International Civil Aviation Organization
North American, Central American and Caribbean Office

INFORMATION PAPER

C/CAR/DCA/14 — IP/14
10/04/15

Fourteenth Directors of Civil Aviation of the Central Caribbean Meeting (C/CAR/DCA/14)
Kingston, Jamaica, 11 to 13 May 2015

Agenda Item 3: Aviation Safety Management
3.3 Second High-Level Safety Conference 2015 (HLSC 2015)

STATE SAFETY PROGRAMME

(Presented by Cuba)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
This information paper presents the experience of Cuba in the application of gap analysis as a preliminary step for the State Safety Programme (SSP) implementation.	
Strategic Objective:	• Safety
References:	• Second High Level Safety Conference (HLSC 2015) • ICAO Global Aviation Safety Plan • *Safety Management Manual* (SMM), Doc 9859, Third Edition, 2013 • Cuban Aviation Regulation RAC 19 Safety Management

1. Introduction

1.1 Among the emerging issues discussed under the subtopic of State Safety Programme of the High-Level Conference held at ICAO Headquarters in February 2015 (HLSC 2015), the importance of having a proactive approach to identify hazards and manage safety risks stood out. The Standards and Recommended Practices of ICAO Annex 19 — Safety Management, stipulate that States must manage aviation safety risks. This strategy is based on the implementation of a State Safety Programme (SSP) to systematically deal safety risks.

1.2 In order to achieve the safety goals set forth in the Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP), ICAO encourages States to have a level of effective implementation of more than 60 percent of the 8 critical elements evaluated in the USOAP audits, which is to say those States which have already established a mature system of safety oversight, to conduct a gap analysis of the SSP and formulate a plan to implement a SSP. This will enable them to identify dangers inherent to their aviation environment and subsequently assess and mitigate the associated risks, including the ones arising from the changes to be done.

2. SSP Gap Analysis

2.1 The percentage of effective implementation of the 8 critical elements of the safety oversight system of Cuba, derived from the USOAP CMA audit is 87.76%, which is over the recommended 60% to begin the implementation of an SSP. Consequently, since 2014 and in order to implement the State Safety Programme, a gap analysis was made through the system that ICAO provides in its website.

2.2 The gap analysis conducted placed Cuba on a L3 level, which shows that all aspects inherent to the SSP were evaluated and 50.9% achieved of the planned actions for a total implementation. It is important to mention that regarding to the 4 SSP components, the implementation performance is as follows:

1.	State Safety Programme policy and objectives	59% implemented
2.	State Safety Programme risks management	20% implemented
3.	State Safety Programme assurance	47% implemented
4.	State Safety Programme promotion	50% implemented

2.3 The aforementioned proofs that the most significant missing issues are precisely the elements that constitute the foundations of the SSP, the processes of hazard identification and risk management. This coincides with the deficiencies identified in the risk management systems of aviation, aeronautic, and airport service providers, identified in the assessments made by the IACC since 2012, which allowed to identify aspects to prioritize when implementing SSP aimed to the services providers SMS operation and the IACC safety oversight system among which are following:

- Ensure the efficiency in the reactive phase of the Safety Management Systems of service providers
- Perfect the risk management based in data, both of the IACC safety oversight system, and of the service providers Safety Management Systems

3. SSP Implementation

3.1 After a Gap analysis and other performed activities, it has been decided to implement in 2015 the safety programme in Cuba, in its initial phase named “Basic”, and its immediate objective is to develop and consolidate the two elements to be prioritized, mentioned in paragraph 2.3 through works and measurable goals aimed at:

- Establishing coherent links between the State safety indicators and the performance indicators from safety management systems service providers, as well as the State safety surveillance system
- Developing and perfecting the practices related to the performance indicators determination and the follow-up and control to ensure that they are and will maintain relevant in interest of the safety goals achievement
- Establishing safety performance acceptable levels, systematically review their effectiveness and perfect them as a linking instrument to evaluate the efficiency of the Safety Management Systems and the State safety surveillance system

4. Conclusions

4.1 For the SSP implementation, the GASP established clear objectives and a strategy to achieve them, considering the maturity level of the States safety oversight system. In our experience, having a higher level of 60% of effective implementation is an indispensable requirement to implement SSP. However, there could be missing elements or gaps for such implementation, which may determine since the beginning the objectives to a longer term related with the necessary change toward a proactive and farsighted culture.

4.2 In our experience, the SSP implementation allows establishing requirements to the 8 critical elements that characterize the State safety oversight system, ensuring that they correspond in each moment with the required operational phase to the Safety Management Systems of service providers.

— END —