



International Civil Aviation Organization

WORKING PAPER

AN-Conf/13-WP/130
19/9/18
(Information Paper)
English only

THIRTEENTH AIR NAVIGATION CONFERENCE

Montréal, Canada, 9 to 19 October 2018

COMMITTEE B

Agenda Item 7: Operational safety risks

- 7.1: Facilitation of data-driven decision-making in support of safety intelligence to support safety risk management**
- 7.2: Operational safety risks at the global, regional and national levels, and the role of RSOOs and RASGs in achieving the GASP goals**

**BRAZILIAN AVIATION SAFETY TEAM AND THE ROLE OF NATIONAL-LEVEL
IMPLEMENTATION OF COLLABORATIVE SAFETY INITIATIVES**

(Presented by Brazil)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper presents a summary of the steps taken in Brazil to implement its national level collaborative safety initiative, the Brazilian Aviation Safety Team (BAST) and discusses the importance of such national level mechanisms in the implementation strategy for the GASP and related safety targets, as said structures can be the ideal counterpart at the national level of the Regional Aviation Safety Group.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Establishing an effective implementation mechanism for safety initiatives, derived from data analysis is one of the greatest challenges for any State, in order to address the need for rapid and effective mitigation of identified risks for operations.

1.2 The first and most exemplar of such initiatives has its roots in the 1990s in the United States, with the advent of the “Commercial Aviation Safety Team”. It was established as a response to the increasing pressure in the aviation safety system, when accident figures were rising together with the expansion of the system.

1.3 Almost ten years later, many States from the Americas recognized the need for such a similar governance structure, and the Regional Aviation Safety Group – Pan-America (RASG-PA) was established. With support from the United States’ Commercial Aviation Safety Team (CAST) and the International Air Transport Association (IATA), the RASG-PA members, States and industry together, were able to start working with safety data to identify impending risks and to develop the corresponding mitigation strategies.

1.4 As a founding member of the RASG-PA, Brazil was watching closely and supporting the developments of the group. In the years that followed the creation of RASG-PA, it had become clear that many of the safety enhancement initiatives (SEI) developed by the Pan-American Regional Aviation Safety Team (PA-RAST), the implementation body of the RASG-PA, would have to reach State-level stakeholders, infrastructure and organizations to actually implement those SEI.

1.5 The question that remained was *how* to achieve such State-level implementation effectively, without imposing additional burden to the administrative structure in place. This paper presents the evolution of such a scenario in Brazil and in the Pan-American region, indicating the main aspects that were essential for achieving a functional national safety initiative in Brazil and its role for the international aviation in the region.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 In 2011 and 2012, the Brazilian Civil Aviation Agency (ANAC-Brazil) began fostering meetings with several industry stakeholders, to discuss what could be done at the national level. The result was a consensus that a national group with similar objectives as those of the CAST should be implemented. That was the Brazilian Aviation Safety Team (BAST) initiative.

2.2 Back in that time, it was consensual between government and industry representatives that a central safety database should be deployed, to serve as a central repository for safety data and to allow studies of risk areas. It took the entire calendar year of 2013 for the group to realize the necessary structure, evaluate the costs involved and start defining the strategy to be followed.

2.3 The requirements to build an independent, de-identified and reliable database are large, and require a large amount of resources from all parties. With that implementation at a slow pace, the initial working groups tasked to identify risk areas were struggling to get past simple operational and ramp issues (load and balancing, refuelling, etc), for any available data, was that individual members were voluntarily willing to take to the meetings.

2.4 By the end of 2014, the BAST members agreed to seek IATA to evaluate the Flight Data Exchange Program (FDX). The conclusion was that the structure provided by IATA could fill the gap of a dedicated, de-identified safety database and the working groups of the BAST could gain more focus on real safety issues to start identifying the core risk areas to invest the resources of the team.

2.5 Based on data, the working groups soon matured and a formal definition of the BAST structure was finally designed, with sub-divisions in four groups: commercial aviation (BCAST); general aviation (BGAST); airport infrastructure (BAIST); and helicopter operations (BHEST). This resulted in the formal inclusion of this structure in the Brazilian Safety Plan, with the formal approval of the Brazilian Civil Aviation Agency (ANAC – Resolution n. 399/2016). Its text brings clear statements about the collaborative nature of the group, and the protected data framework, which means that any data that the group uses should be used solely for the purposes of risk identification and mitigation.

2.6 Due to the involvement of airline representatives since the first days of the BAST, the way data is used has evolved in the meetings, with the most valuable information not coming from a central system's data, but from data voluntarily presented by industry representatives, that often include internal and/or safety management system (SMS) reports. One might argue that identified data in the

working groups could be a problem, but that capacity to work directly with such data is a precise testimony of how much trust and confidence has been built among participants.

2.7 It is a common conclusion of the BAST that trust and confidence have overcome any other issue with data sources. In other words, it will not matter the source of the data if there is enough trust and confidence among participants. That was enough to get the BCAST to a mature level so as to enhance interaction with the PA-RAST.

2.8 By designating a “bridge” member of the BCAST with the PA-RAST, the national initiative has become the natural counterpart to the regional efforts and the one entity to be looked after when any of the RASG-PA activities should involve any aspect of the Brazilian system. The importance of such a mechanism has been crowned with the creation of a Mid-Air Collision Safety Enhancement Team (MAC) at the PA-RAST in parallel to the BCAST working group.

3. CONCLUSION

3.1 When a Regional Aviation Safety Group (RASG) cannot count on a national counterpart with a similar structure, its actions may become limited precisely by the lack of a broader involvement of local stakeholders, for which a national initiative must exist in the first place. Or worse, the RASG can be in a position to use its own resources to implement national-level mitigation plans as the only means to get the desired results.

3.2 National-level initiatives should be built in a way to fully represent all involved local stakeholders, with trust and confidence as its core values and with the objective to interact with the Regional Aviation Safety Group to which said State is a part of. This way, the national initiative can be at least prepared to receive the knowledge and expertise from the RASG, or in cases of a more mature national initiative, be the entity to provide assistance and resources to the RASG to implement safety enhancements.

3.3 From the experience shown, the key values of a national-level safety initiative should reflect all of the following aspects:

- a) that all participants represent the full scope of the national aviation system;
- b) trust and confidence among participants must be built in a way that safety data will be used only by the group with the purpose of identifying risks and of designing mitigation strategies;
- c) that a formal inclusion of the group in the State safety programme (SSP) of the State should guarantee protection, establish roles and rules for participation, where participants share workload, resources and responsibilities; and
- d) cooperation with the RASG to which the State is a part of should be prioritized, so as to make the national-level initiative the official counterpart to the RASG.