

IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM
(English only)

PART 1: IMPACT ASSESSMENT

1.1 What is the problem/opportunity that this proposal is designed to address?

Please include reference to Jobcard / ASBU / work programme item, as applicable

...

1.2 What is the overall impact of this proposal on the strategic objectives of ICAO, namely:

	Answer (Positive / Negative / Negligible / None)	Rationale: <i>Please provide an explanation for your choice and highlight any caveats or limitations in the selection</i>
Safety
Security
Environment
Efficiency

Note: In the following questions 'States' applies to the adoption and oversight of new SARPs. 'Industry' applies to the service provision and use, whether State owned or not (e.g. ANSPs, airlines aerodromes, meteorology, general aviation, etc). With respect to financial costs for States, it refers to the cost to develop, implement, maintain, and consider oversight issues associated with the proposed change. For Industry, it refers to the cost of implementing the change, where compliance is required by the State, which may translate in costs for equipage, human resources, training, documentation, aircraft modifications or upgrades, operations and airworthiness for example.

1.3 What is the overall impact on resources (financial, personnel, etc) of this proposal for:

	Answer (Increase / Decrease / Negligible / Unknown)	Rationale: <i>Please provide an explanation for your choice and highlight any caveats or limitations in the selection</i>
States
Industry

1.4 In your opinion, do the benefits of this proposal justify the cost of implementing the proposal from the perspective of:

	Answer (Yes / No / Not sure / Not applicable)	Rationale: <i>Please provide an explanation for your choice and highlight any caveats or limitations in the selection</i>
States
Industry

PART 2: IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

To assist ICAO and States ensure this proposal will be effectively implemented please answer the following questions.

Note: The ANC recognizes that panel experts may feel limited in their ability to answer some or all of these questions, however, encourages the panels to provide their views. If still unsure, it is acceptable to leave one or more blank. The answers presented to the ICAO Council with the proposed amendment will be further developed by ICAO.

2.1 What supporting documentation is required for this proposed amendment?

Please include reference to any documents that require initial release/amendment e.g. ICAO Document or Circular name and number, industry specification, etc

- ...
- ...
- ...

2.2 What other guidance, training and support activities do you recommend ICAO undertake to ensure the effective implementation of this proposed amendment?

Please include reference to any existing support/promotional programmes and whether it is required globally or regionally e.g. regional seminars, ikits, etc

- ...
- ...
- ...

2.3 What are the essential steps to be followed by a State in order to implement this proposed amendment?

Please include the major steps e.g. amendment of national legislation, change of oversight procedures, training of oversight personnel, required competencies, etc.

- ...
- ...
- ...

2.4 What is the timeframe needed to implement this proposal by:

	Answer (0-1 years / 1-2 years / 2-5 years / 5-10 years / not applicable)	Rationale: <i>For the State, the timeframe is the length of time needed to implement in the national regulatory framework</i> <i>For industry, the timeframe is the length of time needed for industry to start implementing in their operations</i>
States
Industry

PART 3: AUDIT PLAN

Note: This section will be completed by ICAO prior to the presentation of any proposed changes to SARPs or PANS. The Panel Secretary will coordinate with the relevant experts in ICAO.

3.1 Does this proposal require an amendment of the USOAP CMA protocol questions to assess effective implementation by States?

Please include reference to existing PQs that may need amendment or description of any new PQs that may be required. State 'Not applicable' if no impact

- ...
- ...
- ...

Attachment: Guidance on Completing this Form

Part 1: Impact Assessment

Section 1.1: This section is meant to capture, in general terms, a need or an opportunity for change. The information needed will typically be contained and extractable from a related Job card. Its size should ideally be limited to a few statements and its scope should remain focused on the issue at hand.

Section 1.2: This section seeks to establish the impact of the proposed change, in terms of safety, security, efficiency, and the environment. Drop-down boxes are provided to assist selection of a standardized answer. Rationale statements should substantiate in general terms the assessment of these specific items, outlining any significant caveats to which the panel may wish to draw attention. It may also outline differing views of State and Industry if necessary. Items deemed ‘negligible/none’ do not require a rationale statement unless you deem appropriate to provide one.

Section 1.3: This section seeks to obtain a very high-level understanding of the overall impact of the proposal on States and Industry, in terms of financial and other resource costs. For the State, this may include the cost to develop, implement, maintain, and consider oversight issues associated with the proposed change. For the Industry, it may refer to the cost of implementing the change (where compliance is required by the State) which may translate into costs for equipment, human resources, training, documentation, aircraft modifications or upgrades, operations and airworthiness for example. Drop-down boxes are provided to assist selection of a standardized answer.

It is recognized that while the implementation of a proposal may involve an initial cost to one system, the overall impact of the proposal when implemented may be to reduce costs in the overall system over a longer period (for example through introduction of new ATM operational procedures) and this should be reflected in the answer and rationale provided.

Whereas some changes have limited implications, other changes may be far-reaching in terms of resource commitment and long-term implications. The Rationale field should not attempt to quantify the impact on resources, but identify the overall scope (narrow change with no interdependencies; broad changes with numerous interdependencies) and timeline (a one-time change, or an evolving change with short-, medium- and/or long-term implications).

Section 1.4: This section seeks to obtain an overall summary of the merits of the proposal and whether the panel agrees that the proposal should go forward for State consideration. It is structured to allow any differing opinions to be reflected, from the State or industry perspective. The Rationale section should reflect any significant differences of opinion on implementation within the expert group. It must be noted that a negative response selection will not imply that the proposal will be rejected. Likewise, positive responses do not imply it will be accepted. Drop-down boxes are provided to assist selection of a standardized answer.

Part 2: Implementation Plan

The ICAO Council has requested that all proposals for adoption should contain detailed information on the steps necessary for adoption of a proposal. As stated in the form, the ANC recognizes that panel experts may feel limited in their ability to answer some or all of these questions, however, encourages the panels to provide their views. If the panel is unsure, it is acceptable to leave one or more blank. The answers presented to the ICAO Council with the proposed amendment will be further developed by the ICAO Secretariat and ANC in any case. The answers in this section will inform the applicability date decided upon by Council.

Section 2.1: This section seeks to identify all documentation (Annex, PANS, Doc or Circular) that needs to be amended to complete or support the proposal. A simple bullet-point list of the document references is requested.

Section 2.2: This section seeks to identify any promotional activities ICAO should undertake to ensure the proposal is clearly understood and effectively adopted. This is not of particular interest in routine Annex or PANS amendments but is a particular issue for new and/or far-reaching proposals. It is typically addressed by providing regional seminars, producing explanatory ‘ikits’, etc. A simple bullet-point list of suggested activities is requested.

Section 2.3: This section seeks to capture the essential steps a State needs to undertake to effectively implement the new requirement, assisting a State understand the overall impact of the proposal and what it will need to do to fully implement. As an example, the State may need to amend its national regulation, the CAA may need to amend its oversight procedures and applicable operators in the State may need to provide additional training to all flight personnel. A simple bullet-point list of the essential steps is requested.

Section 2.4: This section seeks to obtain a very high-level understanding of the time needed by both States and Industry to implement the proposal. As an example, it is the time needed by a typical State to amend its national regulation and implement perhaps new oversight procedures. The answer should not reflect when the panel believes the final State will implement the proposal (worst-case scenario) but instead the time needed by a typical State. For Industry, the estimate should reflect the time needed to implement a new national regulatory requirement into its operation and again should not reflect the worst-case scenario but instead the average time needed. It should not include any allowances for ‘sunset clauses’ or delayed applicability dates sometimes needed for implementation within operational cycles. Drop-down boxes are provided to assist selection of a standardized answer.

Part 3: Audit Plan

Section 3.1: This section seeks to capture whether an amendment to the USOAP CMA process and its protocol questions is required. The proposal may require a new protocol question to capture if the State is effectively implementing or may simply require an amendment to an existing protocol question. A simple bullet-point list outlining the protocol question(s) is requested.

— END —