the scope of this project to include improvement of emergency planning, ATM services, and safety. The chairman persuaded the group to limit the scope of this effort to the model offered in the ACRP Report 73 of the Airport Cooperative Research Programme (ACRP). After lengthy discussion, the meeting agreed that in order for this project to be effective it must have a limited scope.
- Haiti provided a presentation on the 12 January 2010 earthquake and the impact that it had not only in Haiti but throughout the region. Haiti stated that they had six airports total, with two international airports, all managed by the *Autorité Aéroportuaire Nationale (AAN)*. They discussed the fact that following the earthquake there were serious issues with coordination of aid, decision-making, and the implementation of contingency plans. Haiti expressed concern with the lack of a coordinated effort for aid following the earthquake and stated that many countries sent aid that was unrequested – aid that essentially crowded an already busy airport at PAP. They further stated that there is a serious need for this project and that such an effort would have aided Haiti (PAP) following the earthquake.
- Mexico gave a presentation on its national emergency planning structure. They discussed how airports fit into that structure. Mexico currently has an airport system that is divided into five airport groups. All are operated by proprietary organizations but all fall under the federal system of regulatory authority and the federal law that requires airports to assist other airports in time of need as resources allow. The Mexican airport assistance system is very similar to that described in ACRP 73 as it defines airport classification zones; minimum equipment and staffing levels; receiving procedures and requirements for equipment transfers; and agreement requirements between airport groups. The essential difference in the Mexican system is that it is mandated by regulation and ACRP 73 defines a voluntary system. A discussion followed with agreement to include elements of the Mexican model in the development of a regional programme. Mexico agreed and provided a copy of the model to the ICAO Coordinator.
- Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic and Honduras all provided a review of their national emergency planning structures. All agreed on the need for a regional Airport-to-Airport Mutual Aid Programme and to participate in the Latin America/Caribbean Disaster Operations Planning Group (LACDOG) under the leadership of the ICAO NACC Regional Office.

- Cuba stated that they had an emergency management structure that was similar to other States but that was more top down and that much of the support for disaster response in Cuba would come from the military.
- Costa Rica discussed the importance of involving the CAA and the DGCA. Costa Rica further stated that they believed that their National Committee of Emergencies would support an airport disaster plan such as this. Jamaica further concurred and stated that their National Disaster Committee was at the level of the Office of the Prime Minister and was already interested in this proposal.
- United States provided a presentation on the Airport-to-Airport Mutual Aid ACRP Report 73 and on the Southeast Airports Disaster Operations Group (SEADOG) and the Western Airports Disaster Operations Group (WESTDOG) organizations. The U.S. representative discussed the development of these groups and provided case studies on their activations since 2004. He discussed model mutual aid agreements and the need for airport-to-airport mutual aid agreements as a supplement to existing emergency planning programmes and organizations. His presentations led to a number of questions and a wide-ranging discussion that involved all meeting participants.

Agreements:

- The Meeting agreed to the following definition of airport-to-airport-mutual-aid that will be used in the development of the model and pilot project.
 - A mutual aid programme is a voluntary, non-contractual, written arrangement that provides short-term emergency or disaster assistance between two or more airports.
- The Meeting agreed to explore the control of the programme under one of the following (depending on the member airports/States signing the agreement and their situation, i.e. concessionaire airports, state-owned airports, resources available, etc.)
 - ICAO NACC
 - Airports
 - Member States
 - International Organizations
 - Contractor
- The Meeting agreed to the following essential characteristics of the programme:
 - Clearly defined purpose and scope
 - Voluntary programme
 - Existing bilateral or multilateral agreements fully considered and incorporated
 - Involvement of the full-range of stakeholders in all stages of the programme
 - Involvement of industry
 - Limited to aviation related assistance following a disaster
 - Aid remains under the control of the receiving airport
 - No self-initiated deployment authorized
 - No impact to the operational effectiveness of the airports sending assistance
 - An organizational structure that provides coordinators at the local and programme level
 - A standard operating procedures document to guide response
 - Authorization is defined and settled in the agreement
 - Asset inventories, including a minimum essential resources list for airport operations that identifies the minimum staffing/equipment required and defines the required skill set(s) of volunteers
 - Any effective communication system in place prior to activation

- Estimated costs and funding agreements established in advance
 - A broadly accepted coordination function to connect the airport in need with airports willing to send aid Information flow sufficient to allow matching of needs to aid
 - Liability and indemnity addressed
 - A rapid assessment capability to identify and prioritize needs
 - Close cooperation of airlines, airports, and national agencies to facilitate cross-border travel by aid teams
 - Familiarization among airports in advance of disasters
 - Promotion of the programme and education of stakeholders
 - Development of an after action review process
- The Meeting agreed to the following list of stakeholders that need to be included in coordination of this project:
 - ICAO
 - Regional Safety Oversight Organizations (CASSOS, COCESNA, etc.)
 - Aviation regulatory and safety agencies
 - Air traffic control agencies
 - Transportation security agencies
 - National law enforcement agencies
 - Immigration, border control and customs agencies
 - National emergency management agencies
 - Military
 - Fire, law enforcement, emergency management, and health at the local level
 - Management, operations, maintenance, firefighting, security and emergency management at the airport level
 - Legal counsel at the national and local level
 - Tenants and concessionaires
 - IATA, ALTA, ACI, and unions
 - Airlines and cargo carriers
- The Meeting agreed to the type of airports to be included in the model programme and pilot project.
 - International airports as defined by Annex 14, Volume I (initially)
 - Regional airports (only after the programme is developed and tested and depending upon the effectiveness of the programme test)
- The Meeting agreed to the definition of when the programme would be activated and what type of emergencies would trigger an airport-to airport mutual aid deployment.
 - As prudent and coordinated between involved parties to restore an airport to operational status. Normally restricted to the response phase of an emergency unless coordinated further between parties.
 - Disasters that would affect the operational status of an airport, except in those events where parties agree that the safety and security of the providers could be adversely affected. Normally restricted to natural disasters and not normally provided for terrorism, labour issues, or civil unrest situations.

- The Meeting agreed to address the following unique challenges in development of the project:
 - Costs
 - Qualifications
 - Authorization
 - Immigration/Customs
 - Security
 - Language and culture
 - Liability
 - Equipment differences
 - Procedure differences
 - Enabling legislation
 - Funding control
 - Coordination
 - Lack of aerodrome certification in the region
 - Recordkeeping and accounting

- The Meeting agreed to complete the following future steps to move the project forward:
 - Research existing agreement documents
 - Develop survey of capabilities and capacities
 - Develop working paper for NACC/DCA/5
 - Develop model programme
 - Develop proposed pilot project

Action items:

Research:

A review of existing articles and agreements will be completed by the ICAO NACC Regional Office and provided to the Group before its next meeting (Regional Officer, Air Traffic Management and Search and Rescue)

Capabilities Survey:

All member States will conduct a survey/analysis of emergency planning and airport capabilities and capacity.

- The meeting chairman will draft a survey list and submit it to the proposed DOG for approval through the ICAO NACC Regional Office.
- DOG members will survey all international airports and emergency planning organization within their State and provide data before the next meeting.

Model Programme Outline:

An outline of a model airport-to-airport mutual aid programme and agreement will be developed by the Chairman and coordinated with the ICAO NACC Regional Office and the proposed DOG before the next meeting.

Pilot Project Outline:

An outline of a model airport-to-airport mutual aid pilot project proposal will be developed by the Chairman and coordinated with the ICAO-NACC and the proposed DOG before the next meeting.

NACC-DCA Working paper:

A working paper will be written and presented at the NACC/DCA/5 Meeting in April 2014. The Chairman and ICAO Project Coordinator will draft the report, which will be presented by ICAO to the NACC/DCA/5 Meeting.

Next meeting:

The Secretariat proposed that the next meeting to be held in early summer 2014, after the NACC/DCA/5 Meeting, which was agreed. ICAO asked for volunteers to host the meeting, and State representatives will explore their capability to host the meeting. One proposal suggested that the meeting be held in Miami at the IATA offices, which would begin IATA/ALTA involvement in the project. The Chairman will coordinate with ICAO and discuss further with IATA/ALTA.