



International Civil Aviation Organization

CAR/SAM Regional Planning and Implementation Group (GREPECAS)

**Sixteenth Meeting of the CAR/SAM Regional Planning and Implementation Group (GREPECAS/16)**

Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 28 March – 1 April 2011

GREPECAS/16 – WP/23

02/03/11

---

**Agenda Item 3: Performance framework for Regional Air Navigation Planning and Implementation**

3.1 Global, inter-regional and intra-regional activities concerning air navigation systems in the CAR/SAM Regions

**ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC FOLLOWING RAD 14 IMPLEMENTATION**

(Note presented by the Dominican Republic)

**SUMMARY**

Achievements of the Dominican Republic following the publication and implementation of Dominican Aeronautical Regulation 14 (RAD 14), which incorporates ICAO standards and recommendations into airport design and operation in the Dominican Republic.

**1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Prior to 2006, airports were designed and operated in the Dominican Republic according to Law 505, of the former General Civil Aviation Bureau (*Dirección General de Aeronáutica Civil*), which stated that such activities had to be conducted according to the relevant national regulations, and respecting international agreements between the Dominican Republic and the other members of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). The National Regulations had not been formulated yet, and in their absence, ICAO Annex 14, Vol. I and II was used as regulatory guidance document. In order to change that and enforce the new Law on Civil Aviation 491-06, passed in 2006, the Dominican Aeronautical Regulations (RAD-14, Vol. I) started to be drafted for the regulation of the design and operation of aerodromes. These regulations were approved and finally published in 2008.

1.2           **Analysis:** The absence of legally-established standards and specifications proper to the Dominican Republic for the design and operation of its aerodromes opened the possibility for airport operators to interpret and adopt differing guidelines for airport design and operation, resorting to standards that were deemed good and valid in other States, thus hindering the standardisation of all airports in a given ICAO member State, as required.

1.3           **Conclusion:** The experience of the Dominican Republic following the development and publication of its national regulations for the design and operation of aerodromes, as well as the supplementary technical material for their implementation by the operator, has shown the convenience for each State or group of States to develop its own regulations, in keeping with ICAO standards, and publishing its differences, if any. Following the publication of RAD 14, a positive attitude towards change has been noted at our airports, as reflected in a more transparent, open and friendly relationship with airport operators, which, in view of more clear rules, are now operating in a better-defined legal framework and endeavouring to comply. Consequently, the physical infrastructure, visual aids, rescue and fire-fighting services, ramp support services, and other facilities in support of aircraft movement on the ground have undergone a significantly positive change, leading to higher safety levels at our airports. A critical element in this development has been the drafting and organisation of the internal operating processes of the Aerodrome Department, as well as personnel training, based on which the necessary levels of control have been established to monitor compliance with these regulations, through regular or flash inspections as necessary. The excellent results obtained by the Dominican Republic in the AGA field in the Universal Safety Audit (USOAP) conducted in 2008 are mainly due to the drafting and publication of the national regulations for the design and operation of aerodromes.

1.4           Comparative table of non-conformities identified during general inspections at the international airports of the Dominican Republic, and percentage of corrections following the publication of RAD 14.

Aeropuerto Internacional <i>Dr. Jose Francisco Peña Gomez AILA</i>	<b>Inspección No.</b>	<b>Fecha</b>	<b>Totalidad de No Conformidades</b>
	1	feb-08	61
	2	nov-08	51
	3	abr-09	26
	4	nov-09	38
	5	may-10	31
	6	nov-10	23
Porcentaje de NO Conformidades Eliminadas			<b>62%</b>
Aeropuerto Internacional del <i>Cibao</i>	<b>Inspección No.</b>	<b>Fecha</b>	<b>Totalidad de No Conformidades</b>
	1	feb-08	55
	2	nov-08	52
	3	abr-09	42
	4	nov-09	43
	5	may-10	38
	6	nov-10	33
Porcentaje de NO Conformidades Eliminadas			<b>40%</b>
Aeropuerto Internacional de <i>La Romana</i>	<b>Inspección No.</b>	<b>Fecha</b>	<b>Totalidad de No Conformidades</b>
	1	feb-08	57
	2	nov-08	42
	3	abr-09	31
	4	nov-09	27
	5	may-10	30
	6	nov-10	34
Porcentaje de NO Conformidades Eliminadas			<b>40%</b>
Aeropuerto Internacional de <i>Punta Cana</i>	<b>Inspección No.</b>	<b>Fecha</b>	<b>Totalidad de No Conformidades</b>
	1	feb-08	72
	2	nov-08	55
	3	abr-09	48
	4	nov-09	51
	5	may-10	49
	6	nov-10	49
Porcentaje de NO Conformidades Eliminadas			<b>32%</b>
Aeropuerto Internacional <i>Dr. Joaquín Balaguer</i>	<b>Inspección No.</b>	<b>Fecha</b>	<b>Totalidad de No Conformidades</b>
	1	feb-08	43
	2	nov-08	35
	3	abr-09	32
	4	nov-09	42
	5	may-10	38
	6	nov-10	31
Porcentaje de NO Conformidades Eliminadas			<b>28%</b>
Aeropuerto Internacional <i>Prof. Juan Bosch</i>	<b>Inspección No.</b>	<b>Fecha</b>	<b>Totalidad de No Conformidades</b>
	1	feb-08	22
	2	nov-08	19
	3	abr-09	15
	4	nov-09	21
	5	may-10	24
	6	nov-10	20
Porcentaje de NO Conformidades Eliminadas			<b>9%</b>
Aeropuerto Internacional <i>Gral. Gregorio Luperon</i>	<b>Inspección No.</b>	<b>Fecha</b>	<b>Totalidad de No Conformidades</b>
	1	feb-08	37
	2	nov-08	51
	3	abr-09	35
	4	nov-09	48
	5	may-10	45
	6	nov-10	38
Porcentaje de NO Conformidades Eliminadas			<b>-3%</b>
Porcentaje promedio de reducción logrado			<b>30%</b>

1.5 **Recommendation:** To urge GREPECAS members that have not yet developed their regulations for the design and operation of aerodromes to do so, in view of the convenience of establishing clear rules in each State to avoid the inconsistent adoption of standards from other States

where weather, economic or social characteristics can be quite different from those of the State adopting them.

- END -