



ICAO COSCAP SEA

21st COSCAP South East Asia Steering Committee Meeting (SCM/21)

(Hilton hotel, Manila, Philippines, 24 – 25 April 2024)

Agenda Item 7: Updates from member States / Safety Partners

STATE SAFETY PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION – SHARING OF EXPERIENCE AND LESSONS LEARNT

(Presented by Singapore)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Singapore was the first State to undergo ICAO's State Safety Programme Implementation Assessment (SSPIA) under Phase 2 in April 2022. This working paper shares our experience and lessons learnt arising from SSP implementation.

Action: The Meeting is invited to

- a) encourage States to strengthen the implementation of their SSP, including through the conduct of gap analysis using ICAO iSTARS SSP GAP Analysis; and
- b) request COSCAP-SEA to organise a workshop to demonstrate the use of ICAO iSTARS SSP GAP Analysis and for States to share their experience and lessons learnt from SSP implementation.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 ICAO launched the State Safety Programme Implementation Assessment (SSPIA) in 2015, as part of its Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP), to assess the implementation and maturity level of State Safety Programme (SSP). ICAO adopted a performance-based assessment methodology for the SSPIA in 2019, and further introduced SSPIA Phase 2 in 2021. In SSPIA Phase 2, maturity levels are assessed for each Protocol Question (PQ). Criteria items (CIs) within each PQ describe the expectations for each maturity level for that PQ.

1.2 The SSP maturity level of the assessed State is described in terms of the maturity level for each of the PQs assessed, from Level 0 (Not Present, not Planned), to Level 1 (Not Present but being Worked On), Level 2 (Present) and Level 3 (Present and Effective). States are not assessed to Level 4 (Present, Effective and in Continuous Improvement) in Phase 2 of the SSPIA.

1.3 ICAO conducted a Phase 2 SSPIA on Singapore in April 2022. The ICAO assessors covered four SSP areas viz. General Aspects (GEN); Safety Data Analysis (SDA); Aircraft Operations (OPS); and Aerodromes & Ground Aids (AGA). This paper aims to share Singapore's experience and lessons learnt from this SSPIA.

2. EXPERIENCE AND LESSONS LEARNT

2.1 Singapore's SSP involves multiple government agencies including the Ministry for Transport, the Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore, the Transport Safety Investigation Bureau and the Republic of Singapore Air Force. To provide a comprehensive perspective of our mechanisms and workings under the SSP, appropriate agencies' representatives and subject matter experts participated in the SSPIA. We devoted much resources to perform gap analyses using the SSP Gap Analysis Tool, and regularly conducted self-assessments on our SSP using the SSPIA PQs. We also regularly update the ICAO USOAP Online Framework (OLF), including the results from our self-assessments.

2.2 The self-assessments helped us identify areas for improvement. For example, safety objectives and safety policy under the SSP were sharpened, including to better balance between output-based and outcome-based objectives and to better represent Singapore's risk picture. Guided by our revised safety objectives and policy, we issued the National Aviation Safety Plan 2022 – 2024 in April 2022 to clearly spell out the key safety priorities and deliverables for Singapore, and to galvanise our aviation industry to work together with the government agencies responsible for safety to keep aviation safe. We also enhanced our confidential voluntary safety reporting system through the launch of 'Tell Sarah', and promulgated safety information protection legislation. In March 2022, aviation leaders in Singapore undertook collective commitments to enhance safety culture through the signing of a Safety Charter.

2.3 Given that Phase 2 SSPIA assesses the maturity level of a State's SSP, we paid particular attention to describing our "SSP journey" in our responses to the PQs, highlighting the evolution of the various aspects of our safety management approach over the past 12 years since Singapore established our SSP. We also identified key milestones in our SSP journey and provided the assessors appropriate evidence that marked these milestones. Successes and missteps alike were shared with the assessors, to show that our SSP journey was one of continuous learning and adjustment.

2.4 In order to provide an independent review of SSP implementation, we sought assistance from COSCAP-SEA for an onsite activity. We thank COSCAP-SEA for the 14 recommendations arising from the activity, which helped us continue to evolve and mature our SSP. The COSCAP-SEA recommendations and observations from our own self-assessments were regularly monitored by our SSP Working Committee to ensure timely implementation of actions to address the recommendations.

2.5 As the first State to go through Phase 2, we were not entirely clear of the revised processes and expectations. In the lead-up to the SSPIA, we had valuable and useful conversations with ICAO to understand these processes and expectations.

2.6 During the SSPIA, the ICAO assessors took deliberate efforts to create a comfortable atmosphere that encouraged relevant subject matter experts to step forward to share candidly and contribute positively to the discussions. The in-depth sharing on the SSP journey and meaningful discussions stimulated us to delve deeper and harder, so as to improve our SSP. The ICAO assessors also adopted a fair and balanced assessment approach that recognised achievements and identified opportunities for enhancement.

3. WORKSHOP TO SUPPORT SSP IMPLEMENTATION

3.1 The SSPIA challenges us to be more systematic, comprehensive, and forward-looking in our implementation of initiatives. Yet some enhancements to SSP can take time to develop and mature. Knowing the experience of others who have undergone similar efforts may smoothen the development and maturity process. In this regard, COSCAP-SEA may wish to consider organising a workshop to demonstrate the use of ICAO iSTARS SSP Gap Analysis for States to perform gap analysis, and for States to share experience and lessons learnt in key SSP implementation topics.

4. CONCLUSION

4.1 Overall, the ICAO's Phase 2 SSPIA journey has been a useful learning experience for Singapore. Through the COSCAP-SEA activity and conversations with ICAO during the SSPIA, Singapore also reaped many benefits including opportunities to review and enhance our SSP, to deepen collaboration amongst CAAS Divisions, government agencies and our industry stakeholders, and an impetus to galvanise our aviation sector to move forward in a cohesive direction and strengthen the safety culture of our aviation community. Singapore values the constructive opportunities for enhancement arising from the SSPIA, and continues strengthening our SSP implementation and learning from others. Sharing knowledge and experience among COSCAP-SEA Member States could contribute to improving SSP implementation in the region.

5. ACTION BY THE MEETING

5.1 The Meeting is invited to:

- a) encourage States to strengthen the implementation of their SSP, including through the conduct of gap analysis using ICAO iSTARS SSP GAP Analysis; and
- b) request COSCAP-SEA to organise a workshop to demonstrate the use of ICAO iSTARS SSP GAP Analysis and for States to share their experience and lessons learnt from SSP implementation.

— END —