



WORKING PAPER

RASG-PA ESC/37 — WP/07
02/05/2022

Thirty Seventh Regional Aviation Safety Group — Pan America Executive Steering Committee Meeting (ESC/37)

Mexico City, Mexico, 25 to 26 May 2022

Agenda Item 2: Safety management process within RASG-PA

RST Implementation support project proposal for CAR and SAM Regions

(Presented by the Secretariat)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
Based on RASG-PA ESC/36/C1 and RASG-PA11/C5/2021, this working paper presents a proposal from RASG-PA Secretariat for a new project to support the implementation of effective Local Runway Safety Teams at selected States/Aerodromes with the support of RASG-PA Members and Runway Safety Partners ¹ (RSP)	
Action:	See section 3
<i>Strategic Objectives:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety
<i>References:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICAO Assembly Resolution A37-6 • Global Aviation Safety Plan in its 2020-2022 edition • RASG-PA ESC/36/C1 • RASG-PA11/C5/2021 • Global Runway Safety Action Plan (GRSAP)

1. Introduction

1.1. Runway safety is still one of the high-risk categories of occurrence that need to be address to mitigate the risk of fatalities in international civil aviation. In the PA-Region, RASG-PA has identified Runway Excursions (RE) as one of the high-risk categories (HRCs). The Global Aviation Safety Plan in its 2020-2022 edition (GASP Doc 10004) recommends States, Regions and Industry actions to promote the establishment and implementation of State Runway Safety Programmes and **local Runway Safety Teams**.

¹Runway Safety Partners include ACI, CANSO, EASA, EUROCONTROL, FAA, FSF, IATA, IBAC, ICCAIA, IAOPA, IFALPA, IFATCA. See <https://www.icao.int/safety/RunwaySafety/Pages/RSPProgrammePartners.aspx>

1.2. On May 2021, [RASG-PA ESC Meeting #36](#) endorsed the conclusion ESC/36/C1 to support the implementation of RSTs in Pan America, by collecting data from States to prepare a regional implementation plan. In addition, on November 2021 RASG-PA Plenary endorsed the conclusion RASG-PA11/C5/2021 for the strengthening of RST Implementation through the identification of States/aerodromes where RST may be carried out, based on data in order to prioritize its implementation.

1.3. This working paper presents a project to support the implementation of effective and collaborative Runway Safety Teams at selected aerodromes in the CAR and SAM Regions.

2. Contents

2.1. According to the [Global Runway Safety Action Plan](#), the establishment of effective RSTs has helped to reduce the runway safety related risks globally since 2011, and is now included in ICAO's PANS-Aerodromes as a key responsibility of an aerodrome operator.

2.2. Although the implementation of local RST is considered a cost-effective solution to mitigate the occurrence of runway incursions and excursions (and an integral part of the aerodrome's operator's SMS), in the CAR and SAM Regions its implementation is moving at a relative low pace. According to the information gathered from States in early 2022, in the CAR Region, only 73 out of 146 international aerodromes have a RST implemented, that means 50%. In the SAM Region, current implementation of RST is 33.65%.

2.3. Following conclusion RASG-PA11/C5/2021 (**Project Mandate**), the Secretariat has prepared a Project proposal (in the form of a Project Charter) for the support of implementation of effective Local Runway Safety Teams in CAR and SAM Regions with the support of RASG-PA Members and Runway Safety Partners (RSP). This document is included as **Appendix** to this working paper.

1. Name of the project, activity or initiative	<i>CAR & SAM RST Implementation project</i>
2. Description of the project, activity or initiative	<i>Support the establishment of runway safety teams at specific international aerodromes and support the effectiveness of established RST's in the CAR and SAM Regions by 2025, in order to promote the identification of hazards related to runway safety using a collaborative approach, the development and implementation of action plans, collection of data and the promulgation of runway safety information to CST's and stakeholders, by delivering a mix of activities, including direct technical assistance, training, a mechanism to ensure stakeholder participation and follow up by monitoring specific indicators.</i>
3. Identification of the problem to be solved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Progressive reduction of RS related incidents and accidents</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Mitigation of latent conditions related to Safety Management, Contaminated Runway/Taxiway, poor braking action, Airport Facilities</i>
<p>4. Project/Activity objectives</p>	<p>The <u>main objective</u>: <i>“Establishing and implementing effective local RST at selected international aerodromes by 2025”</i></p> <p><i>Specific Objective 1: GROUP 1, Airports without an RST: Support the implementation of RST, following ICAO guidance, on selected international aerodromes that have not implemented RST’s by YE2025.</i></p> <p><i>Specific Objective 2: GROUP 2, Airports with RST: Establish a reporting mechanism and indicators to ensure that already implemented RST’s at selected international aerodromes are effective to mitigate runway safety risks by YE2025.</i></p>

<p>5. Expected benefits of the implementation of the solution, including the expected effect on one or more SPIs of the RASG-PA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Reduced runway safety related events (incidents and accidents)</i> • <i>Reduce incidents related to the following categories: Abnormal runway contact (ARC); Bird impact/ingestion (BIRD); Ground collision (G-COL); Runway excursions (RE); Runway incursions (RI); Loss of control on the ground (LOC-G); Aerodrome deficiencies (ADRM); Ground Handling (RAMP); Wildlife (WILD); Collision with obstacles during takeoffs and landings (CTOL)</i> • <i>Increase in effective implementation of ICAO SARPs for Runway Safety</i> • <i>Better EI scores on ICAO USOAP activities</i> • <i>Better communication between stakeholders</i> • <i>Promote safety related CAPEX at aerodromes</i> • <i>Increase of overall safety</i> <p>RASG-PA SPI's expected effect:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="776 926 1317 1320"> <thead> <tr> <th>#</th> <th>RASG-PA SPIs</th> <th>Baseline</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Reduction of total number of occurrences (related to runway safety)</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Number of ADRM with RST</td> <td>53.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Percentage of ADRM with RST</td> <td>47</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				#	RASG-PA SPIs	Baseline	1	Reduction of total number of occurrences (related to runway safety)	70	2	Number of ADRM with RST	53.5	3	Percentage of ADRM with RST	47
#	RASG-PA SPIs	Baseline														
1	Reduction of total number of occurrences (related to runway safety)	70														
2	Number of ADRM with RST	53.5														
3	Percentage of ADRM with RST	47														
<p>6. Description of the deliverables and deadlines for each deliverable</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>#</th> <th>Deliverable name</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Estimated Deadline</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>D1</td> <td>RST implementation plan per State</td> <td>Implementation plan per State as per agreed milestones (RASG-PA ESC/35/C1).</td> <td>3Q 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D2</td> <td>RST Effectiveness mechanism</td> <td>Monitoring tool (to be determined) to measure RST deliverables to ensure it is active and effective as per ICAO guidance.</td> <td>3Q 2022</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	#	Deliverable name	Description	Estimated Deadline	D1	RST implementation plan per State	Implementation plan per State as per agreed milestones (RASG-PA ESC/35/C1).	3Q 2022	D2	RST Effectiveness mechanism	Monitoring tool (to be determined) to measure RST deliverables to ensure it is active and effective as per ICAO guidance.	3Q 2022			
#	Deliverable name	Description	Estimated Deadline													
D1	RST implementation plan per State	Implementation plan per State as per agreed milestones (RASG-PA ESC/35/C1).	3Q 2022													
D2	RST Effectiveness mechanism	Monitoring tool (to be determined) to measure RST deliverables to ensure it is active and effective as per ICAO guidance.	3Q 2022													

	D3	Project repository/workplace	Project website to support communications and a repository of best practices and guidance material to support RST implementation.	3Q 2022
	D4	Runway Safety Go-Teams (reports)	Both virtual and on-site, depending on the identified needs by the project.	YE 2025
	D5	Specific training on Runway Safety Teams	Based on ICAO guidance, virtual training for the establishment and effectiveness of RST's.	YE 2022 YE 2025
7. Name of the ESC member that will champion the project, activity or initiative		<i>To be determined, with the support of ICAO Secretariat</i>		
8. Name of the person responsible for its execution		<i>Project Board: RASG-PA ESC Project Managers: - ICAO NACC AGA RO - ICAO SAM AGA RO</i>		
9. Composition of the team that will work on the project, activity or initiative		<i>ICAO Secretariat RSP Members State & Airport focal points</i>		
10. Amount of resources requested from RASG-PA, and the specific way in which they will be used		<i>USD 15000 for Year 1 (see attached project charter for details)</i>		

3. Suggested Actions

3.1. The Meeting is invited to:

- a) Take note on the information provided on this working paper;
- b) Review the Project Charter presented on the appendix to this working paper,
- c) Endorse the proposed conclusion:

CONCLUSION RASG-PA ESC/OM/XX		<i>CAR & SAM RST Implementation Project</i>	
<p>What:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Endorse CAR & SAM RST Implementation Project as per appendix on ESC37/WP07 and approve requested funds for phase 0 & 1 of the project <hr/> <p>How much:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> USD 15000 for year 1 (phases 0 and 1). Other phases will be submitted to RASG-PA in the future (will depend on first iterations, need assessment validation and project review). 		<p>Expected impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Political/Global <input type="checkbox"/> Inter-regional <input type="checkbox"/> Economic <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational/Tech. 	
<p>Why: Take actions to promote the identification and mitigation of runway safety related risks at CAR & SAM selected international aerodromes, in response to Project Mandate (Conclusions RASG-PA ESC/36/C1 and RASG-PA11/C5/2021), RASG-PA objectives and general public safety.</p>			
<p>When: ESC/37</p>		<p>Status: Valid</p>	
<p>Who:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> States <input type="checkbox"/> PA-RAST Co-chairs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ICAO SAM Office (Secretariat) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) 		<p><i>Responsible: ICAO Secretariat</i></p>	

--- END ---

APPENDIX to WP07 – ESC37



International Civil Aviation Organization
Regional Aviation Safety Group - Pan America (RASG-PA)

Project Name:	CAR and SAM RST Implementation Project		
Date:	27/04/2022	Area of interest: RS	Version: 1.5
Author:	ICAO NACC/SAM RO		
Project Sponsor:	RASG-PA Plenary		
Senior User:	RASG-PA ESC		
Client:	CAR & SAM States and Selected Airports		
Document ID:	RS-RST-22-001 <i>(Priority area+Subject+Year+Ref #)</i>		
Document link:	https://www.icao.int/RASGPA/Pages/MeetingsDocumentation.aspx?m=2022-ESC37		

Note: This document is only valid on the day it was printed

1. Executive Summary

- a. Runway safety is still one of the high-risk categories of occurrence that need to be address to mitigate the risk of fatalities in international civil aviation. The Global Aviation Safety Plan in its 2020-2022 edition (GASP Doc 10004) recommends States, Regions and Industry actions to promote the establishment and implementation of State Runway Safety Programmes and local Runway Safety Teams.
- b. ICAO Assembly Resolution A37-6 on Runway Safety urged States to take measures to enhance Runway Safety including the establishment of Runway Safety Programmes using Multidisciplinary approach that include at least Regulators, Aircraft Operators, Air Navigation Service Providers, Aerodrome Operators and Aircraft Manufacturers to prevent and mitigate the effects of runway excursions, runway incursions and other occurrences related to runway safety. Considering that, a RST is intrinsically a collaborative process and in order to increase the implementation of local Runway Safety Teams, there is a need of more action and commitment by States and Industry in the implementation of this mechanism. RASG-PA and International Organizations could leverage these efforts, as part of their commitment towards runway safety.
- c. On May 2021, RASG-PA ESC Meeting #36 endorsed a conclusion (ESC/36/C1) to support the implementation of RST in Pan America, by collecting data from States to prepare a regional implementation plan. In addition, on November 2021 RASG-PA Plenary endorsed a Conclusion (RASG-PA11/C5/2021) for the identification of States/aerodromes where projects and activities to support



Project Charter

Project Name: CAR and SAM RST Implementation Project

the implementation and maintenance of RST may be carried out, justified based on data in order to prioritize its implementation.

- d. The implementation of Runway Safety Teams should follow the ICAO PANS Aerodromes (Doc. 9981) guidance for the prevention of runway incursions, excursions and potential confusion by pilots or vehicle drivers through different strategies. These include procedures for the effective identification of hazards related to runway safety, risk mitigation, coordination and cooperation between different stakeholders, establishment of runway safety action plans and runway safety teams (RSTs), and the collection, sharing and exchange of safety information.
- e. Due to the benefit of the establishment of this systemic approach to runway safety at international aerodromes, there is an opportunity by the Region to take more actions to promote the effective implementation of Local RST at all international aerodromes.
- f. In this regard, the current project proposal looks to support the establishment of runway safety teams at specific international aerodromes and support the effectiveness of established RST's in the CAR and SAM Regions by 2025, in order to promote the identification of hazards related to runway safety using a collaborative approach, the development and implementation of action plans, collection of data and the promulgation of runway safety information by delivering a mix of activities, including direct technical assistance, a mechanism to ensure stakeholder participation and follow up by monitoring specific indicators.

2. Problem / Opportunity Statement

What problems are we addressing or opportunity are we pursuing?

- a. Runway safety (runway excursions/incursions) are still one of the main high-risk categories of occurrence, being Runway Excursions one of the most significant in the PA-Region. According to RASG-PA ASR 11th edition, contributing factors to RE includes safety management (29%), airport facilities (33%) and contaminated runway/taxiway-poor braking action (29%), which are usually addressed under the umbrella of local RST's.
- b. *Increase implementation:* Although the implementation of local RST is considered a cost-effective solution to mitigate the occurrence of runway incursions and excursions (and an integral part of the aerodrome's operator's SMS), in the CAR and SAM Regions its implementation is moving at a relative low pace. According to the information gathered by ICAO NACC and SAM Regional Offices, in the CAR Region only 73 out of 146 international aerodromes have a RST implemented, that means 50%. In the SAM Region, current implementation of RST is reported at 33.65%. See **attachment A** for details at the end of this document.
- c. *Ensure effectiveness on those implemented:* In addition, some States and aerodrome operators report the implementation of RST, but can't demonstrate that the RST is active and effective, or following ICAO and international recommendations, with tangible results and outcomes to reduce runway safety risks.
- d. Considering that, a RST is intrinsically a collaborative process and in order to increase the implementation of local Runway Safety Teams, there is a need of more action and commitment by

Project Charter

Project Name: CAR and SAM RST Implementation Project

States and Industry in the implementation of this mechanism. RASG-PA, International Organizations and Industry could leverage these efforts, as part of their commitment towards runway safety.

3. Business Options

Analysis and reasoned recommendation for the base business options of: do nothing, do the minimal or do something.

- a. **Do Nothing:** States/Airports will remain with safety problems such as runway incursions, excursions and potential confusion by pilots or vehicle drivers, as well as a higher probability of an increase risk due to the increase in the number of operations.
- b. **Do the minimal:** The minimum may alleviate/mitigate the current need for improving Runway Safety, but will not be a systemic approach for creating an integral Safety Management framework at the airports. Regional offices may continue to engage separate efforts to implement RST at their States; Industry may still struggle to participate in most of LRST's, and the support from international organizations and industry partners, including Runway Safety Partners (RSP), will be spread across different efforts (webinars, seminars, direct assistance, runway safety go-teams, etc.) without a clear prioritization and without considering the regional scope.
- c. **Do something:** States/airports to be more proactive and shall identify concerned focal points in each international aerodrome for the implementation of local runway safety. The current Project Proposal aims to have a gradual but systemic approach to States/ Airports to establish, operate and perform an effective Runway Safety Team in support of Collaborative Safety Teams (where available) and the State Safety Programme. This project proposes a direct "hands-on support" and follow-up strategy to support the implementation of RST at selected international aerodromes, starting with those aerodromes with more traffic (more exposure) and/or with data intelligence parameters from RASG-PA.

4. Expected Benefits

The benefits that the project will deliver expressed in measurable terms against the situation as it exists prior to the project.

RSTs have proven highly successful at mitigating the risks of runway incursions and excursions, providing a collaborative solution, which regulators, air, navigation service providers, crews, airline and airport operators have all positively contributed to its implementation. At the end, an improvement in decision making process and actions taken to better mitigate the RS related events should be observed, reflected in the respective performance indicators related to RS.

Main Benefits:

- Reduced runway safety related events (incidents and accidents)
- Reduce incidents related to the following categories: Abnormal runway contact (ARC); Bird impact/ingestion (BIRD); Ground collision (G-COL); Runway excursions (RE); Runway incursions (RI); Loss of control on the ground (LOC-G); Aerodrome deficiencies (ADRM); Ground Handling (RAMP); Wildlife (WILD); Collision with obstacles during takeoffs and landings (CTOL)
- Increase in effective implementation of ICAO SARPs for Runway Safety
- Better EI scores on ICAO USOAP activities
- Better communication between stakeholders



Project Charter

Project Name: CAR and SAM RST Implementation Project

- Promote safety related CAPEX at aerodromes
- Increase of overall safety

5. Expected Detriments

Outcomes perceived as negative by one or more stakeholders. Dis-benefits are actual consequences of an activity whereas, by definition, a risk has some uncertainty about whether it will materialize.

An ineffective RST performance can cause a waste of resources and discourage participants to support and participate. This Project looks to take a close follow-up to avoid this situation and to ensure an effectiveness in the RST performance.

Also as detriment, the stakeholders involved may perceived an increased workload specially if the RST is not effective and properly established and implemented.

6. Project Objectives

Objectives are statements that specifically describe what is to be achieved within the project's mandate in order to meet the overall project goal. Wherever possible, objectives should be quantified and "SMART" (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-Based).

The main objective of the project is to reach the goal of **"Establishing and implementing effective local RST at selected international aerodromes by 2025"**:

To reach this objective, the following 2 specific objectives are proposed, based on the current situation of RST implementation:

Specific Objective 1: *GROUP 1, Airports without an RST:* Support the implementation of RST, following ICAO guidance, on selected international aerodromes that haven't implemented RST's by YE2025.

Specific Objective 2: *GROUP 2, Airports with RST:* Establish a reporting mechanism and indicators to ensure that already implemented RST's at selected international aerodromes are effective to mitigate runway safety risks by YE2025.

7. Scope Statement / Project deliverables

Defines what is being produced. Deliverables relate to, and satisfy, the specific project requirements or capabilities. Deliverables must cross-reference and satisfy the project's objectives.

Scope Statement:

The scope of this project is for selected international aerodromes in the CAR and SAM Regions. The selection criteria of such aerodromes is to be determined under this project, and will be based on safety data from RASG-PA and ICAO in such a way that those aerodromes are prioritized where it makes more sense to have these teams.

Criteria for selection may include (but not limited to):

- Past occurrences (incidents/accidents related to RS)
- Traffic



APPENDIX to WP07 – ESC37

Project Charter

Project Name: CAR and SAM RST Implementation Project

-
- Geographical or other physical problems or gaps (lack of NAVAIDS, runway maintenance or surface issues, non-compliances with SARPs, etc.)
 - Reports from industry partners (IATA/IFALPA)
 - Reports from PA-RAST

Project Deliverables:

The main Project deliverables* (products) are:

#	Deliverable name	Description
D1	RST implementation plan per State	Implementation plan per State as per agreed milestones (RASG-PA ESC/35/C1).
D2	RST Effectiveness mechanism	Monitoring tool (to be determined) to measure RST deliverables to ensure it is active and effective as per ICAO guidance.
D3	Project repository/workplace	Project website to support communications and a repository of best practices and guidance material to support RST implementation.
D4	Runway Safety Go-Teams (reports)	Both virtual and on-site, depending on the identified needs by the project.
D5	Specific training on Runway Safety Teams	Based on ICAO guidance, virtual training for the establishment and effectiveness of RST's.

**Note: other deliverables may be agreed upon after first project iterations and RASG-PA needs.*

8. Critical Success Factors

Defines what is needed as necessary conditions for project success.

- Continuous, high-level engagement and commitment from the different Stakeholders (RASG-PA ESC, State support -DG level, Airport operator support, ANSP support, Air Operator support, etc.)
- Commitment by State Focal Point and Airport Operator Focal Point thru the entire project
- Engagement by involved parties- execution level, including active participation by Focal Point
- RASG-PA support (data, funding)
- State and International organizations support for SMEs. Selection of SMEs
- Successful alignment of RST activities to SMS and SSP

9. Budget / Costs / Funding

Source and funding amount (whether annual or in total) not be exceeded.

The project is proposed to be funded by several sources including but not limiting to: RASG-PA, States own resources, Regional Projects and contributions from States or International Organizations (expertise).

As most of ICAO based projects, State, International Organizations and Industry subject matter experts support on a pro-bono scheme reducing costs to the ones related to missions and document preparation.

Project management and administrative costs are expected to be covered by current known mechanisms of RASG-PA projects.



APPENDIX to WP07 – ESC37

Project Charter

Project Name: CAR and SAM RST Implementation Project

#	Deliverable name	Activity	Potential direct cost (USD)	Notes
D1	RST implementation plan per State	Virtual Meetings	USD 0.00	Follow up by RASG-PA Secretariat (NACC & SAM RO's) with the support of State's and Airports focal points
D2	RST Effectiveness mechanism	Virtual Meetings	USD 0.00	Prepare, with the support of SME's & Focal points, an instrument to measure the effectiveness of RST
D3	Project repository/workplace	Webpage creation Document compilation	USD 0.00	Programming and webpage hosting is assumed will be covered by current ICAO/RASG-PA hosting. Document compilation by PM's.
D4	Runway Safety Go-Teams (reports)	Virtual RS Go-Teams	USD 0 to 1500 per event*	*If simultaneous interpretation is required in virtual activities and not feasible to be provided by State/airport.
D4	Runway Safety Go-Teams (reports)	Face to Face RS Go-Teams	USD 2600 per SME per 5 day mission	Estimate considerations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On-site RS Go-Team duration will depend on scope (complexity), State and location. - Budget including tickets (USD 1200 per round trip ticket) and DSA (USD 280 per day per SME) for 5 day mission - Assuming 1 SME's per mission funded by project. Other SME's funded "in kind" by RSPs or by recipient. - Other costs such as meeting room, interpretation (as needed) projector or visual equipment, coffee breaks, etc., not included and supported by Airport/State
D5	Specific training on Runway Safety Teams	Preparation of RST virtual, on-demand training. In English/Spanish	USD 4600	Training preparation by third party (SRVSOP or other to be determined)

In this regard the Project Proposal for RASG-PA is to cover the costs for Training development (Deliverable #5) and four (4) total on-site RS Go-Teams missions, 2 for CAR Region and 2 for SAM Region, for an estimated total of **USD 15,000 for Year 1 (2022)**.

10. Stakeholder / Communications Plan

Identifies the key individuals or organizations that have a clear stake in the project's success. Who is impacted by the project, and how should they be involved?

Key Individuals/Organizations:	Specific Needs/Concerns:	Actions/Mean/Frequency of Communication
RASG-PA Plenary	Follow-up	WP on RASG-PA meetings
RASG-PA ESC	Follow-up / Decision making	WP on ESC meetings Website
ICAO Secretariat	Follow-up	Monthly reports Email Website



APPENDIX to WP07 – ESC37

Project Charter

Project Name: CAR and SAM RST Implementation Project

Key Individuals/Organizations:	Specific Needs/Concerns:	Actions/Mean/Frequency of Communication
Focal points from Member States	Follow-up / Action	Monthly meetings Monthly reports Email Website
Involved Stakeholders (airport, ANSP, air operator, CAA)	Follow-up	Website
Donors	Follow-up	WP on ESC meetings Website

11. High Level Milestone/Stages Schedule

Identification of the major project phases and when they will be completed

#	Major Project Phases / Milestones	Completion Date
0	Initiation, Preparation & Design phase - Project documents ready - Begin website preparation - Begin training preparation - RST Effectiveness mechanism	3Q 2022
1	Project Deployment phase 1 – Higher risk airports - 4 Face-to-Face RS Go-Teams (2 in CAR, 2 in SAM) - 4 Virtual RS Go-Teams (2 in CAR, 2 in SAM) - Project review. Target validation	1Q 2023
2	Project Deployment phase 2 – Medium risk airports - Face-to-Face RS Go-Teams (to be determined) - Virtual RS Go-Teams (to be determined) - Project review. Target validation	1Q 2024
3	Project Deployment phase 3 – Lower risk airports - Face-to-Face RS Go-Teams (to be determined) - Virtual RS Go-Teams (to be determined) - Project review. Target validation	3Q 2025
4	Closing phase - Goal and objective validation - Project evaluation and acceptance	YE 2025

12. Acceptance Criteria

Identify the quality standards and criteria that apply to the project. Explain how the plan will ensure adherence to these standards and criteria.

- RST implementations measured via survey (score over 90) and CRACIP status
- Tangible results of the implementation of RST’s action plans
- Identification, removal and promulgation of “Hot Spots” at selected aerodromes
- Reduction of runway safety related occurrences



APPENDIX to WP07 – ESC37

Project Charter

Project Name: CAR and SAM RST Implementation Project

- USOAP CMA Audit results (% of EI of specific PQ)

13. Risk Management Plan

List of major risks confronting the project. Assessment of severity (H/M/L, or high, medium or low) as determined by (1) probability, and (2) potential impact. For each High risk item, develop appropriate mitigation plans.

#	Major Risks	Assessment	Mitigation
1	Lack of interest thru the project	H	<i>Demonstrate business case to potential sponsor showing benefits that the project may deliver, along with its alignment to Global ICAO provisions Ensure an Agile project base approach, to keep project interest and momentum Establish a complete communications plan</i>
2	Lack of funding	H	<i>Due to the high benefits of this implementation and relative low cost, look to ensure funding from RASG-PA, ICAO Regional Project or third party interested to support the project</i>
3	Lack of expertise to develop the project	M	<i>Engage with recognized organization or thru ICAO to get the right people for the task. Engagement with Runway Safety Partners (RSP)</i>
4	States may not participate on the project	H	<i>Include the project as part of already accepted mechanisms by States (such as RASG-PA & GREPECAS Projects).</i>
5	Low involvement and consultation of other Stakeholders (airport operator, airlines, pilots, ATC).	H	<i>Foster collaboration with partners (ACI, IATA, CANSO, IFALPA, IFATCA) to ensure stakeholder active participation.</i>
6	Sharing of sensitive data	M	<i>Identifying the measures that will be taken to protect data. Stick to safety data only.</i>
7	Difficulty of participation of Air Operators in all RSTs where they operate	H	<i>Ensure mechanisms are in place to guarantee stakeholder participation (use of virtual means. Surveys. Etc.)</i>
8	Duplication of efforts and confusion with Aerodrome SMS, SSP, other efforts (such as CSTs)	H	<i>Explain the relationship between RST and aerodrome SMS (being RST part of SMS) and its interaction with CSTs (Local RST feed data to CSTs).</i>

14. Project Team Organization

Who will be involved in managing the project and how will they interface?

Project Sponsor:	Responsible for:
RASG-PA Plenary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dictates the Project Mandate and assigns the Project Board. - Delegates authority to the Project Board on decisions of the Project
Project Board:	Responsible for:



APPENDIX to WP07 – ESC37

Project Charter

Project Name: CAR and SAM RST Implementation Project

RASG-PA ESC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accountable for the success or failure of the project. - Provide unified direction to the project and Project Manager. - Supports the provision of resources and authorize the use of funds for the project. - Provide visible and sustained support for the Project Manager. - Ensure effective communication within the project team and with external stakeholders.
Project Manager:	Responsible for:
RASG-PA Secretariat <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NACC RO/AGA (CAR Region) • SAM RO/AGA (SAM Region) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Responsible for the day to day management of the project in behalf of the Project Board
Team Member:	Responsible for:
State assigned focal point	Report to PM and follow-up project activities under his/her area of responsibility
SME's for different work packages	Report to PM and follow-up project activities under his/her area of responsibility

15. Project Control Procedures

Anticipated processes for monitoring and ensuring work progress, including: Status reporting and frequency, Review meetings (including who and when), Tracking methods and tools

- Monthly review meetings
- Monthly reports
- WP on RASG-PA ESC and Plenary meetings
- Website and email exchange (dashboards, etc.)

APPENDIX to WP07 – ESC37

Project Charter

Project Name: CAR and SAM RST Implementation Project

Attachment A

ICAO NACC Regional Office list of Runway Safety Teams* at International Aerodromes**

State	No. of Selected Intl. aerodromes from CAR/SAM ANP Vol. II	RST Implemented*	% RST implemented in the State
Antigua and Barbuda	1	1	100
Bahamas	2	0	0
Barbados	1	1	100
Belize	1	1	100
Costa Rica	1	0	0
Cuba	10	5	50
Dominica	1	0	0
Dominican Republic	8	4	50
El Salvador	1	0	0
Grenada	1	0	0
Guatemala	1	0	0
Haiti	1	0	0
Honduras	3	1	33-3
Jamaica	2	2	100
Mexico	53	53	100
Nicaragua	1	1	100
Saint Kitts and Nevis	1	0	0
Saint Lucia	1	0	0
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	1	0	0
Trinidad and Tobago	2	2	100
Territories			
Anguilla	0	0	0
Aruba	1	1	100
Bonaire	1	0	0
British Virgin Islands	0	0	0
Cayman Islands	1	1	100
Curaçao	1	0	0
French Antilles (Guadeloupe, Martinique, Saint Barthélemy, Saint Martin, San Pierre et Miquelon)	1	1	100
Montserrat	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	1	1	100
Saba	1	0	0
Sint Eustatius	1	0	0
Sint Maarten	1	1	100
Turks and Caicos Islands	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	0	0	0
Total	Total airports: 146 Selected : 103	73	50%

* As reported by State to ICAO NACC RO

** International aerodromes listed in the CAR/SAM Regional Air Navigation Plan



APPENDIX to WP07 – ESC37

Project Charter

Project Name: CAR and SAM RST Implementation Project

ICAO SAM Regional Office list of Runway Safety Teams* at International Aerodromes as of April 2022**

State	No. of Intl. aerodromes CAR/SAM ANP Vol. II	RST Implemented*	% RST in the State
Argentina	16	0	0%
Bolivia	3	3	100%
Brazil	29	16	55%
Chile	8	0	0%
Colombia	11	0	0%
Ecuador	4	1	25%
French Guiana	1	0	0%
Guyana	2	2	100%
Panama	6	1	17%
Paraguay	2	2	100%
Peru	8	8	100%
Suriname	1	0	0%
Uruguay	2	2	100%
Venezuela	11	0	0%
Total	104	35	33.65%

* As reported by State to ICAO SAM RO

** International aerodromes listed in the CAR/SAM Regional Air Navigation Plan



APPENDIX to WP07 – ESC37

Project Charter

Project Name: CAR and SAM RST Implementation Project

Attachment B

RASG-PA RST related conclusions

CONCLUSION		RST IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT	
RASG-PA ESC/35/C1			
What:		Expected impact:	
<p>The Regional Offices will distribute the form in Appendix A of WP05 to their States, so that they can complete the information corresponding to the "Target date" column, in order for the Secretariat to propose a project that allows the implementation of RST in all international aerodromes until 2023.</p> <p>In addition, the Regional Offices will send State Letters to request for updated State's focal points for the implementation of RST.</p>		<input type="checkbox"/> Political / Global <input type="checkbox"/> Inter-regional <input type="checkbox"/> Economic <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational/Tech.	
Why: Runway safety is still one of the high-risk categories of occurrence that need to be addressed to mitigate the risk of fatalities in international civil aviation. The implementation of RST provides a systemic approach to runway safety and collision avoidance strategy			
When:	States to provide feedback on the Checklist and provide Focal points by September 01, 2021	Status:	Valid
Who:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ICAO SAM (Secretariat) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ICAO NACC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Others: Organizations that are part of the RSP	Jaime Calderón – NACC Fabio Salvatierra - SAM	

CONCLUSION		STRENGTHENING OF RST IMPLEMENTATION	
RASG-PA11/C5/2021			
What:		Expected impact:	
<p>That the RASG-PA Executive Steering Committee (ESC) coordinate with the Secretariat and the NACC and SAM Regional Offices, and the work teams, the development of activities and/or projects to strengthen the implementation of Runway Safety Teams (RST);</p> <p>The identification of those States/Aerodromes where projects and activities to support the implementation and maintenance of RST will be carried out must be justified based on data, in such a way that those aerodromes are prioritized where it makes more sense to have these teams.</p>		<input type="checkbox"/> Political/Global <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inter-regional <input type="checkbox"/> Economic <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational	
Why: To strengthen risk mitigation activities associated with the following accident/incident categories: Abnormal runway contact (ARC); Bird impact/ingestion (BIRD); Ground collision (G-COL); Runway excursions (RE); Runway incursions (RI); Loss of control on the ground (LOC-G); Aerodrome deficiencies (ADRM); Ground Handling (RAMP); Wildlife (WILD); Collision with obstacles during takeoffs and landings (CTOL).			
When:	The projects must be approved by the ESC, at the latest, during the ESC/37 meeting 37.	Status:	Valid
Who:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> States <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RASG-PA Co-chairs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ICAO SAM (Secretariat)	Wagner Souza/Javier Vanegas Javier Puente/Sereya Schotborgh	

— END —

