



WORKING PAPER

FACILITATION PANEL (FALP)

FOURTEENTH MEETING

Montréal, 20 to 24 April 2026

Agenda Item 4: Reports of the Facilitation Panel's Working Groups

**REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON ASSISTANCE TO AIRCRAFT ACCIDENT
VICTIMS AND THEIR FAMILIES (WG-AAAVF)**

(Presented by the Rapporteur on behalf of WG-AAAVF)

SUMMARY

This working paper provides an update from the Working Group on Assistance to Aircraft Accident Victims and their Families (WG-AAAVF), particularly regarding gaps in the implementation of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) and guidance material for AAVF and options to help ICAO Member States improve implementation.

Action by the FAL Panel:

- a) note the continued low implementation rate among ICAO Member States for AAVF SARPs and guidance and the potential causes identified by the WG-AAAVF.
- b) endorse the recommendations presented in Appendix A to improve implementation and refer actions to the WG-AAAVF and ICAO Secretariat, as applicable.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The WG-AAAVF job card was approved at the Thirteenth Meeting of the Facilitation Panel (FALP/13). The WG-AAAVF subsequently divided into two subgroups to facilitate efficient discussions. Subgroup 1 identified challenges that impede ICAO Member States' implementation of AAVF standards and recommended practices (SARPs) and guidance material, and identified options to help ICAO Member States improve implementation. The following sections and appendices of this paper focus on the outcomes of Subgroup 1's activities.

1.2 Subgroup 2 was tasked with identifying areas where ICAO AAVF SARPs and guidance material should be improved or clarified to better direct ICAO Member States in the delivery of assistance to aircraft accident victims and their families and, where gaps are identified, with recommending options to improve ICAO SARPs, and/or guidance material.

1.3 Subgroup 2 commenced its work with a review of the existing ICAO framework to assess the adequacy of current AAASF provisions. A gap analysis of relevant ICAO Annexes identified, inter alia, the absence of specific SARPs (and related guidance material) for Aircraft Operators in Annex 6 — *Operation of Aircraft*, as well as the opportunity to amend Recommended Practice (RP) 8.44 in Annex 9 — *Facilitation* by revising its wording to replace the conjunction “OR” with “AND”. In parallel, the Subgroup analysed legislation, regulations and policies issued by States and other relevant stakeholders in the AAASF domain, with the objective of identifying common approaches and differences. On this basis, Subgroup 2 initiated a comparative review of Doc 9998, *ICAO Policy on Assistance to Aircraft Accident Victims and their Families* and Doc 9973, *Manual on Assistance to Aircraft Accident Victims and their Families*, including an assessment of the alignment of the structure and content of Doc 9973 with the framework set out in Doc 9998. Ongoing work will focus on further comparative analysis of these documents, the identification of a repository of relevant AAASF documentation, and the review of past aircraft accidents from an AAASF perspective to assess the assistance provided, derive lessons learned, and support the update of the guidance material.

2. ISSUE STATEMENT

2.1 Implementation rates of ICAO SARPs and guidance for the provision of assistance to aircraft accident victims and their families are low. This suggests that many ICAO Member States may not be equipped to provide timely and compassionate assistance to aircraft accident victims and their families.

2.2 It is important for States to understand and accept that an aviation accident is an unexpected and usually catastrophic event. Concern for people who have experienced suffering and loss as a result of an aviation accident has led to increasing efforts within the aviation industry to establish procedures to respond in a timely manner to the needs of victims and their families.

2.3 Doc 9998 highlights that “assistance programs, in support of aircraft accident victims and their families, require cooperative planning and response by the air operator, airport operator, State of Occurrence, non-governmental organizations, and specialized commercial companies. Irrespective of the scale of an accident, the victims and their families should receive appropriate assistance. Because of variations in the size and circumstances of aircraft accidents, the extent of the resources required to provide family assistance will vary considerably. Therefore, planning for such events is necessary to ensure that in the event of a major aircraft accident the assistance provided to the victims and their families is adequate and sufficient.” Planning contributes to the following outcomes:

- a) **increasing public trust in the reliability of the State’s crisis response system.** All States have a moral obligation to ensure that victims and their families receive sufficient assistance in line with a state's duty to protect and support people in times of crisis. Developing a robust system to assist aircraft victims and their families strengthens the state's overall emergency preparedness, making it better equipped to handle various types of disasters. A responsible and prepared state can help to prevent the erosion of public trust in the aeronautical system after an air accident.
- b) **maintaining International Social Responsibility.** States are generally bound by international aviation regulations and conventions to provide appropriate support to victims and their families. A well-organized response to aircraft accidents confirms a State's international status as a committed and responsible actor on the global stage. Offering assistance to foreign nationals who are victims of an aircraft accident within the state's jurisdiction provides assurance to other States that their citizens will be cared for in a foreign country and allows mutual support.

- c) **managing the economic impact of an aircraft accident.** Effective assistance helps mitigate the immediate trauma and long-term psychological impact on victims and their families. Investing in immediate assistance may help to manage medical and psychological costs, as well as economic consequences that may arise from a mismanaged response. Adequate assistance may also help to ensure confidence in the State's aviation sector, which is crucial to managing economic impacts.
- d) **providing clear and predictable assistance.** Family assistance brings a sense of order to a chaotic environment by establishing mechanisms to provide timely factual information from authoritative sources to victims and family members. Effective family assistance clearly communicates to victims and families the available support, how the process works and expected timeframes for assistance, allowing for consistent messaging and mitigating misunderstandings. Family assistance offers those affected to have their concerns heard and addressed in a safe and secure environment.

3. DISCUSSION

3.1 Available data indicates that implementation rates among ICAO Member States for AAVF SARPs and guidance material are low nearly four years after the entry into force of Standard 8.43 and Recommended Practice 8.44. Appendix B presents the corresponding data and analysis in more detail.

3.2 ICAO's Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) assesses implementation of AAVF SARPs and guidance via Protocol Question (PQ) 6.383.¹ As of February 2026, the Effective Implementation (EI) score among the 55 ICAO Member States audited for PQ 6.383 was 10.91%. In other words, of the 55 States evaluated since PQ 6.383 was added to the USOAP-CMA Programme, 6 countries have been assessed as "satisfactory".

3.3 ICAO Member States self-report alignment with ICAO SARPs via the web-based Compliance Checklist and the Electronic Filing of Differences (EFOD) system. Compliance rates in the EFOD system for Annex 9, 8.43 and 8.44 trend lower (36% and 16% respectively) compared to the average of 52% for the related Annex 9, 8.38-8.42. When reviewing the EFOD data, it should be noted that ICAO Member States are not obligated to file differences for recommended practices.

3.4 Gaps in the data make it difficult to reach definitive conclusions regarding implementation rates for AAVF SARPs. For example, there is a high volume of "no entries" in the EFOD system for AAVF SARPs and only 55 out of 193 ICAO Member States have been assessed based on PQ 6.383. It is still possible, however, to observe three potential causes for low implementation rates: (1) Lack of Awareness of AAVF SARPs and Guidance; (2) Lack of AAVF Expertise, Knowledge, and Experience; (3) Cost and Complexity of Planning for Family Assistance.

Lack of Awareness of AAVF SARPs and Guidance

3.5 States may not be aware of the relatively new Annex 9, 8.43 and 8.44. This observation is supported by the fact that rates for compliance, differences, and no entry in the EFOD system are stable for Annex 9, 8.38-8.42, but decrease for Annex 9, 8.43 and 8.44. However, planning for family assistance is not a new concept. Standard 8.43 existed as Recommended Practice 8.46 before November 2022. Current self-reported compliance with Standard 8.43 (36%) in the EFOD system aligns with results from a 2021

¹ The USOAP CMA Programme also features several protocol questions related to assistance in the context of aircraft accident investigations. See PQ 6.371, 6.381, and PQ 6.397. Work related to these protocol questions is conducted under the purview of ICAO's Accident Investigation Panel (AIGP).

ICAO Survey (26%) with a similar number of responding States. The static rate of self-reported compliance suggests that other factors may influence implementation, beyond the novelty of the SARPs.

3.6 States may also be familiar with Annex 9, 8.43 and 8.44, but not with the associated guidance material outlined in Doc 9998 and Doc 9973, in which case they may be unaware of the documentation and tasks necessary to support aircraft accident victims and their families.

3.7 EFOD compliance rates for Standard 8.43 (i.e., 36%) appear to trend higher than the overall EI of 10.91% for PQ 6.383. The difference between self-reported compliance in the EFOD system compared to the assessment by ICAO auditors for PQ 6.383 may indicate a lack of awareness among ICAO Member States of what family assistance entails and/or what PQ 6.383 measures (e.g., the fact that the USOAP CMA Programme reviews not just standards, but also the recommended practices and guidance).

- For example, Recommended Practice 8.44 refers to the “aircraft **or** airport operator”, while PQ 6.383, Sub-question 2 tests whether, “the State has ensured that air operators **and** aerodrome operators have established family assistance plans” (emphasis added). If States are unfamiliar with PQ 6.383, they may assume that requiring family assistance plans from either aerodromes or air operators is sufficient, rather than both, which PQ 6.383 appears to assess. This may also point to a lack of clarity on what is required from States to align with ICAO AAVF SARPs and guidance.
- There is lower engagement in the EFOD system for Recommended Practice 8.44 compared to the other AAVF-related SARPs (81% of ICAO Member States have no entry). This lack of engagement may impact ICAO Member States’ ability to satisfy PQ 6.383 as its Sub-Question 2 assesses whether States require family assistance plans from air operators and aerodrome operators.
- The divergence between self-reported compliance and assessments under PQ 6.383 may also be caused by state-specific family assistance systems that differ from AAVF SARPs and guidance, but still, in the view of the state, may provide adequate assistance. A family assistance system that differs from the AAVF SARPs and guidance might not satisfy PQ 6.383. However, the low rate of differences for Annex 9, 8.43 and 8.44 in the EFOD system may discredit this theory.
- Finally, differences in the EFOD system and EI for PQ 6.383 may be caused by the high number of EFOD non-entries and the small sample size for PQ 6.383. The States reporting compliance in the EFOD system may differ from those that were assessed as non-satisfactory for PQ 6.383.

Lack of AAVF Expertise, Knowledge, and Experience

3.8 Aspects of family assistance (e.g., health and social services) transcend traditional aviation fields. Most ICAO Member States’ Civil Aviation Authorities (CAA) are staffed by aviation safety and security experts that may lack experience in the delivery of family assistance. As a result, the multi-disciplinary competencies needed to create and implement a family assistance system must be developed within the CAA or sourced from outside of the CAA. Some States may even place responsibility for family assistance outside of the CAA altogether, which would still necessitate ongoing coordination and risk gaps in the delivery of family assistance if the coordination is inadequate.

3.9 Accidents implicating a large volume of victims or family members are more likely to expose issues in a State’s ability to deliver family assistance and recommendations to address said issues. The relative rarity of large accidents means many States never confront the vulnerabilities in their family assistance system and never develop AAVF expertise, knowledge, and experience.

Cost and Complexity of Planning for Family Assistance

3.10 The development of a system for the delivery of family assistance in accordance with ICAO's AAVF SARPs and guidance may involve developing new or modifying existing emergency response plans and systems, which involves significant collaboration between a complex array of aviation and non-aviation organizations, including national, sub-national, and local governments, as well as with the aviation industry and other third-party organizations. The collaboration and organization required to develop such a system can be a barrier to the implementation of AAVF SARPs and guidance.

3.11 States may have difficulty assigning resources to family assistance planning where aircraft accidents, and the need to provide family assistance, are viewed as relatively rare. States may instead opt to prioritize resources for other issues that they view as more pressing. Further, ICAO Member States may lack the political will to undertake the process to develop a family assistance system. Previous experience has shown that many States only create a family assistance system after experiencing the fallout from a large-scale aviation disaster, and in response to advocacy from accident victims and their families.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 The Facilitation Panel is encouraged to:

- a) note the continued low implementation rate among ICAO Member States for AAVF SARPs and guidance and the potential causes identified by the WG-AAVF; and
- b) endorse the recommendations presented in Appendix A to improve implementation and refer actions to the WG-AAVF and ICAO Secretariat, as applicable.

APPENDIX A

OPTIONS TO IMPROVE IMPLEMENTATION OF AAVF SARPS AND GUIDANCE

Enhance Awareness of AAVF SARPs and Guidance

1. Continue promoting and facilitating discussions regarding AAVF at relevant ICAO events.
2. Create an online portal or webpage to consolidate and make easily accessible all AAVF-related ICAO materials, similar to what has been done for aircraft accident and incident investigations. In addition to ICAO SARPs and guidance, include state-level materials and best practices, as appropriate.
3. Translate AAVF course materials and iPack resources into all official ICAO languages (Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian, and Spanish) to ensure wider accessibility.
4. Consider amending the text of Annex 9, 8.44 to read “aircraft and airport operator” rather than “aircraft or airport operator” to clarify that both aircraft and airport operators should plan for family assistance. This would align with Doc 9973 and PQ 6.383 from the USOAP CMA Programme which asks whether the State has ensured that both air operators and aerodrome operators establish family assistance plans.
5. Urge States to enter or review information in the Online Framework (OLF), specifically regarding Annex 9 — *Facilitation*, 8.38 to 8.44 on EFOD and PQ 6.383 on Self-Assessment modules, so that ICAO can consider those entries when planning future audits.
6. Encourage ICAO auditors to make PQ 6.383 a priority protocol question in all USOAP CMA activities that cover the area of aircraft accident and incident investigation (AIG).
7. Continue to reflect AAVF in ICAO’s priorities and forward planning activities.

Build AAVF Expertise, Knowledge, and Experience

8. Promote regional and national workshops with a focus on AAVF SARPs and guidance, best practices, and operational considerations. Encourage States to consider the participation of aircraft accident victims and their families in the workshops. Offer workshops in languages based on regional needs.
9. Build on regional and national workshops with follow-up support and coaching via ICAO regional officers or localized offices in all ICAO official languages to States developing family assistance plans.
10. Review feedback from the AAVF Course, iPack, and related ICAO events in collaboration with the WG-AAVF, to evaluate their effectiveness and to consider adjustments, as needed, going forward.
11. Promote State-to-State mentoring on family assistance (e.g., by inviting representatives from other countries when developing, implementing, and/or testing family assistance plans).
12. Encourage states to consider collaborating with relevant national and international organizations in their implementation of plans and policies for AAVF.

Facilitate Adoption Given Cost and Complexity of Planning for Family Assistance

13. Explore options to conduct cost-benefit analysis on AAVF and disseminate the results to ICAO Member States in order to provide them with the tools to promote the necessary political will.

APPENDIX B

BACKGROUND AND STATUS OF AAVF IMPLEMENTATION

1. AAVF SARPS AND GUIDANCE

1.1 ICAO SARPs for the provision of assistance to aircraft accident victims and their families are included in Annex 9 — *Facilitation*, Chapter 8 (Facilitation Provisions covering specific subjects), I (Assistance to aircraft accident victims and their families), Standards and Recommended Practices 8.38 to 8.44. These SARPs are supported by Doc 9973 – *Manual on Assistance to Aircraft Accident Victims and their Families* and Doc 9998 – *ICAO Policy on Assistance to Aircraft Accident Victims and their Families*. Standard 8.43 and Recommended Practice 8.44 are particularly crucial to ensure comprehensive support for aircraft accident victims and their families:

8.43. Contracting States shall establish legislation, regulations and/or policies in support of assistance to aircraft accident victims and their families.

Note— Attention is drawn to Doc 9998, ICAO Policy on Assistance to Aircraft Accident Victims and their Families and Doc 9973, Manual on Assistance to Aircraft Accident Victims and their Families.

8.44. Recommended Practice – *Contracting States should ensure that each aircraft or airport operator, as appropriate, develop appropriate plans to provide timely and effective assistance to aircraft accident victims and their families.*

Note— Airport operators' plans regarding assistance to aircraft accident victims and their families may form part of the Aerodrome Emergency Plan (AEP) required under Annex 14 — Aerodromes.

1.2 Standard 8.43 and Recommended Practice 8.44 entered into force in November 2022 based on Amendment 29 to Annex 9 (although Standard 8.43 previously existed as a recommended practice, which was created in 2015 via Amendment 25 to Annex 9). These SARPs build on more than two decades of work and collaboration by ICAO Member States, the ICAO Secretariat and Council, the Air Crash Victims Families Federation International and precursors, and aviation industry organizations since the ICAO Assembly adopted Resolution A32-7 in 1998.

1.3 Beyond Annex 9, 8.43 and 8.44, SARPs 8.38 to 8.42 focus on facilitating the entry of family members, authorized representatives of operators involved in accidents and their alliance partners. These SARPs also address expedited issuance of visas and emergency travel documents to these individuals, and repatriation of human remains to their country of origin at the request of family members or the operator. SARPs 8.38 to 8.42 were created in 2005 via Amendment 19 to Annex 9.

2. AAVF IMPLEMENTATION RATES

2.1 The WG-AAVF used data from a 2021 ICAO Survey, ICAO's Electronic Filing of Differences system and the ICAO Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) to assess implementation rates among ICAO Member States for Annex 9 — *Facilitation* Standard 8.43 and

Recommended Practice 8.44, as well as associated guidance material (i.e., *Doc 9973 – Manual on Assistance to Aircraft Accident Victims and their Families* and *Doc 9998 – ICAO Policy on Assistance to Aircraft Accident Victims and their Families*).

2021 ICAO Survey

2.2 In 2021, the ICAO Secretariat conducted a survey on Member States’ implementation of what was then Annex 9, 8.42-8.46 (State Letter EC 6/3-20-26). This survey predated the renumbering of the SARPs, elevation of Recommended Practice 8.46 to Standard 8.43, and the creation of Recommended Practice 8.44. FALP/12-WP/20 Revision No. 1 discussed, among other things, the results of this survey, noting that what was at the time Recommended Practice 8.46 had the lowest implementation levels among the AAVF SARPS.

Table 1. Results from 2021 ICAO Survey of AAVF Implementation (66/193 States Responded)

Question	Yes	No	No Entry
Question 8.41: Does your State have legislation, regulations, decrees, or other legal and administrative arrangements in place with adjacent States to facilitate the entry into their territory on a temporary basis of family members of victims of an aircraft accident?	51 (26%)	12 (6%)	130 (67%)
Question 8.42: Does your State have legislation, regulations, decrees, or other legal and administrative arrangements in place with adjacent States to facilitate the entry into their territory, on a temporary basis, of authorized representatives of the operator whose aircraft has met with the accident, or of the operator’s alliance partner, in order to enable them to provide assistance to survivors and their family members, the family members of the deceased victims of the accident and the relevant authorities in these States?	52 (27%)	11 (6%)	130 (67%)
Question 8.43 Part 1: Does your State require any other travel document than a passport, or an emergency travel document issued specifically to such persons, to enable them to travel to these States?	23 (12%)	40 (21%)	130 (67%)
Question - 8.43 Part 2: In cases where your State requires entrance visas for persons referred to in 8.41 and 8.42 above, is the issuance of such visas expedited?	51 (26%)	7 (4%)	135 (70%)
Question - 8.44: Does your State issue emergency travel documents, if required, to its nationals who have survived the accident?	62 (32%)	3 (2%)	128 (66%)
Question - 8.45: Does your State extend all necessary assistance, such as arranging transport and clearing customs, in the repatriation of human remains to their countries of origin, on request by family members of the deceased or the operator whose aircraft met with the accident?	60 (31%)	5 (3%)	128 (66%)
Question - 8.46 Part 1: Does your state have legislation, regulations, decrees and/or policies in support of assistance to aircraft accident victims and their families?	50 (26%)	14 (7%)	129 (67%)
Question - 8.46 Part 2: Does the State have a Plan (s) to facilitate assistance to aircraft accident victims and their families?	41 (21%)	21 (11%)	131 (68%)

Electronic Filing of Differences

2.3 ICAO Member States self-report alignment with ICAO SARPs via the web-based Compliance Checklist and the Electronic Filing of Differences (EFOD) tool. Table 2 presents implementation rates for Annex 9, SARPs 8.38 to 8.444 based on EFOD Implementation Data (extracted February 2026). When reviewing the EFOD data, it should be noted that ICAO Member States are not obligated to file differences for recommended practices.

Table 2. EFOD Data for AAASF SARPs

SARP	Compliance	Differences	No Entry	Compliance %	Differences %	No Entry %
STD 8.38	101	10	82	52%	5%	42%
STD 8.39	103	10	80	53%	5%	41%
RP 8.40	93	12	88	48%	6%	46%
STD 8.41	104	6	83	54%	3%	43%
STD 8.42	105	8	80	54%	4%	41%
STD 8.43	69	12	112	36%	6%	58%
RP 8.44	31	6	156	16%	3%	81%

USOAP CMA Audits

2.4 ICAO's Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) includes an assessment of ICAO Member States' implementation of AAASF SARPs and guidance via Protocol Question (PQ) 6.383 (Figure 1). PQ 6.383 references Annex 9 SARPs 8.38 to 8.44, as well as Doc 9998 and Doc 9973.²

Figure 1. PQ 6.383 and Sub-Questions

PQ 6.383. Has the State established a comprehensive system for providing assistance to aircraft accident victims and their families? Verify that:

- 1) the primary aviation legislation, specific operating regulations and/or policies establish family assistance plans that address the scope, responsibilities, roles and coordination necessary to provide assistance to aircraft accident victims and their families.
- 2) the State has ensured that air operators and aerodrome operators have established family assistance plans.
- 3) the family assistance plans are periodically reviewed by the State and service providers.
- 4) the State has ensured that air operators have arrangements with aerodromes in which they operate to implement the family assistance plans.
- 5) an agency is designated to coordinate the timely and appropriate delivery of assistance.

2.5 As of February 2026, the Effective Implementation (EI) score among the 55 ICAO Member States audited for PQ 6.383 was 10.91%. In other words, out of the 55 States evaluated since PQ 6.383 was added to the USOAP-CMA Programme, 6 countries have been assessed as "satisfactory".

2.6 Though the EFOD system features a high rate of non-entries and only a small portion of ICAO Member States have been evaluated on PQ 6.383, the available data still suggests that implementation among ICAO Member States of AAASF SARPs and guidance is low nearly four years after the entry into force of Annex 9, 8.43 and 8.44. The findings from EFOD and USOAP audit data align

² The USOAP CMA Programme also features protocol questions related to assistance in the context of aircraft accident investigations. See PQ 6.371, 6.381, and PQ 6.397. Work on these protocol questions is conducted under the purview of ICAO's Accident Investigation Panel (AIGP).

with the 2021 ICAO survey. Of the 66 States that responded to the 2021 ICAO Survey, 60 also provided a response in the EFOD system for at least one of Annex 9 SARPs 8.38 to 8.44.

3. PAST WORK TO IMPROVE IMPLEMENTATION

3.1 Improving implementation of ICAO SARPs and guidance for assistance to aircraft accident victims and their families has been a consistent focus in ICAO's work on in the field of AAVF.

3.2 In December 2021, the First Symposium on Assistance to Aircraft Accident Victims and their Families (AAVF 2021), was held in Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain. It discussed, among other things, that States do not always have the legislation and/or policies to support family assistance. Several of the 30 recommendations emanating from AAVF 2021 related to improving implementation of AAVF SARPS and building capacity for the delivery of family assistance.

3.3 In November 2024, the Second Symposium on Assistance to Aircraft Accident Victims and their Families (AAVF 2024), was held in Haarlem, the Netherlands. It provided a platform for States, aviation experts, regulators, international organizations and associations representing victims and their families to discuss critical issues concerning support for aircraft accident victims and their families. The sessions focused on key themes, including victims' and families' advocacy and support, crisis management, the implementation and oversight of ICAO SARPs, policy and guidance, improvements in accident investigation, insurance and compensation, and protocols for family assistance.

3.4 In September 2025, the 42nd ICAO Assembly included discussions on the need to improve implementation rates of AAVF SARPs and guidance (e.g., on A42-WP16WP/21 Revision No. 1 – presented by the ICAO Council). Resolution A42-15 was also adopted, which “Urges Member States to establish legislation, regulations and/or policies to support victims of civil aviation accidents and their family members, as mandated by ICAO Annex 9 Standard 8.47 (*sic*), and pursuant to Article 28 of the Montréal Convention of 28 May 1999 and Resolution No. 2 adopted by the Montréal Conference.”

3.5 In June 2022, ICAO hosted a validation delivery of its AAVF Course. In December 2022, the first official offering of the course took place. This course is designed to provide CAA representatives, other government officials, aircraft and airport operators and non-governmental organization with the competencies to effectively support aircraft accident victims and their family assistance efforts, in accordance with ICAO Policy on Assistance to Aircraft Accident Victims and their Families (Doc 9998), and the ICAO Manual on Assistance to Aircraft Accident Victims and their Families (Doc 9973).

3.6 The ICAO Secretariat has developed an Implementation Package (iPack) that provides the competencies needed to support accident victims and their families following an aircraft accident. The iPack is a self-contained product which includes relevant documentation, tools, and a give day in-person course. A dedicated subject matter expert will also work with the Civil Aviation Authority, providing guidance in their implementation efforts to achieve the objectives of the iPack.

3.7 Several ICAO Member States and Regional Offices have hosted regional workshops to discuss best practices in the provision of assistance to aircraft accident victims and their families.

3.8 February 20 has been established as an International Day of Remembrance for Air Accident Victims to highlight the importance of AAVF on a yearly basis.