



## Summary

### ATS Safety Management System Implementation Workshop

(Online, 13 -15 June 2022)

#### 1. Introduction

1.1 The ATS Safety Management System Implementation Workshop was held through Zoom platform from 13 to 15 June 2022. It was attended by delegates from Civil Aviation Authorities and air traffic service providers from Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Panamá, Perú, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela.

1.2 Mr. Fabio Rabbani, SAM Office Regional Director, welcomed the participants and opened the event. Mr. Roberto Sosa, ATM Regional Offices was in charge of the Secretariat.

#### 2. Background

2.1 This workshop is part of the regional strategy for implementing the Safety Management System (SMS) in the air traffic services.

2.2 The workshop's main objective is to promote and expedite the implementation of SMS through harmonization and the establishment of a regional approach by ATS service providers; and the acceptance by the Authority.

2.3 As part of the Workshop reaching regional agreements regarding implementing the SMS was proposed.

#### 3. Progress and support to the Regional implementation

3.1 The Secretariat recalled that Annex 11 requirements regarding the safety management system came on applicability for the first time in amendment 43 of Annex 11 of 2005. Subsequently, the requirements were reinforced in amendments 44 of 2006, 47-b of 2009, and 49 of 2013.

3.2 The publication of Annex 19 in 2013 completed the framework for the implementation of the SMS in air traffic services in connection with Doc 9859.

3.3 Nevertheless, after 17 years the progress in SMS implementation remains low, having reach regionally only 16% to 2022 in two SAM States. Among the reasons identified that have prevented States and service providers from moving forward with SMS implementation, are:

- a) Commitment of the administration in the implementation of the SMS
- b) Lack of key personnel for implementation

- c) Lack of knowledge regarding hazard identification
- d) Instruction and education
- e) Communication

3.4 The Secretariat informed the attendees that it has been defined as a goal of the SAM office that by 2025 all air traffic service providers in the region will have implemented and accepted the SMS, so the States including Authorities and service providers are requested their support and commitment to achieve this goal.

3.5 Likewise, it was reported that a supporting process has been initiated as of this year for all the States that are in the implementation stage, which aims to facilitate and expedite the implementation of SMS in the ATS to meet the established goal. The Secretariat makes available to States wishing to participate in the initiative, informing directly of the interest.

#### **4. Best practices and lessons learned**

4.1 The Secretariat informed that a summary of lessons learned and best practices at regional level has been included as part of the workshop, with the aim of taking advantage of the experience and facilitating the implementation of the safety management system (SMS), mainly in those States that are in the early stages of implementation of the system.

4.1 Among the lessons learned, the need to properly identify the following elements, in air traffic service providers, mainly in those that have only a functional separation from the Civil Aviation Authority, are highlighted:

- a) Identification of the accountable Executive:
- b) Designation of the Safety Coordinator or Manager
- c) Resource management
- d) Notification system
- e) Contingency plans

4.2 In the Region, approximately 80% of ATSPs have only functional separation with the Authority, therefore, defining a framework for action with respect to the paragraphs listed above, could accelerate and support the implementation.

4.3 The Meeting emphasizes the importance of defining the profile of the responsible executive that facilitates identification within service providers that has only a functional separation from the regulatory authority.

5.5 With regard to the SMS manager, the Meeting also recognizes the importance of identifying the profile of the responsible executive officer and the coordinator of the safety management system, considering the limitations of the staff and the size of the service providers present in the region.

5.6 With regard to the notification system, it is recognized that it should be as simple as possible in terms of accessing, generating and submitting mandatory and voluntary notifications. Besides, it is essential to start with a reporting system with the means available, and then migrate to a more complex system supported by automation.

5.7 The Secretariat stresses the importance that the voluntary reports have the appropriate treatment within the provider, without it being necessary to reach the authority, unless it is stated in national regulations; however, a reporting system, where voluntary notifications are only accessible to the vendor's operational safety unit, will help to create a reporting culture.

5.8 Regarding emergency response plans (ERP), the Secretariat emphasizes that it is important to consider those indicated by Doc 9859, where ERP may use different terms for the provisions relating to the treatment of emergency situations, recognizing that contingency plans apply to air traffic services, therefore should be considered as an equivalent of the ERP mentioned in Doc.9859; however, it is acknowledged that it is convenient to analyze whether the current contingency plans comply with all the provisions for an SMS.

5.9 As part of this section of the workshop, participants worked in teams analyzing and answering the following three questions:

- a) What should be the Profile of the Accountable Manager of the SMS, in an ATS service provider?
- b) What should be the Profile of the SMS coordinator for the ATS service provider?
- c) Do you consider that ATS Contingency Plans comply with the concept of ERP mentioned in Doc. 9859?

5.10 The Secretariat will share the result of the analysis of the different task forces, so that it can be used by participating States as a guide in the establishment of the safety management system.

## **6. Indicators and Metrics in support of Safety Management Systems**

6.1 The Secretariat developed a presentation related to the establishment of safety metrics and indicators, recognizing that this matter is crucial for the implementation of SMS; but also represents a great challenge for many States and service providers.

6.2 During the presentation, the importance of the proper management of concepts of objective, goal and indicator was emphasized, as part of a strategic management process, which applies directly to operational safety management systems, so it is essential that these three concepts are implicit in an SMS.

6.3 Participants stated the importance of the correct identification of data sources for the construction of safety management indicators.

6.4 The Secretariat recognized that the correct identification of sources is fundamental in order to be able to construct safety indicators, goals and objectives; highlighting that most service providers and authorities already have access to sources of information, and that it is only necessary to recognize them to be used in their SMS.

6.5 As part of the supporting activities in the implementation of the SMS in the ATS, the Secretariat informs that a workshop will be held for operational safety specialists for the development of safety indicators, goals and objectives, which will be held between August and September this year, to this purpose, all States will be informed well in advance.

## **7. Presentation of States' progress**

7.1 States (service providers and Authorities) presented their progress in the implementation of SMS, where it can be noticed the significant progress made by several service providers and Authorities in the implementation of the safety management system.

7.2 Argentina made a presentation on the safety management system, updating on the changes in the structure of EANA that have strengthened safety management; sharing the experience in the maturity of the safety management system.

7.3 Brazil made a presentation of the safety management system, including matters related to the classification of service providers based on risk, the acceptance process, and the progress made in the implementation of the SMS.

7.4 Bolivia presented an advance in the implementation of the SMS, including security exams, and other activities framed within the implementation of the SMS, considering the new structure of the service provider.

7.5 Chile presented the progress in the implementation of the SMS including the changes in the national regulations, the appointment of experts in charge of the SMS, reporting system, among other actions that have been taken as part of the implementation of safety management.

7.6 Colombia made a presentation on the progress achieved in the implementation of the SMS, including changes in the organization, the implementation of the EMS, training process, among other significant progress, to reach SMS acceptance by the end of the year 2022.

7.7 Ecuador shared the progress in implementing SMS, including the system structure and the notification system.

7.8 Guyana reported the progress in implementing the SMS, including the development of regulations and the collaborative work between the authority and the service provider.

7.9 Peru presented the progress made in implementing the SMS in the ATS, including the proposal for the reporting system, the participation in the RST, the runway incursion prevention program, and a summary of the activities developed during the year 2022 regarding safety management.

7.10 Suriname presented the progress in the implementation of the SMS, including the development of documentation to address hazard identification, and risk management, among other issues, also addressing some of the challenges, including staff training and the resources to support SMS implementation.

7.11 Panama presented the progress in implementing the SMS, mentioning the support of the office in implementing the safety management system.

7.12 Uruguay presented the progress in the implementation of the SMS in air traffic services, including the designation of the responsible executive, the SMS coordinator, and the system implementation team; Likewise, the implemented reporting system was discussed.

7.13 Venezuela presented the progress in the SMS implementation, including the identification of the responsible executive, the development of the security policy, and other elements as part of the support in the implementation of the SMS in air traffic services.

## **8 State Operational Safety Programs (SSPIA) Implementation Assessment and its impact on SMS**

8.1 The Secretariat presented the progress made in the assessment of Implementation of the State Operational Safety Programs (SSPIA), and the impact that will have on the Authorities and ATSP with respect to SMS.

8.2 The Secretariat informed that since 2021, ICAO has carried out State Safety Programme Implementation Assessments (SSPIAs), under the framework of the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA), to support two of the six primary goals of the Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP):

- a) Implementation of effective State Safety Programmes (SSPs).
- b) Strengthening of States' safety oversight capabilities

8.3 The programme is focused on assessing the maturity that the State achieved in its SSP implementation and maintenance process. For this measurement, matrices have been developed that address each of the areas to which the SMS implementation requirement applies, including ATS.

8.4 The Secretariat emphasized some important aspect of SSPIA programme, such as:

- a) Reflect the maturity levels the State's has achieved in its SSP implementation and maintenance.
- b) Maturity levels are determined separately for each PQ (there is no "overall area maturity level", nor "overall SSP maturity level").
- c) Complement, and do not impact, the State's Effective Implementation (EI) score.
- d) Do not generate findings.
- e) Do not require the State to submit a "corrective action plan" (CAP).
- f) Will be accompanied by a traditional USOAP CMA activity (i.e. focused audit)
- g) Reflect Annex 19 Amdt 1, SMM 4th edition
- h) Form a dedicated list of PQs (complementing the PQs USOAP).
- i) Are not linked to Critical Elements (CEs), but to applicable SSP components
- j) Are not assessed as "satisfactory/non-satisfactory", but in terms of maturity levels.
- k) Are supported by references from ICAO manuals.

8.5 For the SSPIA five maturity levels has been determined, which are reflected in assessment matrices, as follows:

- 0: Not present and not planned
- 1: Not present but being worked on
- 2: Present
- 3: Present and effective
- 4: Present and effective for years and in continuous improvement

8.6 As part of the activities of the workshop, participants analyzed the measurement matrices to get familiarized, identifying each of the questions and maturity levels.

8.7 The Secretariat emphasized that it is essential that States (Authorities and service providers) carry out an analysis of the maturity of their system using the matrices, identifying the gaps, which allows them to establish a corrective action plan to address them. Therefore, the Secretariat requested States to carry out the evaluation of their system and to submit the results of this evaluation by 30 September of this year.

8.8 As part of the regional support strategy, and as a result of the evaluations carried out by States, support activities will be developed to address the gaps identified at the regional level.

## **9 SMS ATS Acceptance**

9.1 As part of the workshop, the secretariat presented the SMS acceptance process matter and the considerations that the States (Authority and service provider) must carry out to review and accept the safety management system.

9.2 The Secretariat recalled that as part of the consideration and derived from the maturity matrices, the State must:

- a) Identify, document, and develop the skills required for the initial acceptance and continuous observation of the SMS of ATS providers.
- b) A training plan addresses periodic training and on-the-job training for the personnel responsible for the acceptance and continuous observation of the SMS of ATS providers.
- c) The training plan covers the initial acceptance and the continuous observation of the SMS of the ATS providers.
- d) The training plan covers the scalability and complexity of the SMS of ATS providers.
- e) Guidance material and tools are provided to address scalability and complexity issues for the initial acceptance and ongoing observation phases of ATS providers' SMS.
- f) A mechanism supports the exchange of guidance texts, tools, and best practices between technical personnel from different areas within the competent authority.
- g) There is a mechanism to determine the initial and continuing acceptability of the SMS of ATS providers.
- h) The mechanism allows the implementation of the SMS of ATS providers by applying a progressive approach.

9.3 It is essential to consider the two main SMS evaluation processes:

- a) Initial acceptance
- b) Continuous surveillance

9.4 The Authority must define the mechanism for initial acceptance of the ATSP SMS; this process could respond to policies established by the State Authority for the approval of SMS from other operators and/or service providers. The secretariat recommends coordinating the different authority departments regarding the acceptance mechanisms.

## **10 Closing**

10.1 The safety management systems implementation workshop concluded with the issues addressed and shown in this workshop summary.