



International Civil Aviation Organization

WORKING PAPER

A40-WP/361¹

TE/151

2/8/19

Revision No. 1

9/9/19

**English, Arabic, Chinese,
French and Russian only**

ASSEMBLY — 40TH SESSION

TECHNICAL COMMISSION

Agenda Item 28: Aviation Safety and Air Navigation Policy

CHALLENGES IN SSP IMPLEMENTATION IN SUPPORT OF SAFETY MANAGEMENT

(Presented by Venezuela, supported by SAM States and Latin American Civil Aviation Commission (LACAC) States²)

REVISION NO. 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper presents the challenges in State safety programme (SSP) implementation, which may be consistent among different States and regions, and which should be considered in the development of global safety improvement strategies in order to contribute to the achievement of the goals related to effective SSP implementation within the *Global Aviation Safety Plan* (GASP, Doc 10004).

Action: The Assembly is invited to:

- a) take note of the information presented; and
- b) take into account scalability considerations in this paper, for introducing further improvements in the implementation of GASP strategies and activities.

<i>Strategic Objectives:</i>	This working paper relates to the Safety Strategic Objective.
<i>Financial implications:</i>	Not applicable
<i>References:</i>	Doc 9859, <i>Safety Management Manual</i> AN-Conf /13-WP/155, <i>SSP Implementation Pilot Project in the SAM Region</i>

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The main objective of the State safety programme (SSP) is to ensure that a State has established the required minimum regulatory framework and to ensure harmonization between a State's regulatory and administrative organizations as regards their safety risk management roles.

1.2 The experience in SSP implementation as a follow-up to the provisions established in Annex 19 — *Safety Management* to the Convention on International Civil Aviation and to the guidance from Doc 9859, *Safety Management Manual* has led to the need to address a number of challenges in order to establish a sustainable and effective SSP.

¹ Spanish version provided by Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

² Belize, Bolivia, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay.

1.3 As a measure to move forward in SSP implementation, the State takes the decision to participate in the SSP implementation pilot project within the South American (SAM) Region, as indicated in the AN-Conf/13-WP/155 working paper, presented at the Thirteenth Air Navigation Conference. This mechanism has made it possible to create an area among the SAM Region States to share and exchange experiences that help implement the various elements of the SSP framework and that may provide alternatives for the effective and harmonized implementation of the SSP framework in a cooperative atmosphere between participating States and ICAO in other regions, thereby advancing the “*No Country Left Behind*” initiative.

2. CONSIDERATIONS FOR SSP IMPLEMENTATION

2.1 A number of considerations are raised during the States’ SSP implementation within the various regions.

2.1.1 It is important for the State to understand the legal and organizational aspects regarding the establishment and implementation of elements from the SSP framework. States face challenges and have made different choices, adaptable to their realities, which, with appropriate instruments, legally enable effective safety management.

2.1.2 During SSP implementation, it has been observed how the various organizational structures and coordinating bodies within State agencies that carry out the different safety management functions (regulating, certifying, monitoring, investigating accidents, taking preventive or tax measures and related support processes) incorporate risk management criteria into their processes and procedures and the appropriate expertise requirements for the staff to implement them.

2.1.3 To apply the scalability principle to SSP implementation, it is important that the State be aware, based on a standardized classification of groups of States in the various regions (from largest and most complex to small and least complex), that make it possible to have the minimum acceptance criteria in relation to the legal aspects, organizational structures, material and human resources, safety data collection and processing systems (SDCPS), *inter alia*, for effective safety management. Based on performance criteria, documents could be chosen that would list a range of parameters associated with the size and complexity of the State. For instance, a State aviation activity questionnaire (SAAQ) used by the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) offers information of this nature.

2.1.4 To anticipate in the medium term the ability to share and exchange safety data and information between the States’ SSPs and the industry, it is important to establish criteria, harmonized classifications and to consider the technical requirements for the design of safety data and information collection and processing systems, which can be adapted to the size, complexity and needs of the States.

2.1.5 To continue to create areas for the harmonization of safety performance objectives and indicators common to States (at regional scales) for safety management.

2.1.6 To successfully promote the certification recognition processes among States, harmonization of criteria and requirements related to safety management system (SMS) acceptance is required.