Fifteenth Meeting of the Regional Aviation Safety Group – Pan America (RASG-PA/15)

Virtual Phase (asynchronous), 19 January to 12 February 2026

In-Person Phase, Mexico City, Mexico 2 to 4 March 2026

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS

i.1 Place and Date of the Meeting

ii.1.1 The Fifteenth Meeting of the Regional Aviation Safety Group – Pan America (RASG-PA/15) was held in two parts: one as an on-line asynchronous session from 19 January to 12 February 2026; and the second session as an in-person meeting, hosted by Servicios a la Navegación en el Espacio Aéreo Mexicano (SENEAM) and held at the premises of *Centro Internacional de Instrucción de Aeropuertos y Servicios Auxiliares* (CIIASA) in Mexico City, Mexico, from 2 to 4 March 2026.

i.1.2 The Fifth Joint Meeting GREPECAS–RASG-PA (GREPECAS–RASG-PA/5), included under Agenda Item 3 of the RASG-PA/15 meeting, was a joint session of the Plenary meetings of the RASG-PA and the GREPECAS, held in person in the morning of 4 March 2026 in the same venue of the RASG-PA/15 meeting (for meeting report refer to **Appendix B**).

i.2 Opening Ceremonies

i.2.1 On 2 March 2026, Messrs. Michel Roy, Co-Chairperson States, and Javier Vanegas, Co-Chairperson, Organizations and Industry provided welcoming remarks. Messrs. Christopher Barks, Regional Director of the North American, Central American and Caribbean (NACC) Regional Office of ICAO and Secretary of RASG-PA, and Fabio Rabbani, Regional Director of the South American (SAM) Regional Office of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) provided opening remarks and thanked Mexico, SENEAM, and CIIASA for hosting the meeting. Mr. Ricardo Baños, Training Coordinator, SENEAM, welcomed participants to Mexico City and officially opened the meeting.

i.2.2 On 4 March 2026, a single opening was held for the GREPECAS–RASG-PA/5 and GREPECAS/23 meetings. Welcoming remarks were provided by Messrs. Michel Roy, RASG-PA Co-Chairperson States, and Orlando Nevot, Vice-Chairperson of GREPECAS, Christopher Barks, Regional Director of the North American, Central American and Caribbean (NACC) Regional Office of ICAO and Secretary of RASG-PA, and Fabio Rabbani, Regional Director of the South American (SAM) Regional Office of ICAO and Secretary of GREPECAS. Mr. Carlos Manuel Merino, General Director of Airports and Auxiliary Services, Mexico, welcomed the participants to Mexico City and officially opened the meeting.

i.3 Officers of the Meeting

i.3.1 The Meeting was chaired by Mr. Michel Roy, (Canada), Co-Chair of RASG-PA representing States, and Mr. Javier Vanegas (CANSO) Co-Chair of RASG-PA representing the Industry and International Organizations. Mr. Christopher Barks served as Secretary of the Meeting and was assisted by:

SAM Regional Office:

- Fabio Rabbani, Regional Director
- Oscar Quesada, Deputy Regional Director
- Javier Puente, Regional Safety Implementation Office

From the NACC Regional Office:

- Julio Siu Deputy Regional Director,
- Fernando Camargo, Regional Officer, Technical Assistance
- Marcelo Orellana and Mrs. Sereya Schotborgh, Regional Officers, Safety Implementation,

ICAO HQ/ Air Navigation Bureau:

- Marco Merens, Chief Implementation Support Section
- Saulo Da Silva, Chief Global Interoperable Systems,
- Elie El Khoury, Technical Officer, Airspace Management and Optimization,

i.4 Working Languages

i.4.1 The working languages of the Meeting were English and Spanish. The working papers, information papers and draft report of the meeting were available to participants in both languages.

i.5 Schedule and Working Arrangements

i.5.1 The Meeting was conducted in a hybrid format, comprising two complementary phases. The virtual phase, held asynchronously from 19 January to 12 February 2026, enabled participants to review documentation, exchange comments, and develop preliminary outcomes under Agenda Items 1 to 8. This was followed by the in-person phase, held in Mexico City from 2 to 4 March 2026, where participants consolidated the results of the virtual discussions, addressed the remaining agenda items, and finalized the meeting's conclusions and decisions.

i.5.2 For the in-person phase it was agreed that the working hours for the sessions of the meeting would be from 09:00 to 16:30 hours daily with adequate breaks. An Ad hoc Group was created during the Meeting to do further work on specific items of the Agenda item 2 regarding the support for accident investigation reports.

i.6 Agenda

VIRTUAL PHASE (Asynchronous, 19 January to 12 February 2026)	
Agenda Item 1:	**Adoption of the Draft Agenda and Schedule**
Agenda Item 2:	**Follow-up on Valid Conclusions and Decisions from RASG-PA Meetings**
Agenda Item 3:	**Updates on RASG-PA/GREPECAS Joint Activities and Preparation for the RASG-PA–GREPECAS/5 Joint Session**
Agenda Item 4:	**Results of the 42nd Assembly; Global Aviation Safety Plan and Global Air Navigation Plan**
Agenda Item 5:	**Progress on Regional and National Aviation Safety Planning**
Agenda Item 6:	**Status of RASG-PA Safety Improvement Projects and Initiatives**
Agenda Item 7:	**Cross-Cutting and Emerging Safety Issues**
Agenda Item 8:	**Other business (Virtual Phase)**

IN-PERSON PHASE
(Mexico City, Mexico 2 to 4 March 2026)

Agenda Item 9: Enhancing Safety/Just Culture

Agenda Item 10: Safety Data Sharing

Agenda Item 11: Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) 2026-28 Implementation

Agenda Item 12: Preliminary Results from RASG-PA/15 virtual phase

Agenda Item 13: Election of Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Co-Chairs/Vice-Chairs

Agenda Item 14: Other Business

i.7 Attendance

The Meeting was attended by 20 States/Territories from the NAM/CAR/SAM Regions, 11 International Organizations, totalling 112 delegates as indicated in the list of participants contained in the **Appendix A**.

i.8 List of Conclusions

i.8 List of Decisions

i.9 List of Working and Information Papers and Presentations

Refer to the Meeting web page:

NACC - Meetings | International Civil Aviation Organization

WORKING PAPERS

Number	Agenda Item	Title	Date	Prepared and Presented by
WP/01	1	Draft Agenda and Schedule	20/11/25	Secretariat
WP/02	2	Status of Valid Conclusions and Decisions	29/12/25	Secretariat
WP/03	4	RASG-PA Activities and Alignment with Air Navigation Commission (ANC) Global Challenges	29/12/25	CANSO
WP/04	3	Updates on RASG-PA/GREPECAS Joint Activities	31/12/25	Secretariat
WP/05	8	Trial Reduction in the Frequency OF PA-RAST Meetings	22/12/25	PA-RAST
WP/06	8	Extension of Authorization for the Use of RASG-PA Funds to Support Interpretation Services for PA-RAST Meetings	09/01/26	Secretariat
WP/07	8	Filling of Pan American Regional Aviation Safety Team (PA-RAST) and Regional Aviation Safety Group – Pan America (RASG-PA) Leadership Vacancies	03/01/26	Secretariat
WP/08	6	Progress Report on RASG-PA Safety Improvement Projects and Initiatives	22/12/25	Secretariat
WP/09	4	Actions to Address Stagnated GASP Implementation Indicators	09/12/25	Secretariat

WORKING PAPERS

Number	Agenda Item	Title	Date	Prepared and Presented by
WP/10	5	Support for the Implementation of Risk-Based Surveillance (RBS) in the Pan-American Region	09/01/26	Secretariat
WP/11	5	Phased Approach for the Establishment of Collaborative Safety Teams (CSTs) in the PAN-AMERICAN REGION	09/01/26	Secretariat
WP/12	5	Analysis of the Causes of the Failure to Implement the State Safety Programme (SSP) in the NAM/CAR Region	09/01/26	Secretariat
WP/13	9	Implementation and Results of Grupo Aeroméxico Safety Action Programme (GAMSAP) in Alignment with the GASP and the ANC Global Challenges / In-person phase	09/01/26	Aeromexico
WP/14	3	Strengthening Aviation Safety Management in the NACC and SAM Regions by Enhancing ANSP and Regulatory Engagement, Collaboration, Coordination and Harmonization	22/01/26	United States
WP/15	6	Status of the Implementation of Runway Safety Teams in the Pan-American Region	14/01/26	Secretariat
WP/16	-	Cancelled	--	--
WP/17	7	Identification of Cross-Cutting and Emerging Safety Topics in the Pan American Region	09/01/26	Secretariat
WP/18	3	Report on the Results of the RVSM Airspace Monitoring Programme in the CAR/SAM Regions for 2024 and GTE for 2024–2025	23/01/26	Scrutiny group - GTE Rapporteur
WP/19	5	Establishment of regulations and procedures for the implementation of Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems (RPAS) in the Member States of COCESNA	28/01/26	COCESNA
WP/20	5	Aircraft Leasing for Commercial Use	28/01/26	COCESNA
WP/21	12	Preliminary Results from RASG-PA/15 Virtual Phase	18/02/26	Secretariat
WP/22	10	Strengthening RASG-PA'S Safety Intelligence through States' SDCPS sharing and Collaborative Safety Team (CST) Participation	18/02/26	PA-RAST
WP/23	9	Enhancing Safety Culture through Just Culture Frameworks: Practical Actions and the RASG-PA Aviation Safety Action Programme (ASAP) Strategy	18/02/26	PA-RAST
WP/24	9	Cultural Change Strategy	19/02/26	Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela
WP/25	14	Bird Strikes LATAM-CAR REGION	20/02/26	IATA - ALTA

WORKING PAPERS

Number	Agenda Item	Title	Date	Prepared and Presented by
WP/26	13	Election of the RASG-PA Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Leadership	12/02/26	Secretariat

INFORMATION PAPERS

Number	Agenda Item	Title	Date	Prepared and Presented by
IP/01	--	List of Working, Information Papers and Presentations	16/01/26	Secretariat
IP/02	5	Update to the South American Aviation Safety Plan (SAMSP), 2026–2028 Edition	17/01/26	Secretariat
IP/03	5	State Safety Programme as a Guarantee of Safety	09/01/26	Panamá
IP/04	5	Progress and Transparency in Aircraft Accident Investigation within the SAM Region	7/01/2026	Secretariat
IP/05	5	Updating Process of the NACC RASP in accordance with GASP 2026-2028	22/01/26	Secretariat
IP/06	14	Initiatives for the Implementation of Collaborative Safety Teams (CST)	19/02/26	Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela
IP/07	9	Aviation Safety Reporting in Support of Safety Intelligence: Europe's Experience and possible Relevance for the Pan-American Region	20/02/26	EASA
IP/08	14	Baseline Safety and State Oversight of Ground Handling in the New EU Regulations	20/02/26	EASA

PRESENTATIONS

Number	Agenda Item	Title	Presented by
1	11	Global Aviation Safety Developments	Secretariat
2	11	Review of the action taken by the Air Navigation Commission on the report of GREPECAS/22 and RASG-PA/14 meetings and overview of the PIRGs and RASGs Consolidated Report to Council for 2024-2025	Secretariat
3	11	Outcomes of the 42nd ICAO Assembly (A42)	Secretariat
4	9	RASG-PA ASAP Initiative	PA-RAST

PRESENTATIONS

Number	Agenda Item	Title	Presented by
5	10	Safety Data Sharing: Strengthening RASG-PA'S Safety Intelligence	PA-RAST
6	9	Aviation Safety Action Programme (ASAP) Panel	Aeromexico
7	--	GREPECAS-RASG-PA Joint Session – Regional Implementation Challenges in Pan-America – GASP Implementation Challenges	Secretariat
8	--	GREPECAS-RASG-PA Joint Session – Regional Implementation Challenges in Pan-America (Quiz)	Secretariat

Agenda Item 1: Adoption of the Draft Agenda and Schedule

1.1 The Secretariat presented WP/01 supported by IP/01, inviting the Meeting to approve the draft agenda and schedule. The Meeting approved the agenda and schedule with minor changes.

Agenda Item 2: Follow-up on Valid Conclusions and Decisions from RASG-PA Meetings

2.1 Under WP/02, the Meeting reviewed the list of valid Conclusions and Decisions from previous RASG-PA meetings and noted that the Secretariat updated the status of all outstanding items based on a comprehensive review of recent progress and the current regional context.

2.2 The Meeting expressed strong consensus for the proposal to have the NACC and SAM Regional Offices take over the study on State Safety Programme (SSP) implementation obstacles from external academic entities. Members noted that this shift addresses the high costs and lengthy timelines previously proposed by external institutions. Several States emphasized that the resulting analysis must account for the diverse sizes and administrative complexities of individual States rather than seeking a global solution.

2.3 Discussions highlighted that high personnel turnover remains a primary barrier to safety programme maturity. Participants recommended that the Regional Offices integrate a continuous training and orientation programme into the new strategy to maintain institutional knowledge. Furthermore, members identified a need for the Secretariat to clarify the distinct roles between Civil Aviation Authorities (CAAs) and service providers to resolve confusion between State Safety Programmes and Safety Management Systems (SMS).

2.4 Regarding the strategy for SSP implementation support, the Meeting approved the following Conclusion, which supersedes Conclusion RASG-PA/14/C02:

CONCLUSION **RASG-PA/15/C01** **STRATEGY FOR SSP IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT**	
What: That, in order to strengthen the effective implementation of the State Safety Programme (SSP) in the Pan-American Region and address persistent implementation gaps identified through regional monitoring activities, the Secretariat (ICAO NACC and SAM Regional Offices): a) support, in consultation with States, the development of a regional strategy to identify and analyse the obstacles affecting SSP implementation in the Region; and b) present a progress report on the results of this analysis, proposed solutions and an estimated timeline for their implementation, to the 42nd Executive Steering Committee (ESC/42) meeting.	**Expected impact:** ☐ Political / Global ☒ Inter-regional ☐ Economic ☐ Environmental ☒ Operational/Technical
Why: To address SSP implementation challenges through the technical expertise and regional knowledge of the Secretariat, ensuring a cost-effective and regionally tailored approach, replacing the previously considered external study mechanism.	
When: By ESC/42	**Status:** ☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed
Who: ☐ States ☒ ICAO ☐ Other:	

2.5 Regarding the creation of an Ad hoc Group for accident investigations, the Meeting suggested prioritizing collaboration with existing regional mechanisms, such as the Regional Accident Investigation Mechanism, to avoid duplicating efforts. The Meeting accepted the volunteer offered by Boeing to assume the leadership of this group, as noted during previous executive discussions, updating the initial designation established in Decision ESC39/D/01. Brazil and ALTA further noted that the group should establish a clear diagnostic of the current backlog of investigation reports before finalizing a regional strategy.

2.6 Regarding the establishment and leadership of the support for accident investigation reports, the Meeting noted that the ad hoc group originally proposed has yet to be formally established. Consequently, the Meeting approved the following Decision with the lead of Boeing, which supersedes Conclusion ESC/39/C/01:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">DECISION
RASG-PA/15/D02 CREATION OF AN AD HOC GROUP TO SUPPORT STATES IN THE PRODUCTION OF ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION REPORTS</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">What:
That, in order to support States in the production of accident investigation reports:
a) the Ad hoc Group, led by Boeing and composed of Belize, United States, Airbus, ALTA, and the Regional Aviation Accident Investigation Group (GRIAA), identify mechanisms for supporting States in the completion of accident investigations and the issuance of final reports;
b) the Secretariat provide coordination support to facilitate the establishment and operation of the Adhoc Group, including liaison with participating States and existing regional accident investigation mechanisms;
c) the Ad hoc Group develop and submit to RASG-PA/16 a baseline diagnostic report identifying the status of pending accident investigation reports in the Pan-American Region, including recommendations for a regional support strategy.</td><td>Expected impact:
☐ Political / Global
☐ Inter-regional
☐ Economic
☐ Environmental
☒ Operational/Technical</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Why:
To operationalize the previously approved initiative, address the backlog of accident investigation reports in the Pan-American Region, and formalize the transition of leadership from IATA to Boeing.</td></tr>
<tr><td>When:</td><td>a) and b) immediately; c) By RASG-PA/16</td><td>Status: ☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed</td></tr>
<tr><td>Who:</td><td>☒ States ☒ ICAO ☒ Other:</td><td>Boeing</td></tr>
</table>

2.7 As a result of the discussions, Decisions RASG-PA/14 D01, RASG-PA/14 D02, RASG-PA/14/C01, ESC/40 D02 (items a and b), ESC/40 D03, and ESC/40 D04 were considered completed.

2.8 Following this review, the Meeting agreed that Conclusions RASG-PA/14 C02 and ESC/39/C01 have been superseded by RASG-PA/15/C01 and RASG-PA/15/D01.

2.9 Finally, the Meeting reached consensus that Decisions RASG-PA/14 D03, RASG-PA/14 D04, ESC/39 D01, ESC/40 D02 (items c, d, e, f, and g), and ESC/40 D05 remain valid and shall continue to be monitored by the Secretariat, as described in Appendix to WP/02.

2.10 Regarding ESC/40/D05, the Meeting agreed to request RASG-PA Members to designate participants by 30 May 2026, in order to meet the deadline established in ESC/40/D05.

Agenda Item 3: Updates on RASG-PA/GREPECAS Joint Activities and Preparation for the RASG-PA–GREPECAS/5 Joint Session

3.1 Under WP/04, the Meeting reviewed the status of coordinated safety activities between RASG-PA and GREPECAS since the previous plenary. This update advancements in the monitoring of Mid-Air Collision (MAC) and Large Height Deviation (LHD) through the Pan America Regional Aviation Safety Team (PA-RAST) and Scrutiny Working Group (GTE) interface, as well as progress in the CAR/SAM Runway Safety Team (RST) project, Air Traffic Services (ATS) language proficiency initiatives, and Controlled Flight into Terrain (CFIT) mitigation activities. It also covered other agreed areas of coordination, including Unmanned aircraft system(s)/Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems (UAS/RPAS) activities and turbulence-related accidents activities. The document emphasized the stability of the joint coordination framework and its role in harmonizing regional safety data outputs, thereby avoiding duplication of efforts. These elements were further confirmed during the subsequent joint RASG-PA/GREPECAS session, reinforcing the effectiveness of the established coordination framework.

3.2 The Meeting endorsed the progress achieved and discussed technical enhancements to optimize the ongoing projects. Canada and ALTA proposed integrating the Global Action Plan Prevention Runway Incursions (GAPPRI) tracking system to improve the monitoring of RST project results. El Salvador emphasized the need for a consolidated root cause analysis of Traffic Collision and Avoidance System-Resolution Advisory (TCAS-RA) events to better identify if risks stem from human factors or procedural gaps. Furthermore, IATA highlighted the importance of strengthening the coordination between RST activities and GREPECAS initiatives regarding stabilized approaches, specifically under the NEOSPACE/APTA project and the SAMIG/GESEA/SG 2 implementation group, to ensure a harmonized regional approach, as also emphasized during the joint session discussions.

3.3 Participants also explored the evolution of safety oversight mechanisms. IATA and other stakeholders recommended that CAR/SAM States consider the creation or consolidation of safety groups with a broader scope than the traditional RST, citing successful models such as Brazilian Commercial Aviation Safety Team (BCAST) and the United States Commercial Aviation Safety Team (CAST) as references tailored to each State's needs and capacities. Additionally, Guatemala expressed its intention to resume Go Team missions in coordination with the NACC Regional Office, with a view to strengthening safety implementation at the local level.

3.4 The Meeting noted PA-RAST's progress in Controlled Flight Into Terrain (CFIT) mitigation, including the amendment of RASG-PA Safety Advisory (RSA)-07B to reference RASG-PA Safety Issue Alert (RSIA)-01 on Terrain Awareness and Warning Systems (TAWS) limitations, now available in English and Spanish. Development of RSA-07C also has begun to address risks from incorrect altimeter settings during Area Navigation (RNAV) Barometric Vertical Navigation (BARO-VNAV) approaches at non-ILS airports. Furthermore, the Working Group is analysing (TAWS alert clusters near Mexico City to further refine regional safety guidance.

3.5 Under the activities related to UAS/ RPAS, the Meeting discussed regulatory challenges following a proposal for a coordinated regional framework to harmonize regulations and registries. Participants emphasized the need to align UAS safety governance with national standards and to implement risk-proportional Safety Management Systems, reflecting ongoing regional efforts to integrate drone operations through collaborative risk management. Although initially addressed under a separate agenda item, this initiative was transferred to the joint RASG-PA and GREPECAS framework due to the air navigation nature of proposed measures like dedicated air corridors, ensuring regional interoperability and a harmonized approach to integration into controlled airspace. During the joint session, participants further noted the diversity of regulatory approaches across States and emphasized the importance of regional harmonization, including the possible establishment of common registries and strengthened regional oversight mechanisms.

3.6 Activities related to the ATS Language Proficiency Project continued during the period. The training provider selected for the project remained engaged in the development of the course material, which was adjusted from the originally planned content. As noted in the latest PA-RAST update, the course is still under development and has not yet been finalized. Work continues on completing the technical revisions required for the delivery of the course, and further updates will be provided once the material is ready for implementation.

3.7 Under WP/14, the Meeting considered a proposal presented by United States to enhance aviation safety management through improved engagement between Air Navigation Service Providers (ANSPs) and regulators. The paper identified a lack of effectiveness in current coordination mechanisms and advocates for structured, harmonized processes to share and analyse ATM safety data. It emphasizes that regional Safety Enhancement Initiatives (SEIs) must better reflect the operational realities managed by stakeholders across the NAM/CAR and SAM Regions. This issue was also discussed during the joint session, where participants reiterated the need for stronger and more structured coordination mechanisms between ANSPs and regulators.

3.8 Member States, including Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Guatemala, and Panama, expressed strong support for the formalization of these coordination processes. IATA emphasized the importance of establishing a systematic mechanism within RASG-PA to clearly identify safety priorities requiring action by ANSPs. This approach would enable implementation groups to better align their initiatives with operational needs, creating a feedback loop in which RASG-PA evaluates the impact of operational improvements on regional safety levels.

3.9 Venezuela underscored the necessity of ensuring the sustained and meaningful participation of both ANSPs and regulators in PA-RAST, to ensure that regional safety analyses reflect operational realities and that proposed mitigations are effective. Regarding the proposed updates to the Procedural Handbooks, it was noted that while the current RASG-PA Procedural Handbook includes a section on coordination and communication, there is a significant opportunity to document specific coordination processes in greater detail. Consequently, the Meeting adopted the following:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">CONCLUSION
RASG-PA/15/C03 STRENGTHENING OF THE RASG-PA/GREPECAS JOINT COORDINATION MECHANISM</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">What:
That, with a view to ensuring a synchronized and harmonized approach to regional safety management and avoiding duplication of efforts between regional groups, and subject to the alignment of procedural frameworks, the Secretariat:
a) conduct a comprehensive review of the existing coordination processes mandated by the RASG-PA and GREPECAS Procedural Handbooks to identify gaps in the sharing of operational safety information;
b) develop a proposal for a more robust and clearly defined coordination mechanism that enhances engagement between Air Navigation Service Providers (ANSPs) and Regulators; and
c) present the proposed mechanism and necessary handbook amendments to the next RASG-PA/GREPECAS Joint Session for formal approval.</td><td>Expected impact:
☐ Political / Global
☐ Inter-regional
☐ Economic
☐ Environmental
☒ Operational/Technical</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Why:
a) To allow implementation groups to better align their initiatives with operational needs, creating a feedback loop in which RASG-PA evaluates the impact of operational improvements on regional safety levels.
b) To resolve the current lack of effective coordination in sharing ATM safety data and to ensure that regional SEIs are accurately informed by operational realities.</td></tr>
<tr><td>When:</td><td>By RASG-PA/GREPECAS/6 Joint Session</td><td>Status: ☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed</td></tr>
</table>

Who: ☐ States ☒ ICAO ☐ Other:	

3.10 Under WP/18, the Meeting reviewed the results of the Reduced Vertical Separation Minimum (RVSM) airspace monitoring programme in the CAR/SAM Regions for 2024 and the activity report of the Scrutiny Working Group (GTE) for the 2024—2025 period. The paper highlighted that, while the Target Level of Safety (TLS) remains a challenge in several Flight Information Regions (FIRs), the GTE has strengthened its role in the consolidation and analysis of LHD data. The report emphasizes the critical need for States to provide timely and accurate data to CAR/SAM Monitoring Agency (CARSAMMA) to ensure the reliability of regional safety assessments.

3.11 During the discussion of WP/18, the Meeting noted that the vertical Collision Risk Model (CRM) for the 2024 period was 1.255×10^{-9}, remaining within the acceptable Target Level of Safety (TLS) of 5×10^{-9} fatal accidents per flight hour. However, it was highlighted that the La Paz, Panama, Curaçao, Port-au-Prince, and Santo Domingo FIRs presented risk levels exceeding this threshold. The analysis identified that LHDs attributed to Air Traffic Control (ATC) coordination failures (Code E) were the most frequent, with 477 occurrences, followed by operator transfer errors (Code F) and unauthorized RVSM operations (Code L). IATA recalled that, among other measures, the implementation of Air Traffic Services Inter-facility Data Communication (AIDC) connections in Area control centres (ACCs), is fundamental to mitigating risks linked to ATS coordination failures.

3.12 Participants and international organizations emphasized the need for systemic mitigation. IATA expressed its readiness to work with CARSAMMA and North American Approvals Registry and Monitoring Organization (NAARMO) to ensure members´ RVSM approvals are accurately recorded and recommended prioritizing the implementation of AIDC to address the identified Air Traffic Services (ATS) coordination failures. Furthermore, Venezuela and COCESNA advocated for the use of LHD data (Codes E, F, and L) as proactive indicators within ANSP SMS to foster early identification of root causes rather than maintaining purely statistical records.

3.13 Cuba and Panama reaffirmed their commitment to enhancing the quality and timeliness of data provided to the Regional monitoring agencies (RMAs). Panama specifically underscored the necessity of reflecting initiatives related to early detection and timely reporting to ensure a balanced interpretation of safety indicators. The Meeting concluded that maintaining effective and timely communication among States, CARSAMMA, NAARMO, and the GTE is essential to ensuring that RVSM airspace operations remain within established acceptable risk levels.

Agenda Item 4: Results of the 42nd Assembly; Global Aviation Safety Plan and Global Air Navigation Plan

4.1 Under WP/03, the Meeting reviewed the alignment of RASG-PA's activities with the global challenges identified by the Air Navigation Commission (ANC). The paper demonstrated that RASG-PA's outcomes meet the expectations of the Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) through a strategy focused on risk and collaborative implementation. The Meeting endorsed the progress achieved in risk reduction and regional cooperation, while members emphasized the need to restore the official website to ensure access to historical records and safety documentation.

4.2 Under WP/09, the Meeting analysed the stagnation of specific GASP implementation indicators, particularly in areas such as aerodromes, air navigation services, and SSP foundations. The Secretariat proposed adjusting regional monitoring practices to include a core set of indicators and trend-based analyses to identify root causes of implementation delays. This approach aims to provide targeted support to States by moving beyond uniform monitoring to address specific regional challenges.

4.3 The Meeting expressed broad support for the proposed monitoring adjustments and the creation of an ad hoc group to strengthen follow-up mechanisms. Participants noted that a flexible monitoring framework allows for better identification of risks while accounting for local particularities. However, the Meeting underlined that individual States retain the ultimate responsibility for taking corrective actions and advancing safety goals within their jurisdictions.

4.4 During the discussion, members highlighted the importance of integrating regional reporting with existing national and subregional plans to avoid duplication of efforts. The Meeting recognized that the success of the enhanced monitoring framework depends on consistent resource commitments and data sharing from both States and industry stakeholders. Participants also suggested that regional safety reports should incorporate measures tracking specific regional goals alongside global indicators.

4.5 The Meeting reviewed and approved the following decision:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">DECISION
RASG-PA/15/D04 MECHANISM FOR MONITORING AND FOLLOW-UP OF GASP IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">What:
That, building on the approach outlined in WP/09, the PA-RAST, directly or through an Ad hoc Group established for this purpose develop a proposal for a mechanism to strengthen the monitoring and follow-up of the GASP implementation indicators, for consideration by ESC/41.</td><td>Expected impact:
☐ Political / Global
☒ Inter-regional
☐ Economic
☐ Environmental
☒ Operational/Technical</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Why:
To address the stagnation observed in selected GASP implementation indicators in the Pan American Region by strengthening regional monitoring practices and ensuring a structured follow-up mechanism that supports targeted implementation and corrective actions.</td></tr>
<tr><td>When: By ESC/41</td><td colspan="2">Status: ☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed</td></tr>
<tr><td>Who: ☒ States ☐ ICAO ☒ Other:</td><td colspan="2">Industry members</td></tr>
</table>

Agenda Item 5: Progress on Regional and National Aviation Safety Planning

5.1 Under WP/10, the Meeting reviewed a proposal to transition from prescriptive oversight to Risk-based surveillance (RBS). The paper argued that prioritizing oversight activities based on the most relevant operational risks allows for a more efficient allocation of resources and a tangible reduction in accident rates.

5.2 The Meeting noted the potential of this shift to optimize limited human and financial resources. Participants who intervened emphasized that effective RBS implementation depends on the availability of reliable safety data and consistent risk assessment methodologies. The discussion also highlighted that low levels of SSP implementation in certain subregions could act as a barrier, requiring a phased approach and targeted technical assistance.

5.3 Regarding the proposal in WP/10, the Meeting approved the following conclusion:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">CONCLUSION
RASG-PA/15/C05 SUPPORT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RISK-BASED SURVEILLANCE (RBS) IN THE PAN-AMERICAN REGION</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">What:
That, in coordination with the NACC/SAM Regional Offices and Regional Safety Oversight Organization (RSOOs), States promote and support:
a) the progress of States toward risk-based surveillance (RBS) models;
b) the strengthening of cooperation mechanisms for safety information sharing and oversight best practices;
c) the identification of training and technical assistance needs to ensure an effective transition toward RBS; and
d) inform on all the previous actions by ESC/41 Meeting.</td><td>Expected impact:
☐ Political / Global
☐ Inter-regional
☐ Economic
☐ Environmental
☒ Operational/Technical</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Why:
To foster more efficient oversight management that contributes to a tangible reduction in the regional accident rate by leveraging the synergies and resources of existing regional cooperation mechanisms.</td></tr>
<tr><td>When: By ESC/41</td><td colspan="2">Status: ☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed</td></tr>
<tr><td>Who: ☒ States ☒ ICAO ☐ Other:</td><td colspan="2">NACC/SAM Regional Offices</td></tr>
</table>

5.4 Under WP/11, the Meeting examined a phased approach for the establishment of Collaborative Safety Teams (CSTs). The proposal highlighted that building mutual trust through informal State—industry collaboration should serve as a prerequisite before implementing formal organizational structures, ensuring the sustainability of safety initiatives.

5.5 There was support among participants for the trust-first methodology, noting that data protection protocols and a non-punitive culture are essential for open communication. The Meeting recognized that starting with small-scale projects allows for a natural evolution toward formal structures. It was also noted that some States require formal mechanisms to contribute to the revision of regional guidance to ensure it reflects diverse operational realities.

5.6 The Meeting approved the following decision:

DECISION **RASG-PA/15/D06**	**STATE-INDUSTRY COLLABORATION INITIATIVES**
What: That the RASG-PA "CST Strategy" and "CST Implementation Guide" be revised by PA-RAST to promote the development of State—Industry collaboration strategies as a preliminary and preparatory alternative to the formal establishment of CSTs by ESC/41.	**Expected impact:** ☐ Political / Global ☐ Inter-regional ☐ Economic ☐ Environmental ☒ Operational/Technical
Why: To facilitate engagement and collaboration between the CAA and industry, and to build a relationship of mutual trust that enables open communication for effective risk identification and mitigation.	
When: By ESC/41	**Status:** ☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed
Who: ☐ States ☒ ICAO ☒ Other:	PA-RAST

5.7 Under WP/19, COCESNA presented the regulatory challenges posed by the rapid growth of UAS. The paper proposed a coordinated regional framework to harmonize UAS regulations, establish common registries, and implement dedicated air corridors in high-density areas to ensure safe integration into controlled airspace.

5.8 Participants recognized the importance of regional harmonization to facilitate interoperability and cross-border operations. The discussion emphasized that UAS safety governance should align with existing national frameworks and require SMS proportional to operational risks. Regarding the implementation of dedicated air corridors, it was noted that such measures require continuous evaluation as traffic volumes increase. Given the nature of the recommendations and actions involving air navigation matters, it was agreed to share this WP/19 for analysis of the GREPECAS/23 meeting.

5.9 Under WP/20, the Meeting analysed the complexities of aircraft leasing and its impact on safety oversight, as presented by COCESNA. The paper urged States to update national regulations based on ICAO Doc 8335 and 9626 to eliminate redundant processes and adapt to modern aviation business models.

5.10 The Meeting took note of the oversight challenges and operational risks created by inconsistent leasing regulations. Participants suggested that a more uniform regulatory framework would assist in managing risks and achieving the financial benefits of international leasing. States were encouraged to make use of ICAO training resources to improve their approval and authorization processes.

5.11 The Meeting also recognized the importance of ICAO's continued efforts to update related SARPs, guidance material, and audit methodologies to ensure consistent interpretation during oversight activities.

5.12 Under IP/02, the Secretariat presented the updated South American Aviation Safety Plan (SAMSP) for 2026–2028, aligning regional efforts with the Global Aviation Safety Plan and the SAM 2035 Strategy. The plan focuses on strengthening safety risk management and State Safety Programme implementation through risk-based oversight and enhanced regional collaboration with industry. By providing a common reference framework, the SAMSP assists States in aligning national plans with global priorities to ensure sustainable and practical safety improvements across the region.

5.13 Under IP/03, the Meeting noted Panama's progress in consolidating its SSP as a central axis for safety management. The document detailed Panama's transition toward a proactive, data-driven oversight model and its efforts to integrate safety information into national air navigation planning.

5.14 Under IP/04, the Meeting received an analysis of aircraft accident investigation trends in the SAM Region from 2016 to 2024. The paper underscored the importance of transparency and the timely publication of final reports in the Integrated Safety Trend (Analysis) and Reporting System (iSTARS) database to facilitate regional risk mitigation.

5.15 Under IP/05, the Secretariat presented the ongoing process to update the NACC Regional Aviation Safety Plan to ensure its alignment with the ICAO Global Aviation Safety Plan 2026–2028. This update, coordinated by the ICAO NACC Regional Office and the NACC SSP Working Group with support from a drafting Ad hoc Group of eight States, aims to address the current safety risk landscape and implementation challenges within the NAM/CAR Regions. Since beginning work in September 2025, the group has conducted gap analyses and is currently drafting revised sections of the plan, with a first complete draft expected by late March 2026 for regional review and validation.

Agenda Item 6 Status of RASG-PA Safety Improvement Projects and Initiatives

6.1 Under WP/08, the Meeting reviewed the progress of the RASG-PA Work Programme. The Secretariat reported on SEIs and Detailed Implementation Plans (DIPs) targeting high-risk categories such as CFIT and Loss of Control In-Flight. The report also highlighted regional projects, including the Language Proficiency Project and new Safety Advisories. The initiatives reported in that paper included:

- High-Risk Category (HRC) projects;
- other regional safety projects and initiatives;
- Collaborative Safety Teams (CSTs);
- Safety Partners Programme;
- Safety Days;
- safety data review and linkage to SEIs/DIPs;
- PA-RAST/Asia Pacific Regional Aviation Safety Team (APRAST) collaboration; and
- RSAs and RSIAs issued during the reporting period.

6.2 The Meeting expressed broad support for these activities and acknowledged the consistent progress in regional risk mitigation. Brazil questioned whether the current data maturity allows for immediate reporting to the ANC and for the preparation of the Annual Safety Report. The Meeting understood that the Secretariat and PA-RAST Chairs must provide a formal response regarding data readiness for these global reporting cycles.

6.3 Under WP/15, the Meeting evaluated the implementation of local RSTs. The paper identified the status of these teams at international aerodromes and highlighted the need for improved effectiveness monitoring. The Secretariat emphasized that RSTs remain a key multidisciplinary tool for mitigating runway-related risks.

6.4 Member States shared national updates and confirmed their commitment to expanding RST implementation. United States and ALTA underscored that these teams provide a low-cost, high-impact solution when supported by data-driven performance metrics. Panama and Venezuela highlighted their alignment with ICAO guidance and the use of regional assessment tools.

6.5 The Meeting urged States to prioritize the establishment of collaborative RSTs at all remaining international airports. The Meeting also requested Civil Aviation Authorities to gather evidence of implementation and report it to the ICAO Regional Offices. Airport operators should use the RASG-PA tool to verify the effectiveness of existing teams.

Agenda Item 7 Cross-Cutting and Emerging Safety Issues

7.1 Under WP/17, the Meeting reviewed an overview of cross-cutting and emerging safety topics in the Pan American Region, derived from recent PA-RAST discussions. This paper supports a proactive safety framework by identifying systemic factors and evolving risks that span multiple operational domains, ensuring that regional mitigation strategies remain aligned with the GASP.

7.2 The Meeting noted the support from participating Member States and international organizations regarding the identification of these emerging priorities. Participating members, including Aruba, Canada, and El Salvador, recognized the value of these findings for informing future technical discussions. The discussions highlighted that the PA-RAST serves as a key instrument for converting State-level data into actionable regional risk patterns.

7.3 Specifically, the Meeting identified as cross-cutting safety themes involving organizational, human, and systemic factors that influence performance across multiple operational domains. Furthermore, three emerging safety considerations were highlighted as increasing in relevance due to changes in the operating environment: evolving workforce profiles, increased operational complexity, and external pressures on aviation systems. These topics are intended to supplement existing data-driven analyses by providing a forward-looking reflection on latent risks.

7.4 The United States and ALTA recommended that the PA-RAST formally map emerging topics to established high-risk categories to maintain global consistency and avoid redundant initiatives. These participants noted that while existing mechanisms already address some of these issues, there is a need for more coordinated attention and wider dissemination of safety intelligence. The interventions specifically addressed concerns regarding mid-air collisions, adverse weather, and the systemic influence of human and organizational factors.

7.5 The Meeting agreed the following Decision:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">DECISION
RASG-PA/15/D07 INTEGRATION AND MAPPING OF CROSS-CUTTING AND EMERGING SAFETY ISSUES</td></tr>
<tr><td>What:
That, in order to ensure a structured and coordinated follow-up to the cross-cutting and emerging safety issues as noted in paragraph 7.3 of RASG-PA/15 Meeting Report:
a) the PA-RAST be tasked with mapping the identified safety topics to the relevant Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) framework, including applicable High-Risk Categories (HRCs) and other relevant risk categories; and
b) the outputs of this mapping exercise be considered by the ICAO NACC/SAM Regional Offices as input for the next revision cycle of the Regional Aviation Safety Plan (RASP) in 2026.</td><td>Expected impact:
☐ Political / Global
☐ Inter-regional
☐ Economic
☐ Environmental
☒ Operational/Technical</td></tr>
</table>

Why: To ensure global consistency, avoid duplication of initiatives, and strengthen alignment between regional safety priorities and the GASP framework, while enhancing coordinated risk mitigation across the Pan American Region.		
When:	By ESC/42	**Status:** ☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed
Who:	☐ States ☒ ICAO ☒ Other:	NACC/SAM Regional Offices, PA-RAST

Agenda Item 8 Other business (Virtual Phase)

8.1 Under WP/05, the PA-RAST proposed a trial for 2026 to reduce meeting frequency from four to three sessions per year while extending individual meeting duration to four days. This initiative responds to stakeholder concerns regarding travel commitments and evaluates if a restructured calendar maintains the group's effectiveness in delivering its safety mandate through a more sustainable model.

8.2 The Meeting expressed broad support for the trial, noting that it represents a measured step toward aligning governance activities with safety value. States and industry partners emphasized that the trial period must serve as a data-collection phase to determine the most effective meeting cadence without compromising safety objectives. While most participants approved the change, Aeroméxico maintained a preference for the existing quarterly frequency to preserve regional safety momentum, and Panama highlighted potential cybersecurity risks associated with virtual alternatives.

8.3 Participants concluded that the success of the trial depends on maintaining a data-driven approach and ensuring meeting quality through a refined structure. Brazil specifically recommended that the restructured meetings dedicate full days to safety data reviews, the Infoshare approach, and the work of Safety Enhancement Teams. The Meeting also noted the importance of ensuring that the revised calendar remains compatible with ICAO Air Navigation Commission reporting deadlines.

8.4 The Meeting agreed on the following decision:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">DECISION
RASG-PA/15/D08 TRIAL ON THE RESTRUCTURING AND REDUCTION IN THE FREQUENCY OF PA-RAST MEETINGS</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">What:
That, to respond to stakeholder feedback on travel commitments and evaluate operational efficiency:
a) the PA-RAST conduct a trial reduction of meeting frequency from four to three sessions during calendar year 2026, incorporating a data-collection mechanism to assess the impact of the revised meeting cadence on the delivery of its safety mandate as follows:
i. the PA-RAST meeting previously scheduled for 5 to 7 May 2026 be cancelled;
ii. the PA-RAST meeting previously scheduled for 18 to 20 August 2026 in Brazil be extended by one additional day, with the new meeting dates being 17 to 20 August 2026, and be designated as PA-RAST/71;
iii. the PA-RAST meeting previously scheduled for 10 to 12 November 2026 in Mexico be extended by one additional day, with the new meeting dates being 9 to 12 November 2026, with the venue changed to Peru, and be designated as PA-RAST/72; and
b) the Executive Steering Committee (ESC) evaluate the results of the trial and present a report on its performance to ESC/42 (2027).</td><td>Expected impact:
☐ Political / Global
☐ Inter-regional
☒ Economic
☐ Environmental
☒ Operational/Technical</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Why:
To address the burden associated with frequent travel for PA-RAST participants while assessing whether a revised meeting cadence, combined with longer meeting duration, can maintain the effectiveness and technical output of the group in delivering its regional safety mandate.</td></tr>
<tr><td>When:</td><td>a) Calendar year 2026 and b) by ESC/42</td><td>Status:</td><td>☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed</td></tr>
<tr><td>Who:</td><td>☒ States ☒ ICAO ☒ Other:</td><td colspan="2">PA-RAST</td></tr>
</table>

8.5 Under WP/06, the Secretariat proposed institutionalizing simultaneous interpretation services for PA-RAST meetings as a permanent operational support mechanism. The paper highlights that providing English-Spanish interpretation since 2023 significantly increased participation and inclusiveness, allowing regional experts to contribute effectively to technical discussions in their native languages.

8.6 The Meeting expressed broad consensus on the operational value of these services for fostering equitable participation. Most members supported converting the temporary measure into a standing provision, though Brazil and Canada suggested prioritizing interpretation for plenary-style sessions to manage costs. Airbus recommended that the financial ceiling remain adaptable to future changes in meeting schedules.

8.7 The Meeting agreed on the following decision:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">DECISION
RASG-PA/15/D09 CONTINUATION OF INTERPRETATION SERVICES FOR PA-RAST MEETINGS</td></tr>
<tr><td>What:
That, with a view to ensuring inclusive and effective participation of States and industry stakeholders in technical safety discussions, particularly in meetings where no host State assumes responsibility for interpretation arrangements, and subject to the application of RASG-PA financial resources in accordance with the approved policies and monitoring mechanisms:
a) RASG-PA approve the funding of the provision of simultaneous interpretation services for PA-RAST meetings, as necessary, as a permanent operational support mechanism; and
b) the Secretariat amend the Procedural Handbook to include English-Spanish interpretation as a requirement for PA-RAST meetings, detailing the different sources of funding for such services according to the location of the meeting.</td><td rowspan="2">Expected impact:
☐ Political / Global
☐ Inter-regional
☐ Economic
☐ Environmental
☒ Operational/Technical</td></tr>
<tr><td>How much:
RASG-PA funds will be used, on an exceptional and as-needed basis, in accordance with the RASG-PA Policy for the Utilization of Financial Resources, subject to an annual ceiling of USD 30,000, with expenditures reported through the established monitoring mechanisms.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Why:
To sustain the increased participation, inclusiveness, and effectiveness of PA-RAST meetings observed following Decision ESC/38/D03, ensuring that all stakeholders can fully contribute to technical discussions and safety risk mitigation activities regardless of language proficiency.</td></tr>
</table>

When:	Immediately	**Status:**	☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed
Who:	☐ States ☒ ICAO ☐ Other:		

8.8 Under WP/07, the Secretariat presented a proposal to address leadership vacancies within the PA-RAST and the RASG-PA Executive Steering Committee. The paper emphasizes the need for a coordinated approach to filling vacant Co-Chair and Vice-Co-Chair positions to ensure operational continuity and maintain the momentum of regional safety initiatives.

8.9 The Meeting expressed unanimous support for the proposed measures. Canada endorsed aligning leadership terms with the plenary cycle, while the United States recommended that members elected to fill midterm vacancies should only complete the remainder of the original term. Participants agreed on the necessity of updating the Procedural Handbook to include clear guidelines for handling such leadership contingencies.

8.10 The Meeting agreed on the following decision:

DECISION **RASG-PA/15/C10**	**FILLING OF LEADERSHIP VACANCIES IN RASG-PA AND PA-RAST**
What: That, to maintain continuity of leadership, enable orderly succession, and preserve the balance between States and industry, the RASG-PA: a) endorse and approve the PA-RAST election results, declaring Mr. Bryan Franca (Aruba) as Co-Chair and Mr. Victor Zamora (Costa Rica) as Vice-Chair, both representing States and Territories, and Mr. Virginio Corrieri (ALTA) as Co-Chair and Mr. Fabio Catani (Boeing) as Vice-Chair, both representing Industry, for the cycle of 2026 to 2028; b) approve the establishment of a revised periodicity for PA-RAST leadership terms, such that each two-year term begins and ends at a RASG-PA Plenary meeting; c) approve the conduct of RASG-PA elections during the in-person Plenary session of RASG-PA/15 to fill for the 2026–2029 term, declaring Mr. Melvin Cintron (United States) as Co-Chair and Mr. Bernardo Castro (Brazil) as Vice-Chair, both representing States and Territories, and Mr. Rodolfo Quevedo (Airbus) as Co-Chair and Mrs. Pamela Suarez (ALTA) as Vice-Chair, both representing Industry;	**Expected impact:** ☐ Political / Global ☐ Inter-regional ☐ Economic ☐ Environmental ☒ Operational/Technical

d) instruct the Secretariat to update the RASG-PA Procedural Handbook to incorporate the identified provisions addressing leadership vacancies within both the RASG-PA and PA-RAST structures, by the ESC/41.	
Why: feguard the effectiveness, transparency, and credibility of the regional safety governance work.	
When: From a) to b) Immediate and c) by ESC/41	**Status:** ☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed
Who: ☒ States ☒ ICAO ☒ Other:	Industry members

Agenda Item 9: Enhancing Safety/Just Culture

9.1 Under WP/13 and P/06, Aeroméxico presented the implementation and results of the Grupo Aeroméxico Safety Action Programme (GAMSAP), a voluntary, and non-punitive reporting system designed to capture information on operational errors, hazards, and unintentional deviations within a Just Culture framework. The programme aims to promote organisational learning and enable the development of preventive safety measures through systematic analysis of operational data.

9.2 The Meeting noted that GAMSAP has been in continuous operation for more than five years and has generated over 8,000 safety reports, which have been analysed by an Event Review Committee in more than 100 review sessions. The programme represents one of the first aviation safety action programmes of its kind implemented outside Canada and United States, and it was highlighted as a mature safety management tool that supports data-driven decision-making and proactive risk management, consistent with the objectives of the GASP.

9.3 The Meeting further noted that the information generated through GAMSAP contributes to identifying emerging safety trends, strengthening operational training and procedures, and supporting State safety oversight activities. Participants recognized the value of voluntary reporting programmes in enhancing safety intelligence and encouraged the promotion of similar initiatives across the region to strengthen collaboration between operators, authorities, and other aviation stakeholders.

9.4 Under WP/23 and P/04, PA-RAST addressed the need to strengthen safety culture in the Pan American region through the implementation of Just Culture frameworks. The paper highlighted that a robust safety culture depends on an environment in which individuals can report errors and operational hazards without fear of punitive consequences, while still maintaining accountability for gross negligence or wilful violations. The Meeting noted that this approach supports the objectives of modern safety management systems by encouraging transparency and organisational learning.

9.5 Aeroméxico emphasized that current safety reporting in many States relies predominantly on Mandatory Occurrence Reporting systems, which tend to capture only serious incidents and accidents. As a result, weak signals—such as minor deviations, operational ambiguities, or emerging hazards—often remain undetected. To address this limitation, WP/23 promoted the RASG-PA Aviation Safety Action Programme strategy, based on a collaborative governance model involving regulators, operators, and employee groups, formalized through a memorandum of understanding and a consensus-based Event Review Committee.

9.6 The Meeting further noted that the proposed Just Culture framework includes legal protections for voluntary reporting and “sole source” safeguards, allowing critical safety information to be shared without enforcement consequences when appropriate. Aeroméxico encouraged States to review their regulatory frameworks to protect reporter confidentiality and clearly define the boundaries between protected errors and unacceptable behaviours. The initiative aimed to support a transition from reactive safety oversight toward a more proactive and predictive safety management approach across the region.

9.7 Under WP/24, Venezuela presented a strategy aimed at supporting organizational cultural change in aviation, with the objective of strengthening safety performance and contributing to the long-term goal of ensuring safe and secure flights through 2050. The paper highlighted that while international guidance describes the characteristics of a positive safety culture, there remains limited practical guidance on how organizations can transition toward such a culture in a structured manner.

9.8 The proposal emphasized that an effective safety culture depends on the establishment of a Just Culture environment, where personnel are encouraged to report safety concerns without fear of punitive consequences when actions remain within acceptable operational boundaries. To support this transformation, the strategy recommends establishing a governance structure composed of a high-level steering committee and an operational team representing multiple organizational levels, responsible for planning and guiding the cultural change process.

9.9 The approach also includes a diagnostic phase to identify gaps between the current and desired safety culture, followed by the implementation of targeted actions such as awareness campaigns, leadership training, updated safety management practices, and internal communication initiatives. Continuous monitoring, recognition of employee contributions, and the use of change agents were highlighted as key elements to sustain engagement and ensure the effectiveness of the cultural transformation process.

9.10 Following the presentation of the working papers, the PA-RAST conducted a panel on Aviation Safety Action Programme (ASAP), which included the participation of Brazil, United States, International Federation of Air Line Pilots' Associations (IFALPA), and Aeroméxico. The panel discussion on the ASAP, was moderated by the PA-RAST, with the participation of representatives from Brazil, Mexico, United States, and IFALPA, as well as contributions from industry participants including Delta Air Lines and the *Asociación Sindical de Pilotos Aviadores* (ASPA), an IFALPA member association. The discussion examined the implementation and regional expansion of voluntary, non-punitive safety reporting programmes as a practical mechanism to strengthen Just Culture and improve the identification of systemic safety risks. Participants emphasized that traditional Mandatory Occurrence Reporting systems tend to capture only serious events, while voluntary reporting programmes allow the early detection of operational threats and latent hazards that might otherwise remain unnoticed.

9.11 The panel highlighted that voluntary reporting complements automated safety data systems such as Flight Operational Quality Assurance (FOQA) and Flight Data Monitoring (FDM). While automated systems reveal what occurred during an event, ASAP reports provide the narrative context explaining why it occurred, including operational pressures, human factors, or environmental conditions. Participants also explained that the ASAP operates through an Event Review Committee, which brings together the regulator, the operator, and employee or union representatives. Through this tripartite structure, decisions are taken by consensus and focus on identifying systemic corrective actions rather than attributing individual blame.

9.12 The discussions clarified that the ASAP does not constitute a general amnesty mechanism. Participants emphasized that the system maintains clear boundaries by excluding cases involving criminal activity, substance abuse, or intentional disregard for safety rules, thereby preserving both protection and accountability. Mexico shared its experience in implementing the programme through advisory circulars and memoranda of understanding within the framework of its State Safety Programme and Safety Management Systems. This approach demonstrated that States can introduce voluntary reporting protections pragmatically without requiring immediate legislative reform. Contributions from ASPA, Delta Airlines, and IFALPA emphasized that the participation of pilot associations and industry stakeholders is critical to building trust and encouraging frontline personnel to report their own errors without fear of punitive consequences.

9.13 The Meeting also noted that the experiences presented confirmed the replicability of this model in the region. Industry representatives indicated that a significant portion of the safety information generated through voluntary reporting would otherwise remain unknown without a non-punitive reporting environment. Brazil informed the Meeting of ongoing regulatory work to enable similar programmes nationally, and participants highlighted that the experiences shared during the panel could provide a roadmap for other States interested in adopting comparable frameworks.

9.14 The Meeting recognized that voluntary safety reporting programmes such as ASAP represent an effective mechanism to strengthen safety intelligence and support the implementation of Just Culture principles across the region. The discussions reinforced the importance of collaboration among regulators, operators, and pilot associations to ensure credibility and trust in the system. Participants encouraged Member States and industry stakeholders to explore pragmatic approaches for implementing such programmes and noted the potential benefits of participating in regional initiatives under RASG-PA aimed at promoting the exchange of de-identified safety information to better identify precursors to accidents and support preventive safety actions.

9.15 Under IP/07, the European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) presented Europe's experience in aviation safety reporting as a key enabler of safety intelligence, highlighting the role of harmonised regulatory frameworks in ensuring consistent reporting of accidents and incidents, as well as the systematic collection, protection, and analysis of safety data. The presentation emphasized the use of the European Aviation Safety Reporting Portal and the European Coordination Centre for Accident and Incident Reporting Systems (ECCAIRS) 2 platform as integrated tools supporting data standardisation through the ICAO Accident/Incident Data Reporting (ADREP) taxonomy, enabling cross-border data exchange and advanced safety analysis.

9.16 EASA also outlined the benefits of confidential and non-punitive reporting systems in fostering a strong safety culture, together with the Data4Safety initiative, which leverages large-scale data integration to support predictive risk management. The Meeting noted the potential relevance of these practices for the Pan-American region, particularly in areas such as regulatory harmonisation, data sharing, and the development of safety intelligence capabilities.

Agenda Item 10: Safety Data Sharing

10.1 Under WP/22 and P/10, PA-RAST presented a proposal to strengthen regional safety intelligence by addressing existing gaps in the availability and integration of operational safety data across the Pan American Region. The paper highlighted that current regional analyses rely predominantly on data from North American operators through established industry frameworks, which may result in limited visibility of emerging safety trends in other sub-regions. As a result, project teams addressing high-risk categories may lack comprehensive datasets needed to fully understand contributing factors across the region's diverse operational environments.

10.2 To mitigate these limitations, the proposal introduced a framework to incorporate high-level information derived from State Safety Data Collection and Processing Systems (SDCPS), including mandatory occurrence reports, hazard information, and accident data, in line with ICAO *Annex 19* provisions. These aggregated data are intended to complement existing industry sources and enable the identification of regional trends from a State perspective. The initiative also promotes the use of Collaborative Safety Teams as a mechanism to facilitate dialogue between regulators and industry, allowing safety information to be collaboratively assessed, validated and de-identified before being shared at the regional level, thereby supporting the development of reliable and actionable safety intelligence.

10.3 The Meeting noted that the framework draws on successful practices implemented in other regions and includes governance mechanisms designed to ensure trust and the protection of sensitive information, including voluntary participation, standardized taxonomies, and data de-identification protocols. Participants recognized that data sharing would provide mutual benefits, enabling contributing States to access a broader regional safety perspective, support early identification of emerging risks, and enhance the alignment of mitigation actions. It was also clarified that while Collaborative Safety Teams can support the validation process and improve data quality, their existence is not a prerequisite for State participation.

10.4 The Meeting further noted the initiation of a pilot project to demonstrate the feasibility of digital data exchange, with voluntary participation from several States and regional stakeholders, based on a controlled scope of selected occurrence categories aligned with high-risk areas. The ICAO Regional Offices will act as the central aggregator of the information, with the objective of enabling the development of targeted safety enhancement initiatives and on a more comprehensive regional risk picture.

10.5 The Meeting agreed with the following Conclusion

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">CONCLUSION
RASG-PA/15/C11 ENHANCING REGIONAL SAFETY INTELLIGENCE THROUGH STATE DATA SHARING</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">What:
That, in order to strengthen the regional safety intelligence framework of RASG-PA, support the analytical work of the High-Risk Category (HRC) project teams, and address existing limitations in the regional safety data picture:
a) RASG-PA support the voluntary reporting by States of high-level operational safety trends and aggregated occurrence information to the PA-RAST;
b) a State Safety Data Sharing pilot proof-of-concept be established, with the participation of the ICAO NACC Regional Office (acting as the data aggregator), Brazil, Canada, Chile, and Costa Rica (representing the Central American States through their CST);
c) PA-RAST to formalize a standardized Safety Information Contribution Form and identify the specific occurrence categories to be included in the exchange; and
d) the ICAO NACC Regional Office present the results of the pilot proof-of-concept, including governance arrangements, data exchange mechanisms, and analytical outcomes, to the RASG-PA/16 Plenary Meeting.</td><td>Expected impact:
☐ Political / Global
☒ Inter-regional
☐ Economic
☐ Environmental
☒ Operational/Technical</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Why:
To enhance the identification, analysis, and mitigation of operational safety risks in the Pan American Region through the structured, protected and reciprocal sharing of aggregated safety information, enabling data-driven decision-making and strengthening regional collaboration between States and industry.</td></tr>
<tr><td>When:</td><td>From a) to c) Immediately and d) by RASG-PA/16</td><td>Status:</td><td>☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed</td></tr>
<tr><td>Who:</td><td>☒ States ☒ ICAO ☒ Other:</td><td colspan="2">Industry members</td></tr>
</table>

Agenda Item 11: Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) 2026-28 Implementation

11.1 Under P/01, the Secretariat provided an update on recent global aviation safety developments, with particular emphasis on the 2026–2028 edition of the ICAO Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP), endorsed by the 42nd Session of the ICAO Assembly. The Secretariat explained that while the five global high-risk categories remain unchanged, the new edition introduces additional operational risk categories, including aerodrome-related risks, non-powerplant system component failures, and turbulence. The Plan also highlights contributing factors affecting aviation safety, such as radio frequency interference affecting navigation satellite systems.

11.2 The Secretariat outlined that the updated GASP establishes six strategic goals aimed at strengthening global aviation safety performance: reducing operational safety risks, strengthening safety oversight, managing State Safety Programmes, enhancing regional and national collaboration, improving safety planning, and expanding industry data sharing. Updated guidance material has been published to support Member States, including the third edition of the Manual for Developing National Aviation Safety Plans and the second edition of the Global Aviation Safety Roadmap. A new manual for monitoring implementation is scheduled for publication in December 2025.

11.3 The presentation also covered developments in safety management, including the adoption of Amendment 2 to *Annex 19* in June 2025, which is expected to become applicable in the final quarter of 2026. These developments will be complemented by the planned release of the fifth edition of the *Safety Management Manual* and a new *Safety Intelligence Manual*, addressing data analysis, safety reporting, and governance for information exchange. In addition, the implementation of State Safety Programme assessments will be integrated into the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme, with new protocol questions scheduled to be introduced in late 2026.

11.4 Finally, the Secretariat noted progress in national aviation safety planning, including the publication of 98 National Aviation Safety Plans in the global library. States were encouraged to review and update their plans to ensure alignment with the 2026–2028 GASP and with regional safety priorities, supported by planned ICAO outreach activities. The Meeting agreed with the following Conclusion:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">CONCLUSION
RASG-PA/15/C12 DEVELOPMENT AND EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF NASP</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">What:
That, considering the importance of developing and effectively implementing National Aviation Safety Plans (NASPs) to ensure the timely and harmonized implementation of the GASP requirements, and recognizing the challenges identified by States in the development of effective NASPs:
a) States allocate adequate and technically competent human resources dedicated to the NASP and SSP;
b) States ensure the integration of the NASP into institutional strategic and budgetary plans;
c) States promote stronger executive leadership to ensure that operational safety management is treated as a national priority;
d) States work and collaborate regionally and share best practices to ensure that NASP content is aligned with the RASP and regional priorities and targets; and
e) the Secretariat develop high-level initiatives to raise awareness regarding the critical importance of effectively implementing the NASP by RASG-PA/16.</td><td>Expected impact:
☐ Political / Global
☐ Inter-regional
☒ Economic
☒ Environmental
☒ Operational/Technical</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Why:
To reinforce the importance and effective implementation of the NASP as part of each State’s strategic approach to aviation development.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">When: RASG-PA/16</td><td colspan="2">Status: ☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Who: ☒ States ☒ ICAO ☒ Other:</td><td colspan="2">Industry members</td></tr>
</table>

11.5 Under P/02, the Secretariat presented an overview of the review conducted by the ANC of the reports submitted by GREPECAS and RASG-PA in June 2025. The review highlighted the strong level of coordination between both regional groups, particularly in areas such as runway safety implementation, performance-based navigation procedures, and joint initiatives aimed at mitigating CFIT occurrences. The Commission also acknowledged improvements in working methodologies, including the use of hybrid meeting formats and greater reliance on data-driven analysis.

11.6 The presentation also addressed regional safety performance trends. While most States have established National Aviation Safety Plans, the implementation of State Safety Programmes remains comparatively limited. The review further noted significant challenges in the implementation of aircraft accident and incident investigation systems, which are essential components of a proactive safety framework. In addition, the Commission drew attention to the increase in large height deviation events, which rose from 520 in 2021 to 711, and requested further analysis to determine whether this trend indicates a deterioration in operational safety.

11.7 The Commission also emphasized that weaknesses in safety data collection, analysis, and information sharing represent a broader systemic concern affecting effective safety oversight. These deficiencies are now recognized as a global safety challenge that extends beyond accident investigation activities and impacts multiple areas of aviation safety management.

11.8 Finally, the Secretariat reported on challenges related to the transition toward advanced air navigation systems, including the early stages of implementation of Flight and Flow Information for a Collaborative Environment (FF-ICE) and System-Wide Information Management (SWIM). Additional concerns were noted regarding search and rescue compliance, shortages of trained personnel, and delays in adopting modern aeronautical and meteorological information models. The Commission encouraged regions to accelerate implementation efforts, strengthen interregional cooperation, and support Member States through enhanced monitoring and targeted implementation assistance.

Agenda Item 12: Preliminary Results from RASG-PA/15 virtual phase

12.1 Under WP/21, the Secretariat presented the preliminary results of the virtual phase of the RASG-PA/15 meeting, which covered Agenda Items 1 to 8. The working paper consolidates the draft outcomes of the asynchronous discussions held prior to the in-person session and provides the initial report text, including the related conclusions and decisions, for the Meeting’s review and approval.

12.2 The paper indicated that the detailed results of the discussions held during the virtual phase are contained in the appendices to the working paper, where draft report sections, including the associated conclusions and decisions, were initially recorded. These materials served as the basis for consideration of the respective agenda items during the in-person phase of the meeting and for the preparation of the RASG-PA/15 Summary of Discussion.

Agenda Item 13: Election of Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Co-Chairs/Vice-Chairs

13.1 Under WP/26, the Secretariat presented the requirements and procedures for the election of the Executive Steering Committee (ESC) leadership of the Regional Aviation Safety Group – Pan America for the 2026–2029 term. The paper explained that the election process aims to appoint two Co-Chairs and two Vice-Co-Chairs, ensuring a balanced representation between Member States and international industry organizations.

13.2 The Meeting noted that the ESC serves as the central coordination body responsible for guiding and administering the activities of RASG-PA. Its membership is composed of representatives from Member States across the NACC and SAM Regions, together with representatives from international organizations and industry stakeholders, reflecting the collaborative nature of the Group's governance structure.

13.3 The Secretariat explained that the plenary session would facilitate the election process, including the nomination of candidates, voting by the respective member groups, and the formal ratification of the selected candidates. Following the election, the Secretariat would update the official records and relevant governance documentation to reflect the leadership composition for the 2026–2029 term.

13.3 The Meeting agreed on the following Decision:

DECISION **RASG-PA/15/D13**	**LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE IN RASG-PA FOR THE 2026 – 2029 TERM**
What: That, following the election process conducted during the RASG-PA/15 Plenary session and in accordance with the provisions of the RASG-PA Procedural Handbook regarding the governance structure of the Executive Steering Committee (ESC), the Meeting: a) elect United States as Co-Chair and Brazil as Vice-Chair representing the States and Territories members of RASG-PA; b) elect Airbus as Co-Chair and ALTA as Vice-Chair representing the Industry and International Organizations members of RASG-PA; and c) confirm the composition of the ESC for the 2026–2029 term as follows: Aruba, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Panama, and United States, representing States and Territories, and Airbus, ALTA, ATR, Boeing, CANSO and IATA representing Industry and International Organizations.	**Expected impact:** ☐ Political / Global ☒ Inter-regional ☐ Economic ☐ Environmental ☒ Operational/Technical

Why: To formally establish the leadership and membership of the Executive Steering Committee for the 2026–2029 term, ensuring balanced representation between States and Industry, and enabling effective governance, coordination and administration of RASG-PA activities.			
When:	Immediately	**Status:**	☐ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed
Who:	☒ States ☒ ICAO ☒ Other:	Industry members	

Agenda Item 14: Other Business

14.1 Under WP/25, IATA and ALTA presented an analysis of bird strike occurrences in the Latin American and Caribbean (LATAM-CAR) region, highlighting that incident rates remain significantly higher than the global average. The paper explained that this trend is strongly influenced by environmental factors, including the proximity of many airports to mangroves, wetlands, and forested areas that attract large bird populations. Data from 2024–2025 also indicate seasonal peaks in March and October, corresponding to migratory periods, with emerging evidence that climate change is beginning to alter these migration patterns.

14.2 The presentation noted that most bird strike events occur during the approach and departure phases of flight, which are operationally critical. The severity of these events varies depending on the size and weight of the birds involved, with large migratory species capable of causing structural damage or engine failures that may lead to emergency shutdowns. In addition to the safety implications, such occurrences generate significant operational disruptions and maintenance costs. The paper identified Bogotá (BOG), Panama (PTY), and Santiago (SCL) as regional hotspots requiring particular attention in the short term.

14.3 To address this challenge, the paper invited RASG-PA to consider several mitigation actions, including the development of wildlife control strategies at airports and along approach and departure paths, the strengthening of bird strike reporting practices to improve regional safety data, and enhanced regional coordination. In this regard, the Meeting was encouraged to consider establishing a dedicated task group to support a coordinated regional response to the bird strike risk.

14.4 The Meeting further recommended that the subject presented in WP/25 be also brought to the Joint RASG-PA/GREPECAS session, in order to ensure that GREPECAS and the CARSAMPAF Regional committee are informed of the analysis and the associated safety concerns. This approach would facilitate broader regional awareness and encourage coordination between safety and air navigation stakeholders in addressing wildlife hazard risks in the region.

14.5 Under IP/06, Venezuela presented its initiatives for the implementation of CSTs as part of its State Safety Programme framework, aimed at strengthening collaboration and promoting the exchange of operational safety information among aviation stakeholders. The presentation highlighted the development of national guidance material aligned with RASG-PA CST implementation guidance and the establishment of mechanisms to support data sharing from hazard, risk, and occurrence databases within a framework of trust and information protection. Venezuela indicated that these CSTs are intended to support national safety objectives and contribute to regional goals, including through regular meetings with stakeholders to analyse identified risk factors and develop coordinated mitigation actions. The Meeting noted that these initiatives are expected to enhance safety culture and facilitate the alignment of national and regional safety priorities.

14.5 Under IP/06, Venezuela presented its initiatives for the implementation of CSTs as part of its State Safety Programme framework, aimed at strengthening collaboration and promoting the exchange of operational safety information among aviation stakeholders. The presentation highlighted the development of national guidance material aligned with RASG-PA CST implementation guidance and the establishment of mechanisms to support data sharing from hazard, risk, and occurrence databases within a framework of trust and information protection. Venezuela indicated that these CSTs are intended to support national safety objectives and contribute to regional goals, including through regular meetings with stakeholders to analyse identified risk factors and develop coordinated mitigation actions. The Meeting noted that these initiatives are expected to enhance safety culture and facilitate the alignment of national and regional safety priorities.

14.6 Under IP/08, EASA presented the new European Union regulatory framework for ground handling safety and State oversight, adopted in March 2025 and applicable from March 2028. The framework establishes a harmonized safety baseline across EASA Member States by requiring ground handling service providers to implement mandatory management systems, including Safety Management Systems, training, and equipment maintenance proportionate to the scale of their operations. It also introduces a declaration-based compliance regime and transfers primary oversight responsibility to competent national authorities, supported by risk-based supervision and a digital platform for the sharing of oversight information among States to avoid duplication of audits. EASA indicated that the initiative aims to enhance safety, reduce aircraft ground damage and redundant airline audits, and could serve as a reference model for other regions, including Pan America, where oversight practices remain uneven and often rely on voluntary industry standards.

— — — — — —— —— ——

ICAO | OACI

North American, Central American and Caribbean Office (NACC)
Oficina para Norteamérica, Centroamérica y Caribe (NACC)

Fifteenth Meeting of the Regional Aviation Safety Group – Pan America
Decimoquinta Reunión del Grupo Regional de Seguridad Operacional de la Aviación – Pan América
(RASG-PA/15)

Mexico City, Mexico, 2 to 4 March 2026 / Ciudad de México, México, 2 al 4 de marzo 2026

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

ARUBA

1. Moira Callegare

ARGENTINA

2. Bryan Ranca
3. Edwin Kelly
4. Anthony Kirchner

BELICE

5. Ellis Stanley Gideon
6. Nathalie McSweaney

BRAZIL / BRASIL

7. Bernardo Tomaz de Castro
8. Rui Changas Mesquita
9. Willian Yoshinori Tanji
10. Diego Henrique de Brito
11. Fábio Lourenço Carneiro Barbosa
12. Daniel Vieira Soares
13. Axel Vianna Cezar
14. Cleiton Almeida Ataide

CANADA / CANADÁ

15. Michel Roy

CHILE

16. Eduardo Adolfo Peña Merino
17. Francisco Uzieda

COSTA RICA

18. Kenneth Jackson Leon
19. Luis Núñez
20. Carlos Bolaños

CUBA

21. Orlando Nevot

CURACAO / CURAZAO

22. Jaques Lasten
23. Natasha Leonora-Belefanti
24. Andrew Lasten

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC / REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA

25. Gerson Mena
26. Augusto Pérez
27. Elda Almonte

EL SALVADOR

28. José González
29. Francisco Samayoa

FRACE / FRANCIA

30. Randria Ravo
31. Claudia Peyrel

GUATEMALA

32. André Oliva
33. Julio Gálvez
34. André Oliva
35. Héctor Monzón

MEXICO / MÉXICO

36. Vicente Preciado
37. Álvaro Pérez
38. Enrique Cano
39. Joaquín Ramírez
40. Andrés Araujo
41. Juan Carlos Ramos
42. Alejandra Quirós
43. Joaquín Rodríguez
44. Antonio Barrientos
45. Arturo Escobedo

PANAMA / PANAMÁ

46. Ivette Prado
47. Víctor Gorday
48. Agustin Zuñiga

PARAGUAY

49. Juan Carlos González
50. Erica Méndez

PERU / PERÚ

51. Sady Beaumont
52. Julio Ríos
53. Francisco Gutiérrez

UNITED STATES / ESTADOS UNIDOS

54. Melvin Cintron
55. Angel Luna
56. Eric Rossginol
57. Nathan Brown
58. Norma Campos
59. Scott Leis
60. Gene Burdick

URUGUAY

61. Triana Carreira
62. Carolina Gallarza

VENEZUELA

63. Tahina Merchán
64. Pablo Rattia

AEROMEXICO

65. Juan Carlos Villagrana
66. Juan Carlos González
67. Carlos Alberto Gutiérrez
68. Pascual Alvarez

AIRBUS

69. Rodolfo Quevedo

ALTA

70. Pamela Suarez

BOEING

71. Michael Snover
72. Alvimar Lucena

CANSO

73. Javier Vanegas
74. Jones Brandão

CARSAMPAF

75. Arturo Ortiz

COCESNA

76. Juan Carlos Trabanino
77. Alejandro Mena
78. Roger Pérez
79. Jorge Pineda

DELTA AIRLINES

80. Andrew Vermette
81. Michael Wilkinson
82. Andrew Darrow

EASA

83. Alfonso Arroyo

EMBRAER

84. Edson Gomes

IATA

85. Edgar Sánchez
86. Julio Pereira

IFALPA

87. Francisco Gómez
88. Miguel Ángel
89. Gustavo Ortegal

IFATCA

90. Danahe López

IFATSEA

91. Michel Gaulin
92. Xóchitl Llamas

ICAO/OACI

93. Fabio Rabbani
94. Christopher Barks
95. Oscar Quesada
96. Julio Siu
97. Marco Merens
98. Saulo Da Silva
99. Jorge Armoa
100. Luis Sánchez
101. Mayda Ávila
102. Eddian Méndez
103. Javier Puente
104. Fernando Camargo
105. Fabiana Todesco
106. Elie Tanious El Khoury
107. Rodrigo Ribeiro
108. Marcelo Orellana
109. Sereya Schotborgh
110. Maidy Plana
111. Fabio Salvatierra
112. Josue González

AIREON

113. Paco Álvarez
114. Alessander De Andrade Santoro
115. Fernando Killian

FREQUENTIS

116. Adriana Candez
117. Javier Casas Reyes

INDRA

118. Raúl López
119. Mireia Colina
120. Francisco Fernández

SEABURY	**SITA**	**SKYWARE LABS INC.**
121. Emilio Roché	123. Vitor De Marchi	125. Sachin Misra
122. Luc Beaudoin	124. Camilo Cárdenas	126. Miki Sandhu

APPENDIX B
Fifth GREPECAS-RASG-PA Joint Meeting

1.1 Under P/03, the Secretariat presented a summary of the main outcomes of the 42nd Session of the ICAO Assembly, held in Montreal from late September to early October 2025, with the participation of 192 Member States and numerous observer organizations. The Assembly addressed a broad range of technical and executive matters related to global aviation safety and air navigation, adopting several resolutions aimed at strengthening oversight, improving safety, and supporting the safe integration of emerging technologies.

1.2 The Meeting noted that the Assembly endorsed the 2026–2028 edition of the Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) and the eighth edition of the Global Air Navigation Plan (GANP), reinforcing the role of global strategic planning in guiding aviation safety and air navigation priorities. The updated safety plan introduces revised targets and addresses emerging operational risks while maintaining the existing global high-risk categories of occurrences, providing the framework upon which regional and national safety plans are developed.

1.3 The Secretariat also highlighted key discussions related to operational and personnel matters, including ongoing consideration of a possible increase in the pilot age limit for multi-pilot commercial air transport operations to 67 years, as well as initiatives to optimize Air Traffic Management (ATM), safely integrate space transport operations, and address pilot fatigue in increasingly digitalized flight deck environments.

1.4 In addition, the Assembly considered several technical and environmental challenges affecting aviation safety, including the mitigation of radio frequency interference impacting satellite navigation systems, the search for sustainable alternatives to halon for fire suppression, and the management of sustainable aviation fuel quality. The importance of enhanced civil-military coordination and improved risk management for operations in conflict zones was also emphasized.

1.5 Finally, the Meeting noted that ICAO invited regional bodies, including GREPECAS and RASG-PA, to take into account the outcomes of the 42nd Assembly and to review their respective work programmes to ensure alignment with the global strategic directions and actions identified during the Assembly.

1.6 Under WP/04, the Secretariat reported progress in coordinated RASG-PA and GREPECAS safety activities, including monitoring of Mid-Air Collision (MAC) and Large Height Deviations (LHD) events, Runway Safety Team (RST) developments, Controlled Flight Into Terrain (CFIT) mitigation, Air Traffic Services (ATS) language initiatives, and Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) integration, while the Meeting discussed enhancements such as Global Action Plan for the Prevention of Runway Incursions Implementation (GAPPRI) use, Traffic Alert and Collision Avoidance System (TCAS), Resolution Advisory (RA) analysis, and improved alignment of runway safety efforts; these subjects were detailed in Section 3.

1.7 Under WP/14, the Meeting addressed the need to strengthen aviation safety management through improved engagement between Air Navigation Services Providers (ANSPs) and regulators, emphasizing structured and harmonized mechanisms for ATM safety data sharing and analysis, and adopted Conclusion RASG-PA/15/C03 to enhance coordination between RASG-PA and GREPECAS through a review and improvement of existing processes. In parallel, the Meeting reviewed Reduced Vertical Separation Minimum (RVSM) monitoring results, confirming that regional risk remains within acceptable levels despite localized challenges related to LHDs, and highlighted the importance of data quality and proactive safety measures; these subjects were detailed in Section 3.

1.8 Under interactive P/07, the Secretariat provided an overview of the regional implementation of the GASP for the 2026–2028 period in the Pan-American region. The presentation highlighted recent reviews indicating a stagnation in Effective Implementation (EI) indicators, particularly in the areas of Aerodromes and Ground Aids (AGA) and Air Navigation Services (ANS), reflecting uneven progress among States in the region.

1.9 The Secretariat explained that two fundamental pillars of safety management—State Safety Programmes (SSPs) and accident investigation capabilities—continue to present low levels of implementation. Challenges related to the collection, analysis, protection, and sharing of safety data, as required under Annex 19, together with limited accident investigation capacity, were identified as key factors affecting the effectiveness of Safety management system (SMS).

1.10 The Meeting was also informed of organizational challenges that influence these implementation gaps, including the shortage of qualified technical personnel and the lack of sufficient financial resources for safety oversight authorities. These limitations affect the ability of States to meet their national and international safety oversight obligations and to effectively implement safety programmes.

1.11 The presentation further emphasized the importance of developing National Aviation Safety Plans aligned with both the Regional Aviation Safety Plan and the GASP, ensuring that national safety priorities and objectives contribute to regional and global safety goals. Continued attention to the global high-risk categories—CFIT, Loss Of Control In-flight (LOC-I),MAC, Runway Excursion (RE), and Runway Incursion (RI)—together with emerging risks such as turbulence encounters, was also highlighted.

1.12 To reinforce key elements of the presentation, the Meeting participated in an interactive quiz addressing the main concepts and objectives of the GASP framework. This activity supported participants in consolidating their understanding of the plan's strategic priorities and the role of States, regional organizations, and industry in advancing aviation safety through collaborative initiatives such as those promoted by RASG-PA.

1.13 Under the interactive P/08, the Secretariat presented an overview of the GANP as a strategic framework guiding the modernization of ANS through a performance-based and modular approach. The presentation highlighted the transition from system-specific requirements to a model centred on digitalization, sustainability, and resilience, aligned with long-term objectives extending to 2050. Participants characterized the GANP as a complex but essential instrument, emphasizing its role as a strategic guide to ensure safety, interoperability and structured development across the aviation system.

1.14 The Secretariat explained that the latest edition introduces a six-year planning cycle to provide greater stability and allow sufficient time for implementation and system maturation. The discussion confirmed that technological evolution, digital transformation, and the increasing use of data-driven strategies are key drivers shaping the GANP. Participants also stressed that harmonization, collaboration, standardization and clear performance objectives are among the most valuable elements supporting effective planning and implementation at both regional and national levels.

1.15 Through the interactive exercise, the Meeting identified economic constraints as the most significant regional challenge, followed by technological and operational barriers. These challenges were considered to directly impact national implementation, contributing to delays, misalignment of strategic objectives, and difficulties in system modernization. To address these issues, the Meeting emphasized the importance of strengthened regional cooperation, coordinated financial mechanisms, capacity-building initiatives, and targeted technical assistance.

1.16 The presentation underscored the central role of the performance-based approach, supported by Aviation System Block Upgrades (ASBUs), in translating operational needs into concrete technical solutions. Participants highlighted safety, punctuality, interoperability and capacity as priority performance metrics, while also recognizing the importance of improving data quality and availability to support decision-making. The Meeting noted that linking global strategic objectives to national technical implementation is highly valuable for identifying gaps and establishing priorities, despite existing challenges related to data limitations, training needs and resistance to change.

1.17 Innovation and emerging technologies were also addressed, with participants identifying unmanned aircraft systems and new entrants as the most pressing operational challenge for the next five years. Artificial intelligence was recognized as a key enabler for improving efficiency, automation, and predictive capabilities, while also introducing risks related to cybersecurity, ethics, and transparency. Environmental sustainability was highlighted as a core objective, with emphasis on trajectory optimization to reduce fuel consumption and carbon dioxide emissions.

1.18 Finally, the Secretariat presented the concept of a Minimum Implementation Path (MIP) as a mechanism to support States with limited resources by providing clear, prioritized and step-by-step guidance. The Meeting considered this approach highly beneficial, noting that it enhances efficiency and facilitates implementation by focusing on essential capabilities. The overall discussion reaffirmed that the successful implementation of the GANP depends on coordinated efforts to harmonize strategies, technologies and processes across global, regional and national levels.

1.19 Under WP/19, COCESNA presented an overview of the rapid expansion of UAS across Central America and the associated regulatory, operational, and safety challenges arising from this growth. The Meeting was informed that this working paper had originally been presented at the RASG-PA/15 meeting under Agenda Item 5: Progress on Regional and National Aviation Safety Planning. On that occasion, the RASG-PA/15 Meeting considered it important that the subject also be discussed in the joint GREPECAS/RASG-PA framework, noting that several aspects related to airspace management and operational integration are directly relevant to the work of GREPECAS.

1.20 The paper highlighted that the increasing use of drones for recreational, commercial, security, and emergency purposes has generated new opportunities but also significant challenges, particularly regarding regulatory harmonization, certification and oversight mechanisms, and the safe integration of unmanned aircraft into airspace shared with manned aviation. The Meeting also noted that authorities must address emerging security concerns, including cybersecurity risks, privacy protection, and the potential misuse of drones for illicit activities.

1.21 The Meeting was informed that regulatory approaches among States currently vary significantly. While some countries have established comprehensive regulatory frameworks that include pilot training requirements and operational guidance, others maintain more restrictive or limited regulations focused mainly on operational authorizations, registration systems, or restrictions in sensitive airspace areas. This diversity of approaches illustrates the different national contexts but also highlights the need for greater regional coordination.

1.22 COCESNA also emphasized the role of the Central American Agency for Aeronautical Safety (ACSA) as a regional safety oversight organization supporting Member States in meeting international standards and fulfilling their obligations under the Chicago Convention. Strengthening regional oversight mechanisms was identified as an effective way to improve operational safety, increase efficiency, and avoid duplication of efforts among States.

1.23 To support the safe and sustainable development of UAS operations in the region, the paper encouraged greater regional harmonization based on international guidance, including the establishment of a common registry to improve traceability. Additional proposals included the possible implementation of dedicated air corridors in high-density areas, the promotion of education programmes for responsible drone use, and strengthened cooperation through multilateral agreements. The Meeting noted that regional UAS standards developed since 2022 represent an important step toward achieving greater regulatory consistency among Member States.

1.24 Under WP/25, IATA and ALTA presented an analysis of the increasing frequency of bird strike events in the Latin America and Caribbean region, noting that the occurrence rate in the region exceeds the global average and represents a significant safety and operational concern for aviation stakeholders. The Meeting was informed that this working paper had originally been presented at the RASG-PA/15 meeting under Agenda Item 14: Other Business. At that meeting, it was considered important that the subject also be discussed within the GREPECAS/RASG-PA joint framework, recognizing that wildlife hazard management and related operational aspects are also relevant to the work of GREPECAS.

1.25 The paper highlighted several environmental factors contributing to the elevated rate of bird strikes in the region, including the proximity of many airports to wetlands, mangroves, and forested areas that serve as natural feeding and resting grounds for birds. The analysis indicated that occurrences tend to peak during March and October, coinciding with seasonal migration patterns, and that climate change may be influencing these migratory routes as birds respond to shifting environmental conditions.

1.26 The Meeting noted that most bird strike events occur during the approach, landing, and take-off phases of flight, which are among the most critical stages of aircraft operations. Large migratory birds were identified as posing a particular hazard due to their size and mass, with some occurrences leading to significant aircraft damage, including engine impacts that have required emergency shutdown procedures.

1.27 In addition to the safety implications, the paper outlined the operational impact of these events, including flight delays, cancellations, and the costs associated with aircraft inspections and repairs following a reported strike. Several airports in the region were identified as short-term areas of concern, including Bogota, Panama City, and Santiago, where concentrated mitigation measures could be beneficial.

1.28 To address these risks, the paper encouraged States to strengthen wildlife hazard management programmes at airports and in surrounding operational areas, including the development of wildlife control action plans and the promotion of a stronger reporting culture to support improved safety data analysis. The importance of regional coordination was also emphasized, including the possible establishment of a dedicated task group to address wildlife strike risks through a coordinated and data-driven regional approach.