Thirty Seventh Regional Aviation Safety Group — Pan America Executive Steering Committee Meeting by Teleconference (RASG-PA ESC/37)

Mexico City, 25 & 26 May 2022

Summary of discussions

Date	25 & 26 May 2022
Venue	Mexico City
Opening	The Meeting was attended by 35 participants from 7 States and 8 International Organizations and industry (see A**ppendix A**). Messrs. Fabio Rabbani, Regional Director of the SAM Regional Office, and Melvin Cintron, Regional Director of the NACC Regional Office, welcomed the participants and mentioned the importance and relevance of being able to meet again in person since the beginning of the pandemic of the Covid-19. They also mentioned that the RASG-PA continues to evolve and gain greater relevance for the resolution of safety issues in the Region. Messrs. Wagner de Souza (Brazil), Co-Chair representing the States, and Javier Vanegas (CANSO), Co-Chair representing the Industry and International Organizations, welcomed the participants and agreed that the future of RASG -PA is promising, and they also highlighted that the agenda contains various safety-related projects. Mr. Rabbani served as Secretary of the Meeting and was assisted by Mr. Javier Puente, Regional Safety Implementation Officer of the SAM Regional Office and the NACC Regional Office participants.
Agenda Items	**Approval of the provisional agenda** In accordance with WP/01, the Meeting approved the agenda and tentative work program for the Meeting.
Agenda Item 1:	**Items related to RASG-PA's internal operation** ***Safety Monitoring and Reporting Team report (SMRT)*** 1.1 Under WP/02, the SMRT coordinator provided an update on the development of their deliverables. He mentioned that the Annual Safety Report (ASR), which contains data from 2021, was in its last review phase and that it would be distributed to the RASG-PA Executive Steering Committee (ESC) in the coming weeks, through the fast-track mechanism, to collect feedback from members. 1.2 The update of the RASG-PA Dashboard was presented with data provided by the NACC and SAM Regional Offices, corresponding to the first quarter of 2022. The Secretariat, through NI/01, reported on the procedure to access the RASG-PA Dashboard -PA, through the ICAO Secure Portal. ***Pan America – Regional Aviation Safety Team report (PA-RAST)*** 1.3 Under WP/03, the PA-RAST Co-Chairmen reported on the results of the PA-RAST/55 Meeting held in Mexico City on May 23 and 24, 2022. They especially highlighted the agreements reached in order to give greater dynamism to the tasks of the team. An ambitious work plan for risk mitigation and timely production of deliverables was agreed to be developed. 1.4 The PA-RAST requested to present an extemporaneous Working Paper to the ESC, after ESC/37 Meeting, that includes all the agreements reached during PA-

RAST/55, as well as the modifications to its structure and operation. This request was approved by the ESC.

1.5 The main aspects that will be included in said Working Paper are the following:

- Incorporation of the figure of Co-Presidents representing the States and the Industry;
- Propose risk mitigation projects not associated with High Risk Categories (HRCs);
- Request for ICAO to act as the Secretariat of the PA-RAST, including the request for the funds required by said change;
- Possibility of having simultaneous interpretation at the PA-RAST meetings, including the request for the funds required by this incorporation;
- Procedure definition for the implementation of Collaborative Operational Safety Teams (CSTs);
- Amendments to the RASG-PA Procedural Manual to include the proposed modifications.

Agenda Item 2:

Agenda Item 2: Safety management process within RASG-PA

NACC SSP Implementation Improvement Project

2.1 Under WP/4 a project to support CAR Region States in the effective implementation of the State Safety Program (SSP) was proposed, based on the NACC Regional SSP Implementation Strategy.

2.2 Regarding the NACC Project Proposal for the Implementation of the SSP, the meeting agreed to approve the Project and formulated the following Conclusion:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">CONCLUSION
RASG-PA ESC/37/C1 CAR REGION SSP IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">What:
That, in order to enhance the implementation of effective SSP among the CAR States, the Meeting approves the SSP Implementation Project described in Appendix B of this report.

How much: (35,500 USD)</td><td>Expected impact:
☐ Political / Global
☐ Inter-regional
☒ Economic
☐ Environmental
☒ Operational/Technical</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Why:
To provide technical assistance and guidance to States for the implementation of an effective SSP</td></tr>
<tr><td>When: Immediate</td><td colspan="2">Status: ☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed</td></tr>
<tr><td>Who: ICAO NACC Office</td><td colspan="2">Marcelo Orellana, Regional NACC Officer, Safety Implementation</td></tr>
</table>

Criteria for the evaluation of project proposals to be funded by RASG-PA funds

2.3 Reflecting from the discussion on Project proposal review and approval, the meeting identified that certain aspects related to the use of RASG-PA resources,

especially the need to define certain criteria for the analysis of requests and the prioritization of allocation of resources, needed to be defined.

2.4 As such the ESC members commented on some considerations regarding the use of RASG-PA financial resources. They noted that it is a positive sign that different RASG-PA members and teams are submitting requests for funds for supporting Safety enhancement in the region.

2.5 It was indicated, however, that it was important to remember that such requests must be related to activities that have a direct impact on safety and not activities that deal exclusively with compliance issues, for which the NACC and SAM Regional Offices have other funding sources.

2.6 The decision-making role of the Executive Committee (ESC) on issues related to the use of RASG-PA resources was also highlighted, and it was emphasized that all requests must contain the information required by the Policy for the Mobilization of Financial Resources of the RASG-PA, as well as sufficient detail to identify the impact the proposed activity would have on the RASG-PA KPIs.

2.7 It was agreed on the need to define the conditions and criteria that should be taken into account by the ESC when evaluating the requests for resources. After an interesting debate and exchange, the Meeting agreed on the following aspects:

a) RASG-PA resources from donors make up a single budget, whose administrative management is the responsibility of the RASG-PA Secretariat in a coordinated matter between NACC and SAM Regional Offices, but whose use and execution is the responsibility of the ESC, following the RASG-PA Procedural Manual and the Policy for the Mobilization of Financial Resources.

b) Once a Project Proposal is approved by the ESC, the execution of the resources is subject to ICAO administrative procedures. The NACC and SAM Regional Offices will coordinate internally to ensure that the approved resources are available for execution where appropriate.

c) Defined conditions and criteria are required for the consideration, evaluation and prioritization of requests for financial resources.

d) All applications must be directly aligned with the RASG-PA mission and have a direct relationship to its Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).

e) The ESC will not approve the mobilization of resources beyond the ESC/37 Meeting, until there is an approved criteria on this matter.

2.8 In this sense, the Meeting agreed on the following Decision:

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">DECISION RASG-PA ESC/37/D1</th><th colspan="2">CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF PROJECT PROPOSALS TO BE FUNDED BY RASG-PA FUNDS</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">What:
In order to provide the ESC with guidelines for the consideration, evaluation, prioritization and approval/rejection of requests for financial resources, an AD-HOC group draft a "Criteria for the evaluation of requests for RASG-PA funds" to be approved by the ESC.</td><td>Expected impact:
☐ Political / Global
☐ Inter-regional
☐ Economic
☐ Environmental
☒ Operational/Tech.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Why: To have a uniform criteria for the evaluation of RASG-PA Project Proposals.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">When: 30 August 2022.</td><td colspan="2">Status: Valid</td></tr>
</table>

Who:	ESC Adhoc Group: CANSO and US	Javier Vanegas Warren Randolph

NACC AIG Turnkey Project

2.9 Under WP/04, the Secretariat presented a project aimed at supporting Mexico and the States of Central America and the Caribbean, in the implementation of the requirements related to the investigation of aviation accidents and incidents.

2.10 After the meeting exchange and analysis, and noting the availability of other funds to support this AIG Proposal, the Meeting agreed that RASG-PA would not allocate RASG-PA resources to that project at this time.

NACC Project for the implementation of PBN on a visual runway

2.11 Under WP/06, a Project proposal for the implementation of PBN in a visual runway in the CAR Region was presented. The Meeting recalled that this proposal was commented in the previous RASG-PA ESC Meeting. The proposal was formulated following the lessons learned from the experience in the SAM Region, to test the inferences and lessons learned of PBN on visual runways.

2.12 The meeting commented on the positive results of the implementation of the project in SAM and the possibilities and benefits that this type of initiative offers to the different States of the Region. Several members expressed their support for this project proposal. As such, the meeting agreed on the following Conclusion:

CONCLUSION RASG-PA ESC/37/C2	**ENHANCED VISUAL TO PBN PROJECT IN THE CAR REGION**
What: That, in order to enhance the results and outcomes of the previous "Visual to PBN" Project deployed in the SAM Region, the RASG-PA approves the deployment of an enhanced Project in a CAR Region following the support by Mexico, the ICAO NACC Regional Office: a) coordinate with the "Visual to PBN" SAM Project on conducting a similar deployment of the Project but including the lessons learned and best practices observed up to present; b) work with industry partners and Mexico on the best airport for the deployment of the CAR Project; and c) report to the RASG-PA/12 Plenary on the planning and progress on the Project deployment	**Expected impact:** ☐ Political / Global ☐ Inter-regional ☐ Economic ☐ Environmental ☒ Operational/Technical
Why: To support the amendment of ICAO Assembly Resolution A37-11 to incorporate "visual runways with commercial operations" into the targets of the resolution	
When: Project Approval: Immediate Item c) RASG-PA/12	**Status:** ☒ Valid / ☐ Superseded / ☐ Completed
Who: Mexico NACC RO	Mrs. Sereya Schotborgh

CAR & SAM RST Implementation project

2.13 Under WP/7, the Secretariat presented the project proposal aimed to implement and strengthen various Runway Safety Teams (RST) in the CAR and SAM Regions by 2025.

2.14 In general, the project received the support of the members of the ESC. During the exchange, the importance of defining the selection criteria of the aerodromes where it is planned to implement the RSTs was commented on. The importance of having a mechanism for measuring the effectiveness of RSTs once they are implemented was also highlighted.

2.15 In this regard, it was pointed out that the project will help identify best practices, and that, in relation to the RASG-PA KPIs, it is expected to achieve a reduction in the total number of occurrences, as well as increase the number and percentage of aerodromes with RST.

2.16 Finally, the Meeting agreed on the following Conclusion:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">CONCLUSION
RASG-PA ESC/37/C3</td><td colspan="2">RST IMPLEMENTATION IN CAR AND SAM REGIONS</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">What:
Support the CAR and SAM RST Implementation Project according to the Appendix C of this report and approve the funds requested for phases 0 and 1 of the project.
How much: USD 15,000 for year 1 (Phases 0 and 1)</td><td>Expected impact:
☐ Political / Global
☒ Inter-regional
☐ Economic
☐ Environmental
☒ Operational/Tech.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Why: Take actions to promote the identification and mitigation of risks related to runway safety at selected international CAR & SAM aerodromes, in response to the Project Mandate (Conclusions RASG-PA ESC/36/C1 and RASG-PA11/C5/2021), RASG- PA Goals.</td></tr>
<tr><td>When:</td><td>Report Results to RASG-PA/13 Meeting</td><td colspan="2">Status: Valid</td></tr>
<tr><td>Who:</td><td>NACC RO
SAM RO</td><td colspan="2">Fabiana Tedesco
Fabio Salvatierra</td></tr>
</table>

IATA/ICAO CFIT DIP Support Project

2.17 Under WP/8 the Secretariat show the data on the number of Ground Proximity Warnings is very high in Latin America. IATA has developed a Deep Implementation Plan whose implementation will be in charge of IATA and ICAO.

2.18 The project is divided into 2 phases. The first consists of collecting information, and the second consists of the preparation and execution of an action plan.

2.19 This project complements the activities that PA-RAST is carrying out on CFIT.

2.20 The project received the support of the meeting and have the following conclusion formulated:

CONSLUSION ***IATA/ICAO CFIT DIP SUPPORT PROJECT SUPPORT*** **RASG-PA ESC/37/C4**	
What: That IATA and ICAO complete the baseline measurement described in Phase I on CFIT/GPWS by the end of 2022.	**Expected impact:** ☐ Political / Global ☒ Inter-regional ☐ Economic ☐ Environmental ☒ Operational/Tech.
Why: To reduce the risk of CFIT accidents, by reducing GPWS activations.	
When: Report progress to RASG-PA/12 Meeting	**Status:** Valid
Who: NACC and SAM Regional Offices IATA	NACC/RO: Sereya Schotborgh SAM RO: Javier Puente IATA: Fernando Rojas

NACC/SAM Language proficiency project

2.21 Under WP/09, the Secretariat explained the objective of the project Proposal to implement an efficient and sustainable strategy to improve language proficiency in air traffic services in the Pan-American region, identifying those States that could represent the greatest risk in terms of safety.

2.22 After receiving a detailed explanation about the project, the meeting commented on the differences between performance-based safety projects and those based on compliance, and which projects should be managed by the Regional Offices and which by the RASG-PA.

2.23 It was also commented that although this project has an important safety component, and that currently the low levels of language proficiency in the Region represent a risk for air operations, the proposal could benefit from additional data to support the requirement. To do this, the ESC determined that PA-RAST could contribute to the project with a data-based analysis, and based on that exercise, make a recommendation to the ESC. In this sense, the following Decision was approved:

DECISION **NACC/SAM ATS LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY PROJECT** **RASG-PA ESC/37/D2**	
What: In order to identify the level of risk for air operations of the language proficiency in the Pan-American Region, that the PA-RAST: a) conducts a review of the Project Proposal providing additional data to support the requirement and b) presents its assessment review to the RASG-PA Plenary/12.	**Expected impact:** ☐ Political / Global ☒ Inter-regional ☐ Economic ☐ Environmental ☒ Operational/Tech.
Why: To reduce the risk of accidents caused by deficiencies in linguistic competence.	
When: December 31, 2022.	**Status:** Valid
Who: PA-RAST	Gerardo Hueto/Santiago Saltos/Michael Roy

Valley of Mexico TCA´s Analysis

2.24 Under WP/11, the Secretariat shared a project Proposal to identify and implement risk mitigation actions against the progressive degradation of operational safety in the Control Area (CTA) of the Valley of Mexico.

2.25 The comments of the meeting were mainly focused on the role of Mexico in solving/leading the solution to the problem, and particularly on the multiple approaches to resolve or mitigate this risk situation.

2.26 The possibility of submitting the data to PA-RAST for a complementary analysis of the data was suggested. In this regard, the representatives of PA-RAST stated that the data exists, and that PA-RAST has the best intention of supporting it, but unfortunately the State has not responded adequately.

2.27 Mention was made of the importance of concentrating efforts to avoid duplication of efforts and the uncontrolled and uncoordinated proliferation of mitigation actions.

2.28 It was finally agreed that, based on the available data, the PA-RAST would prepare a report for the ESC with the background and its recommendations on the possible mitigation actions, formulating the following Decision:

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">CONCLUSION VALLEY OF MEXICO TCA RISK MITIGATION
RASG-PA ESC/37/C5</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">What:
In order to support with the data and analysis of the safety issues reported in the operational safety in the Control Area (CTA) of the Valley of Mexico, the PA-RAST conducts its analysis and develop a report for the ESC with the background and its recommendations on the possible mitigation by July 30.</td><td>Expected impact:
☐ Political / Global
☒ Inter-regional
☐ Economic
☐ Environmental
☒ Operational/Tech.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Why: To assist in the mitigation and improvement of the operational safety in the Control Area (CTA) of the Valley of Mexico.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">When: July 30, 2022.</td><td>Status: Valid</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Who: PA-RAST</td><td>Gerardo Hueto/Santiago Saltos/Michael Roy</td></tr>
</table>

Status of active RASG-PA Projects

"Visual to PBN" Project in the SAM Region

2.29 Under IP/03, the Secretariat reported on the conclusion of the "Visual to PBN" project in Colombia, and showed the encouraging results obtained. IP/03 contains details on the changes achieved in various safety KPIs. Likewise, the presentation with the summary of the project and the results is available on the website of the ESC/37 meeting.

2.30 The meeting expressed its satisfaction with the results of the project and thanked all those who collaborated with its implementation.

FDAP Project

2.31 It was reported that the Flight Data Analysis Project (FDAP) had also been completed, but that the publication of the Amendment to Annex 6 Part I, where it is incorporated, will take place in 2024.

2.32 Given the repeated postponements related to the treatment and incorporation of the amendment, the Secretariat should conduct the corresponding efforts so that ICAO guarantees that the dates of incorporation (2024) and effectiveness (2026) of the amendment are maintained and are not subject to further modifications.

2.33 In this sense, the RASG-PA should communicate its dissatisfaction to the ICAO Council, in relation to the excessive delay in the treatment of this proposal, and the impossibility, up to now, of seeing the incorporation of the amendment materialized in the Annex. 6.

Agenda Item 3:

Coordinación RASG-PA/GREPECAS

Reunión plenaria consecutiva de RASG-PA y GREPECAS

3.1 Under WP/04, the meeting was informed that the 2022 Consecutive RASG-PA/GREPECAS meetings will be held in the City of Salvador Bahia, Brazil as follows:

a) Twelfth Plenary Meeting of the Regional Aviation Safety Group – Pan America (RASG-PA/12)
Salvador, Bahia, Brazil, November 14 – 15, 2022

b) Second Joint Meeting GREPECAS-RASG-PA
Salvador, Bahia, Brazil, November 15, 2022 (1:00 p.m. local time)

c) Twentieth Meeting of the Regional Group for Planning and Execution of the Caribbean and South America (GREPECAS/20)
Salvador*, Bahia, Brazil, November 16 – 18, 2022*

Agenda Item 4:

Other Businesses

RASG-PA Financial Statement

4.1 Under IP/06, the Meeting took note of the updated financial statement of RASG-PA presented by the Secretariat.

- - - - - - - - - -

Appendix A – List of participants

Thirty Seventh Regional Aviation Safety Group — Pan America Executive Steering Committee Meeting
Trigésimo Séptima Reunión del Comité Directivo Ejecutivo del Grupo Regional de Seguridad Operacional de la Aviación — Panamérica
(RASG-PA ESC/37)
Mexico City, Mexico, 25 to 26 May 2022 / Ciudad de México, México, 25 al 26 de mayo de 2022

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

ARUBA

1. Anthony Kirchner

BRAZIL/BRASIL

2. Wagner de Souza
3. Jorge Ávila

CANADA/CANADÁ

4. Andrew Larsen

CHILE

5. César A. Mc-Namara

COLOMBIA

6. Francisco Ospina

MEXICO/MÉXICO

7. Leonardo Martínez
8. Sandra Carrera
9. Diego Rivera
10. Pablo Carranza

PANAMA/PANAMÁ

11. Aixa Alvarado
12. Ivette Iturrado

UNITED STATES/ESTADOS UNIDOS

13. Nicholas Reyes
14. Warren Randolph
15. Gerardo Hueto
16. Michelle Westover

ACI-LAC

17. María Elena Sandoval

AIRBUS

18. Rudy Quevedo
19. Santiago Saltos

ATR

20. Géraud De Rivals-Mazeres

BOEING

21. Kalan Guiley
22. Fabio Catani
23. Mike Snover

CANSO

24. Javier Vanegas

EMBRAER

25. Paulo Manoel Razaboni

IATA

26. José Antonio Ruiz
27. Floyd Abang

IFALPA

28. Heriberto Salazar

ICAO/OACI

29. Melvin Cintron
30. Fabio Rabbani
31. Julio Siu
32. Javier Puente
33. Marcelo Orellana
34. Sereya Schotborgh
35. Ernie Snyder

APPENDIX - B

Project Name:	SSP Implementation in the CAR Region		
Date:	06/04/2022	**Area of interest:** Other	Version: 0
Author:	ICAO NACC/ RO		
Project Sponsor:	RASG-PA ESC		
Senior User:			
Client:	CAR States		
Document ID:	SAFETY-SSP 2022-01		
Document link:			

Note: This document is only valid on the day it was printed

1. Executive Summary

Based on the GASP, States are urged to develop their safety oversight capabilities and implement and their safety management, collectively implemented through an SSP. One of the key goal of the GASP is Goal 3 aimed at individual States and calls for the implementation of effective SSPs.

Since 2019, the NAM/CAR regions adopted a regional implementation Strategy based on the status of progress shown in the SSP foundation PQs. The Strategy was approved for implementation by all NACC DGs by the conclusion NACC/DCA/7/6 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NACC SSP STRATEGY. In the CAR Region a limited or lack of effective SSP implementation has been identified, which has delayed more its implementation due to the COVID-19 Pandemic impact.

With the advancement of the normalization process in air operations, the ICAO NACC office proposes a SSP implementation Project to resume the follow-up of those states that, due to their score according to the "SSP Foundation", are positioned at a compliance percentage of 95% compliance or more (TIER 1) shall be the focused of assistance in 2022 with the support of the SSP Champion States of Canada, as well on the other SSP updates to all other TIER States, including the documentation revision and guidance documentation target and key for the deployment of an effective SSP.

2. Problem / Opportunity Statement

What problems are we addressing or opportunity are we pursuing?

Limited and lack of effective implementing the SSP among the CAR States

3. Business Option

Analysis and reasoned recommendation for the base business options of: do nothing, do the minimal or do something.

a. Do Nothing: States will remain longer without the capacity to respond to safety matters in a timely and risk-based manner.

b. Do the minimal: The minimum will slower the state's progress to get the capacity to respond to safety matters and improve the overall safety within the state, which also affects the region's progress toward implementing the regional safety plan which requires a systemic approach for creating an integral Safety Management framework.

c. Do something: States to be more proactive and capable to face safety matters in timely and adequate manner, improving the overall safety within the state and collaborating with other states in the region.

4. Expected Benefits

The benefits that the project will deliver expressed in measurable terms against the situation as it exists prior to the project.

A well-implemented SSP is an effective tool for the states to improve their safety levels in a systematic and coordinated manner, establishing the parameters and conditions for the continuous improvement

Main Benefits:

- timely identification of the national safety risks and their mitigation
- Increase in effective implementation of ICAO SARPs
- Better EI scores on ICAO USOAP activities
- Better communication between stakeholders
- Increase overall safety

5. Expected Detriments

Outcomes perceived as negative by one or more stakeholders. Dis-benefits are actual consequences of an activity whereas, by definition, a risk has some uncertainty about whether it will materialize.

The lack of an appropriate SSP implementation can cause a waste of resources and possible stagnation of safety

6. Project Objectives

Objectives are statements that specifically describe what is to be achieved within the project's mandate in order to meet the overall project goal. Wherever possible, objectives should be quantified and "SMART" (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-Based).

The main objective of the project at its final phase, is to reach the goal of establishing and implementing the SSP in the states of the CAR region complying with a required qualification in accordance with the "SSP foundation" by 2025:

- SSP implemented following ICAO guidance
- To foster the identification of National safety risks and their mitigation

7. Scope Statement / Project deliverables

Defines what is being produced. Deliverables relate to, and satisfy, the specific project requirements or capabilities. Deliverables must cross-reference and satisfy the project's objectives.

The current Project is formulated for its implementation from 2022 to 2023 as an initial phase. The scope of this will be for complying with a required qualification in accordance with the "SSP foundation" in the CAR Region and the NACC Regional Implementation Strategy for SSP. The main Project deliverables will be:

- SSP Policy document completely developed by at least 10% CAR States
- Develop an Implementation Team on SSP implementation for the Spanish and another for the English CAR States
- Increase on SSP implementation – GAP Analysis of the CAR States by at least 20% by Mid 2023
- Establishment of the guidance for a safety data collection and analysis system

8. Critical Success Factors

Defines what is needed as necessary conditions for project success.

- Champion State support for ex. Canada
- High-level engagement and commitment from the different Stakeholders
- Commitment by State Focal Point thru the entire project- NACC SSP Implementation Group
- RASG-PA support (dashboard, data, funding)

9. Budget / Costs / Funding

Source and funding amount (whether annual or in total) not be exceeded.

The project is proposed to be funded by: RASG-PA, State's own resources and the MCAAP Project. In this regard the Project Proposal for RASG-PA is for an estimated total request of US$35,500, detailed as follows:

Activity	Notes	Potential direct cost (USD)
1. Workshop on SSP Implementation- lessons learned- focused on TIER 2 and Tier 3 States	Review of GAP Foundation and GAP Analysis Data for updates and revision of Regional Strategy Updates and raise awareness of SSP concepts and implementation approach	2 SMEs to support the workshop together with NACC SAF/RO at NACC RO facilities for three days workshop- estimate: USD $7,000 (SMEs -DSA and tickets and interpretation services) 3 Quarter 2022
2. Updates to NACC SSP implementation Strategy	In conjunction with the state and in close coordination with the NACC office, an update shall be developed and presented to the NACCDCA Meeting in June 2022	Virtual coordination and updates May- June 2022
3. Onsite Technical Assistance Missions to 2 TIER 1 States in 2022 and 2 TIER 2 States in 2023	Share and complete implementation gaps for SSP implementation in one English and one Spanish CAR States, supported by Champ State SME and other SSP Implementation Team members	1 SME and ICAO SAF/RO for a three day on site mission- estimate per mission: US$ 6,000 Total: US$ 24.000 for 2022 and 2023 (mid)
4. provide virtual support and guidance for the development/ improvement of the SSP documentation	The SME will provide the respective guidance to the state in order to comply with the targeted tasks and dates.	Champ State SME and SSP Implementation Team– virtual sessions – interpretation services as needed- estimate: US $2,000 Through the Project duration

Activity	Notes	Potential direct cost (USD)
5. development/establishment of a safety data collection and analysis system	the SME in coordination with the NACC office will provide guidance to the state in order to develop/establish a safety data collection and analysis system	Champion State SME and SSP Implementation Team– virtual sessions – interpretation services as needed- estimate: $2,500

10. Stakeholder / Communications Plan

*Identifies the key individuals or organizations that have a clear **stake** in the project's success. Who is impacted by the project, and how should they be involved?*

Key Individuals/Organizations:	Specific Needs/Concerns:	Actions/Means/Frequency of Communication
RASG-PA ESC/NACC SSP Implementation Group	Follow-up / Decision making	WP on ESC meetings Dashboard/ GAP Analysis
NACC RO/SAF 1	Follow-up	BiMonthly reports Email Dashboard/ GAP Analysis
NACC SSP Focal points/ PoC	Follow-up / Action	meetings Dashboard/ GAP Analysis Email
Involved Stakeholders (state authorities and organizations)	Follow-up	Dashboard/ GAP Analysis

11. High Level Milestone/Stages Schedule

Identification of the major project phases and when they will be completed

#	Major Project Phases / Milestones	Completion Date
1	SSP GAP Analysis and SSP updates- collected from State response	May-2022
2	Updated NACC SSP Implementation Strategy	June 2022
3	SSP Workshop and SSP Group Meeting	Aug/Sept 2022
4	Onsite Technical Implementation Missions to 2 TIER 1 States	Sep- Dec 2022
5	Onsite Technical Implementation Missions to 2 TIER 2 States	February/April 2023
6	SSP Documentation revision	Aug-April 2023
7	Guidance on safety data collection and analysis system	Feb/ May 2023
8	Project Planning next phase	May 2023

State Safety Programme (SSP) Implementation					SSP FOUNDATION SCORE	10-11 2022	01-02 2023	03-04 2023	05-06 2023	07-08 2023	09-10 2023
state	level 1	level 2	level 3	level 4							
Dominican Republic			90.50%		100	X					
El Salvador	95.20%				100	X					
Nicaragua			61.90%		99.21		X				
Cuba			50%		98.47		X				
Costa Rica		95.20%			93.1			X			
Guatemala			81%		92.75			X			
Honduras		97.60%			92.36				X		
Bahamas	92.90%				89.61				X		
Jamaica		97.60%			87.02					X	
Mexico					83.33					X	
Belize		95.20%			81.96						X
Trinidad and Tobago			7.10%		81.01						X

12. Acceptance Criteria

Identify the quality standards and criteria that apply to the project. Explain how the plan will ensure adherence to these standards and criteria.

- SSP implementations measured via SSPIA protocol questions, GAP analysis progress and RASG-PA Dashboard

13. Risk Management Plan

List of major risks confronting the project. Assessment of severity (H/M/L, or high, medium or low) as determined by (1) probability, and (2) potential impact. For each High risk item, develop appropriate mitigation plans.

#	Major Risks	Assessment	Mitigation
1	Lack of interest	H	*engage the stakeholder of the state in the commitment to comply with the GASP*
2	Lack of funding	M	*Due to the high benefits of this implementation and relative low cost, look to ensure funding from RASG-PA, ICAO Regional Project(or third party interested to support the project)*
3	Low involvement and consultation of other Stakeholders	H	*Foster collaboration between stake holders and high level authorities of the states*

#	Major Risks	Assessment	Mitigation
4	Sharing of sensitive data	M	*Identifying the measures that will be taken to protect data. Stick to safety data only.*

14. Project Team Organization

Who will be involved in managing the project and how will they interface?

Project Sponsor:	**Role:**	**Responsible for:**
RASG-PA ESC	Funding	Follow-up High Level engagement to the project Project mandate
Project Manager:	**Role:**	**Responsible for:**
NACC RO/SAF1)	Deployment coordinator	Manage the project activities and deliverables Reports to RAGSPA/NACC RD/DRD
Team Member:	**Role:**	**Responsible for:**
State assigned SSP focal point/TEAM	Participants	Follow-up project activities under his/her area of responsibility

15. Project Control Procedures

Anticipated processes for monitoring and ensuring work progress, including: Status reporting and frequency, Review meetings (including who and when), Tracking methods and tools

- Follow-up review meetings
- reports
- WP on RASG-PA meetings
- Gap Analysis / GAP foundation/ RASG-PA Dashboard

— — — — — — — — — —

APPENDIX C - RST

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

Project Name:	CAR and SAM RST Implementation Project		
Date:	27/04/2022	**Area of interest:** RS	Version: 1.5
Author:	ICAO NACC/SAM RO		
Project Sponsor:	RASG-PA Plenary		
Senior User:	RASG-PA ESC		
Client:	CAR & SAM States and Selected Airports		
Document ID:	RS-RST-22-001 *(Priority area+Subject+Year+Ref #)*		
Document link:	https://www.icao.int/RASGPA/Pages/MeetingsDocumentation.aspx?m=2022-ESC37		

Note: This document is only valid on the day it was printed

1. Executive Summary

a. Runway safety is still one of the high-risk categories of occurrence that need to be address to mitigate the risk of fatalities in international civil aviation. The Global Aviation Safety Plan in its 2020-2022 edition (GASP Doc 10004) recommends States, Regions and Industry actions to promote the establishment and implementation of State Runway Safety Programmes and local Runway Safety Teams.

b. ICAO Assembly Resolution A37-6 on Runway Safety urged States to take measures to enhance Runway Safety including the establishment of Runway Safety Programmes using Multidisciplinary approach that include at least Regulators, Aircraft Operators, Air Navigation Service Providers, Aerodrome Operators and Aircraft Manufacturers to prevent and mitigate the effects of runway excursions, runway incursions and other occurrences related to runway safety. Considering that, a RST is intrinsically a collaborative process and in order to increase the implementation of local Runway Safety Teams, there is a need of more action and commitment by States and Industry in the implementation of this mechanism. RASG-PA and International Organizations could leverage these efforts, as part of their commitment towards runway safety.

c. On May 2021, RASG-PA ESC Meeting #36 endorsed a conclusion (ESC/36/C1) to support the implementation of RST in Pan America, by collecting data from States to prepare a regional implementation plan. In addition, on November 2021 RASG-PA Plenary endorsed a Conclusion (RASG-PA11/C5/2021) for the identification of States/aerodromes where projects and activities to support

the implementation and maintenance of RST may be carried out, justified based on data in order to prioritize its implementation.

d. The implementation of Runway Safety Teams should follow the ICAO PANS Aerodromes (Doc. 9981) guidance for the prevention of runway incursions, excursions and potential confusion by pilots or vehicle drivers through different strategies. These include procedures for the effective identification of hazards related to runway safety, risk mitigation, coordination and cooperation between different stakeholders, establishment of runway safety action plans and runway safety teams (RSTs), and the collection, sharing and exchange of safety information.

e. Due to the benefit of the establishment of this systemic approach to runway safety at international aerodromes, there is an opportunity by the Region to take more actions to promote the effective implementation of Local RST at all international aerodromes.

f. In this regard, the current project proposal looks to support the establishment of runway safety teams at specific international aerodromes and support the effectiveness of established RST's in the CAR and SAM Regions by 2025, in order to promote the identification of hazards related to runway safety using a collaborative approach, the development and implementation of action plans, collection of data and the promulgation of runway safety information by delivering a mix of activities, including direct technical assistance, a mechanism to ensure stakeholder participation and follow up by monitoring specific indicators.

2. Problem / Opportunity Statement

What problems are we addressing or opportunity are we pursuing?

a. Runway safety (runway excursions/incursions) are still one of the main high-risk categories of occurrence, being Runway Excursions one of the most significant in the PA-Region. According to RASG-PA ASR 11th edition, contributing factors to RE includes safety management (29%), airport facilities (33%) and contaminated runway/taxiway-poor braking action (29%), which are usually addressed under the umbrella of local RST's.

b. *Increase implementation:* Although the implementation of local RST is considered a cost-effective solution to mitigate the occurrence of runway incursions and excursions (and an integral part of the aerodrome's operator's SMS), in the CAR and SAM Regions its implementation is moving at a relative low pace. According to the information gathered by ICAO NACC and SAM Regional Offices, in the CAR Region only 73 out of 146 international aerodromes have a RST implemented, that means 50%. In the SAM Region, current implementation of RST is reported at 33.65%. See **attachment A** for details at the end of this document.

c. *Ensure effectiveness on those implemented:* In addition, some States and aerodrome operators report the implementation of RST, but can't demonstrate that the RST is active and effective, or following ICAO and international recommendations, with tangible results and outcomes to reduce runway safety risks.

d. Considering that, a RST is intrinsically a collaborative process and in order to increase the implementation of local Runway Safety Teams, there is a need of more action and commitment by

States and Industry in the implementation of this mechanism. RASG-PA, International Organizations and Industry could leverage these efforts, as part of their commitment towards runway safety.

3. Business Options

Analysis and reasoned recommendation for the base business options of: do nothing, do the minimal or do something.

a. Do Nothing: States/Airports will remain with safety problems such as runway incursions, excursions and potential confusion by pilots or vehicle drivers, as well as a higher probability of an increase risk due to the increase in the number of operations.

b. Do the minimal: The minimum may alleviate/mitigate the current need for improving Runway Safety, but will not be a systemic approach for creating an integral Safety Management framework at the airports. Regional offices may continue to engage separate efforts to implement RST at their States; Industry may still struggle to participate in most of LRST's, and the support from international organizations and industry partners, including Runway Safety Partners (RSP), will be spread across different efforts (webinars, seminars, direct assistance, runway safety go-teams, etc.) without a clear prioritization and without considering the regional scope.

c. Do something: States/airports to be more proactive and shall identify concerned focal points in each international aerodrome for the implementation of local runway safety. The current Project Proposal aims to have a gradual but systemic approach to States/ Airports to establish, operate and perform an effective Runway Safety Team in support of Collaborative Safety Teams (where available) and the State Safety Programme. This project proposes a direct "hands-on support" and follow-up strategy to support the implementation of RST at selected international aerodromes, starting with those aerodromes with more traffic (more exposure) and/or with data intelligence parameters from RASG-PA.

4. Expected Benefits

The benefits that the project will deliver expressed in measurable terms against the situation as it exists prior to the project.

RSTs have proven highly successful at mitigating the risks of runway incursions and excursions, providing a collaborative solution, which regulators, air, navigation service providers, crews, airline and airport operators have all positively contributed to its implementation. At the end, an improvement in decision making process and actions taken to better mitigate the RS related events should be observed, reflected in the respective performance indicators related to RS.

Main Benefits:

- Reduced runway safety related events (incidents and accidents)
- Reduce incidents related to the following categories: Abnormal runway contact (ARC); Bird impact/ingestion (BIRD); Ground collision (G-COL); Runway excursions (RE); Runway incursions (RI); Loss of control on the ground (LOC-G); Aerodrome deficiencies (ADRM); Ground Handling (RAMP); Wildlife (WILD); Collision with obstacles during takeoffs and landings (CTOL)
- Increase in effective implementation of ICAO SARPs for Runway Safety
- Better EI scores on ICAO USOAP activities
- Better communication between stakeholders

- Promote safety related CAPEX at aerodromes
- Increase of overall safety

5. Expected Detriments

Outcomes perceived as negative by one or more stakeholders. Dis-benefits are actual consequences of an activity whereas, by definition, a risk has some uncertainty about whether it will materialize.

An ineffective RST performance can cause a waste of resources and discourage participants to support and participate. This Project looks to take a close follow-up to avoid this situation and to ensure an effectiveness in the RST performance.

Also as detriment, the stakeholders involved may perceived an increased workload specially if the RST is not effective and properly established and implemented.

6. Project Objectives

Objectives are statements that specifically describe what is to be achieved within the project's mandate in order to meet the overall project goal. Wherever possible, objectives should be quantified and "SMART" (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-Based).

The main objective of the project is to reach the goal of ***"Establishing and implementing effective local RST at selected international aerodromes by 2025"***:

To reach this objective, the following 2 specific objectives are proposed, based on the current situation of RST implementation:

Specific Objective 1: *GROUP 1, Airports without an RST*: Support the implementation of RST, following ICAO guidance, on selected international aerodromes that haven't implemented RST's by YE2025.

Specific Objective 2: *GROUP 2, Airports with RST:* Establish a reporting mechanism and indicators to ensure that already implemented RST's at selected international aerodromes are effective to mitigate runway safety risks by YE2025.

7. Scope Statement / Project deliverables

Defines what is being produced. Deliverables relate to, and satisfy, the specific project requirements or capabilities. Deliverables must cross-reference and satisfy the project's objectives.

Scope Statement:

The scope of this project is for selected international aerodromes in the CAR and SAM Regions. The selection criteria of such aerodromes is to be determined under this project, and will be based on safety data from RASG-PA and ICAO in such a way that those aerodromes are prioritized where it makes more sense to have these teams.

Criteria for selection may include (but not limited to):

- Past occurrences (incidents/accidents related to RS)
- Traffic

- Geographical or other physical problems or gaps (lack of NAVAIDS, runway maintenance or surface issues, non-compliances with SARPs, etc.)
- Reports from industry partners (IATA/IFALPA)
- Reports from PA-RAST

Project Deliverables:

The main Project deliverables* (products) are:

#	Deliverable name	Description
D1	RST implementation plan per State	Implementation plan per State as per agreed milestones (**RASG-PA ESC/35/C1).**
D2	RST Effectiveness mechanism	Monitoring tool (to be determined) to measure RST deliverables to ensure it is active and effective as per ICAO guidance.
D3	Project repository/workplace	Project website to support communications and a repository of best practices and guidance material to support RST implementation.
D4	Runway Safety Go-Teams (reports)	Both virtual and on-site, depending on the identified needs by the project.
D5	Specific training on Runway Safety Teams	Based on ICAO guidance, virtual training for the establishment and effectiveness of RST's.

**Note: other deliverables may be agreed upon after first project iterations and RASG-PA needs.*

8. Critical Success Factors

Defines what is needed as necessary conditions for project success.

- Continuous, high-level engagement and commitment from the different Stakeholders (RASG-PA ESC, State support -DG level, Airport operator support, ANSP support, Air Operator support, etc.)
- Commitment by State Focal Point and Airport Operator Focal Point thru the entire project
- Engagement by involved parties- execution level, including active participation by Focal Point
- RASG-PA support (data, funding)
- State and International organizations support for SMEs. Selection of SMEs
- Successful alignment of RST activities to SMS and SSP

9. Budget / Costs / Funding

Source and funding amount (whether annual or in total) not be exceeded.

The project is proposed to be funded by several sources including but not limiting to: RASG-PA, States own resources, Regional Projects and contributions from States or International Organizations (expertise).

As most of ICAO based projects, State, International Organizations and Industry subject matter experts support on a pro-bono scheme reducing costs to the ones related to missions and document preparation.

Project management and administrative costs are expected to be covered by current known mechanisms of RASG-PA projects.

Project Charter
Project Name: CAR and SAM RST Implementation Project

#	Deliverable name	Activity	Potential direct cost (USD)	Notes
D1	RST implementation plan per State	Virtual Meetings	USD 0.00	Follow up by RASG-PA Secretariat (NACC & SAM RO's) with the support of State's and Airports focal points
D2	RST Effectiveness mechanism	Virtual Meetings	USD 0.00	Prepare, with the support of SME's & Focal points, an instrument to measure the effectiveness of RST
D3	Project repository/workplace	Webpage creation Document compilation	USD 0.00	Programming and webpage hosting is assumed will be covered by current ICAO/RASG-PA hosting. Document compilation by PM's.
D4	Runway Safety Go-Teams (reports)	Virtual RS Go-Teams	USD 0 to 1500 per event*	*If simultaneous interpretation is required in virtual activities and not feasible to be provided by State/airport.
D4	Runway Safety Go-Teams (reports)	Face to Face RS Go-Teams	USD 2600 per SME per 5 day mission	Estimate considerations: - On-site RS Go-Team duration will depend on scope (complexity), State and location. - Budget including tickets (USD 1200 per round trip ticket) and DSA (USD 280 per day per SME) for 5 day mission - Assuming **1** SME's per mission funded by project. Other SME's funded "in kind" by RSPs or by recipient. - Other costs such as meeting room, interpretation (as needed) projector or visual equipment, coffee breaks, etc., not included and supported by Airport/State
D5	Specific training on Runway Safety Teams	Preparation of RST virtual, on-demand training. In English/Spanish	USD 4600	Training preparation by third party (SRVSOP or other to be determined)

In this regard the Project Proposal for RASG-PA is to cover the costs for Training development (Deliverable #5) and four (4) total on-site RS Go-Teams missions, 2 for CAR Region and 2 for SAM Region, for an estimated total of **USD 15,000 for Year 1 (2022).**

10. Stakeholder / Communications Plan

*Identifies the key individuals or organizations that have a clear **stake** in the project's success. Who is impacted by the project, and how should they be involved?*

Key Individuals/Organizations:	Specific Needs/Concerns:	Actions/Means/Frequency of Communication
RASG-PA Plenary	Follow-up	WP on RASG-PA meetings
RASG-PA ESC	Follow-up / Decision making	WP on ESC meetings Website
ICAO Secretariat	Follow-up	Monthly reports Email Website

Project Charter
Project Name: CAR and SAM RST Implementation Project

Key Individuals/Organizations:	Specific Needs/Concerns:	Actions/Means/Frequency of Communication
Focal points from Member States	Follow-up / Action	Monthly meetings Monthly reports Email Website
Involved Stakeholders (airport, ANSP, air operator, CAA)	Follow-up	Website
Donors	Follow-up	WP on ESC meetings Website

11. High Level Milestone/Stages Schedule

Identification of the major project phases and when they will be completed

#	Major Project Phases / Milestones	Completion Date
0	Initiation, Preparation & Design phase - Project documents ready - Begin website preparation - Begin training preparation - RST Effectiveness mechanism	3Q 2022
1	Project Deployment phase 1 – Higher risk airports - 4 Face-to-Face RS Go-Teams (2 in CAR, 2 in SAM) - 4 Virtual RS Go-Teams (2 in CAR, 2 in SAM) - Project review. Target validation	1Q 2023
2	Project Deployment phase 2 – Medium risk airports - Face-to-Face RS Go-Teams (to be determined) - Virtual RS Go-Teams (to be determined) - Project review. Target validation	1Q 2024
3	Project Deployment phase 3 – Lower risk airports - Face-to-Face RS Go-Teams (to be determined) - Virtual RS Go-Teams (to be determined) - Project review. Target validation	3Q 2025
4	Closing phase - Goal and objective validation - Project evaluation and acceptance	YE 2025

12. Acceptance Criteria

Identify the quality standards and criteria that apply to the project. Explain how the plan will ensure adherence to these standards and criteria.

- RST implementations measured via survey (score over 90) and CRACIP status
- Tangible results of the implementation of RST's action plans
- Identification, removal and promulgation of "Hot Spots" at selected aerodromes
- Reduction of runway safety related occurrences

- USOAP CMA Audit results (% of EI of specific PQ)

13. Risk Management Plan

List of major risks confronting the project. Assessment of severity (H/M/L, or high, medium or low) as determined by (1) probability, and (2) potential impact. For each High risk item, develop appropriate mitigation plans.

#	Major Risks	Assessment	Mitigation
1	Lack of interest thru the project	H	*Demonstrate business case to potential sponsor showing benefits that the project may deliver, along with its alignment to Global ICAO provisions* *Ensure an Agile project base approach, to keep project interest and momentum* *Establish a complete communications plan*
2	Lack of funding	H	*Due to the high benefits of this implementation and relative low cost, look to ensure funding from RASG-PA, ICAO Regional Project or third party interested to support the project*
3	Lack of expertise to develop the project	M	*Engage with recognized organization or thru ICAO to get the right people for the task.* *Engagement with Runway Safety Partners (RSP)*
4	States may not participate on the project	H	*Include the project as part of already accepted mechanisms by States (such as RASG-PA & GREPECAS Projects).*
5	Low involvement and consultation of other Stakeholders (airport operator, airlines, pilots, ATC).	H	*Foster collaboration with partners (ACI, IATA, CANSO, IFALPA, IFATCA) to ensure stakeholder active participation.*
6	Sharing of sensitive data	M	*Identifying the measures that will be taken to protect data.* *Stick to safety data only.*
7	Difficulty of participation of Air Operators in all RSTs where they operate	H	*Ensure mechanisms are in place to guarantee stakeholder participation (use of virtual means. Surveys. Etc.)*
8	Duplication of efforts and confusion with Aerodrome SMS, SSP, other efforts (such as CSTs)	H	*Explain the relationship between RST and aerodrome SMS (being RST part of SMS) and its interaction with CSTs (Local RST feed data to CSTs).*

14. Project Team Organization

Who will be involved in managing the project and how will they interface?

Project Sponsor:	**Responsible for:**
RASG-PA Plenary	- Dictates the Project Mandate and assigns the Project Board. - Delegates authority to the Project Board on decisions of the Project
Project Board:	**Responsible for:**

RASG-PA ESC	- Accountable for the success or failure of the project. - Provide unified direction to the project and Project Manager. - Supports the provision of resources and authorize the use of funds for the project. - Provide visible and sustained support for the Project Manager. - Ensure effective communication within the project team and with external stakeholders.
Project Manager:	**Responsible for:**
RASG-PA Secretariat • NACC RO/AGA (CAR Region) • SAM RO/AGA (SAM Region)	- Responsible for the day to day management of the project in behalf of the Project Board
Team Member:	**Responsible for:**
State assigned focal point	Report to PM and follow-up project activities under his/her area of responsibility
SME's for different work packages	Report to PM and follow-up project activities under his/her area of responsibility

15. Project Control Procedures

Anticipated processes for monitoring and ensuring work progress, including: Status reporting and frequency, Review meetings (including who and when), Tracking methods and tools

- Monthly review meetings
- Monthly reports
- WP on RASG-PA ESC and Plenary meetings
- Website and email exchange (dashboards, etc.)

— — — — — — — — — —

Project Charter
Project Name: CAR and SAM RST Implementation Project

Attachment A

ICAO NACC Regional Office list of Runway Safety Teams* at International Aerodromes**

State	No. of Selected Intl. aerodromes from CAR/SAM ANP Vol. II	RST Implemented*	% RST implemented in the State
Antigua and Barbuda	1	1	100
Bahamas	2	0	0
Barbados	1	1	100
Belize	1	1	100
Costa Rica	1	0	0
Cuba	10	5	50
Dominica	1	0	0
Dominican Republic	8	4	50
El Salvador	1	0	0
Grenada	1	0	0
Guatemala	1	0	0
Haiti	1	0	0
Honduras	3	1	33-3
Jamaica	2	2	100
Mexico	53	53	100
Nicaragua	1	1	100
Saint Kitts and Nevis	1	0	0
Saint Lucia	1	0	0
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	1	0	0
Trinidad and Tobago	2	2	100
Territories			
Anguilla	0	0	0
Aruba	1	1	100
Bonaire	1	0	0
British Virgin Islands	0	0	0
Cayman Islands	1	1	100
Curaçao	1	0	0
French Antilles (Guadeloupe, Martinique, Saint Barthélemy, Saint Martin, San Pierre et Miquelon)	1	1	100
Montserrat	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	1	1	100
Saba	1	0	0
Sint Eustatius	1	0	0
Sint Maarten	1	1	100
Turks and Caicos Islands	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	0	0	0
Total	**Total airports: 146 Selected : 103**	**73**	**50%**

** As reported by State to ICAO NACC RO*
*** International aerodromes listed in the CAR/SAM Regional Air Navigation Plan*

ICAO SAM Regional Office list of Runway Safety Teams* at International Aerodromes as of April 2022**

State	No. of Intl. aerodromes CAR/SAM ANP Vol. II	RST Implemented*	% RST in the State
Argentina	16	0	0%
Bolivia	3	3	100%
Brazil	29	16	55%
Chile	8	0	0%
Colombia	11	0	0%
Ecuador	4	1	25%
French Guiana	1	0	0%
Guyana	2	2	100%
Panama	6	1	17%
Paraguay	2	2	100%
Peru	8	8	100%
Suriname	1	0	0%
Uruguay	2	2	100%
Venezuela	11	0	0%
Total	**104**	**35**	**33.65%**

** As reported by State to ICAO SAM RO*
*** International aerodromes listed in the CAR/SAM Regional Air Navigation Plan*

Project Charter
Project Name: CAR and SAM RST Implementation Project

Attachment B

RASG-PA RST related conclusions

CONCLUSION RASG-PA ESC/35/C1	**RST IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT**	
What: The Regional Offices will distribute the form in Appendix A of WP05 to their States, so that they can complete the information corresponding to the "Target date" column, in order for the Secretariat to propose a project that allows the implementation of RST in all international aerodromes until 2023. In addition, the Regional Offices will send State Letters to request for updated State's focal points for the implementation of RST.		**Expected impact:** ☐ Political / Global ☐ Inter-regional ☐ Economic ☐ Environmental ☒ Operational/Tech.
Why: Runway safety is still one of the high-risk categories of occurrence that need to be address to mitigate the risk of fatalities in international civil aviation. The implementation of RST provides a systemic approach to runway safety and collision avoidance strategy		
When: States to provide feedback on the Checklist an provide Focal points by September 01, 2021	**Status:** Valid	
Who: ☒ ICAO SAM (Secretariat) ☒ ICAO NACC ☒ Others: Organizations that are part of the RSP	Jaime Calderón – NACC Fabio Salvatierra - SAM	

CONCLUSION RASG-PA11/C5/2021	**STRENGTHENING OF RST IMPLEMENTATION**	
What: That the RASG-PA Executive Steering Committee (ESC) coordinate with the Secretariat and the NACC and SAM Regional Offices, and the work teams, the development of activities and/or projects to strengthen the implementation of Runway Safety Teams (RST); The identification of those States/Aerodromes where projects and activities to support the implementation and maintenance of RST will be carried out must be justified based on data, in such a way that those aerodromes are prioritized where it makes more sense to have these teams.		**Expected impact:** ☐ Political/Global ☒ Inter-regional ☐ Economic ☐ Enviromental ☒ Operational
Why: To strengthen risk mitigation activities associated with the following accident/incident categories: Abnormal runway contact (ARC); Bird impact/ingestion (BIRD); Ground collision (G-COL); Runway excursions (RE); Runway incursions (RI); Loss of control on the ground (LOC-G); Aerodrome deficiencies (ADRM); Ground Handling (RAMP); Wildlife (WILD); Collision with obstacles during takeoffs and landings (CTOL).		
When: The projects must be approved by the ESC, at the latest, during the ESC/37 meeting 37.	**Status:** Valid	
Who: ☒ States ☒ RASG-PA Co-chairs ☒ ICAO SAM (Secretariat)	Wagner Souza/Javier Vanegas Javier Puente/Sereya Schotborgh	

— END —