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

WORKING PAPER

ESC/41 — WP/06
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 5: Regional Safety Performance and Implementation Support

PROPOSAL FOR A MECHANISM TO STRENGTHEN THE MONITORING AND FOLLOW-UP OF GASP IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS

(Presented by the Secretariat)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This working paper responds to Decision RASG-PA/15/D04 by presenting a proposed mechanism to strengthen the monitoring and follow-up of Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) implementation indicators in the Pan-American Region, building on the approach outlined in RASG-PA/15 WP/09. The proposed mechanism aligns regional monitoring with the 2026–2028 edition of the GASP (Doc 10004) and the Manual on Monitoring Implementation of Regional and National Aviation Safety Plans (Doc 10162), and operationalizes GASP Goal 4 (Targets 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3) at the regional level through a core indicator set prioritized according to the objectives of the RASG-PA, trend-based analysis, and a tiered follow-up process to identify and assist States where implementation has stagnated. The mechanism is set out in detail at **Appendix A** and its annual operation illustrated at **Appendix B**.

Action:	The Meeting is invited to approve the proposed mechanism and the suggested actions in Section 3.
Strategic Goals 2026-2050:	Every Flight is Safe and Secure
References:	• RASG-PA/15 Summary of Discussions (Decision RASG-PA/15/D04) • RASG-PA Dashboard • RASG-PA/15 WP/09 • RASG-PA/14 Final Report (Conclusion RASG-PA/14/C01) • RASG-PA Procedural Handbook, Fifth Edition • ICAO Doc 10004, Global Aviation Safety Plan, 2026–2028 Edition • ICAO Doc 10162, Manual on Monitoring Implementation of Regional and National Aviation Safety Plans, Second Edition, 2026 • RASG-PA Annual Safety Report 2025

1. Introduction

1.1 RASG-PA/15, held in a virtual asynchronous phase from 19 January to 12 February 2026 and an in-person phase in Mexico City from 2 to 4 March 2026, analysed under WP/09 the stagnation of specific GASP implementation indicators in the Pan-American Region, particularly in the areas of aerodromes and ground aids (AGA), air navigation services (ANS), and State Safety Programme (SSP) foundations, with comparable structural challenges documented in the area of accident and incident investigation (AIG). Regional monitoring data confirm the trend: the average effective implementation (EI) of the Region's States declined from 72.16 in 2021 to 69.83 in 2024, declining in each intervening year; the percentage of States with EI above 75 per cent fell from 72.2 to 48.57 over the same period; and EI in AGA and ANS remained below the Region's aggregate EI throughout.

1.2 The Meeting agreed on Decision RASG-PA/15/D04, tasking the PA-RAST, building on the approach outlined in WP/09 and acting directly or through an Ad hoc Group established for this purpose, to develop a proposal for a mechanism to strengthen the monitoring and follow-up of GASP implementation indicators, for consideration by ESC/41. WP/09 was itself the follow-up to Conclusion RASG-PA/14/C01, which requested the analysis of limitations in the monitoring of GASP implementation and the identification of actions to address stagnated indicators; that Conclusion was closed as completed at RASG-PA/15. This working paper presents the proposal called for by Decision RASG-PA/15/D04.

1.3 The proposal takes account of the guidance of RASG-PA/15 that a flexible monitoring framework should allow better identification of risks while accounting for local particularities; that regional reporting should integrate with existing national and subregional plans to avoid duplication; that individual States retain the ultimate responsibility for corrective action within their jurisdictions; and that regional safety reports should incorporate measures tracking specific regional goals alongside global indicators.

2. Discussion

2.1 The 2026–2028 GASP requires — and enables — a redesigned regional monitoring approach

2.1.1 RASG-PA/15 WP/09 identified the limitations of current regional monitoring practice: reliance on absolute values instead of proportional indicators; limited use of time-based trend analysis; partial coverage of GASP goals and targets; aggregation that limits visibility at the level of high-risk and additional risk categories; and reliance on EI as a standalone performance metric. Together, these limitations constrain the Region's ability to clearly identify specific implementation challenges and to prioritize targeted corrective actions — the indicators can show that implementation has stagnated, but not where, why, or for whom. The mechanism proposed in this paper is designed to remove each of these limitations.

2.1.2 The 2026–2028 edition of the GASP introduces changes that bear directly on how the Region should monitor implementation. Under Goal 2 (strengthen States' safety oversight capabilities), the previous targets calling for States to reach a given overall EI score were removed, on the basis that setting high EI scores as targets within a short time frame was ineffective and deterred States with low EI scores from taking action. They were replaced by targets addressing specific critical elements (CEs) and audit areas (AAs): sufficient financial resources for the safety oversight authority (Target 2.1, measured through USOAP Protocol Question 2.051); qualified technical personnel for aircraft accident and incident investigation and for aerodromes and ground aids (Target 2.2, CE-4/AIG and CE-4/AGA); and the resolution of safety issues in aerodromes and ground aids (Target 2.3, CE-8/AGA). These globally identified priority combinations correspond closely to the areas of demonstrated stagnation in the Region. A regional mechanism that continues to track only aggregate EI scores would therefore reproduce, at the regional level, the limitation the GASP itself has corrected.

2.1.3 In addition, GASP Goal 4 (regional and national collaboration) assigns the regions three targets that together define the follow-up dimension of the mechanism: by 2026, all regions to identify States that need assistance to address safety issues (Target 4.1); by 2028, all regions to facilitate the required assistance to the identified States (Target 4.2); and by 2027, all regions to implement a mechanism to make use of information on operational safety risks and emerging issues for aviation safety planning (Target 4.3). The mechanism proposed in this paper constitutes the Region's means of achieving these targets; the 2026 deadline attached to Target 4.1 makes its approval at ESC/41 time-critical.

2.2 Proposed mechanism

2.2.1 The proposed mechanism develops the adjustments outlined in WP/09 into four components, set out in detail at Appendix A: a core indicator set drawn from the GASP goals, targets and indicators and prioritized according to the objectives of the RASG-PA; trend-based and proportional analysis of each indicator against a five-year rolling average with 2025 as baseline; a tiered follow-up process operationalizing Goal 4, from continuous monitoring through the identification of States needing assistance to the facilitation of that assistance through existing instruments; and a reporting cadence aligned to the existing ESC, Plenary and Annual Safety Report cycle, complemented by the RASG-PA dashboard. Appendix A also sets out the associated level of effort, and Appendix B illustrates the operation of the mechanism over an annual cycle.

2.2.2 Two features of the design warrant the ESC's attention. First, the core set is prioritized according to the objectives of the RASG-PA as set out in its Procedural Handbook, which notes that regional data may point to different areas of focus than the GASP: the first tier comprises indicators that measure safety impact directly, and the second the implementation indicators on which future safety performance depends. Second, the mechanism imposes no new burden on States — all indicators draw on data already held in ICAO systems, no new indicators are created, and no new data collection or reporting responsibilities are introduced.

2.3 Relationship to other regional workstreams

2.3.1 The mechanism operates in coordination with, and not in duplication of the strategy for SSP implementation support under Conclusion RASG-PA/15/C01 (progress report due to ESC/42), noting that GASP Goal 3 (establish and manage State safety programmes) requires all States to assess the level of implementation of their SSP by 2026 (Target 3.1) and to establish an SSP, including a safety data collection and processing system, by 2028 (Target 3.2); the support for risk-based surveillance under Conclusion RASG-PA/15/C05; the mapping of cross-cutting and emerging issues under Decision RASG-PA/15/D07; and the update of the NACC Regional Aviation Safety Plan and the SAMSP 2026–2028 under GASP Goal 5 (strengthen aviation safety planning), Target 5.1 (publish an updated RASP taking into account the 2026–2028 GASP, by 2026). Root-cause findings generated by the mechanism inform the next revision cycle of the regional plans.

2.4 Role of States and Territories

2.4.1 Consistent with the position expressed at RASG-PA/15 and with the roles defined in the GASP, the mechanism supports — but does not substitute for — State action. Its purpose is to ensure that stagnation is detected early against an objective criterion, understood correctly through analysis of specific critical elements and audit areas, and matched with the most appropriate available assistance. Its effectiveness depends in turn on States: while no new reporting requirement is introduced, the currency of the indicators rests on the information States themselves maintain, in the USOAP CMA Online Framework and in other sources dependent on State input.

3. Suggested Actions

3.1 The Meeting is invited to:

a) take note of the information provided in this working paper;

b) approve the proposed mechanism described in Section 2 and Appendix A as the Region's means of implementing GASP Targets 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 (with deadlines of 2026, 2028 and 2027 respectively), as well its annual operation illustrated at **Appendix B,** with any adjustments the Meeting deems appropriate;

c) task the PA-RAST to finalize the core indicator set, using the GASP Indicator Forms in Doc 10162, and to present the first consolidated monitoring report, including the initial identification of States needing assistance under Target 4.1, to ESC/42; and

d) agree that the results of the mechanism's application be reported to each subsequent ESC meeting and to the RASG-PA/16 Plenary.

— — — — — — — — — — —

APPENDIX A
THE PROPOSED MECHANISM IN DETAIL

1. **Core indicator set aligned with the 2026–2028 GASP and prioritized by regional safety impact.** The core set would be prioritized according to the objectives of the RASG-PA as set out in its Procedural Handbook: first, to develop an integrated, data-driven strategy supporting a regional performance framework for the management of safety risk, to reduce the commercial aviation fatality risk in the Pan-American Region; and second, to support, monitor and report implementation by States of the GASP. The Handbook further notes that regional data may point to different areas of focus than the GASP; this prioritization exercises that provision. Accordingly, the first tier of the core set comprises the indicators that measure safety impact directly (Goal 1 — continuous reduction of operational safety risks): for example, the accident rate disaggregated by global high-risk category, which links regional monitoring directly to the analytical work of the HRC project teams, and the fatal accident and fatality rates for the other risk categories of occurrence, which track the fatality risk RASG-PA exists to reduce. The second tier comprises the implementation indicators on which future safety performance depends and where regional stagnation is demonstrated: for example, the indicators tracking qualified technical personnel for accident investigation and aerodromes (Target 2.2, CE-4/AIG and CE-4/AGA), and the percentage of States having established a safety data collection and processing system (GASP-I.3.2.02, under Target 3.2 — establish an SSP by 2028), the foundation for data-driven safety management. The two tiers are complementary rather than competing: outcome indicators are lagging measures of safety already delivered, while implementation indicators are leading measures — sustained stagnation in oversight and SSP implementation is the earliest available warning of future operational risk. This prioritization governs the regional selection, presentation and analysis of the core set only; it does not modify the GASP framework, consistent with the approach in WP/09. Selection would build on the illustrative regional core set presented in WP/09, Appendix B, and prioritize the Region's areas of demonstrated stagnation. No new indicators are created, and no new data collection or reporting responsibilities are introduced for States. The mechanism relies exclusively on data sources already used in the RASG-PA Annual Safety Report — principally ICAO accident data (including ADREP/ECCAIRS occurrence records) and the USOAP CMA Online Framework — as identified for each indicator in WP/09, Appendix B. Each selected indicator adopts the corresponding GASP Indicator Form in Doc 10162, which already provides the standardized definition, calculation method and data sources for each of the forty-seven GASP indicators. The one adjustment required is editorial: realigning the GASP implementation table published in the RASG-PA Annual Safety Report, which currently reflects targets from the 2023–2025 edition, with the 2026–2028 goals-targets-indicators structure.

2. **Trend-based and proportional analysis.** Each core indicator would be monitored over time rather than read as a point value. The mechanism adopts the measurement convention established in the 2026–2028 GASP: a five-year rolling average, with the year 2025 as baseline. Stagnation is therefore detected against an objective, ICAO-consistent criterion, not against fixed EI reference thresholds. Data would be drawn from the USOAP CMA Online Framework — including the dedicated SSP effective implementation score as it becomes available following the incorporation of the SSP Protocol Questions into USOAP activities after 1 August 2026 — together with iSTARS and State reporting.

3. **Tiered follow-up process.** The follow-up dimension operationalizes Goal 4 (regional and national collaboration) in three graduated steps: (i) continuous regional monitoring and consolidated reporting; (ii) identification, on the basis of the trend analysis, of States needing assistance to address specific safety issues, constituting the Region's delivery of Target 4.1 (by 2026); and (iii) facilitation of the required assistance under Target 4.2 (by 2028). Assistance would be delivered through existing instruments — NACC and SAM Regional Office technical assistance and Go-Team missions, Regional Safety Oversight Organizations, and regional cooperation mechanisms — rather than through the creation of new structures. In support of Target 4.3 (by 2027), the mechanism also incorporates the regional use of information on operational safety risks and emerging issues, including through the ICAO Secure Portal on Operational Safety Risks and Emerging Issues.

4. **Reporting cadence.** A consolidated report — covering indicator trends, States identified as needing assistance, and assistance actions facilitated — would be presented to each ESC meeting and reviewed in full at each RASG-PA Plenary. Results would be reflected in the RASG-PA Annual Safety Report, consistent with the ICAO practice of reporting GASP progress through the annual Safety Report, and compatible with Air Navigation Commission reporting cycles.

5. **Level of effort.** The mechanism imposes no new burden on States: all core-set indicators draw on data already held in ICAO systems — accident data (including ADREP) and the USOAP CMA Online Framework — and no State submission is required. For the RASG-PA structure, the one-time setup effort comprises the adoption of the core set by the PA-RAST, the establishment of the data extraction routine, and the realignment of the GASP implementation table in the Annual Safety Report, the largest single setup item. The recurring effort comprises an annual extraction, computation and interpretation cycle, absorbed into the existing Annual Safety Report and ESC reporting rhythm: the first-tier safety-impact indicators are largely computed already for the Annual Safety Report, whose GASP implementation table and safety data charts publish the accident rate, five-year rate and fatality figures each year, with the disaggregation by global high-risk category the principal new computation, while the second-tier implementation indicators require a modest new extraction from the USOAP CMA Online Framework each cycle. Two elements constitute genuinely new recurring outputs, in fulfilment of GASP obligations the Region carries in any event: the identification of States needing assistance (Target 4.1), an analytical judgment exercised by the PA-RAST each cycle; and the facilitation of assistance (Target 4.2), which falls principally on the NACC and SAM Regional Offices through their existing instruments and scales with the number of States identified. Consistent with WP/09, no new structures, working groups or standing tasks are created; the mechanism is delivered through the existing PA-RAST, Secretariat and reporting arrangements.

— — — — — — — — — — —

APPENDIX B
OPERATION OF THE PROPOSED MECHANISM: ANNUAL MONITORING CYCLE

1 This Appendix illustrates how the mechanism described in Section 2.2 and Appendix A would operate over one annual cycle, identifying the steps, the responsible entity for each, and the indicative timing. The cycle is aligned with the availability of validated data and with the existing RASG-PA reporting rhythm.

Step	Activity	Responsible	Indicative timing
1	**Confirm the core set.** In the first cycle, adopt the tiered core indicator set, building on WP/09, Appendix B: first tier, safety-impact indicators — the accident rate disaggregated by global high-risk category, and the fatal accident and fatality rates for the other risk categories of occurrence (Goal 1); second tier, implementation indicators — qualified technical personnel for CE-4/AIG and CE-4/AGA (Target 2.2), and the percentage of States having established an SDCPS (GASP-I.3.2.02, Target 3.2). In subsequent cycles, review the composition and adjust as needed, without changes to the GASP framework.	PA-RAST, directly or through an Ad hoc Group established for this purpose	First PA-RAST meeting of the cycle
2	**Extract the data.** Pull the data set identified in each indicator's GASP Indicator Form (Doc 10162): ICAO accident data, including ADREP records, for the safety-impact indicators; USOAP CMA Online Framework data, including the SSP EI score as it becomes available, for the implementation indicators. Note that validated ADREP data for year n become available in March of year n+1.	Secretariat, supporting the PA-RAST	Second quarter
3	**Compute the indicators.** Apply the calculation method specified in each GASP Indicator Form; compute the five-year rolling average against the 2025 baseline for each indicator.	Secretariat, supporting the PA-RAST	Second quarter
4	**Analyze the trends.** Interpret each indicator over time using trend-based and proportional analysis; flag sustained stagnation — no improvement, or decline, across consecutive cycles relative to the baseline — at the level of specific critical elements and audit areas, not aggregate EI alone.	PA-RAST (directly or through an Ad hoc Group)	Second to third quarter

Step	Activity	Responsible	Indicative timing
5	**Identify States needing assistance (Target 4.1).** On the basis of the flagged trends, identify the States, and the specific safety issues, for which assistance is needed. Engagement with identified States is conducted through the NACC and SAM Regional Offices, consistent with the supportive and non-punitive purpose of the mechanism and with the RASG-PA/15 guidance that States retain the ultimate responsibility for corrective action.	PA-RAST (directly or through an Ad hoc Group), with the Regional Offices	Third quarter
6	**Match and facilitate assistance (Target 4.2).** Propose, for each identified State, the most appropriate existing instrument — Regional Office technical assistance, Go-Team missions, Regional Safety Oversight Organizations, or regional cooperation mechanisms — and initiate coordination.	NACC and SAM Regional Offices	Third to fourth quarter, continuing
7	**Report.** Present the consolidated report — indicator trends, States identified, and assistance actions facilitated — to the next ESC meeting; review in full at the RASG-PA Plenary; reflect results in the RASG-PA Annual Safety Report.	Secretariat and PA-RAST (directly or through an Ad hoc Group)	Next scheduled ESC meeting; annual Plenary and Annual Safety Report
8	**Feedback.** Direct root-cause findings and emerging-issue information, including through the ICAO Secure Portal on Operational Safety Risks and Emerging Issues (Target 4.3), into the next revision cycle of the NACC Regional Aviation Safety Plan and the SAMSP, and into the Step 1 core-set review of the following cycle.	PA-RAST (directly or through an Ad hoc Group) and Regional Offices	Cycle end

2. By way of hypothetical illustration: the indicator for qualified technical personnel in aerodromes (CE-4/AGA) shows no improvement across two consecutive cycles for a given State, while the Region's aggregate trend improves. Under Step 4, the stagnation is flagged at the CE/AA level. Under Step 5, the State is identified as needing assistance for that specific issue, and the corresponding Regional Office initiates contact. Under Step 6, a Go-Team mission with an AGA focus is proposed as the assistance instrument. Under Step 7, the identification and the assistance action are reported to the ESC and reflected in the Annual Safety Report. Under Step 8, the finding informs the AGA-related content of the next RASP revision.

— END —