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

WORKING PAPER

ESC/41 — WP/05
12/08/26

Forty First Regional Aviation Safety Group — Pan America Executive Steering Committee Meeting (RASG-PA ESC/41)
Mexico City, Mexico, 2 to 3 September 2026

Agenda Item 4: Pan America Regional Aviation Safety Team (PA-RAST) Projects and Activities

PA-RAST MATTERS FOR THE ATTENTION OF THE EXECUTIVE STEERING COMMITTEE

(Presented by the PA-RAST)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This working paper presents matters that the PA-RAST elevates to the Executive Steering Committee for decision or information: the scope and comparability of statistics published in the RASG-PA Annual Safety Report; amendments to the RASG-PA Procedural Handbook on membership and observer criteria; the establishment of a PA-RAST Code of Conduct; a proposed capability to support States on State Safety Programme implementation and the question of its placement; the status of Collaborative Safety Team implementation in the Region; the connection of aerodrome runway safety work with PA-RAST risk analysis; the accomplishments of the PA-RAST/APRAST Collaborative Initiative; the status of the RASG-PA ASAP Initiative, including a call for pilot-project volunteers; and an adjustment to the PA-RAST meeting structure. Supporting detail is placed at Appendices A to D.

Action:	The Meeting is invited to take the actions presented in Section 11.
Strategic Goals 2026-2050:	Every Flight is Safe and Secure
References:	• RASG-PA/15 Summary of Discussions (including Conclusion RASG-PA/15/C01) • RASG-PA Annual Safety Report 2025 • ICAO Safety Report 2025 • RASG-PA Procedural Handbook, Fifth Edition • Decision RASG-APAC 14/4 • APRAST/24 and APRAST/25 Reports of the Meeting • ICAO Doc 10161, Global Aviation Safety Roadmap 2026–2028

1. Introduction

1.1 The PA-RAST has identified matters warranting the attention of the Executive Steering Committee — some requiring decision, others for information. Supporting detail is placed at the Appendices.

2. Annual Safety Report statistics: scope and comparability

2.1 Apparent mismatches have been identified between figures published in the RASG-PA Annual Safety Report and those presented in ICAO global products (the ICAO Safety Report and iSTARS). Illustratively, of two fatal losses of control in-flight accidents recorded in the Region in 2025, only one appears in iSTARS. Following coordination with ICAO Headquarters, the cause has been established, and it is one of scope rather than error: the ICAO products present scheduled commercial operations above 5 700 kg maximum take-off weight, because rates require departures data collated only for scheduled operations, whereas the Annual Safety Report has presented totals including non-scheduled operations. Both derive from the same validation chain.

2.2 The difference is material and, when unlabelled, produces apparent contradictions that risk eroding confidence in the Region's published safety data. The Committee is accordingly invited to decide how the Report is to present these data. The considerations, including a second scope dimension concerning MTOW thresholds, are set out at **Appendix A**.

3. Amendment of the RASG-PA Procedural Handbook: membership and observer criteria

3.1 The visibility of the RASG-PA and the PA-RAST, and interest in participating in their work, have grown. Experience has shown that the Handbook's membership provisions would benefit from greater precision as to which entities qualify as members and how others may engage, so that membership remains aligned with the Group's safety mission.

3.2 The PA-RAST accordingly proposes amendments to Section 4 of the Handbook, which define membership by reference to the ICAO list of international organizations which may be invited to attend ICAO meetings and to operation within the region, and distinguish the entitlement of States to participate as observers from the discretionary consideration of other organizations. The amendments also provide for the recognition by the Executive Steering Committee of regional aviation industry associations contributing to the objectives of the RASG-PA. The proposed amendment text is reflected in WP/03.

4. RASG-PA Code of Conduct

4.1 Members of the RASG-PA serve while representing States and Territories, international organizations and industry, each with its own institutional and commercial interests. The Procedural Handbook makes them responsible for keeping the Group's work focused on safety, and the Confidentiality Agreement bars the use of information disclosed in its meetings for commercial, competitive, punitive or litigation purposes; neither governs the use of membership in the PA-RAST — the Team's name, standing and outputs — in support of an individual organization's positions.

4.2 The RASG-PA is accordingly establishing a Code of Conduct addressing conflicts of interest, the coordination of external communications with the Co-Chairs and the Secretariat, and a commitment not to invoke RASG-PA or PA-RAST affiliation in support of an individual organization's advocacy. Adherence will be a condition of participation.

5. Support to States on State Safety Programme implementation: proposed capability and its placement

5.1 Conclusion RASG-PA/15/C01 tasks the development of a strategy for SSP implementation support. The work to date has identified a practical gap: regional monitoring measures whether States have established the elements of an SSP, and regional data initiatives depend on States having done so, but the Region offers no agreed basis for deciding which elements a State should establish first. Work developed under C01 proposes a phased approach a State can enter at the point matching its maturity, prioritizing the safety data collection and processing system (SDCPS) as the data entry point (**Appendix B**).

5.2 It is proposed to test that approach as a pilot in the NACC Region, with a small number of States entering at different levels of maturity. What is piloted is the prioritization method: whether sequencing SSP elements by their contribution to the Region's safety work brings a State to a functioning SDCPS sooner, and whether the resulting data improves the regional risk picture. The deliverable is a validated method the Region can offer more widely, reported to ESC/42 with the progress report already due under C01. Its relationship to the programme supported by the SAM Regional Office, which is complementary and which this proposal does not alter, the arrangements for sharing lessons learned, and the proposed arrangement for carrying it out are set out at Appendix B. Participating States would work in coordination with the regional mechanisms already supporting SSP implementation — the SSP Working Group in the NACC Region and the SSP Project in the SAM Region — rather than in parallel to them.

6. Collaborative Safety Team implementation

6.1 Collaborative Safety Team (CST) work continues in three States. In Colombia, the Go-Team conducted its initial visit in May 2026 and Terms of Reference are in development, though progress has slowed in the context of the country's new administration. In Mexico, an initiative is under way to connect with the Commercial Aviation Subcommittee established under the Federal Civil Aviation Agency. In Argentina, engagement has been established with the country's operators. In each case the RASG-PA stands ready to engage further when the State so requests. Status is set out at Appendix D.

7. Connecting aerodrome runway safety work with PA-RAST risk analysis

7.1 The PA-RAST and the Regional Offices' aerodromes and ground aids portfolio (AGA TFs and other AGA related implementation mechanisms) in NACC and SAM are working to connect the Region's runway safety work with the PA-RAST's work on the high-risk categories of runway incursion and runway excursion, without creating new bodies or reporting obligations. The PA-RAST intends to establish connection with the Region's Runway Safety Teams (RSTs), so that its regional risk picture can inform and support their work, and — where a Collaborative Safety Team is active in a State — to connect the RSTs with that CST and work through it rather than a parallel channel. The status of Runway Safety Team implementation in the Region, and a proposal to strengthen it through a more risk-based and data-driven approach, are presented separately to this Meeting under *WP/ 10, Agenda Item 4.*

a) decide how the Annual Safety Report is to present accident data — the scheduled-operations set, the total-commercial-operations set, or both — having regard to Appendix A;

b) decide the placement of the capability described in Section 5, from the options at Appendix B, and task the Secretariat with preparing terms of reference accordingly;

e) take note of Sections 6 to 10; and

f) encourage States wishing to volunteer as to the RASG ASAP Initiative pilot project, with an operator and its employee group, to express their interest to the Secretariat.

8. PA-RAST/APRAST Collaborative Initiative: accomplishments

8.1 The Collaborative Initiative between the PA-RAST and the Asia-Pacific Regional Aviation Safety Team (APRAST) was established as a two-year trial under Decision RASG-APAC 14/4 (November 2024) and endorsed by the RASG-PA. It has produced concrete, two-way results: three completed advisory exchanges; Pan-American products taken up in the Asia-Pacific, including the constitution of an APRAST Safety Culture Task Force in direct response to work led by the PA-RAST; and Asia-Pacific practices adopted in the Region, including the Global Action Plan for the Prevention of Runway Incursions (GAPPRI) implementation tracker and the data-sharing concept underlying the programme before the Committee under Agenda Item 5. The accomplishments are set out at **Appendix C**.

9. RASG-PA ASAP Initiative: status and pilot participation

9.1 Under the RASG-PA Aviation Safety Action Program (ASAP) Initiative, the Regional ASAP Working Group — co-led by a State and an operator — is developing guidance material, promoting Just Culture awareness region-wide, and pursuing a pilot project with a State, an operator and their employee group. The pilot in Colombia has made no significant progress, in the context of the country's new administration. The Initiative remains active and is pivoting to States and operators that have expressed interest.

10. PA-RAST meeting structure: dedicated day aligned with the Global Aviation Safety Roadmap

10.1 The PA-RAST is adjusting the structure of its meetings so that one day of each meeting cycle is dedicated to discussion aligned with the Global Aviation Safety Roadmap (Doc 10161), connecting its review of regional risks and Safety Enhancement Initiatives directly to the Roadmap's actions. This applies beginning with PA-RAST/71 (São Paulo, August 2026).

11. Suggested Actions

11.1 The Meeting is invited to:

a) decide how the Annual Safety Report is to present accident data — the scheduled-operations set, the total-commercial-operations set, or both — having regard to Appendix A;

b) decide the placement of the capability described in Section 5, from the options at Appendix B, and task the Secretariat with preparing terms of reference accordingly;

e) take note of Sections 6 to 10; and

f) encourage States wishing to volunteer as to the RASG ASAP Initiative pilot project, with an operator and its employee group, to express their interest to the Secretariat.

— — — — — — — — — — —

APPENDIX A
ANNUAL SAFETY REPORT: CONSIDERATIONS BEARING ON THE PRESENTATION DECISION

1 In deciding how the Annual Safety Report is to present accident data, the Committee may wish to note the following:

a) the scheduled-operations set (MTOW over 5 700 kg) is the only set for which rates can be computed, and is directly comparable with the ICAO Safety Report and iSTARS;

b) the total-commercial-operations set (validated by the ICAO Occurrence Validation Study Group, including non-scheduled operations) presents a fuller picture of the Region's commercial accident experience, but supports counts only — no rates can be derived, as no departure denominator exists for non-scheduled operations, and this applies to fatality figures as well as accident figures;

c) should the Committee decide to report both, the two sets would need to be kept structurally separate, with every table and chart stating its scope (operations basis and MTOW threshold) explicitly and data filtered accordingly;

d) where the Report presents data trends, a brief explanation of what the figures show would make the analytical intent explicit and reduce the risk of unintended interpretation;

e) whichever presentation is adopted, the scope would be documented in the Report's methodology note.

— — — — — — — — — — —

APPENDIX B
SUPPORT TO STATES ON SSP IMPLEMENTATION: PHASED APPROACH AND PLACEMENT OPTIONS

1. The phased approach

1.1 Many States face the same question at the outset: where to begin. In the absence of a shared reference, that question is answered in isolation and in different orders. Work developed under Conclusion RASG-PA/15/C01 — Prioritized SSP Element Implementation in Support of RASG-PA Data-Driven Safety Objectives — proposes a phased approach that a State can enter at the point matching its current maturity: a foundation phase covering the legislative framework, responsibilities and accountabilities, and enforcement policy; a data-ignition phase centred on the safety data collection and processing system (SDCPS); a phase in which the State converts its data into agreed safety performance indicators and data-driven oversight targeting; and a maturity phase completing SSP effectiveness. The SDCPS is prioritized as the data entry point because it is the element that can be implemented by a State without a mature SSP, delivers that State its own risk picture as an immediate return, and contributes to effective implementation as assessed under USOAP CMA.

2. The proposed pilot

2.1 The approach at B.1 would be tested as a pilot in the NACC Region, engaging a small number of States — two or three — entering the phased approach at different points, so that the maturity-adaptive entry which distinguishes the approach can itself be tested. Participating States would be identified in coordination with the Regional Office and selected on three criteria: that the State does not yet have a mature SSP; that it is willing to participate; and that its safety data, once collected, would materially improve the regional risk picture. The implementation of Standards and Recommended Practices, including the establishment of an SSP, remains a responsibility of the Regional Offices and of the States themselves. The pilot does not alter that: the RASG-PA contribution is the risk-based prioritization of elements, consistent with the risk-driven objective of the Group.

2.2 The pilot would establish whether sequencing SSP elements by their contribution to the Region's safety work brings a State to a functioning SDCPS sooner than an undifferentiated approach, and whether the data that results is usable regionally. Its output is a validated method — the sequence, the criteria for entry, and the evidence of what worked and what did not — which the Region could then offer to other States as guidance they remain free to adapt.

2.3 The pilot would report to ESC/42, together with the progress report already due under Conclusion RASG-PA/15/C01.

3 Relationship to the programme supported in the SAM Region

3.1 The SAM Regional Office supports a programme to strengthen State risk management capability and SSP implementation. It is delivered as sustained accompaniment to an individual State over a twenty-four month cycle, beginning from an assessment of that State's USOAP protocol questions, and it measures itself on the effective implementation of the SSP-related protocol questions achieved within that period. Its communications plan identifies the RASG-PA among its stakeholders, for the communication of results and lessons learned. That programme is presented separately to this Meeting by the SAM Regional Office.

3.2 That programme and the pilot proposed here answer different questions. The programme establishes how SSP capability is built within a State that has been selected for support; the pilot addresses which elements, and which States, the Region should prioritize. An approach resting on accompaniment of that intensity cannot be extended across the NACC Region, which comprises 22 States and 19 territories, on present resources; a basis for directing effort is accordingly required before questions of delivery arise. The Secretariat would maintain touch points between the two so that lessons learned pass in both directions. Nothing in this proposal alters that programme.

4. The proposed arrangement

4.1 It is proposed that the pilot be carried out by a task force constituted by the RASG-PA for that purpose, drawing on the PA-RAST for the risk-based prioritization of SSP elements, and composed of the participating NACC States together with the Secretariat. The task force would be constituted for the pilot and would dissolve on its completion. It would not be a standing body for the promotion or implementation of SSP, which remains a responsibility of the Regional Offices and of the States themselves.

4.2 Support to the participating States would be provided through the existing instruments of the NACC Regional Office, so that the pilot requires no additional resources. The arrangement follows the line-of-sight in the Procedural Handbook: the PA-RAST supplies the analysis that informs prioritization, the RASG-PA provides the standing under which the participating States are convened, and the Regional Office delivers.

4.3 Composition by the participating States is intended to keep the pilot in the hands of those on whom the obligation rests. The arrangement would apply to the pilot in the NACC Region only, and would not extend to SSP implementation support activity in the SAM Region.

— — — — — — — — — — —

APPENDIX C
PA-RAST/APRAST COLLABORATIVE INITIATIVE: ACCOMPLISHMENTS

1. **Completed advisory exchanges.** Three exchanges have been completed. The PA-RAST adopted APRAST's regional safety advisory on lithium batteries, modified it for the Pan-American context, and returned the modifications to APRAST for the improvement of its own advisory — an exchange that continues as APRAST develops its reissued advisory (RSA 25-002R1) and regional guidance. The RASG-PA adopted APRAST's advisory on mid-air-collision risk in Reduced Vertical Separation Minima (RVSM) airspace, incorporating PA-RAST input and Large Height Deviation data from the GREPECAS Scrutiny Working Group into RASG-PA Safety Advisory RSA-13, promoted with credit to the Asia-Pacific source. In turn, APRAST adopted RASG-PA Safety Issue Alert RSIA-001 on incorrect altimeter settings.

2. **Pan-American products and approaches taken up in the Asia-Pacific.** The RASG-PA Turbulence Mitigation Toolkit was shared with APRAST's Loss of Control In-flight Task Force, which resolved to develop a toolkit modelled on it; the RASG-PA Global Navigation Satellite System radio-frequency-interference safety alert (RSIA-03A) was offered for APRAST's adoption and modification; and Aeroméxico presented its Aviation Safety Action Program at APRAST/25 as a RASG-PA safety partner. The Region's just-culture/State Safety Programme convergence work, presented at APRAST/24 and APRAST/25 under the Initiative, was taken up in the Asia-Pacific's own just-culture discussions, with follow-on engagement with the Republic of Korea; this workstream is presented separately to the Committee. In direct response to the convergence working paper and the focused-discussion panel led by the PA-RAST, APRAST's Organizational Working Group constituted a Safety Culture Task Force, charged with driving the safety-culture and voluntary-reporting workstream into the Asia-Pacific regional safety plan's existing safety enhancement initiatives on SSP establishment (SEI 3.2.1) and safety data collection and processing systems (SEI 3.2.2), in coordination with their custodians. That approach — embedding the workstream in the regional safety plan rather than running it as a standalone program — has in turn informed the Region's own planning, and corresponding work has begun in the NACC Regional Aviation Safety Plan.

3. **Asia-Pacific practices adopted or under adoption in Pan-America.** The PA-RAST adopted the Global Action Plan for the Prevention of Runway Incursions (GAPPRI) implementation tracker developed by APRAST's Runway Incursion Task Force, and APRAST has now flagged its newly developed tracker for the Global Action Plan for the Prevention of Runway Excursions (GAPPRE) for RASG-PA use in the same manner — which the PA-RAST intends to take up as the next exchange under the Initiative. The Asia-Pacific Regional Data Sharing concept, identified through the Initiative, was adapted as the design basis of the State Safety Information Sharing Programme presented to the Committee under Agenda Item 5. Further Asia-Pacific practices identified for potential Pan-American application include the CANSO/ACI Runway Safety Checklist and the mechanism for adopting industry-developed guidance as a regional safety output.

— — — — — — — — — — —

APPENDIX D
COLLABORATIVE SAFETY TEAM IMPLEMENTATION: STATUS

1. **Colombia.** Following the prioritization of Colombia for CST support, the Go-Team conducted its initial visit in Bogotá on 12–13 May 2026, engaging the Aerocivil, six operators, airport managers, and IATA, ALTA and Airbus. The CST's Terms of Reference are in development, and the Aerocivil has been advised not to finalize them without industry's input, consistent with the collaborative character of the mechanism. Progress has slowed in the context of the country's new administration, and the Aerocivil has yet to confirm the first CST meeting. The Aerocivil intends to sign a Declaration of Intent with the RASG-PA. The RASG-PA stands ready to engage as soon as the Aerocivil so requests, to support a sound CST implementation.

2. **Mexico.** An initiative is under way to connect with Mexico's Commercial Aviation Subcommittee (*Subcomité de Aviación Comercial*), established under the Federal Civil Aviation Agency (AFAC in Spanish), to identify jointly with its participants opportunities to align their team with the RASG-PA CST Guidance. Contact has been established, and a first meeting of this kind is pending confirmation by the Mexican side.

3. **Argentina.** An approach has been made in Argentina, where engagement to date has been established with the country's operators. Consistent with the principle that collaboration precedes structure, this operator-level engagement focuses on shared operational safety priorities as the foundation on which any future collaborative arrangement would rest. The RASG-PA stands ready to engage with Argentina's civil aviation authority and its operators when called upon and when they are ready to do so.

— END —