



WORKING PAPER

RASG-PA/15 — WP/11
09/01/26

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 5: Progress on Regional and National Aviation Safety Planning

PHASED APPROACH FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF COLLABORATIVE SAFETY TEAMS (CSTs) IN THE PAN-AMERICAN REGION

(Presented by the Secretariat)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Working Paper presents a proposal to RASG-PA for a phased and realistic approach to the development of CSTs in the region, emphasizing that effective State-industry collaboration must precede any formal structure. The objective is to create the necessary conditions for CSTs to emerge, consolidate, and remain sustainable over time.

Action:	The Meeting is invited to: a) review the contents of this Working Paper; and b) comment on and approve the proposed Conclusions in 4.2.
<i>Strategic Goals 2026-2050:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every flight is safe and secure
<i>References:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RASG-PA CST Strategy • RASG-PA CST Implementation Guidance

1. Introduction

1.2 The establishment of Collaborative Safety Teams (CSTs), promoted by RASG-PA, represents one of the most robust strategies for strengthening the exchange of safety information through sectoral collaboration. Analysing their implementation across Pan-America shows that the determining factor for success is an orientation toward concrete objectives. The most effective CSTs are those that prioritize active risk identification over the creation of complex administrative structures. By prioritizing operational agility and immediate added value over purely formal establishment processes, the Team’s sustainability is ensured, allowing it to truly transform safety within the region.

1.2 Initial efforts often generate enthusiasm but can quickly lose momentum. The following section analyses the critical factors that have provided sustainability and functionality to the CSTs that have successfully endured over time.

2. Critical Factors for CST Sustainability and Functionality

2.1 A review of recent experiences reveals that the success of a CST does not depend solely on its formal constitution, but on the establishment of enabling conditions that transform traditional challenges into management pillars. Based on lessons learned, the following best practices and success factors have been defined as necessary to ensure a solid and functional operating model:

- **Mature and collaborative Authority–Industry relationship:** Authorities that promote a bond based on trust and shared responsibility, empowering the industry and avoiding the perception of being both "judge and jury"; this encourages openness and the voluntary exchange of information by service providers.
- **Realistic and progressive expectations regarding data use:** Define a phased strategy: start with aggregated, non-sensitive data, and gradually move toward greater granularity as clear rules for preventive use, "need-to-know" criteria, and confidentiality guarantees are consolidated.
- **Legal framework and institutional culture that protect information exchange:** Ensure from the outset formal mechanisms (legal and procedural) that allow for the protection of shared information, including viable agreements, data protection protocols, and a culture that reinforces the preventive and non-punitive purpose of the CST.
- **Narrow scope, clear focus, and planned expansion:** Design the CST with a manageable initial scope (e.g., a specific type of operation or a subset of stakeholders) with concrete objectives; then gradually expand to other sectors (airports, General Aviation (tGA), helicopters, Remote piloted aircraft system (RPAS), flight schools, etc.) once the model has been proven.
- **Early wins and visible value delivery:** Prioritize actions that generate quick and tangible results (*quick wins*) to strengthen trust and credibility; focus the CST on manageable problems at the beginning, avoiding attempts to solve excessively large systemic challenges without a phased roadmap.

3. Phased Approach for State-Industry Collaboration

3.1 A CST, by its very nature, implies a formal structure. It requires governance, Terms of Reference (ToRs), confidentiality rules, and the definition of roles and processes. All this demands time, resources, and, above all, trust among stakeholders who have historically held asymmetric positions.

3.2 This proposal seeks to create less formal exchange platforms that allow for the gradual development of a relationship based on trust and mutual gain. State-industry collaboration initiatives do not require vast volumes of data, formal structures, regulations, or organizational charts; they require safety information and a common understanding aimed at the continuous improvement of safety through the mitigation of priority risks.

3.3 When these platforms are established, allowing communication and collaboration to develop gradually, information tends to flow naturally. No party is under a formal obligation, yet everyone can contribute their part. These spaces allow parties to learn to trust one another and understand the true value behind collaboration and open communication.

3.4 To understand the primary safety risks, it is essential for the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and service providers to engage in dialogue, exchange criteria, and generate a shared vision regarding safety priorities.

3.5 These State-industry collaboration initiatives, as they prove successful, will tend to evolve into a CST over time. This leads to the central principle: collaboration first, structure second. First, the parties trust each other enough to solve a specific problem together; then comes the framework that allows that cooperation to be sustained over time. A CST should not be the gateway to collaboration, but rather its outcome. The region has attempted this in reverse order, resulting in friction, fatigue, and frustration. Changing the sequence may be less glamorous, but it is more realistic and, above all, more effective. The goal is to be able to demonstrate value before formalizing.

3.6 The proposed path is deliberately modest. It does not promise to transform systems in six months or showcase spectacular achievements. It promises something more valuable: to build, step by step, the capacity for data-driven shared decision-making, focusing on priority risks and feasible mitigations. As that "muscle" strengthens, the CST will follow naturally, built on firm foundations.

4. The Role of RASG-PA

4.1 RASG-PA can catalyse this transition by promoting a phased, coherent, and realistic regional approach through:

- a) The provision of practical guidance for the design of State-industry collaboration initiatives;
- b) The facilitation of exchange platforms without the requirement of a formal structure; and
- c) The alignment of incentives, recognizing progress in effective collaboration and mitigation beyond the mere nominal establishment of CSTs.

4.2 In this regard, the Meeting is invited to consider the following Draft Decision:

DRAFT DECISION		STATE-INDUSTRY COLLABORATION INITIATIVES	
RASG-PA/15/DXX			
What: That the RASG-PA “CST Strategy” and “CST Implementation Guide” be revised to promote the development of State-Industry collaboration strategies as a preliminary and preparatory alternative to the formal establishment of CSTs by the ESC/41.		Expected impact: <input type="checkbox"/> Political/Global <input type="checkbox"/> Interregional <input type="checkbox"/> Economic <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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: Before ESC/41 meeting		Status: Valid	
Who: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PA-RAST <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Secretariat			

5. Suggested Action:

5.1 The Meeting is invited to:

- a) review the contents of this Working Paper; and
- b) comment on and approve Draft Decision in 4.2 of this paper.