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 air navigation goals, targets and indicators, including the priorities set in the regional air navigation plan

Acceleration of State Safety Program Implementation and allocation of adequate resources to achieve GASP Goal 3

(Presented by Secretariat)

SUMMARY
This paper highlights the need to accelerate State Safety Programme (SSP) implementation in the AFI Region in view of the applicability of the USOAP CMA Safety Management Protocol Questions, Annex 19, Amendment 2, and the implementation targets contained in the GASP 2026-2028. The low rate of SSP self-assessment completion on the ICAO USOAP CMA Online Framework (OLF) indicates that many States may not be sufficiently prepared to meet the relevant 2026 milestones or achieve effective SSP implementation by 2028. The paper therefore calls for stronger State-level accountability and the allocation of sufficient and sustained human, financial and technical resources. It also proposes enhanced regional monitoring and coordinated implementation assistance. Action by the Meeting is in paragraph 3.

References	• Annex 19, Amendment 2 - Safety Management • Doc 9859 - Safety Management Manual • Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) 2026–2028
Strategic Objectives	*A - Every Flight is Safe and Secure*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) 2026-2028, Goal 3, calls upon States to implement effective State Safety Programmes. Target 3.1 requires all States to assess their level of SSP implementation using the SSP self-assessment tool available on the USOAP CMA Online Framework (OLF) by the end of 2026.

1.2 GASP Target 3.2 calls for all States to establish a SSP by 2028, including an operational Safety Data Collection and Processing System (SDCPS) and a framework for the protection of safety data and safety information.

1.3 The implementation timeline for 2026 coincides with the applicability of the USOAP CMA

Safety Management Protocol Questions from 1st August 2026 and Annex 19, Amendment 2, from 26 November 2026. These concurrent milestones require urgent and coordinated action by States and regional organizations.

1.4 The purpose of this paper is to highlight the regional implementation gap and propose measures to strengthen accountability, resource allocation, implementation assistance and progress monitoring.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1. Implementation requirements

2.1.1. SSP self-assessment and Gap-analysis are the basis for determining the State's level of implementation, identifying gaps and developing a prioritized SSP Detailed Implementation Plan (SSP-DIP), with assigned responsibilities and task dates for completion. It also supports the planning and targeting of assistance by ICAO Regional Offices, Regional Safety Oversight Organizations (RSOOs) and other implementation partners.

2.1.2. From 1st August 2026, the Safety Management Protocol Questions became applicable to all USOAP CMA activities. In accordance with EB 2026/4, the results will include an SSP Effective Implementation score (SSP EI) as well as the Effective Implementation (EI) score for each SSP component to measure the State's effective Implementation. Therefore, States should conduct and submit their self-assessment and periodically update the USOAP-CMA OLF to reflect implementation progress and supporting evidence, in order to ensure that the SSP Effective Implementation reflects the national SSP status.

2.1.3. Annex 19, Amendment 2, applicable from 26 November 2026, introduces new or enhanced provisions including:

a) Strengthening SSP and SMS implementation through enhanced safety governance, risk management, and safety performance monitoring.
b) Expansion of SMS applicability to international remotely piloted aircraft system (RPAS) operators, associated approved maintenance organizations, and certified heliports.
c) Enhancement of Safety Intelligence by improving the collection, analysis, and sharing of safety data to support data-driven decision-making

2.1.4. These requirements reinforce the need for States to expedite the establishment and effective implementation of their SSPs. States should therefore undertake timely gap analyses, and self-assessment, establish a detailed implementation plan, assign responsibilities and adequate resources, and strengthen coordination among the relevant State authorities and aviation service providers to ensure States meet their safety management obligations.

2.2. Regional implementation status

2.2.1. Based on the OLF SSP Self-assessment data, ten (10) ESAF States and seven (7) WACAF States completed the SSP self-assessment. Only 17 of the 48 States in the AFI Region (35%) have completed the SSP self-assessment, while 31 States (65%) have yet to complete this foundational step. Further details regarding States's self-assessment are provided in the attachment to this paper.

2.2.2. The information reported demonstrates that the rate of progress must increase significantly if all States are to complete the self-assessment by the end of 2026 and establish an effective SSP by 2028.

2.3. Implementation and resource gaps

2.3.1. Challenges reported by States include insufficient institutional coordination, limited availability of qualified personnel, competing oversight priorities, inadequate safety-data collection and processing capabilities and the absence of dedicated implementation budgets.

2.3.2. SSP implementation is a State-wide responsibility that extends beyond the civil aviation authority. Effective implementation requires commitment from senior State leadership, coordination among different stakeholders, such as civil aviation authorities (CAA and AIA), aviation service providers, where appropriate, and other national entities responsible for collecting, analysing or protecting safety information or with responsibilities in the aviation system.

2.3.3. States should establish an SSP governance structure, led by a designated chairperson from the authority responsible for SSP coordination and supported by:

a) a full-time SSP coordinator or focal point;
b) a multidisciplinary national SSP implementation team;
c) an approved, time-bound and costed SSP-DIP;
d) an identified and sustained implementation budget for each entity with SSP responsibilities;
e) qualified personnel with competencies in safety management and safety-data analysis
f) appropriate legislative, regulatory, organizational and technical arrangements to support the SSP, the SDCPS and the protection of safety data and safety information.

2.3.4. Resource allocation should be based on the results of the SSP self-assessment and Gap-analysis, the national implementation priorities, and the size and complexity of State's aviation system.

2.3.5. SSP implementation should cover, as applicable, legislation, regulations, policies, processes, procedures, personnel, training, stakeholder coordination, SDCPS, tools, safety-data analysis, State safety risk and safety performance management, safety promotion and the monitoring of service provider SMS performance.

2.4. Regional coordination and monitoring

2.4.1. States requiring assistance should submit requests to the relevant ICAO Regional Office or RSOO.

2.4.2. To support AFI-States in meeting their safety management obligations ICAO Regional Offices, RSOOs and implementation partners should coordinate their assistance programmes to reduce duplication and prioritize States facing the most significant implementation gaps.

2.4.3. SSP implementation progress should remain a standing item on the agenda of the region. Regional monitoring should include, at a minimum:

a) completion of the SSP self-assessment and Gap-analysis;
b) approval and implementation of the SSP-DIP;
c) establishment of SSP governance arrangements;
d) implementation of the SDCPS;
e) establishment of safety-data protection arrangements; and
f) progress towards GASP Target 3.2.

2.4.4. A consolidated regional implementation dashboard should be maintained by the Secretariat, based on information available through the OLF or other tools in place and updates submitted by States. This would support early identification of delays and more effective prioritization of regional assistance.

2.4.5. The regional dashboard should identify implementation status, implementation trends, assistance requirements, and areas requiring intervention.

2.5. Conclusion

2.5.1. The combined effect of the GASP 2026-2028 targets, the applicability of the USOAP CMA Safety Management Protocol Questions and Annex 19 Amendment 2, introduces significant implementation demands within a short timeframe. Based on the current implementation status, a significant proportion of States in the AFI Region may not achieve effective SSP implementation unless implementation efforts, resource allocation and regional support are substantially accelerated.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1. The meeting is invited to:

a) take note of the SSP-related milestones arising from the GASP 2026-2028, the USOAP CMA Safety Management Protocol Questions and Annex 19, Amendment 2;

b) recognize the need to accelerate the SSP implementation across Member States; and urge States that have not yet done so, to complete their SSP self-assessments in the ICAO OLF by 31 December 2026 and, where necessary, seek support from relevant ICAO Regional Office or RSOO;

c) urge States to develop, approve and implement a time-bound and costed SSP Detailed Implementation Plan based on the gaps identified through the self-assessment and the gap-analysis;

d) call upon States to allocate sufficient and sustained human, financial and technical resources for SSP implementation; and

e) encourage development partners and implementation support organizations to prioritize assistance to States demonstrating significant implementation gaps and resource constraints.

Attachment

AFI-Region Status of implementation of USOAP-CMA SSP Self-Assessment

Region	State	OLF SSP Self-assessment
WACAF	Benin	
WACAF	Burkina Faso	**6%**
WACAF	Cameroon	**12%**
WACAF	Cabo Verde	**100%**
WACAF	Central African Republic (the)	
WACAF	Chad	
WACAF	Congo (the)	
WACAF	Côte d'Ivoire	**100%**
WACAF	Democratic Republic of the Congo (the)	
WACAF	Equatorial Guinea	
WACAF	Gabon	**100%**
WACAF	Gambia (the)	**100%**
WACAF	Ghana	**6%**
WACAF	Guinea	
WACAF	Guinea-Bissau	
WACAF	Liberia	
WACAF	Mali	
WACAF	Mauritania	
WACAF	Niger (the)	
WACAF	Nigeria	**31%**
WACAF	Sao Tome and Principe	**100%**
WACAF	Senegal	**100%**
WACAF	Sierra Leone	
WACAF	Togo	**100%**

Region	State	OLF SSP Self-assessment
ESAF	Angola	**100%**
ESAF	Botswana	**6%**
ESAF	Burundi	
ESAF	Comoros (the)	
ESAF	Djibouti	
ESAF	Eritrea	**100%**
ESAF	Ethiopia	**100%**
ESAF	Kenya	**100%**
ESAF	Lesotho	
ESAF	Madagascar	
ESAF	Malawi	
ESAF	Mauritius	
ESAF	Mozambique	**100%**
ESAF	Namibia	**100%**
ESAF	Rwanda	**100%**
ESAF	Seychelles	
ESAF	Somalia	
ESAF	South Africa	
ESAF	Eswatini	**100%**
ESAF	Uganda	**100%**
ESAF	United Republic of Tanzania (the)	**93%**
ESAF	Zambia	**100%**
ESAF	Zimbabwe	
ESAF	South Sudan	

Source OLF 27/10/2026