



ICAO

International Civil Aviation Organization

Seventh Meeting of the Aerodromes Operations and
Planning Sub-Group (AOP/SG/7)

Bangkok, Thailand, 3 to 6 July 2023

Agenda Item 4: Provision of AOP in the Asia/Pacific Region

RUNWAY SAFETY TEAM (RST) AND RUNWAY SAFETY GO-TEAM

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY

This paper presents the ICAO requirements on RST and relevant guidance for its establishment at aerodromes. The paper also highlights the benefits in availing ICAO Runway Safety Go-Team assistance by States and airports in the area of runway safety.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Procedures for Air Navigations (PANS) – Aerodromes (Doc 9981) in its 3rd Edition, July 2020 incorporated a new chapter (Chapter 8) in Part II, which contains provisions pertaining to runway safety. The chapter deals with the prevention of runway incursions, excursions and confusion through different strategies. These include effective identification of hazards related to runway safety, risk mitigation, coordination and cooperation between different stakeholders, establishment of runway safety action plans and runway safety teams (RSTs), and the collection, sharing and exchange of safety information.

2. DISCUSSION

Runway Safety Team (RST)

2.1 An aerodrome operator shall establish a Runway Safety Team (RST) comprised of relevant organizations operating or providing services on the aerodrome in accordance with 8.2.1 of *PANS-Aerodromes (Doc 9981)*.

2.2 The terms of reference and composition of the RST should be established and included in the aerodrome manual. Activities to be included in the terms of reference as well as the proposed composition of an RST are included in the *Appendix to the Chapter 8 of Part II of PANS-Aerodromes (Doc 9981)*.

2.3 The primary role of the RST should be to develop a runway safety action plan. This action plan should, as a minimum, facilitate the identification of runway safety hazards and the conduct of runway safety risk assessments and recommend measures for hazard removal and mitigation of the residual risk.

2.4 Detailed information on the establishment of a RST is available in the ICAO RST Handbook which can be downloaded from:

<https://www.icao.int/safety/RunwaySafety/Pages/Documents%20and%20Toolkits.aspx>.

2.5 ICAO has been maintaining a RST Survey to keep track of the establishment of RSTs at aerodromes. The survey results and questionnaire were available at:

<https://www.icao.int/safety/RunwaySafety/Pages/Runway%20Safety%20Team%20Register.aspx>.

Currently new webpage is under development.

2.6 As of date, out of **355** aerodromes used for international operations in Asia Pacific Regions, only **93 aerodromes** have participated in ICAO RST Survey. The list of aerodromes participated in ICAO RST Survey is provided in **Attachment A**.

2.7 APANPIRG/31 adopted the following Conclusion:

Conclusion APANPIRG/31/6 (AOP/SG/4–11): Runway Safety Team

That, States/Administrations to urge operators of aerodromes used for international operations to:

a) establish runway safety teams (RSTs) in accordance with PANS-Aerodromes (Doc 9981) and ICAO RST Handbook; and

b) participate in the ICAO RST Survey to register their RSTs.

2.8 As indicated in the GRF Implementation Action Plan Template (<https://www.icao.int/APAC/Pages/eDocs.aspx>), the RST is a major player in the implementation of GRF, providing feedback to the CAA in such matters as development of national procedures and guidance material, provision of on-the-job training, arrangement of trials prior to implementation, as well as the implementation plan. As such, the establishment and effective running of RSTs will be crucial for States to fine-tune and carry out their GRF implementation action plan.

ICAO Runway Safety Go-Team “FULL” Version

2.9 The ICAO Runway Safety (RS) Go-Team is a collaborative effort with the objective to provide assistance from ICAO, Runway Safety Programme (RSP) partner organisations and other safety related organizations (including existing RST’s, RSOO’s, etc.) to a State and airport when establishing an RST. It may also review an RST performance if already established. The RS Go-Team achieves its objective by providing technical assistance, including expert advice and guidance based on ICAO documents (e.g. *Doc. 9981 PANS-Aerodromes*), State and Industry best practices and recommendations.

2.10 The RS Go-Team is a voluntary, multi-disciplinary form of assistance provided by an ad-hoc group of experts; it is not an ICAO audit, validation, inspection or certification action; however, it could help to prepare for such in the future.

2.11 RS Go-Team will be formed in response to recommendation from the RASG, a proposal by ICAO, or a request received from a State, airport or international organisation to corresponding ICAO Regional Office. Runway Safety Programme (RSP) partner organisations will be informed and invited to participate.

2.12 The duration of on-site activities is usually three days, which may include a runway safety workshop for runway safety stakeholders, airport visits, attendance in RST meeting and debriefing.

2.13 The detailed information on RS Go-Team is available in *ICAO RS Go-Team Methodology* posted on ICAO Website at the following URL:
<https://www.icao.int/safety/RunwaySafety/Pages/Documents%20and%20Toolkits.aspx>

2.14 Recognising the benefits the RS Go-Team brings to States and runway safety stakeholders, the RASG-APAC at its 5th Meeting had taken a Decision, which is reproduced below:

Decision RASG-APAC 5/6 (2015)

That, ICAO APAC RO, with assistance from the COSCAP Chief Technical Advisors, coordinate the implementation of ICAO Runway Safety Go-Teams in the APAC region, and share relevant information on implementation with States/Administrations and industry.

2.15 Two RS Go-Team missions in the APAC Region were conducted in March 2020 – to Manila, Philippines and Makassar, Indonesia. Recommendations were provided to the States and airports for enhancing runway safety. The two missions utilized the funding available under COSCAP-SEA and was therefore available free-of-charge to the two States.

2.16 With the upcoming applicability of GRF-related SARPs and PANS, the scope of RS Go-Teams may be extended to assist States and airports in the implementation of GRF. In such cases, the duration of RS Go-Team on-site activities may be slightly extended to incorporate additional activities.

RS-Go Team “LITE” Version

2.17 To date, RS-Go Teams have been delivered using a 3 to 5 days on-site format, preceded by a virtual preparation phase. Due to COVID-19 restrictions, a “LITE” version of the RS Go-Team (i.e. Go-Team LITE) has been designed, facilitating a flexible approach, whilst ensuring that the important function performed by Go-Teams can continue. A Go-Team LITE is less comprehensive, does not include a site visit and would result in a set of recommendations that will focus upon facilitating the establishment of an RST, or improving performance of an existing RST, rather than the comprehensive set of runway safety-related agreed actions and timelines of a full Go-Team.

2.18 Characteristics of the Go-Team LITE are:

- it is entirely on-line;
- may be followed by a “FULL” Go-Team mission in the future, including more activities at site visit and the more comprehensive set of action and timelines;
- However, a Go-Team LITE will fulfil the objectives of preparing for the implementation of an RST or improving the performance of an existing RST;
- The benefits of a Go-Team LITE are ease of organisation and execution, reduced cost and effort.

2020 Edition of USOAP CMA Protocol Questions

2.19 As announced in Electronic Bulletin 2021/3, the 2020 Edition of the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) Protocol Questions (PQs) is now posted on the USOAP CMA online framework, under the heading “CMA Library”.

2.20 In association with Chapter 8 of Part II of PANS-Aerodromes and relevant guidance materials, there is a new PQ on whether a State ensures “that aerodrome operators comply with requirements related to runway safety, including the establishment of a runway safety team”. The new PQ is extracted as follows.

| | | | | | |
|-------|--|--|---|-----|------|
| 8.204 | Does the State ensure that aerodrome operators comply with requirements related to runway safety, including the establishment of a runway safety team? | 1) Evaluate mechanism to ensure effective implementation. 2) Review evidence of a systematic approach to runway safety and collision avoidance strategy, e.g. establishment of runway safety teams. | PANS Doc 9981 (AGA) Part II, C8 GM A14 Vol. I, Att. A, Section 21.3 Doc 9870 C3 | Yes | CE-6 |
|-------|--|--|---|-----|------|

USOAP CMA PQ – AGA 8.204

2.21 AOP/SG/5 meeting urged:

- a) States to take actions on RST establishment and participation in ICAO RST Survey (**Conclusion APANPIRG/31/6** refers); and
- b) States in need of assistance in the areas of runway safety to request for RS Go-Team Missions through ICAO APAC Office and/or its corresponding COSCAP and PASO Office.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to note the information contained in this paper:

Status of Participation by States/Aerodromes in ICAO RST Survey

| Status of Participation by States/Aerodromes in ICAO RST Survey By Sub-regions | | | | |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| | <u>Established</u> | <u>% Established</u> | No info or <u>Not Established</u> | <u>Total</u> |
| NA | 4 | 2.88% | 135 | 139 |
| SEA | 59 | 61.46% | 37 | 96 |
| SA | 25 | 46.30% | 29 | 54 |
| PAC | 5 | 7.58% | 61 | 66 |
| APAC Total | 93 | 26.20% | 262 | 355 |

| Status of Participation by States/Aerodromes in ICAO RST Survey | | | | |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| | <u>Established</u> | <u>% Established</u> | No info or <u>Not Established</u> | <u>Total</u> |
| Afghanistan | 0 | 0% | 4 | 4 |
| American Samoa | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1 |
| Australia | 4 | 14% | 24 | 28 |
| Bangladesh | 0 | 0% | 3 | 3 |
| Bhutan | 1 | 100% | 0 | 1 |
| Brunei | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1 |
| Cambodia | 0 | 0% | 3 | 3 |
| China | 1 | 1% | 86 | 87 |
| Cook Islands | 0 | 0% | 2 | 2 |
| DPR Korea | 0 | 0% | 2 | 2 |
| Fiji | 1 | 50% | 1 | 2 |
| French Polynesia | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1 |
| Guam | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1 |
| Hong Kong, China | 1 | 100% | 0 | 1 |
| India | 20 | 74% | 7 | 27 |
| Indonesia | 23 | 70% | 10 | 33 |
| Japan | 0 | 0% | 37 | 37 |
| Kiribati | 0 | 0% | 2 | 2 |
| Lao PDR | 0 | 0% | 4 | 4 |
| Macao, China | 1 | 100% | 0 | 1 |
| Malaysia | 18 | 95% | 1 | 19 |
| Maldives | 1 | 33% | 2 | 3 |
| Marshall Islands | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1 |
| Micronesia | 0 | 0% | 4 | 4 |
| Mongolia | 1 | 33% | 2 | 3 |
| Myanmar | 3 | 100% | 0 | 3 |

| | | | | |
|------------------|-----------|---------------|------------|------------|
| Nauru | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1 |
| Nepal | 1 | 33% | 2 | 3 |
| New Caledonia | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1 |
| New Zealand | 0 | 0% | 6 | 6 |
| Niue | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1 |
| N. Mariana Is. | 0 | 0% | 3 | 3 |
| Pakistan | 1 | 10% | 9 | 10 |
| Palau | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1 |
| Papua New Guinea | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1 |
| Philippines | 7 | 78% | 2 | 9 |
| Rep. of Korea | 0 | 0% | 8 | 8 |
| Samoa | 0 | 0% | 2 | 2 |
| Singapore | 2 | 100% | 0 | 2 |
| Solomon Islands | 0 | 0% | 2 | 2 |
| Sri Lanka | 1 | 33% | 2 | 3 |
| Thailand | 5 | 50% | 5 | 10 |
| Timor Leste | 0 | 0% | 2 | 2 |
| Tonga | 0 | 0% | 2 | 2 |
| Tuvalu | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1 |
| Vanuatu | 0 | 0% | 2 | 2 |
| Viet Nam | 1 | 10% | 9 | 10 |
| Wallis et Futuma | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 93 | 26.20% | 262 | 355 |