



**Twenty-first Meeting of the CAR/SAM Regional Planning and Implementation Group
(GREPECAS/21)**

Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, 15 to 17 November 2023

Agenda Item 3: Global and Regional Developments
**3.2 Work report on the CAR/SAM Regional Air Navigation Plan Vol. III
and Regional Progress**

WORKING SESSION FOR THE KPIS OF THE RASG-PA AND GREPECAS

(Presented by the Secretariat)

1. Introduction

1.1 Good communication, underpinned by seamless data exchange, is the cornerstone of efficient and effective collaboration in our interconnected world. Effective communication ensures that diverse entities, whether individuals or organizations, operate in harmony, with clarity of purpose and aligned goals.

1.2 Meanwhile, seamless data exchange acts as the tangible medium of this communication, allowing for the swift and accurate transfer of vital information. Together, they form an invaluable synergy: while good communication establishes mutual understanding and trust, seamless data exchange ensures that this understanding is based on accurate, timely, and relevant data.

1.3 This duo is crucial for making informed decisions, optimizing processes, and fostering innovation, thereby driving both individual and collective success in an increasingly complex and data-driven landscape.

2. The Current Scenario

2.1 Although RASG-PA and GREPECAS each respond to a different Strategic Objective and are responsible for monitoring the implementation of different Global Plans, safety and air navigation are not foreign to each other and coexist daily to ensure the safe and efficient development of air transport.

2.2 The RASG-PA is responsible for monitoring the implementation of the Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) and for promoting the development and updating of Regional and National Safety Plans (RASP & NASP). To carry out this monitoring, the GASP has a reference framework that is composed of a series of 6 objectives, with their respective goals and indicators. The indicators related to Objective 6, as seen below, are linked to activities that naturally correspond to GREPECAS, and that are not captured by any of the data analysis processes used by RASG-PA.

- Number or percentage of infrastructure-related air navigation deficiencies by State, against the regional air navigation plans
- Number or percentage of States having implemented infrastructure-related PQs linked to the basic building blocks

2.3 Besides, GREPECAS is responsible for monitoring the implementation of the Global Air Navigation Plan (GANP).

2.4 In the seventh edition of the GANP, under the Strategic Performance Areas (KPA) the following Safety Indicators were incorporated:

the Key performance Area (KPA) “Safety” is deployed within the Performance objective catalogue¹, defining the following indicators:

- KPI20 Number of aircraft accidents
- KPI21 Number of runway incursions
- KPI22 Number of runway excursions
- KPI23 Number of airprox/TCAS alert/loss of separation/near midair collisions/midair collisions (MAC)

2.5 Although the values that these indicators measure have an influence in the efficiency of the provision of air navigation services, they are ultimately safety indicators, and have historically been or should be monitored by the RASG-PA.

2.6 This potential duplication of efforts to obtain values in both air navigation and safety indicators, as well as the risks associated with such duplication, has been widely addressed by the RASG-PA and by GREPECAS, in different meetings.

2.7 Both groups have agreed that the most efficient measure would be for GREPECAS to provide the values of the GASP Objective 6 indicators to the RASG-PA, and for the RASG-PA to provide the values of the Safety KPA indicators of the Vol III e-ANP CAR/SAM to GREPECAS.

2.8 These coordination and agreements are recorded in the following conclusions:

- RASG-PA12/C14/2022
- RASG-PA12/C15/2022
- RASG-PA ESC/38/C03
- GREPECAS/20-16
- GREPECAS/20-17

2.9 However, the mechanisms to carry out this exchange have not yet been agreed upon and it is necessary to consider that the collection and exchange of data are activities that demand resources from both groups, which already have a considerable workload and a considerable number of meetings.

3. The Way Forward

3.1 The coordination and close collaboration between RASG-PA and GREPECAS and their corresponding working groups is a favorable factor that can facilitate the exchange of information.

¹ See GANP Portal; <https://www4.icao.int/ganportal/ASBU/PerformanceObjective>

4. GROUP TASK:

4.1 Discuss with your group the pros and cons of this new information exchange process between RASG-PA and GREPECAS. Avoid a commitment of additional resources that the groups could fail to fulfill due to lack of availability. Propose an efficient solution that is sustainable over time.

4.2 To begin discussions, group members could ask themselves the following questions:

- Is the data available to feed all the indicators required by GASP and GANP?
- Is it easy to identify in each group the source of information to feed each indicator?
- Is it appropriate and efficient to include safety indicators in the GANP and ANS indicators in the GASP?
- What and how many resources will this exercise require in each group?
- What would be the period between reports?

— END —