



Agenda Item 2: Beginning of the implementation of national safety plans

**ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR AERODROME CERTIFICATION AS PART OF GREPECAS
 PROJECT F AND IN SUPPORT OF SAMSP GOALS**

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY	
<p>This paper presents a methodology for providing direct assistance to States under GREPECAS Project F1 for the SAM Region, so that States facing problems for aerodrome certification may receive support from experts of other States, with the assistance of the Regional Office and the TC of the SRVSOP, for the certification of their aerodromes and, as a result, SMS implementation in aerodrome operators, pursuant to the objectives and goals established in the SAM Regional Safety Plan - SAMSP.</p>	
<p>Action: The Meeting is invited to take note of the opportunities offered by the Project and to study the possibility of making use of it.</p>	
References:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ICAO Global aviation safety plan (GASP) - ICAO Global air navigation plan (GANP) - SAM Regional Safety Plan (SAMSP) - Regional air navigation plan (eANP) - Annex 14 - Aerodromes, Vol. I, 8th Edition, July 2018 - Doc 9981 PANS Aerodromes – Second edition, 2016 - Fourth meeting of the GREPECAS PPRC (PPRC/4) - Eighteenth meeting of GREPECAS (GREPECAS/18) - Thirteenth meeting of the SRVSOP Aerodrome Panel. 	
ICAO strategic objectives:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A – Safety B – Air navigation capacity and efficiency

1. Introduction

1.1 Aerodrome certification has been an ICAO standard since 2001 (Annex 14, Vol. I – *Aerodrome Design and Operations*). Aerodrome certification has a major impact on effective implementation (EI) ratings in the AGA field, given its link to a significant number of USOAP protocol questions, and serves as the basis for effective continuous State oversight in the AGA field. Furthermore, one of the components of certification is the acceptance of the SMS of the aerodrome operator, which is an essential step towards effective implementation and operation of the SSP.

1.2 The SAM Region signed the Declaration of Bogota, which established the goal of certifying 20% of international aerodromes based on Table AOP of the Regional Air Navigation Plan. However, progress has been slow.

1.3 The PPRC/4 meeting took note the little progress made and decided to take action to reassess the strategy of Programme F projects to attain the objectives proposed under the GREPECAS methodology, analysing the need to reassess the strategy of both projects to improve their effectiveness, and including the support offered by the United States and ACI-LAC.

1.4 Based on the above, the task was performed and submitted to the consideration of GREPECAS/18, which formulated Conclusion GREPECAS18/18, whereby, in order to gain efficiencies, Projects F1 and F2 of the GREPECAS Aerodromes and Ground Aids (AGA) Programme would be merged into a single Project F called “*Safety implementation and aerodrome certification project*”.

1.5 Based on the *SAM Safety Plan (SAMSP)*, there is a need to identify mechanisms for the AGA field (identified as one of the audit areas with the lowest performance in the States) to significantly improve its effective implementation. This new project has a more “direct” approach, involving various activities, such as surveys, drafting of documents and training, with a view to preparing direct assistance missions to States for the implementation of aerodrome certification.

2. General aspects of the project

2.1 The project, which is based on the PRINCE2® project management methodology, consists of missions by teams of experts of SRVSOP member States and/or other volunteer States, under the coordination of the GREPECAS AGA Programme Coordinator and the SRVSOP TC, who provide advice to the host State and the aerodrome operator and accompany the entire process through a combination of on-site and virtual missions using follow-up and communication tools.

2.2 The main objective is to give direct support to the State in the certification of its aerodromes, while training national inspectors to monitor the process in the other international aerodromes of the State, in accordance with the list published in Table AOP of the Regional Air Navigation Plan.

2.3 The duration of the assistance will depend on some variables, such as level of maturity and/or harmonisation of national legislation with the LARs, guidance material of their own or to be provided, level of maturity of the operator, *inter alia*. However, a model business case is shown in **Appendix A** to this paper as a reference for interested States, in which the estimated duration is 12 months.

2.4 Regarding the cost to the State, it would basically cover the missions by the experts and the administrative costs of project RLA99/901, which would manage the resources. Each budget is prepared in coordination with the requesting State and in accordance with the level of complexity identified.

2.5 In addition to direct technical assistance for preparing and conducting the certification, and the respective reports, there is also the possibility of providing on-the-job training to selected State inspectors.

2.6 For more details on the project, the Secretariat makes available the contact of the GREPECAS Programme F Coordinator in the SAM Region, Fabio Salvatierra, at fsalvatierra@icao.int

3. **Suggested action**

3.1 The Meeting is invited to:

- a) take note of the information contained in this paper;
- b) review and comment on the content of this paper and its corresponding attachment;
and
- c) encourage those States facing difficulties for certifying their aerodromes to consider the possibility of requesting this assistance.

APPENDIX A



INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION
SOUTH AMERICAN REGIONAL OFFICE

PROJECT DOCUMENTATION

BUSINESS CASE

Project: SAM Aerodrome Certification Assistance for the Certification of Aerodromes – [STATE]

Release: *****DRAFT VERSION *****

Date: DD / MMM / YYYY

PRINCE2

Author: SAM Programme F Coordinator

Owner: ICAO SAM

Client: [STATE]

Document Ref: SAF-AGA-17-003

Version No: 1.2

1 Business Case History

1.1 Document Location

This document is only valid on the day it is printed.

The source of the document will be found at this location. – *[AGA Projects\Project SAF-AGA-17-003_Aerodrome Certification]*

1.2 Revision History

Date of this revision: dd/mm/yy

Date of next revision:

Revision date	Previous revision date	Summary of changes	Changes marked
DD/MM/YY		First version	

1.3 Approvals

This document requires the following approvals.

Signed approval forms must be properly filed in the project filing system.

Name	Signature	Title	Date of issue	Version
		Director [STATE]		
		[ICAO counterpart]		

1.4 Distribution

This document has been distributed to:

Name	Title	Date	Version
Project Team			
ACI-LAC			
RLA99/901 Project Coordination			
Aerodrome Operator			

2 Table of Contents

1	Business Case History.....	2
1.1	Document Location.....	2
1.2	Revision History.....	2
1.3	Approvals.....	2
1.4	Distribution.....	2
2	Table of Contents.....	3
3	Executive Summary.....	4
4	Reasons.....	4
5	Business Options.....	5
6	Expected Benefits.....	5
7	Expected Disbenefits.....	6
8	Timeframes.....	6
9	Costs.....	7
10	Investment Appraisal.....	7
11	Major Risks.....	7

3 Executive Summary

As part of the GREPECAS Aerodromes (AGA) Programme for the SAM Region, the **Safety Implementation and Aerodrome Certification Project** includes in its activities the planning of assistance teams or “Go-Teams” to support States in the implementation of aerodrome certification.

Through letter [YYYY], [STATE] requested direct assistance for the certification of its aerodromes within the framework of GREPECAS Project F for the SAM Region.

The purpose of this project is to provide assistance to the [CAA] of [STATE] and to the selected aerodrome operator for the conduction of the aerodrome certification process in accordance with national regulations, which have been reported to be in line with the AGA LARs. The assistance will consist of advisory services by experts from other States and from operators of the Region.

According to ICAO Annex 14, the certification process guarantees that, at the time of certification, international aerodrome operators meet the specifications concerning facilities and operation and, according to the certification authority, they are capable of continuing to meet such specifications.

4 Reasons

Aerodrome certification has been an ICAO standard for aerodromes with international operations since 2003 (according to Annex 14, Volume I, 1.4.1). However, [STATE] does not have certified aerodromes. Certification includes important processes such as the acceptance of the SMS of the aerodrome operator, and other processes related to emergency management, maintenance, infrastructure, operation, among others.

SMS implementation has been identified as a key element for the implementation of the SAM Regional Safety Plan (SAMSP), just like the creation and operation of RSTs has been identified in the ICAO Global Runway Safety Action Plan as a strategy for enhancing runway safety. Both processes are analysed during aerodrome certification.

Likewise, aerodrome certification is directly related to a significant number of USOAP protocol questions (PQs). Therefore, it is expected that its implementation in all the international aerodromes of the State will result in a significant increase in effective implementation (EI), according to the objectives regionally agreed in the SAMSP.

In the report of the last USOAP CMA validation activity in [STATE] (ICVM, [day] [month] [year]), ICAO identified as a high priority: *[include background of the report of the last USOAP activity]*.

Likewise, the [CAA] has noted that its staff does not have enough experience to conduct an aerodrome certification process. Accordingly, in addition to supporting the certification process, the objective of this assistance project is to provide on-the-job training (OJT) to [AAC] staff for the conduction of the process.

In accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding between ICAO and the Latin American Civil Aviation Commission (LACAC), one of the main objectives of the Regional Safety Oversight Cooperation System (SRVSOP) is to recommend the necessary measures so that States can resolve the issues identified during USOAP activities and to ensure compliance with the corresponding safety

oversight responsibilities by its member States. To this end, it has experts that can support those States that do not have a proper combination of disciplines to achieve aerodrome certification. This has been done in other SRVSOP member States with very positive results.

5 Business Options

1. Do nothing

If no action is taken, the State would continue to be in noncompliance with ICAO Annex 14 and would not be able to guarantee that international aerodrome operators meet the specifications concerning facilities and operation and, according to the certification authority, are capable of continuing to meet these specifications.

2. Do the minimum

The State could undertake aerodrome certification projects without international assistance; however, there is a high risk of delay in such projects, given the lack of experience in aerodrome certification processes and in the resolution of problems in case of identifying deviations from national regulations.

3. Do something: Direct assistance for aerodrome certification

With the direct assistance of ICAO, the SRVSOP and the support of ACI and other States, the State and the aerodrome operator would have a highly competent advisory team with experience in certification processes to carry out the process in a continuous, documented, and orderly manner, allowing for the transfer of knowledge to achieve the certification objective.

6 Expected Benefits

- **Main Outputs:**

- Direct assistance by experts to the [CAA]
- Guidance material for the implementation of aerodrome certification
- Training of both [AAC] inspectors and aerodrome personnel

- **Main Outcomes:**

- Aerodrome certification in accordance with existing national regulations
- Aerodrome with an agreed corrective action plan (CAP)
- State inspectors gaining experience and knowledge to be able to continue with aerodrome certification
- On-going oversight can be based on monitoring compliance with certification conditions and any additional relevant requirements
- The operator of the certified aerodrome will have a system to maintain the certification and ensure safety through the SMS.

- **Main Benefits:**

- Enhanced safety (due to a better assessment and control of aerodrome risks)

- Possibility of enhancing effective implementation of ICAO standards and recommended practices in the AGA field.
- Compliance with regional goals in the AGA field and contribution to the regional goals set forth in the SAMSP.
- Better position to implement the SSP.
- Potential reduction of on-going oversight costs.
- Better definition of investment priorities through gap identification at the certified aerodrome.
- Prestige and other benefits for the aerodrome as a result of proven regulatory compliance.
- Economies of scale: opportunities will be identified for the SRVSOP to better contribute to aerodrome certification and oversight in Panama and in other SRVSOP member States.

7 Expected disbenefits

- Workload: The project will generate the need for human resources in the [CAA] and the aerodrome operator for the execution of the project within the stipulated timeframe.
- Costs: The project will identify investment needs and the need for the operator to adjust its processes, which could entail costs.

8 Timeframes

This Project proposal includes two on-site missions, in addition to virtual assistance.

The scope of the Project will initially cover one (1) international aerodrome, to be designated by the [CAA], estimating a process lasting between 12 and 18 months. The detailed project plan will be developed subsequently.

The first on-site assistance will be a 5-day mission of at least 4 regional experts to start project activities, and the second on-site 5-day mission will consist of at least 5 regional experts to support on-site verification and provide OJT to [CAA] inspectors.

Stage 0	Start of the project
Stage 1	Expression of interest <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-site assistance (mission #1)
Stage 2	Formal request <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Virtual assistance
Stage 3	Documentation assessment (Handbook) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Virtual assistance
Stage 4	On-site verification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-site assistance (mission #2)
Stage 5	Corrective action plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Virtual assistance
Stage 6	Closing of the project

9 Costs

The project budgeted cost is [US\$XXXXX], which includes:

1. Initial on-site mission for 1 week by 4 experts to conduct an initial assessment, explain the methodology, develop the project, including a 2-day workshop for 20 participants (facilities provided by the host).
2. On-site verification mission by 5 experts for 1 week to accompany the CAA in on-site verification, in accordance with the fourth phase of the certification process.

10 Investment Appraisal

Most of the project costs are related to travel tickets and travel expenses for the experts who will provide assistance to the State and the operator. However, the project offers these missions on a *pro bono* basis, whereby experts will not charge fees for this activity. Furthermore, the follow-up to on-site missions, through virtual assistance (expert-hours) by the advisors and members of the technical committee will entail no direct cost for the State. The organisations supporting the project are committed to continue paying the salary of the experts that provide the assistance during such activities.

Use of the guidance material developed by the SRVSOP is already covered by the fees paid by the State under project RLA 99/901.

11 Major Risks [to be tailored to each State]

ID	Description	Probability	Impact	Pxl*	Mitigation	Status
1	Lack of support by the operator	2	3	6	Encourage participation and openness through support by ACI LAC. Explore mechanisms with the State to generate trust in the operator.	Identified
2	Lack of experts	2	3	6	Use experts of SRVSOP member States/ACI members or other volunteer States	Identified
3	Complexity of the process	2	2	4	Use AGA LAR guidance material and methods and their corresponding alignment to national regulations to facilitate the process.	Identified
4	Follow-up to activities	3	3	9	The Regional Office and the SRVSOP technical committee will manage the project, and will issue regular reports.	Identified

Risk log notes:

Probability/severity score: 1 (low) 2 (medium) 3 (high)

*Specific actions must be identified where Pxl (=Probability x impact) > 3
Status: Identified / Accepted / Transferred / Avoided or Exploited / Reduced or Enhanced / Shared / Contingency Plan
invoked*