



WORKING PAPER

**DANGEROUS GOODS PANEL (DGP)
MEETING OF THE WORKING GROUP OF THE WHOLE**

Montréal, 15 to 19 April 2013

Agenda Item 6 : Resolution, where possible, of the non-recurrent work items identified by the Air Navigation Commission or the Dangerous Goods Panel

IDENTIFICATION AND JUSTIFICATION FOR NON-RECURRENT WORK ITEMS

(Presented by the Secretary)

SUMMARY

This working paper presents the concept of job cards as part of the Air Navigation Commission's Work Programme review and guidance on completing job-cards.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 During its review of the agenda for DGP/24, the ANC noted that the non-recurrent work items contained issues suitable for "job cards" (amendment forms) and asked that their use be initiated in this biennial cycle. The following information explains the concept of job cards as part of the Air Navigation Commission's (ANC) work programme review.

1.2 Proposals for new work items or the amendment of existing work items are normally assessed by the ANC Working Group of the whole for Strategic Review and Planning (ANC-WG/SRP) prior to approval by the ANC. In general, the assessment considers if an item addresses an existing or emerging safety risk, or if there is justification on air navigation efficiency grounds, i.e. it is probable that there will be economically sound sustainability or implementation benefits. To do this assessment, the proposal must include sufficient and adequate information, which is to be provided using the form shown in Appendix B. Proposals for new work items will only be assessed if submitted to the chairperson of the ANC-WG/SRP on the amendment form (otherwise known as a job-card).

1.3 Proposals for the amendment of the ANC work programme shall be submitted to the ANC-WG/SRP on a job-card for an initial discussion, and shall be approved by the ANC. For each amendment, at least the following information forming a work plan will be provided:

- 1) a title (i.e. what is being addressed);
- 2) a problem statement (i.e. why it needs to be addressed);
- 3) expected benefits (in terms of safety, cost and environmental impact); and
- 4) the required action, by whom and when.

1.4 Proposals for new or future work items for panels and study groups are normally developed during meetings and included in the meeting report. It would be helpful for the proposals to be outlined in the job-card format as the ANC-WG/SRP will usually consider the proposals during a review of the meeting report.

1.5 The template to be used is provided in Appendix A and guidelines on completing job-cards is provided in Appendix B

APPENDIX A

Working Group on Strategic Review and Planning – ANWP Amendment Input Form (job-card)

PART I				
Category	Safety	Sustainability	Implementation	Reference:
Title				
Proposed by				
Problem Statement				
Specific Details (including impact statements)				
PART II				
Rating	High	Medium	Low	
Rationale for acceptance/rejection				
Action already in progress				
Interdependencies/References				
Required Action	By Whom/Resources	Deliverables	Timescales (for deliverable)	
1				
2				
3				
4				
Issue Date:	Date Assessed by SRP:	Date Approved by ANC:	Next Review Date:	Completed Date:

APPENDIX B

GUIDELINES ON COMPLETING THE JOB-CARD

Part I

Category	Indicate which one or more of the 3 categories the proposal best addresses – highlight the category in bold
Reference	This will be provided by the SRP
Title	Provide a short one line title that describes the task proposed
Proposed by	Provide the name or the name of the meeting/conference
Problem Statement	This should be one sentence that describes the issue that needs to be addressed
Specific Details (including impact statements)	This area should be used to describe in more detail the specifics of the issue, including any evidence of its magnitude or impact on aviation (e.g. safety or cost statistics from any credible source); anything that provides compelling evidence of scale of the problem. For example, how often has the “problem” occurred; how many fatalities have occurred; how many hull losses have occurred in the last 5 or 10 years? It might also be useful to know whether it is global or region specific; whether there are any specific conditions under which it occurs, such as related to weather, night/day, topography and phase of flight. Consider also to include details of the impact if the amendment was not developed. It may not be possible to provide accurate information on impact statements (safety, cost, environmental, regulatory, etc.) at this stage (unless perhaps it is to counter safety data) but an outline of potential impacts would be very useful for further development during the project. These details will be used by the WG/SRP (and ANC) in determining the merit of the proposal.

Part II

Rating	Suggest a rating by highlighting it in bold. In general, but according to the category, one of the following criteria will apply: High – will result in a mitigating reduction of an unacceptable safety risk/hazard or will enable an essential global business objective; Medium – will enable general safety or business efficiency improvements; Low – will not have any impact on safety or efficiency, or is needed to update, improve or provide guidance on existing provisions.
Action already in progress	Detail here any part of the proposal that is already accounted for in another work item, either in ICAO or another body.
Interdependencies/References	Detail here the relevant work contained in existing work items and/or documentation that may be impacted by this proposal.
Rationale for Acceptance/Rejection	This will be completed once the ANC’s decision is known.
Required Action	Provide details of what you think should be done (and what the deliverables should be) and by when. In general, all accepted work items should be addressed by project-based actions (i.e. following the SMART principle).

Note. — It should be possible to complete the form on one page. Where possible, and to avoid expanding the length of the form, hyperlinks to references or other documentation can be inserted in the form.

— END —