



**INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION
EASTERN AND SOUTHERN AFRICAN OFFICE**

**TENTH MEETING OF THE AERODROME OPERATIONS PLANNING SUB-GROUP
(AOP/SG/10) (NAIROBI, KENYA, 5-7 AUGUST 2013)**

Agenda Item 3: Examination of deficiencies in the AOP field

TITLE: Problems of aerodrome certification in the ASECNA Region

(Presented by UEMOA-COSCAP)

SUMMARY

This paper presents the problems encountered in the certification of airports in ASECNA Member States where several stakeholders (ASECNA Community Activities, ASECNA National Activities or other independent Airport Management Structures, Ground handling companies...) operate autonomously, without any hierarchy...

The entity applying for the aerodrome certificate is generally not formally designated; nor are its responsibilities and interactions with other stakeholders, and the obligations of each party with respect to safety management clearly defined. Finally, the lack of effective coordination mechanisms between the stakeholders concerned hinders the process of airport certification in conformity with ICAO requirements.

Action required : The meeting is invited to :

- take into account the information contained in this working paper;
- consider the wish expressed in the action paragraph.

Références:

- ICAO Annex 14
- Doc 9774

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The results of the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) have revealed that many States experienced difficulties in carrying out their airport certification and safety oversight obligations.

1.2 The certification of an airport is in response to civil aviation safety requirements and concerns all the entities which operate, at an airport, activities covered under certification, as defined in ICAO Doc 9774.

2 DISCUSSION

2.1 In the subregion, the technical operation of airports is shared out between ASECNA structures (National Aeronautical Activities, Community Activities) and independent (public or private) entities responsible for the management of the airport domain without any hierarchy, leaving the doors open to various influences (political,...)

2.2 Other structures such as Civil Aviation Authorities in some cases (management of infrastructure works at the airport, issuing of driving licenses on the airside,...), the armed forces, ground handling companies (which are often entrusted with the responsibilities of managing the traffic area), oil companies,...equally take an active part in activities related to the safety of operations, and hence airport certification..

2.3 Because of this organizational problem, some aspects which are vital for the safety of aerodromes remain without any real responsibility coverage. These include: the emergency plan, the control of animal hazards, the provision of airports situated near swamps or water bodies with appropriate rescue equipment.

2.4 The situation described above raises certain questions which can be summarized as follows: To whom should the certificate be issued (ASECNA National Activities, ASECNA Community Activities, other operators, ...)? Which coordination mechanisms exist between these entities? What is the level of responsibility of the certificate holder over the activities of other stakeholders? Which authority does he have over the other parties? Does he have the possibility to review the activities of the other stakeholders during internal audits under the SGS? Does the certificate holder have the authority or the technical and financial capability to solve security problems at the aerodrome? What are the relationships (in terms of safety management) which exist between ASECNA National Activities, ASECNA Community Activities and Headquarters for the airports which are fully managed by ASECNA? Who is responsible for the activities not defined in the concession conventions?, Etc.

3 CONCLUSION

3.1 In such a context, we agree that airport certification requires that a single entity be designated as responsible, with sufficient powers to coordinate all the stakeholders involved in the certification process. The efficiency of the airport certification process will largely depend on the selection of this entity. This designation which is incumbent upon the State through concession conventions with airport operators is not done formally in most cases.

3.2 The same applies for interactions, responsibilities and obligations between the designated entity and the other stakeholders in matters of safety management, which should be formally established to enable efficient safety management at the airport. This work which may affect some operational functions and procedures of stakeholders should be carried out by States, but also, to a large extent, by operators and service providers, including ASECNA, and requires a wide consultation within a specific working framework.

4 ACTION BY THE MEETING

4.1 The Meeting is invited to:

- take note of the information provided above ;
- adopt the principle of formalization at the level of each State concerned, by designating a single entity to be responsible for certification at each airport ;
- adopt the principle of formalization at the level of each State concerned, for interactions, responsibilities and obligations between the designated entity and the other stakeholders in matters of safety management ;
- strongly recommend to States to keep the airport certification process away from political influences ;
- recommend to States to establish, at each aerodrome, responsibilities for each of the themes covered by certification ;
- adopt the principle of establishing at each aerodrome, to that effect, a working framework bringing together entities operating at an aerodrome, which would be responsible for preparing draft texts/memoranda of understanding, as necessary, and ensure the implementation of related recommendations.
