International Civil Aviation Organization
North American, Central American and Caribbean Office

WORKING PAPER

SSP/WG/6 — WP/02
02/10/26

Sixth State Safety Programme Working Group Meeting for the NAM/CAR Regions (SSP/WG/6)
Mexico City, Mexico, 6 to 8 October 2026

Agenda Item 7: **Future Initiatives to Accelerate NASP Development and Updates in Alignment with the Latest GASP Revision**

INTEGRATION OF THE NATIONAL AVIATION SAFETY PLAN (NASP) INTO INSTITUTIONAL STRATEGIC AND OPERATIONAL PLANNING: THE EXPERIENCE OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

(Presented by the Dominican Republic)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This working paper presents the experience of the Dominican Republic in integrating its National Aviation Safety Plan (NASP), known nationally as the National Strategic Aviation Safety Plan (PENSO) 2025–2028, into institutional strategic and operational planning. The review shows a clear integration of the NASP with the Institutional Strategic Plan (PEI) and the Annual Operational Plans (POAs) of the Dominican Civil Aviation Institute (IDAC), as well as a substantive linkage with components of the strategic plans of the Civil Aviation Board (JAC) and the Aircraft Accident Investigation Commission (CIAA) in matters falling within their respective areas of responsibility. It also identifies areas for improvement regarding inter-institutional traceability, indicator alignment, coordination with resources and procurement, and change control among planning instruments governed by different authorities and timelines. This experience provides a practical basis for regional exchanges on mechanisms for integrating the NASP into national planning systems.

Action:	Suggested actions are presented in Section 4.
Strategic Objectives:	• Safety
References:	• Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) 2026-2028 • *Manual on the Development of Regional and National Aviation Safety Plans* (Doc 10131), Third Edition • Annex 19 — *Safety Management* • National Strategic Aviation Safety Plan (PENSO) 2025-2028, the NASP of the Dominican Republic

1. Introduction

1.1 ICAO uses the National Aviation Safety Plan (NASP) as an instrument for setting out the State's strategic direction for aviation safety over a specified period. In the Dominican Republic, the NASP for the 2025–2028 period is known as the National Strategic Aviation Safety Plan (PENSO). Hereinafter, this working paper uses the common term NASP.

1.2 The Dominican Republic's NASP expressly provides for its alignment with the Institutional Strategic Plan (PEI) of the Dominican Civil Aviation Institute (IDAC) and requires that the actions contained in its roadmaps be operationalized through the Annual Operational Plan (POA) of the responsible entities. The NASP has a national, multi-stakeholder scope, while the PEI and POA are the primary instruments for translating these priorities into institutional management.

1.3 In a logical sequence, the NASP defines national aviation safety priorities; the PEI incorporates them into institutional outcomes; the POA translates them into annual outputs and activities; and the Annual Procurement and Contracting Plan (PACC) provides the resources necessary for their implementation. The Dominican Republic's experience demonstrates that this chain can be established even when the instruments are governed by different authorities, regulatory frameworks, and administrative timelines.

1.4 This coordination has been developed among instruments governed by different authorities, responsibilities and formulation cycles. The NASP is framed by ICAO's international guidance and, in the Dominican Republic, is led and maintained by IDAC in coordination with the other SSP stakeholders, covering a four-year period (2025–2028). The PEIs also cover a four-year period (2025–2028), form part of the national public planning system and fall under the authority of the Ministry of Finance and Economy. Institutional POAs likewise follow national planning guidelines; however, they are formulated annually and are also subject to the guidelines of the Ministry of Finance and Economy. The Annual Procurement and Contracting Plans (PACC) of each institution fall under the authority of the Directorate General of Public Procurement (DGCP) and are prepared annually with the participation of each institution's planning units. The coexistence of these governing authorities and planning cycles has required sustained coordination efforts to maintain continuity among aviation safety planning, institutional planning, and procurement and contracting programming.

2. Integration of the NASP into Institutional and Operational Planning

2.1 The review shows clear integration between the NASP and IDAC's 2025–2028 Institutional Strategic Plan (PEI). The strategic pillars, strategic objectives, specific objectives, and expected outcomes related to aviation safety are aligned with the institutional strategic framework. This relationship is also reflected in indicators and targets associated with areas such as the effective implementation of the USOAP/CMA, the effectiveness of the SSP and the reduction of accident rates.

2.2 The NASP complements this strategic framework through initiatives and actions to which responsible entities and implementation timeframes are assigned. A comparison with the 2025 and 2026 POAs identified links between the actions envisaged in the NASP and the activities incorporated into IDAC's operational planning. At the same time, the structure of the PEI is carried through and reflected in the POAs, particularly at the levels of strategic pillars and outcomes, enabling strategic priorities to be implemented through annual outputs, indicators, targets, responsible parties and activities.

2.3 Given its national scope, implementation of the NASP also encompasses responsibilities assigned to the Civil Aviation Board (JAC), including the Aircraft Accident Investigation Commission (CIAA), which forms part of its institutional structure. The areas in which the NASP assigns responsibilities to the JAC/CIAA include updating the Civil Aviation Law, establishing the institutional conditions necessary for accident investigations, ensuring the availability and competency of technical personnel, and managing internationally required aviation safety information. The JAC's 2025–2028 Institutional Strategic Plan incorporates the CIAA's strategic framework, with the objective of contributing to aviation safety through the investigation of accidents and serious incidents, and the issuance of recommendations intended to prevent their recurrence. A substantive linkage can therefore be observed between the NASP and components of JAC/CIAA's strategic planning.

3. Areas for Improvement

3.1 In terms of performance measurement, the strategic alignment between the NASP and IDAC's PEI is broader than the direct equivalence of their indicators and targets. It would be advisable to determine which NASP indicators require direct counterparts in institutional planning and which may remain subject to NASP-specific monitoring mechanisms. This distinction would help maintain consistency in national monitoring without creating unnecessary duplication.

3.2 Continuity among operational planning, resources, procurement and contracting also requires greater formalization. The PACCs reviewed did not contain a common field that would systematically link each POA activity to the procurement or contracting action supporting it. A common identifier or controlled cross-reference matrix could link a PACC procurement or contracting action to a POA operational activity, which would be linked to a PEI institutional strategy that, in turn, contributes to a NASP target or initiative.

3.3 The different timelines for formulation, approval and updating make change control particularly important. When a modification to any of the plans affects responsibilities, targets, initiatives or timeframes already incorporated into approved instruments, its impact on the other plans should be assessed in a coordinated manner and, where appropriate, the entire planning framework should be updated.

3.4 In the case of the JAC/CIAA, although links can be observed between its PEI and the responsibilities assigned to it under the NASP, these relationships are not identified through references that allow each NASP initiative or action to be traced to its corresponding institutional outcome, output or activity. This traceability should be strengthened, particularly for actions related to the availability of budgetary resources for accident investigations; the determination of technical personnel requirements; recruitment, training and retention; and contributions to updating the legal framework.

3.5 The review of the PEIs of other institutions and key stakeholders involved in the NASP did not identify any explicit linkage between those instruments and the NASP. Some of these stakeholders have inter-institutional coordination mechanisms in place; however, these mechanisms are not integrated into the planning chain. This does not imply that all such PEIs should replicate the NASP. Rather, the area for improvement lies in determining which actions are necessary to link their planning processes to the NASP.

4. Suggested Actions

4.1 The Working Group is invited to:

a) take note of the experience of the Dominican Republic and the progress achieved in integrating the NASP into institutional and operational planning;
b) invite States to share the mechanisms used to allocate and trace NASP responsibilities among participating institutions, as well as to align them with annual planning, resource allocation and procurement, where applicable; and
c) consider including in the NAM/CAR/SSP/WG work programme the exchange or development of a voluntary traceability matrix and practical guidance on inter-institutional coordination, alignment among planning instruments and change control, adaptable to the different administrative frameworks of States.

— END —