



ICAO

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

**State Safety Programme (SSP) Meeting for the
NAM/CAR Regions
(NAM/CAR/SSP/1)**

Final Report

Mexico City, Mexico, 20 to 22 November 2018

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of ICAO concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

List of Contents

Contents	Page
Index	i-1
Historical	ii-1
ii.1 Place and Date of the Meeting.....	ii-1
ii.2 Opening Ceremony.....	ii-1
ii.3 Officers of the Meeting	ii-1
ii.4 Working Languages	ii-1
ii.5 Schedule and Working Arrangements.....	ii-1
ii.6 Agenda	ii-2
ii.7 Attendance	ii-3
ii.8 List of Working and Information Papers and Presentations	ii-3
List of Participants	iii-1
Contact Information	iv-1
Agenda Item 1	1-1
<i>Update on ICAO Expectations and timelines / ICAO Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) and Safety Management-Related Goals</i>	
Agenda Item 2	2-1
<i>NAM/CAR Regional State Safety Programme (SSP) Implementation Strategy</i>	
Agenda Item 3	3-1
<i>Work with the Regional Implementation Groups (GREPECAS, RASG-PA, ANI/WG, etc.) in analysing key areas of the State Safety Programme (SSP) and Safety Management System (SMS) within the NAM/CAR Regions</i>	
Agenda Item 4	4-1
<i>Canada’s State Safety Programme (SSP)</i>	
4.1 <i>Process of Implementation</i>	
4.2 <i>Lessons Learned</i>	
4.3 <i>Best Practices</i>	
4.4 <i>Continuous Evaluation and Monitoring</i>	
Agenda Item 5	5-1
<i>Experiences from other NAM/CAR Region States – Group/Tier 1 States</i>	
Agenda Item 6	6-1
<i>Development of Implementation Strategies for Specific States</i>	

Contents	Page
Agenda Item 7 <i>Creation of Continuous Support from Canada for Phase 1 and Other Implementation Aspects for SSP</i>	7-1
Agenda Item 8 <i>Other Business</i>	8-1

HISTORICAL

ii.1 Place and Date of the Meeting

The State Safety Programme (SSP) Meeting for the NAM/CAR Regions (NAM/CAR/SSP/1) was held at the ICAO NACC Regional Office in Mexico City, Mexico, from 20 to 22 November 2018.

ii.2 Opening Ceremony

Mr. Ricardo Delgado, Regional Officer Aviation Security and Facilitation and Officer in Charge of the North American, Central American and Caribbean (NACC) Office of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) provided opening remarks, welcomed the participants to Mexico City and officially opened the meeting.

ii.3 Officers of the Meeting

Mr. Eddian Méndez, Regional Officer Air Traffic Management and Search and Rescue served as Secretary of the Meeting, assisted by Mr. Marc St. Laurent, Accidents Investigation Consultant and Mr. Javier Alemán, Aircraft Operations Consultant, all from the ICAO NACC Regional Office.

ii.4 Working Languages

The working languages of the Meeting were English and Spanish. The working papers, information papers and report of the meeting were available to participants in both languages.

ii.5 Schedule and Working Arrangements

It was agreed that the working hours for the sessions of the meeting would be from 09:00 to 16:00 hours daily with adequate breaks.

ii.6 Agenda

Agenda Item 1 Update on ICAO Expectations and timelines / ICAO Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) and Safety Management-Related Goals

Agenda Item 2 NAM/CAR Regional State Safety Programme (SSP) Implementation Strategy

Agenda Item 3 Work with the Regional Implementation Groups (GREPECAS, RASG-PA, ANI/WG, etc.) in analysing key areas of the State Safety Programme (SSP) and Safety Management System (SMS) within the NAM/CAR Regions

Agenda Item 4 Canada’s State Safety Programme (SSP)

- 4.1 Process of Implementation
- 4.2 Lessons Learned
- 4.3 Best Practices
- 4.4 Continuous Evaluation and Monitoring

Agenda Item 5 Experiences from other NAM/CAR Region States – Group/Tier 1 States

Agenda Item 6 Development of Implementation Strategies for Specific States

Agenda Item 7 Creation of Continuous Support from Canada for Phase 1 and Other Implementation Aspects for SSP

Agenda Item 8 Other Business

ii.7 Attendance

The Meeting was attended by 8 States from the CAR Region and one International Organization, totalling 13 delegates as indicated in the list of participants.

ii.8 List of Working and Information Papers and Presentations

Refer to the Meeting web page:

<https://www.icao.int/NACC/Pages/meetings-2018-ncssp1.aspx>

WORKING PAPERS

Number	Agenda Item	Title	Date	Prepared and Presented by
WP/01	--	Review and Approval of the Provisional Agenda and Schedule of the Meeting	14/11/18	Secretariat
WP/02	2	Regional SSP Implementation Strategy for the NAM and CAR Regions	13/11/18	Secretariat

INFORMATION PAPERS

Number	Agenda Item	Title	Date	Prepared and Presented by
IP/01	--	List of Working, Information Papers and Presentations	06/12/18	Secretariat
IP/02	1	Thirteenth Air Navigation Conference Recommendations	13/11/18	Secretariat
IP/03	5	Strategy and Implementation Status of the Dominican Republic State Safety Programme	13/11/18	Dominican Republic

PRESENTATIONS

Number	Agenda Item	Title	Presented by
P/01	3	GASP implementation status in the Panamerican Region	Secretariat
P/02	1	State Safety Programme Implementation Tools	Secretariat
P/03	1	SSP Implementation Plan	Secretariat

PRESENTATIONS			
Number	Agenda Item	Title	Presented by
P/04	1	Safety Management Competencies	Secretariat
P/05	4	SSP Implementation Process – Canada	Canada
P/06	2	State Safety Programmes (SSP) Implementation Assessments Under USOAP CMA - NACC SSP Implementation Strategy	Secretariat
P/07	5	Estrategia y Estado de Implementación SSP (<i>available only in Spanish</i>)	República Dominicana
P/08	5	Reunión sobre el Programa de Seguridad Operacional del Estado (<i>available only in Spanish</i>)	Cuba
P/09	5	Estado de Implementación del SSP (<i>available only in Spanish</i>)	El Salvador
P/10	5	Programa de Seguridad Operacional del Estado (<i>available only in Spanish</i>)	Honduras
P/11	5	Programa Estatal de Seguridad Operacional (<i>available only in Spanish</i>)	México
P/12	5	Implementación SSP (<i>available only in Spanish</i>)	Nicaragua
P/13	8	Effective Safety Investigations and SMS	Secretariat

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

CANADA/CANADÁ

Gordon Swanson

CUBA

Mario Ardanza González

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC/REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA

Ninoska Elizabeth Rodríguez Reynoso
Brenda Alexandra Núñez de Bretón
Kelvin M. Abreu Ortiz

EL SALVADOR

Eduardo Mauricio Barahona Alfaro

HONDURAS

Ernesto José España Zelaya

MEXICO/MÉXICO

Victor Manuel Rosales Siurob
Leonardo Martínez Bautista

NICARAGUA

Uwe David Cano Navarro

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO/TRINIDAD Y TABAGO

Nigel Gomez
Andre N O'Brien

COCESNA

Elvin Rigoberto Lacayo Rodríguez

ICAO/OACI

Eddian Méndez
Marc St-Laurent
Javier Alemán

CONTACT INFORMATION

Name / Position Nombre / Puesto	Administration / Organization Administración / Organización	Telephone / E-mail Teléfono / Correo-e
Canada/Canadá		
Gordon Swanson Executive Advisor, State Safety Program	Transport Canada	Tel. +1 604 666 5821 E-mail gordon.swanson@tc.gc.ca
Cuba		
Mario Ardanza González Especialista Aeronautico Oficina CMA IACC	Instituto de Aeronáutica Civil de Cuba (IACC)	Tel. 53-7 838 1123 E-mail mario.ardanza@iacc.avianet.cu
Dominican Republic/República Dominicana		
Ninoska Elizabeth Rodríguez Reynoso Encargada División Gestión Estatal del Riesgo de la Seguridad Operacional	Instituto Dominicano de Aviación Civil (IDAC)	Tel. +1 809 274 4322 ext2237 E-mail NINOSKA.RODRIGUEZ@IDAC.GOV.DO
Brenda Alexandra Núñez de Bretón Encargado División de Aseguramiento Estatal de la Seguridad Operacional	IDAC	Tel. +809 274 4322 Ext6221 E-mail brenda.nunez@idac.gov.do
Kelvin M. Abreu Ortiz Encargado del Departamento de Gestión Estatal de la Seguridad Operacional	IDAC	Tel. +809 274 4322 ext2229 E-mail KABREU@IDAC.GOV.DO
El Salvador		
Eduardo Mauricio Barahona Alfaro Encargado del SSP e Investigacion de ACC. E Inc.	Autoridad de Aviación Civil (ACC)	Tel. +503 2565 4458 E-mail ebarahona@aac.gob.sv
Honduras		
Ernesto José España Zelaya Jefe de Departamento SSP	Agencia Hondureña de Aviación Civil (AHAC)	Tel. +504 9600 1212 E-mail eespana@ahac.gob.hn
Mexico/México		
Leonardo Martínez Bautista Subdirector de SSP	Dirección General de Aeronáutica Civil (DGAC)	Tel. +55 5723 9300 Ext.18058 E-mail lmartinb@sct.gob.mx
Victor Manuel Rosales Siurob Director General Adjunto de Seguridad Aérea / Coordinador del SSP	DGAC	Tel. +5255 5723 9300 ext18058 E-mail victor.rosaless@sct.gob.mx

NAM/CAR/SSP/1
List of Participants – Contact Information

iv – 2

Name / Position Nombre / Puesto	Administration / Organization Administración / Organización	Telephone / E-mail Teléfono / Correo-e
Nicaragua		
Uwe David Cano Navarro Coordinador SSP	Instituto Nicaragüense de Aeronáutica Civil (INAC)	Tel. + 505 22 76 8580 ext 1250 E-mail inspcns01@inac.gob.ni ; cgsafety@inac.gob.ni
Trinidad and Tobago/Trinidad y Tabago		
Nigel Gomez Airworthiness Inspector	Trinidad and Tobago Civil Aviation Authority (TTCCA)	Tel. +1 868 668 8222 E-mail ngomez@caa.gov.tt
Andre N O'Brien Manager Flight Standards	TTCAA	Tel. +1 868 668 8222 E-mail aobrien@caa.gov.tt
COCESNA		
Elvin Rigoberto Lacayo Rodríguez Analista de Planificación – Secretaría Técnica	COCESNA	Tel. +505 2233 1115 Ext5990 E-mail elvin.lacayo@cocesna.org ; capacitación@inac.gob.ni
ICAO		
Eddian Méndez Regional Officer, Air Traffic Management and Search and Rescue/Especialista Regional en Gestión del Tránsito Aéreo y Búsqueda y Salvamento	North American, Central American and Caribbean Office / Oficina para Norteamérica, Centroamérica y Caribe (NACC)	Tel. + 55 5250 32 11 E-mail emendez@icao.int
Marc St-Laurent AIG Consultant/Consultor AIG	North American, Central American and Caribbean Office / Oficina para Norteamérica, Centroamérica y Caribe (NACC)	Tel. +5255 52503211 ext136 E-mail MSt-Laurent@icao.int
Marc St-Laurent OPS Consultant/Consultor OPS	North American, Central American and Caribbean Office / Oficina para Norteamérica, Centroamérica y Caribe (NACC)	Tel. +5255 52503211 ext136 E-mail jaleman@icao.int

Agenda Item 1 Update on ICAO Expectations and timelines/ICAO Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) and Safety Management-Related Goals

Thirteenth Air Navigation Conference Recommendations

1.1 The Secretariat presented IP/02, which provides details regarding the recent recommendations resulted from the 13th Air Navigation Conference.

State Safety Programme Implementation Tools

1.2 With P/02 the Secretariat presented ICAO latest State Safety Programme Implementation tools. This is a revised message to the aviation community for ICAO SSP implementation strategy, explaining proposed changes to the ICAO Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) objectives.

1.3 States were encouraged to begin their journey toward effective SSP implementation, starting with ensuring a solid safety oversight foundation is established. Instead of expecting a 60% of Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) Effective Implementation (EI) to begin with SSP implementation, ICAO developed the SSP Foundation Tool. This application displays a sub-set of 299 Protocol Questions (PQs) out of the 1,047 PQs used to calculate the USOAP EI. This sub-set of questions is considered as the foundation for a SSP implementation. This sub-set of PQs aims to assist the States to build a solid safety oversight foundation for the implementation of SSP and identify the real gap. These PQs can be prioritized and addressed when conducting the SSP gap analysis or while defining the SSP implementation/action plan.

1.4 The SSP gap analysis remains as the main reference to guide the SSP implementation. This tool includes 55 questions to be completed to determine gap and support the development of an SSP implementation plan.

1.5 The SSP Foundation Tool and the SSP gap analysis, among other tools, are include in the iSTARS section of the ICAO Portal.

SSP Implementation Plan

1.6 The Secretariat presented P/03 with information to support SSP implementation. SSP implementation involves many tasks and subtasks to be completed within a set timeframe. The understanding of the size and complexity of a State's aviation system and the interactions between the elements is fundamental to planning the SSP. The State should describe the aviation system and the various State aviation authorities in a civil aviation system description as part of the SSP implementation planning process. Development of a plan for the implementation process is therefore crucial.

Safety Management Competencies

1.7 P/04 was a briefing on Annex 19 – *Safety Management* requirements for personnel competencies, and provided examples for reference of safety management competency frameworks. A new set of competencies are required for both civil aviation and the service providers' personnel for performing their safety management related tasks properly. Organizations should implement actions to address the gaps in order to ensure that their personnel are competent to perform their safety management duties.

Agenda Item 2 NAM/CAR Regional State Safety Programme (SSP) Implementation Strategy

Regional SSP Implementation Strategy for the NAM/CAR Regions

2.1 WP/02 presents a follow-up on the approval and execution of the NACC SSP Regional Implementation Strategy since the last update given on this implementation in the Thirtieth Regional Aviation Safety Group — Pan America Executive Steering Committee Meeting (RASG-PA ESC/30) held in Mexico City, Mexico, from 21 to 22 March 2018.

2.2 This strategy was developed in accordance with Conclusion NACC/DCA/07/6 – *NACC SSP IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY* and encompassed with the ICAO NACC Systemic Assistance Programme (SAP), to assist member States to comply with the requirements for the implementation of State Safety Programmes (SSPs) by States and Safety Management Systems (SMS) by service providers as established in the ICAO Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP).

2.3 The activities related to the strategy comprise direct actions to assist NAM/CAR member States to complete the implementation of every element required for the SSP implementation.

2.4 The NAM/CAR Regions status according to overall SSP Foundation Protocol Questions (PQs) results by State (iSTARS March 2018) showed the following:

1. Above 95% (8 States): Canada, Costa Rica; Cuba, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua and United States;
2. Between 85-94.9% (1 State): Jamaica;
3. Between 75-84.9% (3 States): Belize, Honduras, Mexico and Trinidad and Tobago; and
4. Below 75% (8 States): Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Grenada, Haiti, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and Grenadines.

2.5 The SSP Implementation strategy proposes the following grouping scheme of States for the SSP implementation:

1. Tier 1: States that currently have a SSP Foundation Index above 95%, agree with the ICAO NACC Regional Office a SSP Implementation Plan, and receive technical assistance as required to implement SSP by 2020;
2. Tier 2: States that have a SSP Foundation Index above 85%, agree with the ICAO NACC Regional Office a SSP Implementation Plan, and receive technical assistance as required to implement SSP by 2021;

3. Tier 3: States that have a SSP Foundation Index above 75%, agree with the ICAO NACC Regional Office a SSP Implementation Plan, and receive technical assistance as required to implement SSP by 2022;

4. Tier 4: States that have a SSP Foundation Index above 60%, agree with the ICAO NACC Regional Office a SSP Implementation Plan, and receive technical assistance as required to implement SSP by 2023;

5. NAM/CAR States that complete any phase of the SSP implementation can be considered as Champion States to support other States in the implementation of the phases that have already implemented.

Note: it is expected that no State has an EI below 60% by 2022.

2.6 It was consensus among participants that Tier 1 States of the strategy should work immediately to develop an initial SSP implementation action plan. Also, to raise awareness of Tiers 2, 3, 4 States to the importance to enhance their State Safety Oversight System.

State Safety Programmes (SSP) Implementation Assessments under USOAP-CMA - NACC SSP Implementation Strategy

2.7 With P/06 the Secretariat provided information regarding the State Safety Programmes (SSP) Implementation Assessments under USOAP- Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA). The Meeting was briefed on SSP related activities under the USOAP CMA, including the amendment of the SSP related PQs and the SSP implementation assessments. The assessments will be implemented in two phases (Phase 1: 2018 – 2020 and Phase 2: Starting in 2021).

2.8 To prepare States for the aforementioned assessments, detailed information regarding the NACC SSP Implementation Strategy was also Included. One of the main objectives of the strategy is to prepare the NAM/CAR Regions States to transition for a proactive safety oversight.

Agenda Item 3 Work with the Regional Implementation Groups (GREPECAS, RASG-PA, ANI/WG, etc.) in analysing key areas of the State Safety Programme (SSP) and Safety Management System (SMS) within the NAM/CAR Regions

GASP implementation status in the Pan American Region

3.1 The Secretariat presented P/01, which briefed the Meeting on the level of implementation of the GASP in the NAM/CAR and SAM Regions. The presentation also included information regarding the SSP implementation strategy for the SAM Region.

3.2 The Meeting discussed the draft of the GASP 2020 – 2022, including goals, targets and indicators. The new GASP is focused on:

- Achieve a continuous reduction of operational safety risks
- Strengthen States' safety oversight capabilities
- Implement effective State safety programmes (SSPs)
- Increase collaboration at the regional level
- Expand the use of industry programmes
- Ensure the appropriate infrastructure is available to support safe operations

Agenda Item 4 Canada's State Safety Programme (SSP)

- 4.1 Process of Implementation**
- 4.2 Lessons Learned**
- 4.3 Best Practices**
- 4.4 Continuous Evaluation and Monitoring**

SSP Implementation Process – Canada

4.1 P/05, presented by Canada, briefed the Meeting with detailed information on its SSP implementation strategy, lessons learned, challenges and strengths. The presentation included information regarding the Canadian Civil Aviation (SSP) Governance Structure and their evolution of safety philosophy.

4.2 The Meeting discussed, in detail, the Canadian SSP implementation project and each sub project, to gather information regarding the initiatives undertaken by Transport Canada Civil Aviation Authority (TCCA) to enhance its aviation safety decision-making.

4.3 One aspect that raised particular attention of participants was the Change Management (CM) strategy implemented by TCCA, to support people in the transition from a reactive to a predictive aviation safety programme. The lessons learned by Canada in this process have a significant added value to the SSP implementation in the NAM/CAR Regions.

4.4 Canada is willing to contribute with the ICAO NACC SSP Implementation strategy, as a Champion State.

4.5 The availability of assistance from Canada to the Region, in its role as Champion State, can be laid down with the following actions:

- Build close relationships with various SSP Subject Matter Experts
- Provide with peer review of draft policies and other documents
- Available for quarterly teleconferences to share best practices and lessons learned around a theme and review next steps generally
- Available to receive guests in structured training courses and workshops
- Open to host face-to-face workshops annually (or maybe twice annually) to focus on specific technical subjects of need
- Willing to share policies, procedures, tools and other documents as needed
- Allow inspectors and subject-matter-experts from the NAM/CAR Regions to visit Transport Canada to observe the SMS audit process

4.5 The Meeting agreed that all support should be based on the agreed SSP action plan with ICAO NACC Regional Office. In order to make the best possible use of Canada's support, it was agreed to develop a joint action plan for 2019.

4.6 The Meeting agreed that the assistance offered by Canada is not only important because of its demonstrated progress in the implementation of its risk-based safety oversight system, but also because of the need for States of the Region to have an objective and well-founded guidance for the implementation of predictive tools. The participants recognized the value that the initiative presented by Canada has for the improvement of safety and efficiency levels in the civil aviation systems of the Region.

Agenda Item 5 Experiences from other NAM/CAR Region States – Group/Tier 1 States

5.1 Under this Agenda Item States presented their individual experience regarding the SSP implementation. States highlighted their challenges, and emphasized the benefits for regional collaboration for this topic.

5.2 Participants agreed that, in order to facilitate collaborative work and make the best possible use of the resources available in the region to support the implementation of the SSP, it was necessary to agree on a common SSP implementation plan.

5.3 Planning should require that all States complete the ICAO SSP Gap Analysis Project, and reach agreements on requirements for compliance of each SSP element and component.

5.4 It was also considered necessary to establish harmonized requirements for the SMS of operators and service providers, including safety performance indicators. In line with harmonization, States agreed that the most simple and useful software for the collection and exchange of their aviation safety information available to all States is European Coordination Centre for Accident and Incident Reporting Systems (ECCAIRS). The majority of participants confirmed that their States have implemented or are in the process of implementation of ECCAIRS. Therefore, to encourage its regional use could have significant benefits. In addition, the Meeting agreed on the need to have harmonized procedures for the establishment of the Acceptable level of safety performance (ALOSP).

5.5 Another aspect was the promotion of a process based scheme. This would allow developing common SMS acceptance and oversight processes.

5.6 Participants raised the challenges they are facing to have access to ICAO Portal (ICAONET and iStars). It was considered a priority to encourage access of safety related personal, from the CAA and Industry, to the Portal. At the same time, it was highlighted the need to promote the access to the ICAO Safety Management Website.

5.7 Participants from Central American States briefed the Meeting on the *Programa de análisis de Sucesos Operacionales Centroamericanos* (PASOC), promoted by COCESNA's Central American Agency for Aviation Safety (ACSA), it is a tool designed for the collection of information on events, safety deficiencies and hazards during the provision of aeronautical services that facilitates proper management of them in accordance with international standards. ACSA establishes the PASOC Programme, which is based on the analysis and exchange of voluntary information as a resource to collect and analyze data to identify safety hazards and make recommendations to control risks, in order to strengthen safety in the region.

Agenda Item 6 Development of Implementation Strategies for Specific States

6.1 After reviewing the level of implementation of each State, it was agreed that the SSP action plan for each State shall be comprised by the open PQs from the SSP foundation tool and the questions of the SSP Gap Analysis Tool.

6.2 For Tier 1 States, the SSP action plan will be handled as an additional subproject to the ICAO NACC Regional Office Systemic Assistance Programme. A template for the SSP Action Plan is included as an **Appendix**.

6.3 It was agreed that, in order to provide consistency to the implementation process of the SSP at regional level, current SSP projects from each State should be validated by the ICAO NACC Regional Office.

6.4 In order to support proper follow up of the SSP Action Plan at State level, SSP implementation team must be involved, or have knowledge, of the current actions taken within their States to enhance their State Safety Oversight (SSO) system.

6.5 Number one priority for Tier 1 States is to develop and update their SSP GAP Analysis. Some States may require assistance to develop their SSP Gap Analysis. This will be handled as an integral task of the subproject.

6.6 When all Tier 1 States have their action plan completed, the ICAO NACC Regional Office should consider this as a milestone of the project and promote as such.

Agenda Item 7 Creation of Continuous Support from Canada for Phase 1 and Other Implementation Aspects for SSP

7.1 The Meeting emphasized the benefits of sharing support amongst all States for SSP implementation, especially because of the limited of expertise in the Region.

7.2 The Meeting recognized the importance of the support from Canada, as vital to promote SSP implementation progress in the Region, due to the lack of guidance and recognized consultants to implement key SSP components specially related to risk management.

7.3 The SSP Action Plan, developed and validated by the ICAO NACC Regional Office, needs to be the main reference for implementation, and the support required to Champion States has to be in line with that action plan.

7.4 The ICAO NACC Regional Office, through the ICAO NACC Systemic Assistance Programme, shall serve as the coordinating entity for the SSP Implementation, providing the guidance and initial assistance to States. Having information on the capabilities and requirements of each State, the ICAO NACC Regional Office will request and coordinate the assistance provided by Champion States, including Canada.

7.5 The Meeting also identified the direct interrelation between SSP and accident investigation. States should see their Accident Investigation Authority as an integral part of the SSP implementation team. However, it was also identified the lack of detailed guidance to define the required collaboration of the Accident Investigation Board (AIB).

7.6 The ICAO NACC Regional Office, as part of this implementation strategy, should work to identify common challenges and opportunities, and develop a mechanism to share information among States.

7.7 It was also agreed to hold a Second State Safety Programme (SSP) Meeting for the NAM/CAR Regions (NAM/CAR/SSP/2) in 2019, and encourage Accident Investigation and Prevention (AIG) personnel participation.

Agenda Item 8 Other Business

Effective Safety Investigations and SMS

8.1 With P/13 the Secretariat highlighted the key role of AIG and IA's investigations in relation to the States' Risk Management and Safety Oversight functions, particularly the contribution of the investigations analysis and findings to the identification of hazards (finding the problem) leading to the risk assessments and the development of effective safety actions (fixing the problem) by the risk owners and stakeholders towards accident prevention and improving aviation safety overall. The availability and use of common safety analysis frameworks and methodologies (e.g. Bowtie, STAMP) for both hazard identification and risk assessments was also highlighted.

8.2 The Secretariat AIG Consultant also shared some of the outcomes from the Meeting for Regional Accident and Incident Investigation Organizations (RAIOs) Implementation in the CAR Region (RAIO/CAR/01) held in the ICAO NACC Regional Office, Mexico City, from 12 to 14 November 2018, in particular the AIG vision statement that was presented and agreed to in principle, and the keen interest from the various States' AIG representatives in getting more involved in SMS and SSP. Also, the next AIG meeting is to be held jointly with a three-day workshop in March 2019, with SMS and SSP being some of the topics to be included.

8.3 The active participation, comments and discussions from the attendees during the presentation allowed the opportunity to emphasize and clarify some key Investigations and SMS/SSP principles:

- a. The primordial need for establishing independent investigation authorities, insofar as to ensure the objectivity of the investigations and their freedom from any interference, especially given that the scope of investigations would include not only the operators or services providers involved in the occurrence but also the regulatory and safety oversight activities exercised by Civil Aviation Authorities.
- b. The need for investigation authorities to become fluent and knowledgeable on safety management, not only in order to incorporate that aspect within their investigations, but also to become fully aware of the key role of investigations within SMS and SSP.
- c. The distinct but complementary nature of quality or compliance management functions in relation to the safety management functions within organizations, with risk being the common language.
- d. The need to focus on effective safety actions and their consequent changes as being the ultimate objective of investigations and safety/risk management.

- e. The reactive and proactive aspects of SMS being in relation to known issues and the prevention of injury and damage from accidents, and the predictive aspects of SMS being in relation to the discovery of unknown or not yet manifested issues.
- f. The continuity in the investigation and risk management processes, from the initial occurrence reports or audit findings, through hazard identification and all the way to the initiation of safety actions and the monitoring of their effectiveness.
- g. The primary role and intent of safety recommendations from investigations being non-prescriptive and focused on the communication of identified hazards or safety issues to be considered and effectively dealt with by risk owners and stakeholders as part of their SMS/SSP processes.
- h. The need for authorities to acknowledge that SMS tools such as risk matrix and the Safety Performance Indicators (SPIs) would be expected to be adapted by operators and services providers and tailored to their specific safety management needs, in the same way that States would need to adapt their SSP risk matrix and SPIs.
- i. The need in evaluating the performance and effectiveness of SMS and SSP programmes to consider not only the changes in the number of events/occurrences but also, and perhaps more importantly, the resulting changes in the overall risk level.
- j. The importance for regulatory and safety oversight authorities to foster and incorporate just culture within their SSP and their regulatory enforcement policies.

8.4 The Meeting agreed on the need to involve Accident Investigation Authorities from States in the following SSP related activities and events, as the accident investigation processes from States comprise a key component for the SSP.

NO	SSP Foundation PQs	Activities	OLF	Accountable	Deadline	Completed

NO	SSP Gap Analysis	Activities	Status	Accountable	Deadline	Completed
1.1-01	Has [State] promulgated a national safety legislative framework and specific regulations that define the management of safety in the State?					
1.1-02	Are the legislative framework and specific regulations periodically reviewed to ensure that they remain relevant to the State?					
1.2-01	Has [State] identified a SSP placeholder organization and an Accountable Executive for the implementation, and coordination of the SSP?					
1.2-02	Has the [State] established an SSP implementation team?					
1.2-03	Has [State] defined the State requirements, responsibilities and accountabilities regarding the establishment and maintenance of the SSP?					

NO	SSP Gap Analysis	Activities	Status	Accountable	Deadline	Completed
1.2-04	Does the State have an SSP implementation plan in place, which includes a timeframe for the implementation of actions and gaps as identified through the gap analysis?					
1.2-05	Is there a documented statement about the provision of the necessary resources for the implementation and maintenance of the SSP?					
1.2-06	Does the [State] SSP Accountable Executive have control of the necessary resources required for the implementation of the SSP?					
1.2-07	Has [State] defined the specific activities and accountabilities related to the management of safety in the State that each aviation regulatory organization under the SSP is accountable for?					
1.2-08	Does [State] have a mechanism or platform for the coordination of SSP implementation and subsequent SSP continuous monitoring activities involving all state regulatory organizations?					
1.2-09	Does the [State] SSP Accountable Executive coordinate, as appropriate, the activities of the different State					

NO	SSP Gap Analysis	Activities	Status	Accountable	Deadline	Completed
	aviation organizations under the SSP?					
1.2-10	Has [State] established a safety policy?					
1.2-11	Is [State] safety policy signed by the [State] SSP Accountable Executive or an appropriate authority within [State]?					
1.2-12	Is [State] safety policy reviewed periodically?					
1.2-13	Is [State] safety policy communicated to the employees in all [State] aviation organizations with the intent that they are made aware of their individual safety responsibilities?					
1.2-14	Has the [State] initiated a unified SSP document as part of the SSP implementation plan to describe its SSP framework components and elements?					
1.2-15	Has the SSP document been completed, approved and signed by the SSP Accountable Executive and the document communicated/ made accessible to all stake holders upon full implementation of the SSP?					
1.2-16	Does [State] have a documentation system that ensures appropriate storage, archiving, protection and retrieval of all documents relating to SSP activities?					

NO	SSP Gap Analysis	Activities	Status	Accountable	Deadline	Completed
1.2-17	Does the [State] have a periodic internal review mechanism for assurance of continuing improvement and effectiveness of its SSP?					
1.3-01	Has [State] established an independent accident and incident investigation process the sole objective of which is the prevention of accidents and incidents, and not the apportioning of blame or liability?					
1.3-02	Is the organization/authority for accident investigation functionally independent. (See Manual of Aircraft Accident and Incident Investigation Doc 9756, paragraph 2.1)?					
1.4-01	Has [State] promulgated an enforcement policy?					
1.4-02	Does the State's primary aviation legislation provide for the enforcement of the applicable legislation and regulations?					
1.4-03	Does the enforcement policy take into account that service providers are normally allowed to deal with, and resolve routine safety or quality deviations internally within the scope of its approved SMS/ QMS procedures?					

NO	SSP Gap Analysis	Activities	Status	Accountable	Deadline	Completed
1.4-04	Does the enforcement policy establish the conditions and circumstances under which the State may deal with safety deviations directly through its established investigation and enforcement procedures?					
1.4-05	Does the SSP enforcement policy include provision to prevent the use or disclosure of safety data for purposes other than safety improvement?					
1.4-06	Does the SSP enforcement policy include provision to protect the sources of information obtained from voluntary incident reporting systems?					
2.1-01	Has the State promulgated harmonised regulations to require service providers to implement a SMS?					
2.1-02	Are these SMS requirements and related guidance materials periodically reviewed to ensure they remain relevant and appropriate to the service providers?					
2.2-01	Has [State] individually agreed/ accepted service provider's safety performance indicators and their respective alert/ target levels?					
2.2-02	Are the agreed/ accepted safety performance indicators commensurate					

NO	SSP Gap Analysis	Activities	Status	Accountable	Deadline	Completed
	with the scope/ complexity of the individual service provider's specific operational context?					
2.2-03	Are the agreed safety performance indicators periodically reviewed by the [State] to ensure it remains relevant and appropriate to the service provider?					
3.1-01	Has the State established a formal surveillance programme to ensure satisfactory compliance with State safety regulations and requirements by service providers?					
3.1-02	Has the State established a process for the initial review and acceptance of individual service providers' SMS?					
3.1-03	Has State established procedures for the review of individual service providers' safety performance indicators and their relevant alert/ target levels?					
3.1-04	Does the State's safety oversight programme include periodic assessment of individual service provider's SMS?					
3.1-05	Does the State's periodic SMS surveillance programme include assessment of service provider's hazard identification and safety risk					

NO	SSP Gap Analysis	Activities	Status	Accountable	Deadline	Completed
	management processes?					
3.1-06	Does the State's periodic SMS surveillance programme include assessment of service provider's safety performance indicators and their relevant alert/ target levels?					
3.1-07	Does the State have a periodic internal review mechanism for assurance of effective compliance of the SSP and its related safety oversight functions?					
3.2-01	Has [State] established mechanisms to ensure the mandatory reporting, evaluation and processing of accidents and serious incident data at the aggregate State level?					
3.2-02	Has the State established a voluntary reporting system to facilitate the collection of data on hazards and associated safety risks that may not be captured by a mandatory incident reporting system?					
3.2-03	Has [State] established mechanisms to develop information from the stored data and to promote the exchange of safety information with service providers and/or other States as appropriate?					

NO	SSP Gap Analysis	Activities	Status	Accountable	Deadline	Completed
3.2-04	Has [State] established an acceptable level of safety performance (ALoSP) as defined by selected safety indicators with corresponding target and alert levels as appropriate?					
3.2-05	Are the ALoSP safety indicators appropriate and relevant to the scope and complexity of its aviation activities?					
3.2-06	Does the State have a mechanism for periodic monitoring of the SSP safety indicators to assure that corrective or follow up actions are taken for any undesirable trends, alert level breaches or non achievement of improvement targets?					
3.3-01	Has [State] developed procedures to prioritize inspections, audits and surveys towards those areas of greater safety concern or need?					
3.3-02	Is the prioritization of inspections and audits associated with the analysis of relevant internal/ external safety or quality data?					
4.1-01	Is there a process to identify safety management related training requirements , including SSP & SMS training, for relevant personnel of the regulatory/ administrative					

NO	SSP Gap Analysis	Activities	Status	Accountable	Deadline	Completed
	organizations?					
4.1-02	Are there records to show that personnel involved in SSP implementation and its operation have undergone appropriate SSP/ SMS training or familiarisation?					
4.1-03	Does the State maintain a mechanism for the consolidation, communication and sharing of safety information amongst its regulatory and administrative organizations involved in the SSP?					
4.1-04	Does the internal safety information/ data sharing include occurrence, investigation and hazard reports from all its aviation sectors?					
4.2-01	Does the State facilitate the continuing education, communication and sharing of safety information with and amongst its service providers?					
4.2-02	Do the State regulatory organizations participate in regional and global aviation safety information sharing and exchange, and facilitate the participation of their respective service providers in the same?					
4.2-03	Is there a formal process for the external dissemination of regulatory					

NO	SSP Gap Analysis	Activities	Status	Accountable	Deadline	Completed
	documents and information to service providers and a means of assuring the effectiveness of this process?					
4.2-04	Is the State's SSP document and its associated safety policy, enforcement policy and aggregate safety indicators included in the State's safety information communication & sharing process?					