



ASSEMBLY — 39TH SESSION

TECHNICAL COMMISSION

Agenda Item 33: Aviation safety and air navigation monitoring and analysis

HARMONIZATION OF ACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF SAFETY PERFORMANCE (ALoSP)
AMONG STATES

(Presented by Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of))

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The efforts and progress made by ICAO to ensure that States implement and harmonize acceptable levels of safety performance in order to establish the SSPs enshrined in GASP are analysed in this working paper.

Action: The Assembly is invited to:

- a) note and consider the views expressed in this working paper,
- b) urge ICAO to redouble its efforts to establish/review jointly with States in each region the harmonization among States of ALoSP for SSP purposes.

<i>Strategic Objectives:</i>	This working paper relates to the Safety Strategic Objective
<i>Financial implications:</i>	Not applicable.
<i>References:</i>	<i>Global Aviation Safety Plan 2014-2016 (GASP) (Doc.10004). Annex 19 on Safety Management. Safety Management Manual (Doc. 9859). Working Paper A38-WP/255.</i>

¹ Spanish version provided by Venezuela

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 GASP has established a strategy for the continuous safety improvement so that States may, in the next 15 years, establish basic aviation safety systems (effective safety oversight system), State safety programmes (SSP) and, subsequently, more advanced systems involving predictive risk management.

1.2 World standardization of international civil aviation activities is one of the key roles of ICAO and GASP objectives presents a broad picture and pose a challenge to States worldwide.

1.3 SSP implementation has required constant involvement by industry and States. The experience of Venezuela and of other States shows that progress in SSP implementation is not homogeneous.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 To achieve the goal of ensuring that States switch from a compliance-based oversight approach to an approach that begins with proactive international risk management by identifying and monitoring existing or emerging safety problems, States must continue to interact on those aspects.

2.2 As identification of existing or emerging safety issues does not affect one State in isolation, the State's effort to manage them by setting objectives and goals measurable by its State safety performance indicators contributes to the attainment of acceptable levels of safety beneficial to the industry and, from a systemic standpoint, to international operations in interaction with other States.

2.3 It was recommended in Working Paper A38-WP/255 that universal safety performance indicators be developed by ICAO in close cooperation with States and regional organizations in order to ensure sustainable air transport development and avoid future conflicts among States over non-recognition of their declared ALoSP.

2.4 Working Paper A38-WP/255 highlighted the need to build common safety indicators and to generate activities in each region in order to support States in building indicators. These activities should support initiatives to standardize GASP safety management and would contribute to the achievement of GASP objectives for SSP implementation.

2.5 Positive initiatives have reflected on indicators and goals set and agreed by civil aviation authorities in the regions, as in the Bogota Declaration (SAM Region) concerning high-consequence events, and progress in effective EI implementation under USOAP and SSP.

2.6 Furthermore, under GASP initiatives, ICAO continues to give priority to three safety areas, namely improvement in runway safety, reduction in the number of controlled flight into terrain (CFIT) accidents and lowering the number of loss of control in flight (LOC-I) accidents and incidents.

2.7 It is noted that the goal of the forthcoming Amendment 1 to Annex 19 will be to harmonize SSP processes by regarding the role of each critical element (CE) of an SSO system as the necessary basis for an effective SSP that will support States in implementing SSP more efficiently.

2.8 Owing to the experience noted above, the new policy lines in the most recent revision of Doc. 9859 and the future provisions of Amendment 1 to Annex 19, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela has endeavoured to understand four aspects of acceptable levels of safety performance:

ACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF SAFETY PERFORMANCE FOR SSP PURPOSES				
Types of indicator	Short- and medium-term management	Planned features of predictive management expected in the long term under GASP	Linked to achievement under Annex 19	Linked to achievement under Amendment 1 to Annex 19
Sets of indicators for high- and low-consequence events (of interests).	Reactive	Jointly with other States, Organizations and the Industry	Chapter 3, section 3.1 and Attachment A, section 2	Chapter 3, section 3.3 State safety risk management
Sets of indicators derived from State oversight in terms of effectiveness and identified critical areas	Proactive	Standardization, information management and real-time monitoring for decision making be management	Chapter 3, section 3.1 and Attachment A, section 3	Chapter 3, section 3.4 State safety assurance
Sets of indicators for safety oversight (eight critical elements)	Proactive	Continuous monitoring approach integrated into State safety management	Chapter 3, section 3.2, Appendix 1	Chapter 3, relevant paragraphs of section 3.2 , 3.3 y 3.4 and Appendix 1 (SSO)
Sets of indicators for promotion, dissemination and safety culture	Proactive	Information sharing with other States, organizations and the industry	Chapter 3, section 3.1 Attachment A, section 4	Chapter 3, section 3.5 State safety promotion

2.9 Initial progress achieved in our efforts is detailed in the first statistical bulletin on operational safety at <http://www.inac.gob.ve/art/template3/9cc04Informeieso.pdf>, covering the first set of indicators.

3. CONCLUSION

3.1 This initial frame of reference provides States with an approach to which sets of indicators should be developed in implementing SSP components.

3.2 Moreover, all parties in all regions should consider further efforts in order to harmonize these set of indicators among SSPs and States, inasmuch as the aviation system is systemic, and the regions should, after evaluation, identify common existing or emerging safety problems.

3.3 As States, especially those which have more than 60% of their EI, are implementing their SSP on the basis that the integration of State safety oversight system (SSO) and SSP framework components will entail additional administrative costs for States that have already established and published an SSP and, in view of the adjustments to legislation that could be required in States, especially if many aviation authorities are involved in safety management activities, it is important to visualize those indicators that are being measured and the goal that each State must set in developing its SSP indicators.

4. RECOMMENDATION

4.1 The Assembly is invited to note and consider the views expressed in this working paper.

4.2 ICAO and the industry should pursue efforts to achieve GASP objectives by continuously improving safety.

4.3 Initiatives should be taken in each region and effort should be made by all parties to harmonize these sets of indicators (ALoSP) between SSPs and States.