



WORKING PAPER

RASG-PA /11 — WP/05
21/10/21

**Eleventh Plenary Meeting of the Regional Aviation Safety Group — Pan America
(RASG-PA/11)**

Online, October 28, 2021 and November 4 and 5, 2021

Agenda Item 4: Specific measures that require consideration by the ANC and the Council

INCOMPATIBILITY BETWEEN SOME GASP TARGETS WITH THE FREQUENCY OF THE USOAP AUDIT CYCLE
(Presented by the Secretariat)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Working Paper presents the description of the incompatibility identified between the temporal references for those GASP goals that depend on increasing the effective implementation (EI), the frequency of the USOAP audit cycle (which is currently the only recognized mechanism for measure such progress) and the frequency with which RASGs are required to report the level of progress of regional implementation, for consideration by the ICAO Air Navigation Commission (ANC).

Action:	The Meeting is invited to: a) Review the content of this Study Note; and b) Comment and approve the Conclusion and Decision proposed in 3.4 of this Working Paper.
<i>Strategic Objectives:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety
<i>References:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RASG-PA Procedural Handbook • RASGs Terms of Reference • Doc 10004 – Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP)

1. Introduction

1.1 The RASGs Terms of Reference (TORs), approved by the ICAO Council, require that the annual meetings of these groups report, among other things, the specific measures or improvements that would require an examination by the ANC and the Council to solve particular problems and recommendations in this regard; and comments on implementation issues and concrete recommendations to the ICAO Council to continually improve future editions of the Global Safety Plan (GASP) that identify regional safety objectives and priorities to ensure adequate attention to emerging safety concerns operational.

1.2 The TORs also state that the reports of RASG meetings should reflect the structure of the GASP, and the expected results of the RASG should outline the objectives and anticipated goals of the GASP.

1.3 Finally, the RASGs are expected to report to the ANC and the ICAO Council, on an annual basis, on the implementation status of the GASP in each of their regions, as well as to identify common implementation problems and possible solutions.

1.4 The RASG-PA, through the work described in Working Papers 3 and 4, has completed the exercise of verifying the implementation status, and through this has identified a specific aspect in the performance measurement framework of the GASP, which it considers should be analysed by the ANC and the Council, with a view to future editions of the GASP.

2. Reference framework for measuring the progress of GASP implementation

2.1 To allow measurement of the progress of GASP implementation at the global level, and of regional and national safety plans at regional and national levels, respectively, the GASP includes six safety objectives and eleven safety goals.

2.2 Based on these objectives and goals, each region is expected to promote the implementation of the GASP in its corresponding geographic area, and report the progress status to the ANC and the ICAO Council once a year.

2.3 Four (2.1, 2.2, 3.1 and 6.1) out of the eleven GASP targets, depend on measuring the level of effective implementation (EI). This measurement is carried out through the audit activities that ICAO carries out through the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Program (USOAP).

Target	Description	Relationship with USOAP
2.1	<i>All States to improve their score for the effective implementation (EI) of the critical elements (CEs) of the State's safety oversight system (with focus on priority PQs) as follows: by 2022 – 75 per cent by 2026 – 85 per cent by 2030 – 95 per cent</i>	<i>Currently, the only official means to measure effective implementation progress, is through the USOAP audit activities.</i>
2.2	<i>By 2022, all States to reach a safety oversight index greater than 1, in all categories</i>	<i>Safety Oversight Index is calculated based on traffic data and effective implementation. In order to update each State SOI, a new measurement of EI is required.</i>
3.1	<i>By 2022, all States to implement the foundation of an SSP</i>	<i>SSP foundation is calculated from a subset of 299 protocol questions (PQs), therefore, progress updates are dependent on USAOP activities.</i>
6.1	<i>By 2022, all States to implement the air navigation and airport core infrastructure</i>	<i>Until a clear measure for this target is agreed, RASG-PA is using, among other KPIs AGA and ANS effective implementation.</i>

2. Discussion

2.1 In the Pan American Region, the average frequency between ICAO State Audits is **12.9** years. For their part, the GASP targets contain compliance references to 2022, 2025 and 2030, that is, within one, four and nine years from 2021 respectively.

2.2 Given this situation, progress in GASP implementation activities at the regional and national levels, related to targets 2.1, 2.2, 3.1 and 6.1, can only be confirmed through an audit activity, that is, in cycles of approximately 12 years. Consequently, **there is an incompatibility between the time references for those GASP targets that depend on increasing effective implementation (EI), the frequency of the USOAP audit cycle (which is currently the only recognized mechanism to measure such progress) and the frequency with which RASGs are required to report the level of progress of regional implementation.**

2.3 The problem described in the previous paragraph, prevents the regional safety groups (RASGs) from reporting, in a complete and timely manner, the level of progress in the implementation of the GASP for those targets related to the progress of the EI, at least in the form and frequency indicated in the terms of reference of the RASGs.

2.4 Additionally, it could affect the prioritization of implementation activities in some States, favouring those that, can be measured, independently of the USOAP Program audit cycles, especially in those States that have been recently audited.

3. Examples of alternative mechanisms for measuring the progress of effective implementation in NACC and SAM

3.1 Systemic Assistance Program (NACC) - The Systemic Assistance Program (SAP) of the Regional Office for North America, Central America and the Caribbean (NACC) was born from the application of the ICAO “No Country Left Behind (NCLB)” initiative to assist the States of the NAM / CAR regions in the application of the ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) and in the resolution of Significant Safety Concerns (SSC) and Aviation Security against acts of interference illicit (SSeC).

To meet the objective of the NCLB initiative, the SAP assistance activities of the NACC Office are more focused on building capacity and preventive self-diagnosis in the States, following up on the main challenges they face to improve Effective Implementation (EI) of the SARPs. After an audit, the areas of the system where an adequate level of EI of the SARPs has not been achieved are identified, and that is where the efforts of the SAP are concentrated, covering all parts of the system.

Within the SAP, an approach based on more specific objectives is adopted that identify metrics, deliverables and expected results, clearly establishing the responsibilities and objectives of the Regional Specialists and their training to carry out audits and resolve the queries raised by the States in their respective subjects.

SAP is currently structured in five main phases:

- a) First phase: Political Commitment
- b) Second phase: Data collection and analysis
- c) Third phase: Development of the Action Plan

- d) Fourth phase: Implementation, measurement and monitoring of the Action Plan
- e) Fifth phase: Monitoring and sustainability

The SAP Action Plan comprises four work areas that correspond to the areas where ICAO conducts audits:

- a) Operational safety; Air Navigation Services; Implementation of Aerodromes and Ground Aids. These work areas are verified by USOAP-CMA audits.
- b) Security of civil aviation against acts of unlawful interference. This work area is verified by USAP-CMA audits.

3.2 PRO-SAM-003: Procedure to support the advancement of corrective action plans (CAPs) and review of priority protocol questions (PQs) of the SAM Region - (SAM) – The objective of this procedure is to establish a mechanism for supervision of the Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) of the member states of the ICAO South American Regional Office. The procedure has the purpose of maintaining an interaction with the States, to promote the verification of the progress in their CAPs and the review of the status of their priority PQs.

It is expected that the information generated with this follow-up will guide the strategies of the SAM Office, directing assistance when necessary, and inform the Implementation and Development Section (ISD-SEC) of ICAO Headquarters in Montreal. (HQ).

To supervise and support the monitoring of the CAPs, periodic virtual meetings are scheduled, monthly, on dates agreed with each State of the SAM Region, and follow-up visits of the implementation and / or assistance, according to their needs. Meetings are conducted individually with each of the States unless two or more States propose joint participation in the meetings.

3.3 The procedures described in 3.1 and 3.2 represent regional mechanisms for measuring the progress of effective implementation.

3.4 In order to allow Regions and States a timely measurement of the levels of implementation of the GASP, the following conclusion is proposed addressed to the ICAO Air Navigation Commission:

CONCLUSION RASG-PA/CX/2021	
<p>What:</p> <p>Communicate to the ICAO Air Navigation Commission (ANC) that there is incompatibility between the references to achieve the GASP targets that depend on the increase in effective implementation (EI), the frequency of the USOAP audit cycle (which currently constitutes the only recognized mechanism for measuring such progress) and the frequency with which RASGs are required to report the level of progress of regional implementation.</p>	<p>Expected impact</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Polítical/Global</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inter-regional</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Económico</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ambiental</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operacional/Técnico</p>
<p>Why: To allow the RASGS to measure the progress of the GASP goals at the Regional level with the frequency established in the Terms of Reference (TORs) for the RASGs.</p>	

When: To be included at the RASG-PA 11 report	Status: Valid
Who: <input type="checkbox"/> States <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ICAO <input type="checkbox"/> PA-RAST Co-chairs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ICAO SAM Office (Secretariat) <input type="checkbox"/> ICAO NACC	Responsible: Secretariat

4. Suggested Actions

4.1 The Meeting is invited to:

- a) Review the content of this Study Note; and
- b) Comment and approve the Conclusion and Decision proposed in 3.4 of this Working Paper.
