INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

**AFI PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION REGIONAL GROUP
NINETEENTH MEETING (APIRG/19)
(Dakar, Senegal, 28 to 31 October 2013)**

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

Agenda Item 3.1: **Aerodrome Operational Planning (AOP)**

REVIEW OF THE REPORT OF THE TENTH MEETING OF THE AERODROME PLANNING SUB-GROUP (AOP/SG/10)

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY
This paper presents the report of the Tenth Meeting of the Aerodrome Operational Planning Sub-Group (AOP/SG/10). The Sub-Group received and reviewed the follow-up action taken on the APIRG/18 meeting Conclusions and Decisions. Whilst reviewing the list of deficiencies in the AOP field, the meeting acknowledged the slow progress of the removal of these deficiencies in some States. It noted that Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) developed by the States after completion of safety oversight audits under ICAO USOAP to remove the findings observed were not being fully implemented. The meeting noted the AOP issues of major concerns raised in the safety audits in particular the requirements for aerodrome certification, State Safety Programme, Safety Management Systems and Runway Safety.
Action required by APIRG/19 is at paragraph 3
REFERENCES: -AN CONF/12 Report -APIRG 18 Report -AOP/SG/10 Report
Strategic Objective(s)   This working paper related to the Strategic Objectives A and C**.**

1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 The Tenth Meeting of the Aerodrome Operational Planning (AOP/SG/10) was held in Nairobi, Kenya from 5 to 7 August 2013 and was attended by 45 participants from 13 States and 4 International and Regional Organizations of ASECNA, COSCAP-UEMOA, IFALPA and IFATCA

2. **DISCUSSION**

2.1 **Follow up of APIRG/18 Meeting Conclusions and Decisions related to AOP Field**

General

2.2.1 Under this agenda item, the meeting reviewed the status of implementation across the AFI Region of the previous APIRG meetings. It was noted that although substantial implementation progress had been achieved, there had been several challenges in particular related to the scarcity of adequately trained

and experienced aerodromes inspectors. After discussion, the meeting formulated the following draft conclusion:

> **DRAFT CONCLUSION 10/1:**   **AERODROME INSPECTOR TRAINING**
>
> **That:**
>
> a) **States wishing to get ICAO training (Integrated Safety Management Course, Aerodrome Inspector's Courses and Aerodromes Certification Course) should send requests to ICAO Regional Offices, and where possible coordinate such requests with other States for Region-wide benefit, and that when such courses are organized, States should include participants from the "Regulator", "Aerodrome Operator" and "Airline Operators"; and**
> b) **Regional Safety Oversight Organizations (RSOOs) which have developed Aerodrome Inspector Training Systems should share them with others.**

2.2   Review of the AFI Air Navigation Plan

2.2.1   AFI ANP List of International Aerodromes

2.2.2   The meeting revisited this long standing issue with respect to the existence in the AFI ANP List of International Airports of some airports which are not currently receiving and are not planning to receive in the foreseeable future regular international flights. Such airports are not therefore given priority in allocation of resources and are therefore poorly equipped. Consequently such aerodromes continue to remain with deficiencies for a long time. The meeting acknowledged that specific circumstances in Africa sometimes require flights across boarders which technically are international flights. Aerodromes from and to which such flights operate are international Airports as defined by Annex 9 (Facilitation) to the Chicago Convention and some States include them in their list of international aerodromes for AFI ANP purposes. However due to the small volume of traffic and in many cases the size of the aircrafts used, such aerodromes were not properly equipped.

2.3   12th Air Navigation Conference (AN CONF/12) (Montreal, 19-30 November 2012)

2.3.1   The meeting further noted that following the outcome of the 12th Air Navigation Conference (AN CONF/12, Montreal, 19-30 November 2012) Recommendation 6/11 "Regional performance framework – alignment of air navigation plans and regional supplementary procedures", it was necessary to align the areas of applicability of the Regional Air Navigation Plans (ANPs) with the Regional Supplementary Procedures (SUPPs). The alignment of the areas of applicability of the ANPs and SUPPs will integrate, within each planning and implementation regional group (PIRG). This will provide benefits to States, PIRGs and the ICAO Secretariat to support a more efficient implementation of the Aviation System Block Upgrades (ASBU) methodology in the regions. The meeting therefore reviewed the changes consequent to this outcome related to some States from the Africa-Indian Ocean (AFI) ANP (Doc 7474) to the Middle East (MID) ANP (Doc 9708) and from AFI ANP to Europe (ANP Doc 9639). The meeting was appraised of the ICAO Council approved procedure for the amendment of the Basic ANP and FASID. The meeting formulated the following draft conclusion:

> **DRAFT CONCLUSION 10/2:**   **REVIEW OF THE AFI AIR NAVIGATION PLAN**
>
> **That ICAO should, where it has obtained official communication from the States, proceed with the amendment of Doc 7474 Vol. I, AFI ANP – List of International Aerodromes, in accordance with the procedure for amendment of the Basic ANP approved by the Council.**

2.4   ICAO Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme

2.4.1   The meeting acknowledged that the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) has unquestionably contributed towards improving the safety of international civil aviation by promoting the systematic implementation by States of ICAO safety-related Standards and Recommended Practices. The fundamental and time-tested process of identifying deficiencies through the safety oversight audits, encouraging States to develop and implement plans to correct the deficiencies and analyzing the audit results to create a guide for future improvements is the cornerstone for the success of USOAP.

2.4.2   The meeting appreciated the evolvement of USOAP to a Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) which will monitor the safety oversight capabilities of ICAO Member States on an ongoing basis and carry out various USOAP activities based on an analysis of safety risks.

2.4.3   The meeting reviewed an evaluation of the USOAP results that indicate that in all the critical elements of a State's safety oversight system (including in the AGA area) the percentage of Lack of Effective Implementation (LEI) in the AFI Region is substantially higher than the global average and formulated the following draft conclusion:

> **DRAFT CONCLUSION 10/3:   UNIVERSAL SAFETY OVERSIGHT AUDIT PROGRAMME (USOAP)**
>
> **That:**
>
> a)   **In order to realize improved LEI of the various Critical Elements, States should ensure aerodrome inspectors are adequately trained, including on-the-job training, specialized training, refresher training etc. to effectively perform all the safety oversight functions;**
>
> b)   **For ASECNA member States, where there are occasions where several aerodrome operator responsibilities are shared among several entities, the concerned States should identify and clearly designate which entity shall be certified and shall hold that certification on behalf of all the others and shall therefore have accountability on the activities of all the other entities; and**
>
> c)   **ICAO should consider publishing for the use by States a technical guidance material on the conduct of aeronautical studies and the use of the results of the aeronautical studies for the evaluation of requests for exemptions.**

2.5   Runway Safety Programmes

2.5.1   The meeting noted that runway safety programmes should be based on inter-organizational safety management including the creation of local runway safety teams that address prevention and mitigation of runway excursions, runway incursions and other occurrences related to runway safety.

2.5.2   The meeting was apprised of the fact that a Global Runway Safety Symposium (GRSS) was held in Montreal, Canada, from 24 to 26 May 2011. The symposium was an important first step in coordinating a global effort for improving runway safety by identifying what a State can do to improve runway safety outcomes, including determining a common framework for the enhancement of runway safety. The GRSS recommended the holding of Regional Runway Safety Seminars (RRSS) at the regional levels, and so far there have been two RRSS in the AFI region, the first one took place in Cape Town, South Africa in October 29-30, 2012 whilst the second was held in April 10-12 in Agadir, Morocco. In general the outcomes and conclusions of the two meetings were that States were encouraged to establish Runway Safety Teams (RSTs).

2.5.3   At these Regional Runway Safety Seminars, ACI committed to support AFI States by providing free training related to SMS and basics of ICAO Annex 14 and in particular aerodrome signs and markings as well as facilitating knowledge sharing and information. In addition, ACI promoted the idea of self-assessment as a first step to Aerodrome Certification. CANSO, on the other hand, committed to facilitate

communication with ATC to obtain their commitment and to provide guidance material. As a successful RST programme requires all key stakeholders to cooperate in a collaborative manner, ICAO committed to develop a Runway Safety Team Handbook.

2.5.4   The meeting was informed that as a follow up, the ESAF Regional Office is collaborating with AVIASSIST and the Civil Aviation Safety and Security Regional Safety Oversight Agency (CASSOA) for the East African Community (EAC) to hold a seminar on runway safety at Entebbe, from 4 to 8 November 2013. The seminar programme will include establishment of a Runway Safety Team at Entebbe International Airport and the participants from the five EAC Partner States are expected to establish the RSTs in their State.

2.5.5   The meeting considered that for the RSTs to be efficient and effective, they should include at least the following:-

    a)   airport operator;
    b)   air traffic services;
    c)   commercial air operators;
    d)   pilots;
    e)   members from the general aviation community (if applicable);
    f)   the regulatory authority;
    g)   military operator (if applicable);
    h)   support services (de-icing, catering, ground handling, etc.);
    i)   emergency response service providers; and
    j)   subject matter experts (upon invitation).

2.5.6   The meeting agreed that RSTs should be hosted by the airport operator and the agenda for the meeting should as a minimum include:

    a)   an update on previous recommendations;
    b)   new hazards and associated consequences;
    c)   risk assessments of the consequences; and
    d)   proposed recommendations for managing the risk.

2.5.7   The meeting formulated the following draft conclusion:

DRAFT CONCLUSION 10/4:   RUNWAY SAFETY PROGRAMMES

That:

    a)   **States should ensure that all international aerodromes establish RSTs; and**
    b)   **The runway safety teams established should be appropriately mandated to monitor the runway incursion and excursion incidences and accidents and propose mitigation measures proactively.**

2.6   Aviation System Block Upgrade (ASBU) Concept

2.6.1   The meeting was apprised of the content of the Global Air Navigation Plan (GANP) (Doc 9750) which introduces the ICAO Aviation System Block Upgrade (ASBU) methodology and supporting technology roadmaps based on a rolling fifteen-year planning horizon. The meeting noted that although the GANP has a global perspective, it is not intended that all ASBU modules are to be applied around the globe. Some of the ASBU modules contained in the GANP are specialized packages that should be applied where specific operational requirements or corresponding benefits exist. Of some importance is the need for each of the modules to be both flexible and scalable to the point where their application could be managed through any set of regional plans and still realize the intended benefits. The preferential basis for the

development of the modules relies on the applications being adjustable to fit many regional needs as an alternative to being made mandated as a one-size-fits-all application. Even so, it is clear that many of the modules developed in the block upgrades will not be necessary to manage the complexity of air traffic management in many parts of the world.

2.6.2   In particular, the meeting took note of the Conclusion 6/1 of the AN-Conf/12 as well as the outcome of PIRG-RASG coordination meeting held in March 2013, calling on PIRGs to develop regional action plans for ASBU by May 2014. The action plans are expected to contain:

        a)   priorities and targets for ASBU Block 0 Modules;
        b)   identification of implementation challenges; and
        c)   determining implementation and benefit indicators/metrics.

2.6.3   The meeting established a Task Force to develop the categorization and prioritization of ASBU block 0 Modules for AFI region in the area of Aerodrome Operations and a related set of Air Navigation Reporting Forms (ANRFs) 1 for Block 0 Modules with performance objectives, targets, challenges and implementation as well as benefit metrics.

2.7   ICAO-ACI APEX Programme

2.7.1   Under this agenda item, the meeting was apprised of the ICAO-ACI APEX Programme, an ACI initiative announced at the ICAO Global Runway Safety Symposium in Montreal in May 2011 whose aim is to assist airport operators with the improvement of level of safety and compliance with ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices. The APEX in Safety Programme was launched in September 2011, with a pilot Safety Review being performed in Lomé, Togo. Following this first successful mission and by the end of 2012, five other pilot Safety Reviews have been conducted, covering four regions, namely Africa, Asia-Pacific, Europe and Latin America.

2.7.2   The procedure of the APEX in Safety Programme is based on a Memorandum of Cooperation ("MoC") between ACI and ICAO to provide a framework in order to jointly pursue the highest possible levels of safety at airports worldwide.

2.7.3   The APEX in Safety programme is based on ICAO Annex 14 Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPS) and ACI Best Practices. It takes the form of a peer review process called a Safety Review, including a self-assessment of the safety level, gap analysis, recommended solutions and design of an action plan following an on-site visit at an airport (the "Host Airport") which has requested assistance to enhance its level of safety. The meeting acknowledged the benefits associated with the ICAO-ACI APEX Programme through access to experts, training, workshops and seminars, working groups at local, regional and international levels. These benefits result to the State oversight capabilities receiving a boost, as the airport participating in the APEX in Safety Programme will display a greater level of compliance with SARPS and the national regulations applicable. The APEX in Safety Programme offers a unique opportunity for airports to assess their current level of safety in a manner which is non-punitive and all-inclusive, as well as ensuring that their safety needs are addressed and appropriate solutions are developed. The airports being reviewed benefit from ACI best practices, operational expertise from peer airports and other Programme partners, and contribution from ICAO. The meeting therefore formulated the following draft conclusion:

        DRAFT CONCLUSION 10/6:   ICAO-ACI APEX PROGRAMME

        That States:

        a)   Support the use of the APEX in Safety Programme at airports in the AFI region;
        b)   Encourage airport operators to approach ACI for assistance through the APEX in Safety Programme; and to recommend airports operators in the AFI region to

c) **participate in the APEX Safety Reviews Programme and share relevant information on safety;**

d) **Encourage the pooling of competences of States to carry out aerodrome certification audits, considering the poor human resources available at the national level;**

e) **Encourage the sharing of experiences between ICAO, States, the COSCAP projects and regional civil aviation safety oversight organizations; and**

f) **Encourage the participation of these Organizations in the ICAO/ACI APEX programme.**

2.7.4   The meeting was briefed and appreciated that the activities being conducted within UEMOA-COSCAP had allowed it to obtain extensive experience in the region and knowledge of the subsequent problems. It noted that UEMOA-COSCAP will continue to provide technical assistance to all the UEMOA Member States and Mauritania. The objectives being to certify in the medium term the main airports. The programme established by the UEMOA-COSCAP to that effect covers six phases, ranging from training to the conduct of certification and continuing oversight activities.

2.7.5   Within the framework of international cooperation, the UEMOA-COSCAP takes part in joint assistance missions together with other organizations (ICAO Regional Office, EASA and AFCAC). Also, at the request of ICAO, UEMOA-COSCAP Inspectors take part in assistance missions to States which are not members of the Project. The UEMOA- COSCAP has also provided AFCAC with Inspectors under the AFI-CIS programme. The meeting noted with appreciation that within the framework of this international cooperation, the UEMOA-COSCAP is prepared to assist the ICAO/ACI APEX programme by putting its technical staff at its disposal.

2.8   High Level Safety Targets-Abuja 2012 Ministerial Conference

2.8.1   Under this agenda item, the meeting noted that the ministers responsible for civil aviation demonstrated goodwill and political support at the Ministerial Conference on Aviation Safety which will significantly help to implement aviation safety in the AFI region. The political support demonstrated during the Conference is seen as an important element for achieving the Safety Targets within the time lines as indicated in the Plan of Action on Aviation Safety in Africa. In order to systematically and effectively achieve the above Safety Targets, the Conference developed a Plan of Action on Aviation Safety in Africa to monitor and evaluate the status of implementation of the various issues, conclusions and initiatives. Bearing this in mind, the meeting formulated a draft conclusion:

DRAFT CONCLUSION 10/7:   HIGH LEVEL SAFETY TARGETS-ABUJA 2012 MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE

That:

a) **AFI Member States are urged to strictly adhere to the AFI 2012 Ministerial Conference proposed plan of action for the implementation of the proposed Safety Targets in conformity with the set time lines; and**

b) **AFI States should provide information/feedback on the implementation status of the Safety Targets to enable AFCAC monitor the level of implementation.**

2.9   Review of the AOP/SG terms of reference in support of the ICAO strategic objectives

2.9.1   Under this agenda item, the meeting reviewed its terms of reference and future work programmes with a view to incorporating ICAO's emphasis on ensuring all activities support the ICAO Strategic Objectives. The meeting amended item 1.3 of the ToR to include the Sub-Group's contribution towards the ASBU concept, the aerodrome planning and design and runway safety:

3.   ACTION REQUIRED BY THE MEETING

3.1   The meeting is invited to:

      a)   note the information provided in the AOP/SG/10 meeting report
      b)   take action on the proposed draft conclusions.

----END----