INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

Second Meeting of the Africa – Indian Ocean Air Navigation System Planning and Implementation Group (AASPG/2)

Livingstone, Zambia, 2 – 6 November 2026

Agenda Item 4: Implementation of air navigation goals, targets and indicators, including the priorities set in the regional air navigation plan.

REPORTING OF ATS SAFETY OCCURRENCES AND PARTICIPATION IN THE WORK OF THE AFI REGION ATS EVENT ANALYSIS GROUP (AEAG)

(Presented by Chad)

SUMMARY	
This paper reflects the conclusions of the Second Meeting of the AFI Region ATS Event Analysis Group (AEAG/2), held in N'Djamena, Chad, from 12 to 15 October 2026. It identifies a persistent challenge: few States report ATS safety occurrences, and many submissions lack the information required for analysis. The paper urges States to provide complete occurrence reports and actively contribute to the Group's work to support safe air navigation in the AFI Region. Action by the Meeting is at paragraph 3.	
Strategic Goals	A – Every flight is safe and secure

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Established by APIRG/27 to review ATS safety occurrences reported in the AFI Region, the AFI Region ATS Event Analysis Group (AEAG) has met twice:

- At its first meeting (AEAG/1), held in Libreville, Gabon, in October 2025, the Group reviewed 455 ATS occurrences reported in 2023 and 2024 and developed eight recommendations.
- The second meeting (AEAG/2), hosted by the Civil Aviation Authority of Chad in N'Djamena from 12 to 15 October 2026, brought together 92 participants representing 14 States, air navigation service providers (ANSPs), regional organizations and partner institutions. During the meeting, the Group reviewed 793 ATS occurrences and developed 14 safety recommendations.

1.2 Together, these two reviews show that the number of occurrences analyzed remains low relative to the Region’s size and traffic volume. Reports were received from only a limited number of States, and many lacked essential information.

1.3 This paper focuses on two requirements essential to the relevance of the Group’s analysis: comprehensive reporting and sustained State participation in its work.

2 DISCUSSION

2.1 Few States report ATS safety occurrences. The AEAG/2 analysis is based on data submitted by only 12 States, ANSPs and airspace users. Thus, only a small proportion of the 54 AFI Region States provide data to the Group. Most did not contribute, despite hosting international aerodromes, transit traffic and airspace where serious events may occur, including near-mid-air collisions, losses of separation and runway incursions.

2.2 This results in an incomplete picture of regional safety. The trends identified by AEAG/2, the high proportion of collision risks en route and during transfers of control between FIRs are based on a limited sample and may reflect the practices of the reporting States. For States that submit no data, the Group lacks the evidence and trends needed to develop tailored recommendations. As regional aviation safety and air navigation plans rely on this information, corrective measures are developed without adequately reflecting those States' circumstances.

2.3 The same pattern applies to participation in the Group's meetings. Most States represented at AEAG/2 that designated focal points already submit data, while absent States are generally those whose occurrences remain unanalyzed. This self-reinforcing cycle weakens the Group's role as a regional mechanism and causes collective recommendations to rely on data from only a limited number of States.

2.4 Inadequate data quality prevents many occurrences from being analyzed. Completeness depends not only on the number of reported occurrences but also on the accuracy of the information provided for each one. AEAG/2 found, for example, that the flight level was missing for 464 of the 793 occurrences analyzed, or 59 per cent. This information is essential for locating an occurrence within the vertical structure of the airspace and identifying the traffic flows involved.

2.5 When information such as the flight level, threat level or contributing factors is missing, meaningful analysis is often impossible. The occurrence can be recorded, but it becomes difficult to identify an appropriate corrective action. Consequently, regional recommendations are based on only part of the available occurrence data and cannot fully reflect what is happening across the Region.

2.6 The Group's experience also shows that varying recording methods complicate analysis. To process the data collectively, the secretariat had to align submissions with the AEAG lists. Consistent use of the AEAG template would substantially reduce this preparatory work and make it easier to compare data across States.

2.7 The ATS safety occurrence database developed by the Group's secretariat, together with the training provided to national focal points, can achieve its purpose only if States supply a sufficient number of complete occurrence records.

2.8 Chad endorses and commends the AFI Region RSOOs' safety efforts and calls on all States to carry out the actions below.

3 ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

a) note that only a limited number of States report ATS safety occurrences to the AEAG and that many of the reports submitted do not contain the information required for analysis;
b) urge airlines to report all ATS safety occurrences to the relevant State authorities for investigation;

c) urge all States in the AFI Region to submit complete ATS safety occurrence reports using the AEAG template;
d) urge States to designate or confirm their focal points and to participate actively in the AEAG's work, including its quarterly virtual meetings and in-person meetings; and
e) request the secretariat to present, at the next meeting, a State-by-State assessment of the volume and completeness of the data received.

-END-