International Civil Aviation Organization
Regional Aviation Safety Group - Pan America (RASG-PA)

WORKING PAPER

RASG-PA/15 — WP/09
09/12/25

Fifteenth Meeting of the Regional Aviation Safety Group – Pan America (RASG-PA/15) and Fifth RASG-PA–GREPECAS Joint Meeting (RASG-PA–GREPECAS/5)
Mexico City, Mexico, 2 to 4 March 2026

Agenda Item 4: **Assembly 42nd results; Global Aviation Safety Plan and Global Air Navigation Plan**

ACTIONS TO ADDRESS STAGNATED GASP IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS

(Presented by the Secretariat)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This working paper presents the follow-up to *Conclusion RASG-PA/14/C01*, which requested the analysis of limitations in the monitoring of Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) implementation and the identification of actions to address stagnated indicators. Based on a review of PA-RAST reports since PA-RAST/66, the RASG-PA Annual Safety Reports 2024 and 2025, and the Global Aviation Safety Plan 2026–2028 (Doc 10004), the paper identifies persistent structural and capacity-related challenges affecting implementation performance in the Region and proposes concrete actions, initial implementation steps and follow-up mechanisms to enhance regional monitoring practices and targeted support to States.

Action:	As presented in Section 8.
Strategic Goals 2026-2050:	• Every flight is safe and secure
References:	• Fourteenth Meeting of the Regional Aviation Safety Group – Pan America (RASG-PA/14) Final Report • Pan America Regional Aviation Safety Team (PA-RAST) Meeting Reports (PA-RAST/66 to PA-RAST/69) • RASG-PA Annual Safety Report 2024 • RASG-PA Annual Safety Report 2025 • Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) 2026–2028 (Doc 10004)

1. Introduction

1.1 In accordance with *Conclusion RASG-PA/14/C01*, this working paper addresses the need to improve the monitoring of GASP implementation in the Pan American Region and to identify actions to address stagnated safety indicators.

1.2 This paper presents the results of an analysis conducted by the Secretariat, informed by PA-RAST reports, Annual Safety Reports, and existing RASG-PA discussions, and proposes concrete and implementable actions for consideration by the RASG-PA/15 Meeting. The proposed approach is intentionally limited in scope and designed to systematize existing practices, without creating new structures, working groups or standing tasks within the PA-RAST.

2. Background

2.1 Paragraph 2.2 of the RASG-PA/14 Report identified opportunities to improve the processing and presentation of GASP implementation information, including the design and scope of indicators and the analytical methods applied.

2.2 Paragraph 2.3 noted that several indicators have remained stagnant over recent years, particularly in relation to Effective Implementation (EI) in Aerodromes and Ground Aids (AGA) and Air Navigation Services (ANS), as well as State Safety Programme (SSP) implementation, and highlighted the need to identify root causes and corrective actions.

2.3 These observations are reinforced by successive RASG-PA Annual Safety Reports, including the Annual Safety Report 2024, which identified persistent challenges related to SSP implementation, effective oversight capabilities and uneven safety performance across the Region, as well as by the Annual Safety Report 2025, which confirmed the continued relevance of these issues.

2.4 In parallel, the publication of the Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) 2026–2028 introduced changes to the global safety monitoring framework, shifting emphasis from fixed EI targets toward addressing specific organizational and operational challenges faced by States.

3. Review of Current GASP Implementation Monitoring

3.1 The review of current monitoring practices identified limitations consistent with those previously noted, including:

a) reliance on absolute values instead of proportional indicators;
b) limited use of time-based trend analysis;
c) partial coverage of GASP goals and targets;
d) aggregation of indicators that limits visibility at High-Risk Category (HRC) and Additional Risk Category (ARC) levels; and
e) reliance on Effective Implementation (EI) as a standalone performance metric.

3.2 These limitations constrain the ability of the region to clearly identify specific implementation challenges and to prioritize targeted corrective actions.

3.3 The *GASP 2026–2028* shifts the global focus from fixed EI targets toward addressing specific organizational and operational challenges, reinforcing the need to adapt regional monitoring approaches accordingly.

4. Analysis of Stagnated Indicators

4.1 A review of PA-RAST reports since PA-RAST/66, together with the RASG-PA Annual Safety Reports 2024 and 2025, confirms the persistence of stagnated indicators in several safety implementation areas.

4.2 The Annual Safety Report 2024 highlighted, inter alia, continuing difficulties in State Safety Programme (SSP) implementation, uneven maturity of safety oversight systems, and limitations in the effective use of safety data to support proactive risk management. These findings are consistent with those identified in subsequent PA-RAST discussions and in the Annual Safety Report 2025.

4.3 Contributing factors consistently identified across these sources include:

a) limited availability of qualified technical personnel;
b) constraints in financial and institutional resources;
c) challenges in effective SSP implementation;
d) persistent weaknesses in AGA and Air Navigation Services (ANS) oversight; and
e) limited capacity to translate safety data and safety intelligence into targeted mitigation actions.

4.4 These factors are aligned with the global organizational challenges identified in the *GASP 2026–2028*, reinforcing the need for a targeted and coordinated regional response.

4.5 In this context, the *GASP 2026–2028* identifies persistent challenges in the area of Accident Investigation (AIG), noting consistently low levels of Effective Implementation and limited progress over time, as evidenced by Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) results.

4.6 The GASP further highlights that AIG is particularly affected by organizational challenges, including the availability and retention of qualified investigators, institutional independence, and the capacity to translate investigation outcomes into systemic safety improvements. While not explicitly labelled as stagnation, this characterization reflects a structural condition comparable to other stagnated implementation areas identified in the Region and reinforces the need for targeted and differentiated regional approaches, consistent with the actions proposed in this working paper.

5. Role of PA-RAST and Existing RASG-PA Mechanisms

5.1 The PA-RAST supports GASP implementation through safety data review, the development of RASG-PA Safety Advisories (RSAs) and RASG-PA Safety Issue Alerts (RSIAs), support to Collaborative Safety Teams (CSTs), and engagement with the Safety Partners Programme.

5.2 The *Annual Safety Report 2024* emphasized the positive safety impact of collaborative mechanisms, including CSTs and industry engagement initiatives, while also noting that broader and more consistent application of these mechanisms is required to address persistent implementation challenges across all States.

5.3 While these mechanisms have produced measurable safety benefits, their impact on stagnated GASP implementation indicators has been limited in the absence of a structured approach specifically focused on monitoring, prioritizing, and addressing these indicators.

5.4 There is therefore an opportunity to better align existing PA-RAST mechanisms with the systematic follow-up of stagnated GASP implementation areas, consistent with the monitoring philosophy of the *GASP 2026–2028*.

6. Proposed Adjustments to RASG-PA´s GASP Monitoring Practices

6.1 Enhance regional monitoring practices through the development of a standardized regional approach for the use and presentation of existing GASP implementation indicators, to be applied consistently in PA-RAST reporting and future *Annual Safety Reports*. This approach would not entail the creation of new GASP indicators, but rather the identification of a limited regional core set of indicators drawn from the GASP framework, as sampled for reference in **Appendix A**, together with standardized indicator descriptions and presentation templates, as illustrated in **Appendix B**, and their pilot application in PA-RAST reporting and the *Annual Safety Report*. This would rely exclusively on existing data sources and reporting inputs already used in PA-RAST reports and *Annual Safety Reports* and would not introduce new data collection or reporting responsibilities.

6.2 Building on the standardized regional core set of GASP implementation indicators described in paragraph 6.1, align regional monitoring and follow-up activities with the goals and targets of the GASP 2026–2028 through the systematic use of trend-based and proportional analysis. This would include the consistent interpretation of core set indicators over time, with emphasis on observed trends and rates of change, and their association with specific organizational and operational challenges, rather than the use of fixed EI reference thresholds as a primary decision-making criterion.

6.3 Use the proposed monitoring approach to inform regional focus on AGA, ANS and SSP-related challenges, where established regional mechanisms and precedents exist.

6.4 As an initial step, apply the proposed monitoring and support approach on a pilot basis to a limited number of recurrent implementation challenges identified by the PA-RAST, based on observed trends in the regional core set of indicators. The pilot application would focus on the structured use of standardized indicators, trend-based analysis and the internal analytical framework, and would leverage existing regional mechanisms and resources, with results documented through regular PA-RAST reporting and the *Annual Safety Report.*

6.5 Where relevant, insights derived from the pilot application may be shared, for information, through existing regional coordination mechanisms, without expanding their scope or mandate. This includes as appropriate, existing Collaborative Safety Teams and established coordination channels with safety partners.

6.6 Note that the PA-RAST, with Secretariat support, would be expected to consolidate the results of this approach and report progress through existing reporting mechanisms, including the *Annual Safety Report* and briefings to the Executive Steering Committee.

7. Conclusion

7. The analysis confirms that the concerns identified in paragraphs 2.2 and 2.3 of the RASG-PA/14 Report remain valid and continue to affect the effective monitoring and implementation of the *Global Aviation Safety Plan* in the Pan American Region.

7.2 The actions proposed in this working paper translate this analysis into concrete, proportionate and implementable steps, aligned with the updated GASP framework and existing RASG-PA mechanisms.

7.3 As a result of the considerations presented in this WP, the following draft decision is submitted for consideration:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">DRAFT DECISION
RASG-PA/15/Dxx MECHANISM FOR MONITORING AND FOLLOW-UP OF GASP IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">What:
That, building on the approach outlined in this Working Paper, 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 the ESC/41.</td><td>Expected impact:
☐ Political / Global
☒ Inter-regional
☐ Economic
☐ Environmental
☒ Operational/Technical</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Why:
To address 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>

8. Suggested Actions

8.1 The Meeting is invited to:

a) take note of the analysis presented in this working paper regarding stagnated GASP implementation indicators;

b) endorse the proposed adjustments to the RASG-PA´s GASP monitoring practices and the initial implementation steps for these adjustments described in this working paper and in the proposed decision in section 7; and

c) request the PA-RAST, with Secretariat support, to further refine and propose for consideration an appropriate mechanism to address the monitoring and follow-up of stagnated GASP implementation indicators, building on the approach outlined in this working paper, and to report accordingly to ESC/41.

— — — — — — — — — — —

APPENDIX A
EXAMPLE OF A STANDARDIZED REGIONAL GASP IMPLEMENTATION INDICATOR AND PRESENTATION TEMPLATE

1. Purpose of this Appendix

1.1 This Appendix provides an illustrative example of a standardized regional approach for the use and presentation of existing GASP implementation indicators, as referenced in paragraph 6.1 of this Working Paper.

1.2 The purpose of this Appendix is to demonstrate how a limited regional core set of indicators may be consistently defined and presented in PA-RAST reporting and Annual Safety Reports, without creating new indicators or modifying the GASP framework.

2. Example of a Standardized GASP Implementation Indicator

a) **Indicator Title**
Percentage of States having completed their SSP PQ self-assessment, using the ICAO online framework (OLF)

b) **GASP Reference**
Goal 3 – Implement effective State Safety Programmes

c) **Indicator Definition**
Percentage of States having completed their SSP PQ self-assessment, using the ICAO online framework (OLF)

d) **Method of Calculation**
Number of States having completed their SSP PQ self-assessment using the ICAO online framework (OLF), divided by the total number of States, expressed as a percentage

e) **Unit of Measure**
Percentage (%)

f) **Baseline**
Baseline to be established using available SSP PQ self-assessment data reported through the ICAO online framework (OLF)

g) **Target**
Increase in the percentage of States having completed their SSP PQ self-assessment using the ICAO online framework (OLF)

h) **Data Source**
ICAO online framework (OLF)

i) **Reporting frequency**
Annual

i) **Responsible entity**
States, with ICAO monitoring

3. Standardized Presentation Elements

3.1 For consistency across PA-RAST reports and Annual Safety Reports, each indicator included in the regional core set would be presented using the following standardized elements:

a) a common indicator title and definition aligned with the GASP;
b) a clearly identified GASP goal and target reference;
c) a standardized calculation method and unit of measure;
d) a defined time reference and trend presentation;
e) a concise, standardized interpretation text; and
f) identification of known limitations affecting interpretation.

4. Use of the Standardized Template

4.1 The standardized indicator and presentation template illustrated in this Appendix is intended to be applied, on a pilot basis, to a limited number of existing GASP implementation indicators identified by the PA-RAST.

4.2 Its use is aimed at improving consistency, comparability and clarity in regional monitoring and reporting, while preserving flexibility to adjust the core set of indicators as needed, without requiring changes to the GASP framework or additional decisions by the RASG-PA.

— — — — — — — — — — —

APPENDIX B
PROPOSED INITIAL REGIONAL GASP MONITORING CORE SET (ILLUSTRATIVE)

1. Purpose of this Appendix

1.1 This Appendix presents an illustrative initial regional core set of existing GASP implementation indicators, as referenced in paragraph 6.1 of this Working Paper.

1.2 The purpose of this core set is to support a standardized and consistent regional approach to the monitoring and presentation of GASP implementation, without introducing new indicators or modifying the GASP framework.

2. Proposed Initial Regional GASP Monitoring Core Set

No.	Indicator	GASP Goal	Primary Data Source	Purpose of Monitoring
1	Accident rate (number of accidents per million departures)	Goal 1	ICAO accident data	Monitor overall operational safety risk trends
2	Accident rate by G-HRC	Goal 1	ADREP / ECCAIRS	Track risk trends by Global High-Risk Categories
3	Fatal accident rate by other risk categories of occurrence	Goal 1	ICAO accident data	Monitor fatal accident trends beyond G-HRCs
4	Fatality rate by other risk categories of occurrence	Goal 1	ICAO accident data	Monitor fatality trends beyond G-HRCs
5	Number of injuries per billion passengers carried (injury rate)	Goal 1	ICAO accident data	Monitor injury outcomes at global and regional level
6	Percentage of States with a “satisfactory” rating for the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) protocol question (PQ) 2.051	Goal 2	USOAP CMA	Monitor implementation of key AGA-related oversight elements
7	Percentage of States having completed their SSP PQ self-assessment, using the ICAO online framework (OLF)	Goal 3	ICAO online framework (OLF)	Monitor SSP implementation progress at regional level
8	Use of safety data for State-level risk management (regional overview)	Goal 3	SSP / PA-RAST inputs	Assess maturity of data-driven safety management

No.	Indicator	GASP Goal	Primary Data Source	Purpose of Monitoring
9	Number of active Collaborative Safety Teams (CSTs)	Goal 4	RASG-PA records	Monitor regional collaboration mechanisms
10	Use of safety data for safety risk management at regional level	Goal 5	PA-RAST / regional safety data sources	Assess the extent to which safety data are used to support regional safety risk management
11	Participation in safety data sharing programmes (regional overview)	Goal 6	PA-RAST / industry inputs	Monitor level of data-sharing engagement

3. Notes on the Use of the Core Set

a) The indicators listed above are derived from existing ICAO and RASG-PA data sources and do not constitute new indicators.

b) The core set is intended to be applied, on a pilot basis, to PA-RAST reporting and Annual Safety Reports, using standardized definitions and presentation templates as illustrated in Appendix A.

c) The composition of the core set may be adjusted by the PA-RAST, as appropriate, without requiring changes to the GASP framework or additional decisions by the RASG-PA.

d) The indicators are intended for regional-level monitoring and trend analysis only and do not imply State-level ranking or benchmarking.

— END —