



HLCC 2021-WP/243
SAF/155
18/10/21

**HIGH-LEVEL CONFERENCE ON COVID-19
(HLCC 2021)**

Montréal, 12 to 22 October 2021

**DRAFT REPORT OF THE SAFETY STREAM
ON AGENDA ITEM 3
(Sub-items 3.1, 3.2, 3.3)**

The attached draft report on Agenda Item 3 is presented for approval by the Safety Stream for submission to the Plenary.

Agenda Item 3: Standardization**3.1: Oversight and new approaches**

3.1 The Safety Stream reviewed HLCC 2021-WP/5-SAF/2, presented by the Secretariat, and acknowledged the complexity of oversight caused by the growing number of new business models, including short-term aircraft interchange operations, cross-border group operations as well as crew interoperability. The Safety Stream noted ICAO's work on the development of the cooperative oversight framework and supported the recommendations in the working paper. It was further noted that the expansion of the cooperative oversight framework to cross-border operations performed by other service providers should be considered after the Cooperative Oversight for Cross-border Operations Sub-Group (COCBO-SG) completes its work.

3.2 The following working papers regarding remote safety oversight activities, necessitated due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, were reviewed by the Safety Stream: HLCC 2021-WP/114-SAF/87, presented by Bolivia (Plurinational State of) and co-sponsored by Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of); HLCC 2021-WP/140-SAF/106, presented by Costa Rica; HLCC 2021-WP/96-SAF/74, presented by Japan; HLCC 2021-WP/164-SAF/125 presented by Samoa on behalf of the Pacific Aviation Safety Office (PASO) Member States; HLCC 2021-WP/14-SAF/11 presented by Slovenia on behalf of the European Union and its Member States¹, the other Member States of the European Civil Aviation Conference², EUROCONTROL and supported by Singapore; and HLCC 2021-WP/49-SAF/34, presented by AFCAC on behalf of 54 African States³. The Safety Stream agreed that States be encouraged to adopt measures on the use of remote oversight activities, and share related experiences and challenges. The Safety Stream further agreed on the importance of developing guidance material for such activities. Additionally, the Safety Stream acknowledged the importance of promoting digital technology to conduct oversight activities to reduce health risks associated with COVID-19, and agreed that the use of electronic auditing in ramp inspections would be dependent on ongoing work in ICAO related to development of relevant provisions for electronic manuals, documentations and ramp inspections. HLCC 2021-WP/154-SAF/118, presented by the United Arab Emirates, on behalf of the member States of the Arab Civil Aviation Organization (ACAO), was also reviewed regarding the challenges related to appropriate risk management of crises that falls outside the scope of pre-existing plans. It highlighted the ad-hoc and inconsistent methodologies used to adapt contingency plans tactically or promulgate flexibility measures to deal with the pandemic.

3.3 HLCC 2021-WP/35-SAF/22 presented by the International Coordinating Council of Aerospace Industries Associations (ICCAIA), highlighted the need for provision of a safe and efficient means to promote multilateral recognition of certificates and licences. The Safety Stream noted the endorsement of ICAO's work in this area and recognized that the relevant expert groups were currently addressing these tasks. The Safety Stream agreed that ICAO should continue its work in this area.

¹ Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden.

² Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Republic of Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Norway, San Marino, Serbia, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine and United Kingdom.

³ Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

3.4 HLCC 2021-WP/122-SAF/95 presented by Brazil, Rwanda, Singapore, United Kingdom, World Food Programme (WFP) and Flight Safety Foundation (FSF); and HLCC 2021-WP/103-SAF/81 presented by Rwanda, highlighted the developments related to the introduction and use of unmanned aircraft systems (UAS), challenges encountered from a regulatory perspective, need for additional guidance and support, and benefits that could be obtained, especially related to the delivery of humanitarian and medical supplies during the pandemic. The Safety Stream cautioned on the use of automatic dependent surveillance-broadcast (ADS-B) Out on small UAS in low level airspace due to frequency congestion. However, it acknowledged that risk-based approaches to drone safety are essential to enabling innovative drone applications, while keeping other aircraft and the public safe. The Safety Stream noted the need for UAS cross-border provisions including urban and advanced air mobility. The Safety Stream supported the request to expand the topic of UAS in the *Global Air Navigation Plan* (GANP, Doc 9750).

3.5 Information papers provided by: China (HLCC 2021-WP/161-SAF/122); Greece (HLCC 2021-WP/80-SAF/58); Japan (HLCC 2021-WP/167-SAF/127); Republic of Korea (HLCC 2021-WP/224-SAF/148); United States (HLCC 2021-WP/202-SAF/137 and HLCC 2021-WP/196-SAF/131); International Air Transport Association (IATA) (HLCC 2021-WP/31-SAF/18); and IATA, the African Airlines Association and the Latin American and Caribbean Air Transport Association (HLCC 2021-WP/32-SAF/19) were noted.

3.6 As a result of the discussion, the Safety Stream agreed on the following recommendations:

Recommendation 3.1/1 – Oversight and new approaches

That States:

- a) recognize the importance of the establishment of the cooperative oversight framework;
- b) and international organizations continue to provide support to ICAO in progressing the work on cooperative oversight;
- c) recognize and adopt measures for the appropriate use of remote oversight activities to assess continued compliance with operational requirements;
- d) and service providers share their experiences related to oversight activities during the COVID-19 pandemic.

That ICAO:

- e) together with relevant stakeholders, continue the work on the cooperative oversight framework;
- f) consider expanding the cooperative oversight framework to cross-border operations performed by other service providers, including aerodrome operators, air navigation service providers as well as maintenance and training organizations;

-
- g) establish a programme that would assist States in implementing the cooperative oversight framework;
 - h) in collaboration with industry, develop guidance material for conducting remote/hybrid safety oversight activities, taking into consideration the competencies of inspectors, appropriateness of available applications, information security aspects, and limitations;
 - i) encourage States to continue conducting remote/hybrid oversight where proven effective to fulfil their obligations;
 - j) continue ongoing work in the development of guidance material on the process to accept a Type Certificate (TC), and post-certification activities;
 - k) further develop risk-based surveillance guidance material; and
 - l) continue to collect newly identified emerging issues and analyze them to adjust *Global Aviation Safety Plan* (GASP, Doc 10004) and *Global Air Navigation Plan* (GANP, Doc 9750) priorities accordingly.

Recommendation 3.1/2 – Furthering the regulatory framework for UAS

That States:

- a) implement regulations that provide a clear, repeatable process that can lead to timely approval of unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) operations, including those use cases serving medical or humanitarian response needs;
- b) develop repeatable processes to streamline assessment and approval of operations that fall outside of current regulations;
- c) adopt safety risk analysis procedures that are context-appropriate to low-resource and remote locations;
- d) implement training programmes for regulators to better understand the safety processes and mitigations that can be applied; and
- e) establish communications practices for other third parties who may be in the area of operation.

That ICAO:

- f) continue development of the UAS regulatory framework and consider feedback on the ICAO Model UAS Regulations;
- g) provide advice on which Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) apply during international flights of small UAS, including an appropriate process for exempting such flights from these;

- h) provide support to assess the air and ground risk of UAS operations;
- i) consider further studies and the pros and cons of low-powered automatic dependent surveillance-broadcast (ADS-B) Out on small UAS in low-level airspace in areas of low-density traffic; and
- j) consider additional guidance for the development, harmonization and implementation of UAS regulations within the GANP.

Agenda Item 3: Standardization

3.2: Risk management

3.7 HLCC 2021-WP/12-SAF/9 presented by the Secretariat, explored key areas to be addressed with a comprehensive recommendation to improve the effectiveness of aviation safety-risk management, which was widely supported by the Safety Stream.

3.8 Proposals presented in the following working papers were supported by the Safety Stream: HLCC 2021-WP/55-SAF/40, presented by Panama and supported by Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela, recognizing change management as a key component in successfully implementing safe, efficient and sustainable change; and HLCC 2021-WP/61-SAF/4,5 presented by Ecuador and supported by Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Guyana, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela, on improvements to safety risk management guidance and additional capacity building initiatives. The Safety Stream agreed that these proposals be forwarded to the appropriate expert groups. While HLCC 2021-WP/123-SAF/96, presented by Brazil, Rwanda, Singapore, United Kingdom and FSF, discussed the importance of human factors considerations in the presence of increasingly automated systems and received wide support, it was noted that further work to develop guidance in this area should be informed by industry research.

3.9 HLCC 2021-WP/120-SAF/93 presented by China, discussed the measures taken to promote the implementation of safety management system (SMS) at airports. As these items are already on the ICAO work programme, the Safety Stream agreed to forward this information to the appropriate expert groups to support their ongoing work. The Safety Stream further agreed that States and international organizations should be encouraged to submit practical examples and tools related to State safety programme (SSP) and SMS implementation for sharing through the ICAO Safety Management Implementation website (www.icao.int/SMI).

3.10 HLCC 2021-WP/111-SAF/84 presented by Chile, discussed concepts to facilitate agile decision-making in aviation. Although many States expressed support, concerns were raised regarding the need to prioritize implementation of effective risk management.

3.11 HLCC 2021-WP/46-SAF/31 presented by the African Civil Aviation Commission (AFCAC) on behalf of 54 African Contracting States⁴, proposed the implementation of a collaborative safety-risk management approach among States to mitigate the effects emanating from disruptions caused

⁴ Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

by the COVID-19 pandemic. The Safety Stream supported most of the proposals presented, and noted that proposals related to regional safety oversight organizations (RSOOs) were to be considered under Agenda Item 4 to avoid duplication.

3.12 HLCC 2021-WP/99-SAF/77, presented by the Republic of Korea, discussed the development of safety intelligence and the importance of establishing and managing effective leading safety performance indicators (SPIs); and HLCC 2021-WP/124-SAF/97, presented by Singapore, United Kingdom and FSF, discussed the benefits of learning from all operations to expand insights and translate them into action. The Safety Stream supported the need for the sharing of examples related to the practical application of learning from all operations, and agreed to forward related proposals to the appropriate expert groups.

3.13 HLCC 2021-WP/116-SAF/89, presented by Venezuela and supported by Argentina, Bolivia, Ecuador, Guyana, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname and Uruguay, discussed human-software interaction in the design and operation of safety data collection and processing systems (SDCPS). The Safety Stream noted that the development of guidance related to specifications for SDCPS was underway, which would assist States in establishing a system to support their individual needs. However, concerns were raised about dedicating ICAO resources to develop additional guidance to address human-software interface quality issues, because these are not unique to aviation. The Safety Stream agreed to forward the proposals to the appropriate expert group.

3.14 HLCC 2021-WP/78-SAF/56, presented by Qatar and supported by Member States of the Arab Civil Aviation Organization (ACAO), and HLCC 2021-WP/86-SAF/64, presented by the United States and the United Kingdom and co-sponsored by France and Singapore, both highlighted concerns related to risks associated with non-compliance with dangerous goods regulations. HLCC 2021-WP/86-SAF/64 described the growth in consumer reliance on e-commerce to meet the demand for goods during the pandemic and the expansion of the online market place, which could lead to the increased likelihood of unintentional non-compliance by entities unaware of the safety risks. The Safety Stream supported the proposals in HLCC 2021-WP/86-SAF/64. HLCC 2021-WP/78-SAF/56 highlighted the need for States to conduct dangerous goods oversight of shippers, freight forwarders and designated postal operators and to apply effective enforcement procedures to prevent recurrent non-compliance. It was noted that the proposed recommendation related to certification Standards for fire-resistant containers (FRCs) and fire containment covers (FCCs) did not fall within the purview of the Airworthiness Panel (AIRP). The Safety Stream acknowledged ongoing efforts to clarify State oversight responsibilities in relation to Annex 18 — *The Safe Transport of Dangerous Goods by Air*, as well as various initiatives such as an ICAO training course on air cargo safety management, and the development of an implementation package (iPack) on establishing and maintaining a cargo safety programme as part of the SSP.

3.15 Information papers provided by: China (HLCC 2021-WP/162-SAF/123); Republic of Korea (HLCC 2021-WP/225-SAF/149); Rwanda, Singapore and FSF (HLCC 2021-WP/209-SAF/139); United States (HLCC 2021-WP/197-SAF/132 and HLCC 2021-WP/199-SAF/134); FSF (HLCC 2021-WP/220-SAF/144 and HLCC 2021-WP/221-SAF/145); and FSF and IATA (HLCC 2021-WP/83-SAF/61) were noted.

3.16 As a result of the discussion, the Safety Stream agreed on the following recommendation:

Recommendation 3.2/1 – Improving the effectiveness of aviation safety risk management

That States:

- a) continue to develop and implement risk management strategies to overcome the effects of the pandemic, while working collaboratively with other States, regional safety oversight organizations (RSOOs), international organizations and service providers;
- b) consider the impact on other domains when managing aviation safety risk and the impact on safety when managing risk in other domains to support an integrated risk management approach and reduce the overall risk across the aviation system;
- c) increase attention to the management of interfaces by service providers in order to ensure hazards are identified and associated risks are effectively mitigated;
- d) build upon the collaborative engagements established during the pandemic in order to share safety data and safety information on identified hazards and best practices in a timely manner;
- e) develop aviation safety intelligence capabilities in collaboration with other States, RSOOs and international organizations, and share their experience and lessons learned to support safety risk management and data-driven decision-making; and
- f) contribute practical sector-specific examples of processes, case studies and lessons learned related to complex safety risk management and the development of safety intelligence for sharing on the ICAO Safety Management Implementation (SMI) website.

That ICAO:

- g) promote collaborative and cooperative approaches for the management of safety risks during extraordinary circumstances;
- h) continue to evolve ICAO SARPs and associated guidance material to further support a more proactive, predictive and integrated approach to risk and resilience management;
- i) consider the need to enhance existing provisions to recognize the need to support human performance for effective safety risk management;
- j) develop additional implementation support initiatives to assist States in building capacity in all aspects of State safety programme (SSP) implementation to be prioritized based on an analysis of feedback collected through various mechanisms;

- k) invite relevant regional and international organizations to contribute practical sector-specific examples of processes, case studies and lessons learned related to complex safety risk management for sharing on the ICAO Safety Management Implementation (SMI) website;
- l) encourage States, international organizations and service providers to develop targeted safety promotion activities based on analysis for communities unfamiliar with aviation safety culture in order to foster a common understanding of their potential impact on aviation safety;
- m) promote an understanding across the aviation community of the benefits of learning from all operations to support effective safety risk management; and
- n) consider enhancing existing guidance for States on how to address human factors considerations commensurate with increasing levels of automated systems.

Agenda Item 3: Standardization

3.3: Ground handling

3.17 The Safety Stream reviewed HLCC 2021-WP/4-SAF/1, presented by the Secretariat, and recognized the importance of strengthening the regulation of ground handling services to enhance safety, regularity, capacity and efficiency of aerodrome operations.

3.18 The Safety Stream reviewed HLCC 2021-WP/36-SAF/23, presented by Argentina and supported by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), which discussed new forms of activities to improve safety in ground handling services in order to achieve more flexible, proportional and risk-based regulation. It also promoted harmonization of the collection and sharing of safety information related to ground handling operations. HLCC 2021-WP/72-SAF/51, presented by Saudi Arabia on behalf of the Contracting States, member of the Arab Civil Aviation Organization (ACAO), examined the need for standardization in the provision of ground handling worldwide by developing a regulatory framework. HLCC 2021-WP/90-SAF/68, presented by Airports Council International (ACI) highlighted ground handling service providers (GHSPs) as part of the longer-term economic and social sustainability of the aviation ecosystem as well as the application of safety management processes by GHSPs and States. HLCC 2021-WP/95-SAF/73 presented by the International Transport Workers' Federation (ITF) proposed a holistic approach that supplements core regulatory reforms concerning ground handling.

3.19 The Safety Stream agreed on the need to strengthen regulation of ground handling on a global basis and noted that various views and suggestions on how to achieve the goal, including a balanced approach and the need for flexibility, were expressed by States and industry. The Safety Stream also noted that work was ongoing within ICAO to address ground handling in a holistic manner and agreed that the proposals be forwarded to the relevant expert groups to inform the ongoing work.

3.20 The information paper HLCC 2021-WP/88-SAF/66 provided by Oman was noted.

3.21 As a result of the discussion, the Safety Stream agreed on the following recommendation:

Recommendation 3.3/1 – Strengthening the regulation of ground handling

That States:

- a) recognize the importance of ground handling service providers (GHSPs) as key participants of the aviation ecosystem, including the significance of ensuring their longer-term social and economic sustainability, so as to ensure the future safety, efficiency, resilience and development of the air transport system on a national and global level;
- b) review the performance of ground handling services at aerodromes under their jurisdiction and strengthen the regulatory oversight of ground handling services, taking into account existing guidance material; and
- c) promote the reporting of ground handling related occurrences and hazards, including the protection of safety data, safety information and related sources.

That ICAO:

- d) continue to work with States and industry to develop a flexible approach in considering the development of SARPs and Procedures for Air Navigation Services (PANS) related to ground handling, taking into account views from and impact on different stakeholders;
- e) promote the harmonization, collection and sharing of safety information related to ground handling operations, to monitor effectiveness of current safety initiatives and support future ones; and
- f) consider launching additional initiatives necessary to strengthen the regulation of ground handling on a global basis.

— END —