INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

Second Meeting of the Africa - Indian Ocean Aviation System Planning and Implementation Group (AASPG/2)
Livingstone, Zambia, 2 - 6 November 2026

Agenda Item 4: Implementation of safety and air navigation goals, targets and indicators, including priorities set in the Regional Aviation Safety and Air Navigation Plans

Namibia's experience in the development and implementation of the National Aviation Safety Plan (NASP)

(Presented by Namibia)

SUMMARY
This paper presents Namibia's experience in progressing from its first National Aviation Safety Plan (NASP), published in 2023, to the second edition for the 2026-2028 planning cycle. The NCAA reviewed the NASP alongside the State Safety Programme (SSP), strengthening the link between global and regional safety planning, national safety information and implementation through the State's safety-management framework. The paper describes how Namibia used State safety data and SSP outputs to establish national priorities, targets, indicators and Safety Enhancement Initiatives (SEIs), and how implementation and monitoring are being carried through the SSP. Action by the Meeting is at **paragraph 3**.

References	• Global Aviation Safety Plan • AFI-Regional Aviation Safety Plan
Strategic Goals	*Every flight is safe and secure*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Namibia published its first National Aviation Safety Plan (NASP) in June 2023 for the 2023-2025 planning cycle. The first edition established the basis for structured national aviation safety planning and provided a framework for translating State safety priorities into defined actions.

1.2. Thereafter, Namibia undertook a comprehensive review of both the NASP and the State Safety Programme (SSP) in preparation for the 2026-2028 planning cycle. This review resulted in the second edition of both documents and provided an opportunity to strengthen their relationship as complementary instruments within the State's safety-management framework.

1.3. GASP Target 5.2 of the 2026-2028 edition requires States to publish an updated National Aviation Safety Plan (NASP), taking into consideration the corresponding Regional Aviation Safety Plan (RASP) and the latest edition of the GASP. In line with this requirement, Namibia developed its second NASP with reference to ICAO Annex 19 - Safety Management, the Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) 2026-2028 (Doc 10004), the Manual on the Development of Regional and National Aviation Safety Plans (Doc 10131), the Global Aviation Safety Roadmap (Doc 10161), the Manual on Monitoring Implementation of Regional and National Aviation Safety Plans (Doc 10162), and the applicable AFI regional safety priorities. The review and update of the NASP were also informed by national safety information, safety oversight results, and consultation with relevant aviation stakeholders.

1.4. The review was further supported by the ICAO ESAF Workshop on National Aviation Safety Plan Development and Implementation hosted by Namibia in Windhoek from 17 to 21 August 2026. The workshop provided an opportunity to test the revised approach against current ICAO guidance, including the relationship between global and regional priorities, national operational safety risks, organizational challenges, safety goals, targets and indicators, SEIs and implementation monitoring.

1.5. This paper presents Namibia's experience in moving from its first NASP to the second planning cycle, with particular emphasis on evidence-based prioritization, translation of global and regional direction into national action, integration with the SSP, and arrangements for implementation and monitoring.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1. Development of the second NASP

2.1.1. Development of the second edition commenced with a review of the safety information available to the State. Namibia considered mandatory, voluntary, confidential and hazard reports; flight-data information; certification and surveillance findings; accident and incident investigation information; aircraft movement data; ICAO USOAP information; and safety information generated through service-provider Safety Management Systems (SMSs). The intention was to establish the national safety picture before determining the final priority set.

2.1.2. The national data demonstrated the importance of State-level adaptation. In 2025, Namibia recorded 51,221 aircraft movements. Across the seven categories designated as national high-risk priorities, 214 events were recorded, of which 101 related to maintenance or technical issues and 72 to wildlife. Together, these two categories accounted for 80.8 per cent of the recorded high-risk-category events. Scheduled commercial operations involving aircraft with a maximum take-off mass (MTOM) above 5,700 kg recorded no accidents during the same period.

2.1.3. Based on this evidence, the second NASP retains the five ICAO Global and Regional High-Risk Categories - Controlled Flight into Terrain, Loss of Control In-flight, Mid-Air Collision, Runway Excursion and Runway Incursion - and supplements them with wildlife strikes and maintenance and technical occurrences as Namibia-specific high-risk priorities. Other global occurrence categories remain under SDCPS trend monitoring and may be elevated if the national risk picture changes. The Plan also addresses organizational factors that affect safety performance, including regulatory capability, qualified technical personnel, financial resources, SSP maturity, risk-based surveillance and the State's capacity to collect and use safety information.

2.2. Alignment of global, regional and national priorities

2.2.1. The second edition uses the six goals of the GASP 2026-2028 as the strategic foundation for Namibia's national aviation safety strategy. Rather than reproducing global targets mechanically, the related national goals, targets and indicators are adapted to Namibia's operational context using SDCPS information, USOAP results and other State safety evidence, while maintaining a clear link to the applicable AFI regional priorities. In this way, global and regional direction provides the common framework, and national evidence determines the emphasis and additional State-specific action required.

2.2.2. The resulting framework combines leading and lagging indicators, baselines, targets and alert levels. It translates the six GASP goals into measurable national objectives covering operational risk reduction, safety-oversight capability, effective SSP implementation, safety reporting and use of safety information, regional and national collaboration, aviation safety planning, and participation in recognized evaluation and safety-data-sharing programmes. Where applicable, five-year rolling averages and the 2025 baseline

are used to support trend monitoring.

2.3. **Relationship between the NASP and the SSP**

2.3.1. The coordinated review of the NASP and SSP enabled Namibia to clarify how the two instruments operate together. The SSP is the State's enduring framework for managing aviation safety, encompassing governance, safety risk management, safety assurance, safety promotion and the management of safety information. The NASP is a key output of that framework and converts SSP processes and safety intelligence into time-bound national priorities, targets, indicators and SEIs for the current planning cycle. In practical terms, the SSP provides the continuing safety-management framework, while the NASP focuses that framework on the priority actions and measurable outcomes for the 2026-2028 planning cycle.

2.3.2. Implementation of the NASP is therefore carried through the existing SSP arrangements rather than through a parallel structure. The SSP Steering Committee, supported by the Technical Working Group and specialized Safety Working Groups, provides the mechanism for considering safety information, oversight results, investigation findings and operational experience and for determining the appropriate State response. The SDCPS supports this process by consolidating the safety data and information used for oversight, risk-based surveillance, resource allocation and national safety planning.

2.3.3. The second SSP also provides a measurable implementation baseline. Namibia's ICAO USOAP Effective Implementation stood at approximately 73 per cent, SSP implementation at approximately 74 per cent, SMS implementation by applicable service providers at 95 per cent, regulatory SMS acceptance at 73 per cent, and technical staffing at approximately 70 per cent of assessed requirements. A State SSP self-assessment completed in July 2026 assessed 14 of the 16 applicable SSP Protocol Questions as satisfactory. These measures provide a practical baseline for monitoring whether implementation arrangements are maturing and producing the intended results.

2.4. **Implementation and monitoring**

2.4.1. The second NASP moves from identified priorities to measurable action through separate roadmaps for operational and organizational safety risks. Each SEI identifies the safety issue to be addressed, the required action, responsible entity, relevant stakeholders, timeframe, priority and the measure to be used to determine implementation or effectiveness. This was intended to make the NASP an implementation instrument rather than a statement of aspiration.

2.4.2. Progress is monitored through safety-performance reviews, SEI tracking, quarterly reporting to the SSP Steering Committee, annual updating of safety-performance information and periodic review of the NASP. Where performance deteriorates or targets or alert levels are not achieved, further analysis and corrective action are required. The Plan may therefore be adjusted during the triennium where new evidence, emerging risks or implementation results justify revision.

2.5. **Experience arising from the second planning cycle**

2.5.1. The second planning cycle has reinforced that alignment is most useful when it results in deliberate national translation rather than simple replication. Global and regional priorities provide a common strategic direction, but the State's own safety information must determine the relative emphasis placed on individual risks and whether additional national priorities are required. Namibia's inclusion of wildlife strikes, and maintenance and technical occurrences illustrates this approach.

2.5.2. The experience has also shown that implementation arrangements should be established while the plan is being developed. Assigning responsibilities, timeframes and measures

of effectiveness to SEIs, and linking these to existing SSP governance and performance-monitoring processes, provides a clearer basis for following progress throughout the cycle. Indicator interpretation is equally important: an increase in voluntary or hazard reporting may indicate a stronger reporting culture and improved safety intelligence, whereas adverse trends in lagging outcome indicators may indicate deteriorating safety performance.

2.5.3. For the remainder of the 2026-2028 cycle, Namibia will continue to focus on strengthening technical capability and recurrent competency, improving SMS oversight, increasing the effective use of safety information, expanding risk-based surveillance, following up safety recommendations and corrective actions, and demonstrating that implemented safety controls are producing the intended safety outcomes. The effectiveness of the second NASP will therefore be judged not only by completion of planned actions, but by whether those actions result in measurable improvement in the national safety picture.

2.5.4. Hosting regional capacity-building activities, such as the National Aviation Safety Plan (NASP) Workshop conducted by ICAO, provides a valuable opportunity to strengthen the capabilities of both the Namibia Civil Aviation Authority (NCAA) and national aviation industry experts. Such initiatives not only support the development of national expertise but also contribute to regional safety enhancement efforts by fostering the exchange of knowledge, best practices, and experience among States, thereby strengthening the pool of aviation safety professionals across the AFI Region.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1. The meeting is invited to:

a) note Namibia's experience in progressing from its first NASP to the second edition for the 2026-2028 planning cycle;
b) note the approach used to translate global and regional safety priorities through national safety information, and to implement the resulting priorities through the SSP; and
c) encourage continued exchange of practical experience among States of the AFI region on the development, implementation, monitoring and periodic refinement of NASPs.