



ICAO

**FIFTEENTH MEETING OF THE ASIA PACIFIC REGIONAL AVIATION
SAFETY TEAM (APRAST/15)**

Bangkok, Thailand, 24 to 25 June 2020 on Virtual Platform

Agenda Item 5: Updates from the Sub-groups

**GUIDELINE FOR STATES OR ADMINISTRATIONS TO USE THE ONLINE
MONITORING TOOL**

(Presented by SEI WG)

SUMMARY

Pursuant to Decision APRAST 12/7, SEI WG conducted a survey to seek feedback on applicability, priority, implementation challenges as well as if any particular assistance is required during the SEI implementation, one of the feedbacks from the result of the survey is to have a guideline for APAC States/Administrations to use the online monitoring tool.

In APRAST/14, SEI WG was tasked to develop a guideline to facilitate APAC States/Administrations to report their SEIs outputs and safety tools implementation progress and SEI Core Group has prepared and finalised the guideline as the Decision APRAST 14/6.

Action by the meeting is in Paragraph 3 of this Working Paper.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 At the APRAST/12 meeting, a workshop on SEI Implementation Progress was conducted and the SEI WG reviewed the feedback from the workshop and discussed the issues and challenges relating to the progress and update of the online monitoring tool for SEI implementation. Pursuant to Decision APRAST 12/7, SEI WG conducted a survey to seek feedback on applicability, priority, implementation challenges as well as if any particular assistance is required during the SEI implementation, one of the feedbacks from the result of the survey is to have a guideline for APAC States/Administrations to use the online monitoring tool.

1.2 In APRAST/14, SEI WG was tasked to develop a guideline to facilitate APAC States/Administrations to report their SEIs outputs and safety tools implementation progress. Based on the current practices and experience from APAC States/Administrations on updating their implementation progress in the online monitoring tool, SEI Core Group¹ has prepared a guideline to facilitate users on how to report their SEIs outputs and safety tools implementation progress as the Decision APRAST 14/6.

¹ The SEI Core Group includes Australia, Cambodia, China, Hong Kong China, Macao China, India, Indonesia, Singapore, Thailand, IFALPA, COSCAP-NA, COSCAP-SEA, COSCAP-SA, US CAST, and IATA.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 The proposed guidance provides general guidance and consideration on how to evaluate and determine the progress status of each SEI output or safety tool implementation phase, of which progress indicators (0%, 25%, 50%, 75% and 100%) are used to indicate the status of the SEIs outputs and safety tools implementation. Examples are also provided in the proposed guidance to allow users to have a better understanding of how to use proper indicators to show the SEIs outputs and safety tools implementation status in different cases.

2.2 Besides addressing the Decision APRAST 14/6, this proposed guideline will also address the AP-RASP action item A.I.19 at the same time as suggested by the SEI core group members during the preparation of this guideline. Even though APAC States/Administrations may have different methods to evaluate their implementation progress of the SEIs outputs and safety tools, a list of guidance questions is provided in the appendix of this proposed guideline as one of the possible methods to conduct the self-evaluation of the SEIs outputs and safety tools implementation status.

2.3 The proposed guideline was circulated, discussed, and concluded among SEI Core Group Members by email exchange with an additional video meeting on 7 May 2020, and the guideline was further discussed during the Webex SEI WG coordination meeting on 13 May 2020. The suggestions and conclusions from those discussions are incorporated into the final proposed guideline as attached in this working paper.

2.4 Since the RASG-APAC Monitoring Mechanism User Guide (Issue 1 – January 2017) is being updated for the new version of the online monitoring tool by the Secretariat, SEI WG proposes to incorporate this guideline as part of the user guide when the online SEI Implementation Monitor Tool and its user guide is ready.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The Meeting is invited to:

- a) Endorse the proposed guideline as part of the user guide for APAC States/Administrations to use the online monitoring tool; and
- b) Secretariat to incorporate this guideline into the user guide when the online SEI Implementation Monitor Tool and its user guide is ready.

— END —

The online monitoring mechanism is developed to facilitate the monitoring of the implementation status of Safety Enhancement Initiatives (SEIs) outputs and safety tools under RASG-APAC.

In order to effectively capture the implementation status of SEIs outputs and safety tools under RASG-APAC, APAC States/Administrations are encouraged to provide relevant information for each phase with the following considerations:

Phase	Consideration
A – Review status by State/Administration	<p>States/Administrations should review each SEI output or safety tool to determine whether the States/Administrations have already developed or planned to have their regulations, requirements or guidance developed which can achieve the goals and intentions of the SEI output or safety tool implementation.</p> <p>Progress indicator (0%, 25%, 50% 75% or 100%) should be selected according to the State/Administration’s review status, and progress indicator (N/A) should not be selected for this Phase.</p>
B - Implementation status by State/Administration	<p>If States/Administrations consider the SEI output or safety tool is applicable but the States/Administrations determined that they do not have their regulations, requirements or guidance to achieve the goals and intentions of that particular SEI output or safety tool after the A – Under Review phase, progress indicator (0%, 25%, 50% 75% or 100%) should be selected according to the State/Administration’s status of their development on their regulations, requirements or any other means determined by the State/Administrations as appropriate to support that SEI output or safety tool implementation.</p> <p>Progress indicator (N/A – not applicable) may only be selected if that particular SEI output or safety tool is not applicable to that State/Administration. (For instance, the SEI output or safety tool applies to only helicopter operations, but there is no helicopter operations in that State/Administration).</p>
C - Implementation status by Service Provider	<p>States/Administrations need to follow up on the implementation of their regulations, requirements, guidance or other means determined by their service provider(s) for that particular SEI output or safety tool. It can be done during their surveillance activities, by surveys or any other means as appropriate to look into the implementation status of all applicable service providers.</p> <p>Progress indicator (0%, 25%, 50% 75% or 100%) should be selected according to the implementation status of all applicable service providers. (For instance, the SEI output or safety tool applies to aeroplane operations, the progress indicator should be selected solely based on the implementation status of all aeroplane operators in that State/Administrations).</p> <p>Progress indicator (N/A) may only be selected if the SEI output or safety tool is not applicable to any service provider in the State/Administration (For instance, the SEI output or safety tool applies to State/Administration’s inspector training programme, and it does not apply to any service provider).</p>
D - All actions completed	<p>Only if all progress indicators in Phases A, B and C are selected 100%, the checkbox in Phase D may be ticked to indicate all applicable actions are fully completed. For any other cases, the checkbox in Phase D should not be ticked.</p>

Appendix

States/Administrations have many flexible methods to evaluate their implementation progress of the SEI output or safety tool. Using the Guiding Questions in below table is one of the methods to facilitate States/Administrations in their self-evaluation of their implementation status for each Phase (A to C). States need not be limited to these questions if they have other self-evaluation methods which better reflect their context.

Phase	Guiding Questions for self-evaluation framework <i>[Can there be 4 GQs per Phase in no fixed sequence, each assigned a 25% weightage that can be added up to give a subtotal for each Phase?]</i>
A – Review status by State/Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Has the SEI output or safety tool been disseminated to the relevant experts in the State/ Administration and a coordinator appointed to organise the review? ii) Has the State/ Administration reviewed and determined if the SEI or safety tool is relevant to its operational context? iii) Has the State/ Administration conducted a gap analysis i.e. by comparing the contents of the SEI output or safety tool with its existing regulations/ procedures/ guidance? iv) Has the State/ Administration planned the key milestones and associated timeline for implementing the SEI output or safety tool?
B - Implementation status by State/Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Has the State/ Administration identified how it will incorporate the relevant contents of the SEI output or safety tool, and if appropriate, which regulations/ procedures/ guidance to revise? If not, has an alternative means of consultation/ communication with the service provider(s) been identified? ii) Has the State/ Administration promulgated the revised regulations/ procedures/ guidance and informed the relevant regulated entities, or has the alternative means of consultation/ communication with the service provider(s) been activated? iii) Has the State/ Administration put in place the required resources e.g. infrastructure, training, etc to support implementation/ transition by the service provider(s)? iv) Has the State/ Administration identified how it will monitor and verify the implementation by the service provider(s) in a timely manner?
C - Implementation status by Service Provider	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Have the service provider(s) planned the key milestones and associated timeline for implementing the revised regulatory requirements? ii) Have the service provider(s) amended their work procedures to fulfil the revised regulatory requirements? iii) Have the service provider(s) ensured that their staff have been adequately trained for proper implementation of the revised regulatory requirements? iv) Is the State/ Administration satisfied with the level of implementation by each service provider?