



International Civil Aviation Organization

CAR/SAM Regional Planning and Implementation Group (GREPECAS)

**Fifteenth Meeting of the CAR/SAM Regional Planning and Implementation Group (GREPECAS/15)**

Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 13 – 17 October 2008

GREPECAS/15 - WP/15

13/10/08

---

**Agenda Item 4: Regional air navigation deficiencies/problems**

**4.1 Reports of the ASB/8 and ASB/9 Meeting**

**REPORT OF THE ASB/9 MEETING**

(Presented by the Secretariat)

**SUMMARY**

This working paper presents information on the work carried out during the Ninth Meeting of the Aviation Safety Board (ASB/9), held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, on 12 October 2008.

**References:**

- Report of the GREPECAS/14 Meeting.
- Report of the Eighth Meeting of the GREPECAS Aviation Safety Board (ASB/8).
- Uniform Methodology for the Identification, Evaluation and Reporting of air Navigation deficiencies approved by the ICAO Council.

**1. Introduction**

1.1 The ASB/9 Meeting was held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, on 12 October 2008. Participating in the Meeting was the Chairman, the GREPECAS Secretary, the ICAORD NACC Office, the Chairpersons of the Subgroups, the Vice-Chairpersons of the Subgroups, the Secretaries of the ATM/CNS, AGA/AOP, AERMET, AIM/MAP Subgroups, the Secretary of the ATM Committee and an Officer from the ICAO Air Navigation Bureau. The agreed Agenda was the following:

Agenda Item 1	Review of the ASB/8 Meeting Report
Agenda Item 2	Review of the results of the classification of “U” deficiencies as per the Conclusion ASB/8/2
Agenda Item 3	Analysis of the standard classification of air navigation deficiencies “A” and “B”
Agenda Item 4	Other Business

1.2 The main purpose of the ASB/9 Meeting was to discuss the implementation of Draft Conclusion ASB/8/1 and Draft Decision/8/2 formulated during the ASB/8 Meeting. Both actions were approved by GREPECAS under the “fast track” mechanism. In this regard, it should be noted that same became approved actions; therefore, the “draft” designation shall be removed.

## 2. Summary of the ASB/9 Meeting

### Review of the ASB/8 Meeting Report

2.1 The ASB/8 Meeting was a special event convened in accordance with GREPECAS Decision 14/60-*Procedures for classifying and addressing “U” deficiencies*. With respect to the work performed by the Meeting, the following should be noted:

- a) The Meeting reviewed work performed by the Secretariat in relation to the improvements introduced to the GANDD, which contemplated a complete revision of the way to capture and store information in the database, as well as the reformulation of the reports provided by the database. In this regard, Appendices A, B, C and D were eliminated, and it was agreed to report the unresolved deficiencies in only one format and to maintain corrected deficiencies only for statistical purposes.
- b) The documentation prepared by the Secretariat concerning “Procedures for Classifying and Addressing GREPECAS “U” deficiencies was reviewed. It was noted that these procedures support application of the Uniform Methodology for the Identification, Assessment and Reporting of Deficiencies approved by ICAO Council, which contains criteria to determine whether or not a “U” deficiency exists.

*Note: Concerning the “Procedures for Classifying and Addressing GREPECAS “U” the ASB/9 Meeting considered expanding same for all deficiencies for the reasons indicated in par. 2.4 of this working paper.*

- c) The Meeting considered the criteria for classifying “U” deficiencies using the Risk Analysis model used by ICAO for SMS risk determination. According to this criteria, risk indices 5A, 5B, 5C, 4A, 4B and 3A correspond to priority “U” deficiencies. In this regard, the ASB/8 Meeting formulated Conclusion ASB/8/2 in order that States/Territories and International Organizations carry out a risk analysis for presentation to the ICAO Regional Offices for documentation at the ASB/9 Meeting. Concerning this matter, it was noted that the “last resort action” indicated by GREPECAS Conclusion 13/92 is subject to the work to be performed under directive of Conclusion ASB/8/2. The ASB/8 Meeting also considered the possibility of expanding the criteria being used for “U” deficiency risk assessment to type “A” and “B” deficiencies. By means of formulating Decision ASB/8/1, the Secretariat was requested to carry out an analysis on this matter for presentation at the ASB/9 Meeting. Conclusion ASB/8/2 and Decision ASB/8/1 are attached as **Appendix A** to this working paper
- d) Concerning GREPECAS Conclusion 14/59-*National Coordinator responsible for updating the GANDD*, the Meeting was informed of the available list of contacts, which is continuously updated by the Secretariat as required.

### **Review of the results of the classification of “U” deficiencies per Conclusion ASB/8/2**

2.2 The Meeting reviewed the implementation of Conclusion ASB/8/2. In this regard, the Meeting noted that the lists of “U” deficiencies were only circulated to the States/Territories and not to IATA and IFALPA as directed by the mentioned Conclusion due to an involuntary error. It was noted that the replies to the exercise received from the CAR States in assessing risk were very good, allowing for risk assessments to be carried out for all CAR “U” deficiencies. Concerning the SAM Region, it was noted that few States had performed the exercise. **Appendix B and C** to this working paper presents the information obtained in performing the exercise requested by Conclusion ASB/8/2, which includes the list of “U” deficiencies circulated by the ICAO Regional Offices to the States/Territories of each ICAO Region for better reference.

2.2.1 In examining the above-mentioned Appendices, the valuable contribution that IATA and IFALPA can make concerning deficiency risk assessment was pointed out. Therefore, the Meeting was of the opinion to continue the exercise with the participation of IATA and IFALPA. It was agreed that the States that have been not yet performed the actions contained in Conclusion ASB/8/2 complete the exercise. IATA and IFALPA requested clarification regarding their participation and the methodology to perform the risk assessment. After the explanation provided by the Meeting, it was agreed that IATA and IFALPA, using the information provided by ICAO, (also available in the GANDD) perform the risk assessment and provide the information to the respective ICAO Regional Office as soon as possible, and in any event not later than 1 March 2009.

2.2.2 Based on the above, and considering the nature of “U” deficiencies, the Meeting was of the opinion that a special ASB Meeting should be convened to analyze the results of the exercises to be performed by IATA and the remaining States. In this regard, the following Conclusion for GREPECAS approval was formulated:

**DRAFT**  
**CONCLUSION 15/XX                      FURTHER ACTIONS TO IMPLEMENT**  
**CONCLUSION ASB/8/2**

In order to complete Conclusion ASB/8/2 that:

- a) immediately after the GREPECAS/15 Meeting, the ICAO Regional Offices forward to IATA and IFALPA the list of “U” air navigation deficiencies currently available in the GANDD;
- b) IATA and IFALPA carry out the “U” deficiencies risk assessment using the ICAO SMS Risk Analysis model, and submit the results to the ICAO Regional Offices not later than 1 March 2009;
- c) States that have been not yet done so, carry out the “U” deficiency risk assessment and submit results to the accredited Regional Office not later than 5 January 2009; and
- d) ICAO conducts a special ASB Meeting at the NACC Regional Office in Mexico City in April 2009, to analyze the results of the completed exercise.

2.2.3 The Meeting noted that the ICAO Regional Offices, following the Uniform Methodology approved by the Council, would use the information provided by the States/Territories, IATA and IFALPA to prioritize the deficiencies (par. 2.1.1 f) of the Uniform Methodology.

#### **Analysis of the standard classification of “A” and “B” air navigation deficiencies**

2.3 The Meeting reviewed the implementation of Decision ASB/8/1. In this regard, it was noted that GREPECAS has developed criteria for the classification of “U” deficiencies using the current SMS Risk Analysis model, and that by the above-mentioned Decision, the Secretariat was requested to carry out an analysis to expand the use of this criteria to the classification of “A” and “B” deficiencies.

2.3.1 The Secretariat presented the analysis to the Meeting, which was supported as follows:

- a) the ICAO SMS Risk Analysis model is applicable only to those situations involving matters affecting the safety of air operations;
- b) an “A” deficiency is defined as a deficiency with high priority requirements necessary for air navigation safety; and
- c) a “B” deficiency is defined as deficiency with intermediate requirements necessary for air navigation regularity and efficiency.

2.3.2 Based on the above facts, the Secretariat analysis concluded that other than the elements of the SMS Risk Analysis model considered for classification of “U” deficiencies (elements 5A, 5B, 5C, 4A, 4B and 3A) the remaining elements could be used to classify an “A” deficiency. Therefore, upon analyzing a deficiency affecting safety using the SMS Model, it is noted that a deficiency not related to the risk indices associated with type “U” could be classified as an “A” deficiency, and matters affecting regularity and efficiency of the air operations could be classified as a “B” deficiency.

2.3.2 Extensive exchange of views concerning this matter occurred. In this regard, it was noted that considering the SMS risk management criteria, there exists elements where there is an acceptable level of risk and the risk can be managed so as to be negligible. However, considering the criteria of the Uniform Methodology approved by the Council, the deficiency does exist and, therefore, should be classified. Considering this fact, the Meeting was of the opinion that the SMS model should subsequently be used only as a tool to classify deficiencies affecting safety, i.e., “U” or “A” according to the Uniform Methodology approved by the Council. The Meeting recognized that improvements could be made regarding the classification criteria; however, it was the opinion of the Meeting that it was more important to put the mentioned criteria into practice and obtain experience with its application.

2.3.3 Based on the above, **Appendix D** to this working paper presents the ICAO SMS Risk Analysis model that could be used for “U”, “A” and “B” deficiencies.

#### **Other Business**

2.4 The Meeting reviewed a proposal to amend the Uniform Methodology approved by the Council in order to provide State/Territories with a procedure, which could allow 7 working days to provide comments to ICAO Regional Offices in order to verify respective identified deficiencies prior to being entered into the GANDD. The Secretariat explained that a better option than a proposal for amendment to the Uniform Methodology would be to introduce this procedure in the supplementary procedures for classifying and addressing GREPECAS “U” deficiencies as indicated in par. 2.1 b) above so as to include this matter as an additional procedure.

2.4.1 In considering the proposal, it was noted that the mentioned supplementary procedures indicated above only were developed in light of the need to resolve the problem of “U” deficiencies; however, and considering that the deficiency classification procedures could now be applied for all deficiencies, the procedures in the following Draft Conclusion for GREPECAS consideration was formulated:

**CONCLUSION 15/XX      REFINEMENT      OF      PROCEDURES      FOR  
CLASSIFYING      AND      ADDRESSING  
DEFICIENCIES**

That ICAO:

- a) refine the procedures developed during the ASB/8 Meeting concerning classification and addressing of “U” deficiencies for all deficiencies, and include in same a procedure for State/Territories to comment regarding verification of the data concerning newly identified deficiencies to be sent to ICAO within a period of 7 working days before entering the deficiency in the GANDD; and
- b) present the results to the next ASB Meeting.

3. **Suggested action**

3.1 The Meeting is invited to note the information presented in this working paper in order to:

- a) take note of the work to be carried out to complete implementation of Conclusion ASB/8/2, and approve the action in this respect indicated in par. 2.2.2 above;
- b) consider the analysis to extend the use the SMS Risk Assessment model from “U” deficiencies to “A” and “B” deficiencies and approve **Appendix D** to this working paper;
- c) approve the action proposed in 2.4.2; and
- c) adopt other actions as deemed appropriate.