



ASSEMBLY — 39TH SESSION

TECHNICAL COMMISSION

Agenda Item 34: Aviation safety and air navigation policy

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE GASP AMENDMENT

(Presented by Peru and supported by the countries of the South American (SAM) Region and the twenty-two Member States of the Latin American Civil Aviation Commission (LACAC)²)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Consideration should be given to the establishment of a new GASP planning deadline, setting out objectives that are clear and achievable by 2022, with a 6-year GASP review cycle, removing the current rigidity and taking account of the specific maturity level of each State's SSP.

Action: The Assembly is invited to:

- a) analyse the relevance of maintaining a referential milestone of 60 per cent EI (effective implementation) of SARPs;
- b) extend the GASP amendment deadline to at least 6 years, given that it takes time for States to be able to achieve the strategic objectives. ICAO could ask for comments in the interim three-year period, in order to be able to make an appropriate amendment every 6 years;
- c) promote this new vision in the corresponding fora.

<i>Strategic Objectives:</i>	This working paper relates to the Safety and Air Navigation Capacity and Efficiency Strategic Objectives.
<i>Financial implications:</i>	N/A.
<i>References:</i>	Annex 1 — <i>Personnel Licensing</i> Annex 6 — <i>Operation of Aircraft</i> Annex 8 — <i>Airworthiness of Aircraft</i> Annex 11 — <i>Air Traffic Services</i> Annex 13 — <i>Aircraft Accident and Incident Investigation</i> Annex 14 — <i>Aerodromes</i> Doc 10004, <i>Global Aviation Safety Plan (2014-2016 and 2017-2019)</i> State Letter AN 8/3.1-16/16 on the Adoption of Amendment 1 to Annex 19 ESC/25-NE/08 Rev. Twenty-Fifth Regional Aviation Safety Group-Pan America Executive Steering Committee Meeting (RASG-PA ESC/25) http://www.icao.int/RO_NACC/Pages/meetings-2015-rasgpaesc25.aspx

¹ Spanish version provided by Peru.

² Presented by 22 Contracting States (Argentina, Aruba, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)).

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Important changes have been made to the Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) as the guidance instrument for defining high-level policies which, as with the Global Air Navigation Plan (GANP), establishes guidelines and complements the continuous improvement of the global air transport sector.

1.2 The GASP proposes the targets and priorities to be addressed by State and aviation safety regional planners. It also sets out a common planning framework for States to make improvements in safety through the use of four Safety Performance Enablers: standardization, collaboration, resources and safety information exchange. It also proposes strategies and best practice guidance material to assist States and regions to find concrete solutions to address the global objectives and priorities.

1.3 One of the most important aspects of the GASP's objectives is that all States implement over the next few years effective safety oversight systems and fully implement the ICAO State Safety Programme (SSP) framework.

1.4 Although the GASP sets global objectives and priorities, it needs to incorporate a clear, achievable, long-term vision for both States and industry, which wins over and inspires the different stakeholders to work on and make improvements in their organizations for the attainment of this vision. This engaging and inspiring vision should generate a leadership process, which helps to mobilize political will and resources to achieve the proposed objectives.

1.5 Attachment E to State letter AN 8/3.1-16/16 regarding Amendment 1 to Annex 19 – *Safety Management*, proposes 07 November 2019 to States as the applicability date for this amendment.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 The following improvement opportunities could be considered when developing the new GASP:

- a) the region fully agrees that States, which have an effective implementation of SARPs below 60 per cent, should concentrate their efforts on achieving an effective safety oversight system before starting to implement the SSP;
 - However, States that are above 60% are not necessarily in a position to be audited with the 91 PQs as of 2018, considering the marginal progress made with SSP and SMS implementation in the region;
 - Therefore, the results obtained at the time when the audits are conducted should not affect the effective implementation percentage for the other PQs and hence, it should be recorded separately, at least until all States are subject to the same audit conditions.
- b) The GANP and the GASP currently have a similar structure, something which is not necessarily commensurate with the special characteristics of the information contained therein. Therefore, it would be useful to adjust the structure of the GASP in order to avoid restricting its content and conditioning its effectiveness; and

- c) develop an efficient and effective futuristic vision that addresses evolutionary developments in aviation and safety activities.

2.2 Building the vision

2.2.1 The first step should be to define the vision of the future environment that we want to build with the Plan. We then need to analyze the current situation on the basis of this vision, before defining the strategies needed to achieve this future vision. In other words, we need to envisage as clearly as possible what we want to achieve or where we want to go with the GASP. Once this has been defined, we need to chart out the course of the GASP towards the future and define the corresponding milestones.

2.2.2 The vision should take account of the environment in which air transport will operate in 2022. It will perhaps operate in a very advanced technological environment with an autonomous, continuous and automatic cloud-based flow of information enabling the immediate, safe exchange of data between in-flight and ground entities; an environment in which sensors transmit and receive data and can selectively determine which information is useful for improving safety. This concept has already been captured in the GANP but it has not been so clearly stated in the GASP.

2.2.3 Furthermore, this vision should take into account that safety management systems may become smart information systems that process data and calculate risks automatically, based on the data shared by multiple entities, and that are also capable of generating real-time hazard alerts and intervening in systems when so required.

2.2.4 This will only be possible if States accompany this evolutionary process. Only a mature SSP can guarantee the proper conditions for a continuous and safe exchange of information, thus permitting timely processing of data. SSPs must mature as the GASP progresses, and should be fully mature by the time risk management based on the flow of information shared in the cloud starts operating.

2.3 The GASP review cycle

2.3.1 According to the region's experience, a minimum period of 6 years is required to be able to launch and move forward with a new concept. For example, the SSP Programme has not yet been able to be implemented, in spite of the fact that the corresponding standards became applicable on 23 November 2006 for Annexes 6, 11 and 14 and on 18 November 2010 for Annexes 1, 8 and 13. Amending a new concept, programme or new provisions within as short a period as three years only causes confusion amongst States, holds up progress and interrupts the implementation cycle underway.

2.3.2 Given the response times of the civil aviation system to review the GASP for the 2019-2022 triennium, a working group could be created to duly visualize the future of safety management systems, in order to enable the development of a roadmap that works backwards from the end date, and defines the milestones to be attained at each stage. ICAO could call upon industry professionals, data analysts and other experts who are capable of defining the characteristics of this future.

2.3.3 The new GASP should not be limited by the structure and content of the GANP. Instead, some points of convergence should be defined to make sure that both plans are developed in a coordinated manner, without conditioning or limiting the specific requirements and potential of the other.

2.3.4 The process should be supported by an aggressive, global communication campaign to disseminate the goals of the GASP and the importance of the role played by States and Regions in ensuring compliance.

2.3.5 Since the GASP has been set up as a high-level policy document to guide and complement air transport progress, it must contain realistic deadlines and compliance targets. It must also be harmonized with GANP provisions, Annex 19 and the relevant implementing provisions.

3. **CONCLUSION**

3.1 The GASP has to be an inspiring document that generates a process of global leadership and offers an engaging and irresistible vision so that it is perceived as the realistic global reference on the milestones and specific priorities to be taken into account by States and aviation safety regional planners. It also needs to be harmonized with Annex 19.

— END —