INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

First 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

SSP Implementation challenges in the AFI region

(Presented by Kenya)

SUMMARY	
This working paper presents the key challenges faced in the implementation of a State Safety Programme (SSP) in the AFI region. The SSP requires the establishment of integrated set of laws, regulations, policies, objectives, processes, procedures and activities aimed at managing safety, at the State level. This requires a collaborative and risk-focused approach to achieve progress in implementation. Action by the Meeting is at paragraph 3	
Reference	• Annex 19 -Safety Management • Doc 9859 - Safety Management Manual • Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) 2026–2028 • AFI Regional Aviation Safety Plan (AFI-RASP)
Strategic Objectives	A - Every Flight is Safe and Secure

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Annex 19 requires States to establish a State Safety Programme (SSP) to manage risks at the State level. However, implementation remains a significant challenge since States must establish the institutional capacity, resources, safety data systems, and coordination mechanisms needed to identify hazards, manage safety risks, and continuously monitor aviation safety performance.

1.2 Continuous monitoring of the Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) targets has identified the low level of SSP implementation as one of the main organizational challenges at the global level. This is the same at the regional level, and one of the Regional Aviation Safety Plan (RASP) targets is for all States to establish an SSP by 2028.

1.3 ICAO introduced SSP as the 9th audit area in the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP-CMA). Starting from 1st August 2026, a dedicated SSP Effective Implementation score (SSP EI) as well as the Effective Implementation (EI) score for each SSP component will be provided to measure the State's effective implementation and maintenance of an SSP.

1.4 USOAP-CMA has established 16 SSP Protocol Questions (PQs) against which States will be evaluated. States can review their SSP implementation progress in the self - assessment module on the Online Framework (OLF).

2. DISCUSSION

2.1. SSP implementation continues to represent a challenge for Kenya and many other States in the AFI region. Despite progress achieved over the years, implementation efforts have often focused on developing documentation and procedures without necessarily resulting in a fully functional system for managing safety risks.

2.2. SSP implementation involves several institutions, including the Civil Aviation Authority, accident investigation authority, transport ministry, air navigation service provider, aerodrome operator, meteorological services, and other government agencies. The challenges of establishment of a State – level coordination committee has contributed to information gaps and inefficient management of safety risks.

2.3. Kenya has established a Safety Data Collection and Processing System (SDCPS) to capture, store, aggregate, and enable the analysis of safety data. However, there are challenges presented by the current system that has limited analytical tools, and insufficient mechanisms for sharing information between the regulator and service providers. Without reliable data, there are challenges in identification of emerging hazards, determination of national safety priorities, and lack of the foundation for data-driven decision making.

2.4. The State Safety Oversight (SSO) System is the foundation of the SSP. Traditional oversight often emphasizes compliance with regulations, policies and procedures which are validated during inspections and audits. SSP requires a more proactive approach in which oversight priorities are determined by safety risks and performance information. This requires development of risk-based surveillance programmes, establishment of effective safety performance indicators (SPIs), and use risk assessments to guide oversight activities.

2.5. The effective implementation of SSP requires sustained investment in personnel, training, information technology, surveillance, safety studies, and aircraft accident investigation. However, there are competing national priorities and limited budgets that may delay implementation plans and inhibit development of safety initiatives over time. SSP activities should be integrated into the Government expenditure budget and be linked to outputs and measurable safety outcomes.

2.6. The SSP requires a common understanding of safety management across the Civil Aviation Authority and industry. Inconsistent training for inspectors, service providers, and senior decision-makers can lead to different interpretations of SSP requirements, weak implementation of Safety Management Systems (SMS), and difficulty integrating safety management into everyday operations.

2.7. Several States lack the data, technical expertise, and consistent methodologies required to establish meaningful safety performance indicators, targets, and alert levels. There exists a challenge in measurement of whether safety enhancement initiatives are effective, rather than merely confirming that activities have been completed.

2.8. The effective implementation and maintenance of SSP will be evaluated during USOAP-CMA audits. A State may have an approved SSP document, established safety committees, and published regulations, yet still face implementation difficulties if it lacks qualified personnel, reliable safety data, adequate resources, inter-agency coordination, and mechanisms for measuring the effectiveness of safety interventions.

3 ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to note the information provided in this paper, including challenges faced by Kenya, and urge States to:

a. conduct a review of their SSP implementation progress in the self - assessment module on the Online Framework (OLF);

b. strengthen safety governance by establishing an effective national safety coordination mechanism involving all relevant Government authorities and aviation service providers;

c. support the development of an integrated SDCPS that supports safety reporting, data quality, analysis, information protection, and exchange; and

d. build technical capacity through specialized training in safety data analysis, risk assessment, statistical methods, and safety performance management.