



ICAO

International Civil Aviation Organization  
North American, Central American and Caribbean Office

WORKING PAPER

NACC/WG/RAP/04 — WP/03  
06/05/26

**Fourth Meeting of Rapporteurs of the North American, Central American, and Caribbean  
(NACC/WG/RAP/04)**

Meeting Online, 6-7 May 2026

**Agenda Item 3: Dashboard of the Air Navigation Services (ANS) areas, reviewing updated indicators and implementation status.**

**DASHBOARD FOR AIR NAVIGATION SERVICES (ANS) AREAS: REVIEW  
OF UPDATED INDICATORS AND IMPLEMENTATION STATUS.**

(Presented by the Secretariat)

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This Working Paper proposes a structured and strategic review of the indicators currently used in the NACC regional dashboard (iSTARS 4.0), in order to ensure that they accurately reflect: (i) the actual implementation of the Working Groups, (ii) the contribution to ICAO's Strategic Objectives, and (iii) progress towards the targets of the Air Navigation Plan (regional GANP/ANP), and additionally, (iv) the 'critical' indicators that the region actually needs to measure in order to guide operational and planning decisions.

<b>Action:</b>	The suggested actions are set out in section 4
<i>Strategic Objectives:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Safety</li><li>• Air Navigation Capacity and Efficiency</li><li>• Security &amp; Facilitation</li></ul>
<i>References:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• NACC/WG/10 — NE/25 Presentation of progress in ANS implementation via the NACC dashboard</li><li>• Draft Final Report GREPECAS/23</li><li>• ICAO iSTAR 4.0 portal</li></ul>

**1. Introduction**

1.1 The NACC Regional Dashboard on the iSTARS 4.0 portal ([ICAO NACC iSTARS 4.0 Dashboard](#)) is designed as a strategic tool for comprehensively visualising indicators related to operational safety and air navigation, enabling the identification of gaps, the monitoring of performance and the support of informed decision-making.

1.2 Within the framework of results-based management, the value of the Dashboard extends beyond mere visualisation to its ability to:

- Monitor performance and progress in implementation.
- Identify gaps, risks and opportunities for improvement.
- Adjust interventions in a flexible manner.
- Communicate results and priorities to stakeholders.

1.3 During NACC/WG/10, Study Note NE/25 was presented, documenting the evolution of the Dashboard, its institutional purpose and the ongoing need to maintain up-to-date and strategically selected data and indicators. This Study Note builds on that foundation and deepens the focus on indicator governance and the use of the Dashboard as a mechanism for coordination between Working Groups.

## 2. Discussion

Are the current indicators useful for reflecting regional implementation and strategy?

2.1 The Dashboard was launched as part of the results-based approach, developed through interregional coordination (NACC and SAM), with the aim of improving access to and use of aeronautical data tailored to regional needs.

2.2 It is also established that dashboards must be a reliable and timely source; therefore, the implementation status shown must reflect current levels and use sufficiently representative indicators to guide actions. These indicators are valuable insofar as they allow progress to be visualised by area and module (e.g. Air Navigation Services, Aerodromes, among others), providing a regional 'snapshot' that supports monitoring and comparison.

2.3 However, the value of an indicator lies not merely in its 'existence' but in what it enables:

- Does it effectively reflect the status of implementation of the Working Groups' tasks and deliverables?
- Is it aligned with the Strategic Objectives (operational safety, capacity/efficiency, etc.) of the NACC/WG?
- Does it allow for measuring progress towards GANP/ANP targets and regional priorities?
- And, crucially: are these the indicators that the region really needs to measure in order to guide decisions (prioritisation, support, sequencing of implementations, sub-regional cooperation)?

2.4 For example, during the implementation of the AIM Tracking System, it became apparent that certain indicators in the ANS module did not adequately reflect regional objectives, leading to the conclusion that other areas should also be reviewed using guiding questions (strategic relevance, data availability, updating, usability).

Is the recorded data up to date and does it reflect the actual status?

2.5 The modules have different update dates (some in 2024 and others in 2025), which suggests that the Dashboard may display temporal discrepancies between domains. This may lead to inconsistent readings if areas with different update levels are compared or if the Dashboard is intended for integrated decision-making (e.g., dependencies between ATM/AIM/CNS).

2.6 An implementation-oriented Dashboard must uphold a basic premise: ‘what is seen’ must correspond to ‘what is happening’. It is clear that out-of-date indicators can distort results and affect decisions, so it is recommended that relevance and alignment be periodically validated.

2.7 Therefore, rather than asking “Is it up to date?”, the proposal is to institutionalise three checks:

- Timeliness: minimum frequency and a visible “cut-off date” for each indicator.
- Quality: validation of the integrity, consistency and traceability of sources.
- Governance (accountability): responsible parties (PoC/Rapporteurs/Secretariat) and escalation routes.

### **3. Proposal: A practical definition of ‘Dashboard’ for NACC: from visualisation to management**

3.1 In line with the concept of a dashboard, the Dashboard should be used for management (not merely observation). This implies that its purpose is to show the status of implementation and, furthermore, to act as a “bargaining chip” between task groups to coordinate:

- Implementation dates for common or interdependent tasks.
- Sequencing of deliverables when one activity depends on the progress of another.
- Alignment of work plans and evidence-based replanning.

3.2 The Dashboard can also enable a differentiated approach by ‘clusters’ of States: based on the data displayed, groups can decide to proceed in different stages with sub-groups (e.g., States ready for piloting vs. States in the preparation phase), optimising cooperation, assistance and project roll-out. This approach aligns with the idea of using data to adjust interventions in an agile manner.

3.3 As a strategic tool, the NACC Dashboard should be used for:

- **Monitoring and accountability regarding implementation:** objective tracking of progress at regional and state level (including gaps).
- **Management of responsibilities and coordination between working groups:** aligning timelines and prerequisites across working groups.
- **Evidence-based strategic prioritisation:** selecting projects/collaborations with the greatest impact, identifying bottlenecks and opportunities.
- **Segmentation for phased implementation:** defining differentiated approaches by groups of states according to demonstrated maturity/capacity.
- **Executive communication:** clear and comparable reports for NACC/WG, GREPECAS, NACC/DCA forums and decision support.
- **Continuous improvement of indicators:** periodic review of relevance, measurability and usability

4. Suggested actions

4.1 The Meeting is invited to request and agree that:

- a) The Secretariat should maintain the momentum of the periodic review of the Dashboard, ensuring visibility of update dates by module/indicator, promote minimum data governance guidelines, and continue to facilitate access and coordination with States/organisations for the updating of information and Points of Contact (PoC).
- b) The Task Group Rapporteurs conduct (with support from the Secretariat) a review of the relevance of indicators within their area, explicitly addressing their strategic relevance, data availability, updating and usability, and propose adjustments to the set of indicators (retain, modify, remove or create new ones), prioritising those that reflect implementation and interdependencies between Working Groups.
- c) Task Force members (and by extension the States) should examine the implementation status reflected in the NACC Dashboard, verify consistency with the actual national/organisational status, and update their PoCs.