



ICAO

UNITING AVIATION

ICAO MID-SEIG/3

Virtual Meeting 23 Nov 2021

Chakib Mohamed
RO-SAF/IMP





State Safety Programme Implementation Assessment (SSPIA)

1. Roll-out of SSPIAs under phase 2
2. SSP-related PQs
3. Maturity levels
4. Associated guidance material
5. Training of ICAO SSP implementation assessors



- ❑ ICAO launched SSP Implementation Assessments (SSPIAs) under the USOAP CMA
- ❑ From 2018 to 2019, ICAO conducted three voluntary and non-confidential SSPIAs **under Phase 1**
- ❑ Three additional assessments were scheduled in 2020; however, they were postponed, due to global pandemic restrictions.



- ❑ Reflect the maturity levels the State's has achieved in its SSP implementation and maintenance.
- ❑ Maturity levels are determined separately for each PQ (there is no "overall area maturity level", nor "overall SSP maturity level").
- ❑ Complement, and do not impact, the State's Effective Implementation (EI) score.
- ❑ Do not generate findings.
- ❑ Do not require the State to submit a "corrective action plan" (CAP).
- ❑ Are conducted by a limited pool of assessors, to ensure consistency.
- ❑ Will be accompanied by a traditional USOAP CMA activity (i.e. focused audit)



- ❑ Level of implementation of SSP Foundation PQs and evidence of:
 - A robust and sustainable safety oversight system and aircraft accident/serious incident investigation system; and
 - An effective mandatory safety reporting system, State aircraft accident and incident database and safety analyses; and

- ❑ Effective completion and updates of PQ self-assessment by the State (for all PQs, including SSP-related PQs).



- ❑ Reflect Annex 19 Amdt 1, SMM 4th edition and lessons learnt from voluntary assessments conducted.
- ❑ Form a dedicated list of PQs (complementing the PQs on “core” safety oversight and investigation functions).
- ❑ Are not linked to Critical Elements (CEs), but to applicable SSP components (e.g. State safety policy and objectives, State Safety Risk Management, State Safety Assurance and State Safety Promotion).
- ❑ Are not assessed as “satisfactory/non-satisfactory”, but in terms of maturity levels.
- ❑ Are supported by references from ICAO manuals.



1. SSP general aspects (GEN);
2. safety data analysis general aspects (SDA);
3. personnel licensing and training (PEL);
4. aircraft operations (OPS);
5. airworthiness of aircraft (AIR), approved maintenance organization (AMO) aspects only;
6. air navigation services(ANS) (air traffic services) (ATS) aspects only;
7. aerodromes and ground aids (AGA); and
8. aircraft accident and incident investigation (AIG).



The amended SSP-related PQs have as a ‘background’ the following key questions related to SSP implementation:

- What are the State’s main/top safety risks?
- How does the State know it?
- What is the State doing about it?
- Is it working?



5 maturity levels have been determined:

- 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



- ❑ The assessment is made separately for each PQ, for each assessed area.
- ❑ Determination of the overall PQ maturity level is made by assessing every item in that same level.
- ❑ A higher maturity level can only be assessed upon the fulfillment of the corresponding items in the previous maturity level (i.e. in order to be further assessed for “present and effective” the PQ first needs to meet the criteria for “present”).
- ❑ “Present and effective for years and in continuous improvement” is only applicable upon a State’s 2nd SSPIA.



Example

PQ No.	Protocol Question	References in ICAO Guidance Material	SSP Component	Maturity Levels			
				Not Present and Not Planned	Not Present but Being Worked On	Present	Present and Effective
SSP.SDA.01	What safety data collection and processing systems has the State established to support safety data analysis at the State level?	SMM Ch. 5	State Safety Risk Management	Based on current situation in State	Based on State's work in progress	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a mechanism in place to ensure the collection, processing and analysis of safety data at the State level. 2. The sources for safety data and safety information include data and information derived from accident and incident investigations, mandatory occurrence reporting systems and other sources, including voluntary reporting. 3. There is a mechanism in place at the State level to ensure the categorization of safety data and an agreed upon taxonomy at the State level, with supporting definitions. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The safety data that are collected, processed and analyzed contain all relevant data that might be collected. 2. The safety data at the State level are categorized using an agreed upon taxonomy and supporting definitions, in a way that supports analysis of the safety data.



Issues

- ❑ SSP-related PQs and associated maturity levels
- ❑ Core “safety-oversight and investigation” aspects
- ❑ Methodology for preparation, conduct and reporting of SSP implementation assessments

Guidance Material

- ❑ SMM, 4th edition
- ❑ Doc 9734 — Safety Oversight Manual, Part A — The Establishment and Management of a State Safety Oversight System
- ❑ Existing internal process + guidance to be included in the next edition of Doc 9735 — Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme Continuous Monitoring Manual



- ❑ A team of assessors is being trained progressively to address SSP-related PQs in the various areas.
- ❑ Assessors include ICAO staff as well as secondees from States and Regional Safety Oversight Organizations.



THANK YOU!