



## **THIRTEENTH AIR NAVIGATION CONFERENCE**

**Montréal, Canada, 9 to 19 October 2018**

### **REPORT OF COMMITTEE B TO THE CONFERENCE ON AGENDA ITEM 7**

The attached report has been approved by Committee B for submission to the Plenary.

Mr. Simon Allotey  
Committee Chairperson

*Note.— After removal of this covering sheet, this paper should be inserted in the appropriate place in the Report Folder.\**

---

\* (1 page)



- Agenda Item 7: Operational safety risks**  
**7.1: Facilitation of data-driven decision-making in support of safety intelligence to support safety risk management**

*Facilitation of data-driven decision-making*

7.1 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/23, presented by the Secretariat, which presented analysis solutions developed or proposed by ICAO that facilitate data-driven decision-making and assist stakeholders in identifying and managing safety risks in support of the development and dissemination of safety information and the implementation of State safety programmes (SSPs) and safety management systems (SMSs). The Committee acknowledged that those solutions, including data, tools, methodologies and training, facilitated data-driven decision-making and helped stakeholders identify and manage safety risks. The tools and methodologies also contributed to the development of safety information, supported the implementation of predictive risk management measures based on the objectives of the Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) and allowed ICAO to monitor the achievement of targets outlined in the Global Air Navigation Plan (GANP).

7.2 The Committee discussed AN-Conf/13-WP/125, presented by the United States, on facilitating international safety data sharing for effective risk management. The Committee noted that many type design holders had robust risk management processes used in their continued airworthiness systems. However, it was likely that a majority of a certain type of fleet were operated outside of the States of Design (SoD) and that could lead to a significant amount of operational data that was not made available to the type design holder and manufacturer of the aircraft. Lacking that critical safety data, the type design holder would not be able to access a full view of the safety issues that could affect a product. The Committee acknowledged the need for further development of safety data sharing guidance among users of the aviation system. Specifically, the sharing of safety data with organizations responsible for the type design and manufacture of aircraft, to facilitate effective risk management.

7.3 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/126, presented by the United States, which discussed the lack of guiding principles to assist the States of Registry (SoR) when validating design approvals that would provide for better recognition of the SoD safety systems and demonstrated technical capabilities and competence. The Committee emphasized the importance and the broad benefits of developing standardized risk-based decision-making policies and best practices for the validation of foreign products. The Committee noted the information presented and agreed with the proposed recommendations. Furthermore, the Committee agreed that the development of ICAO provisions, as necessary, would encourage Member States to adopt a standardized approach for importing products that another State had certified. This would benefit the aviation industry by having globally harmonized safety Standards to design products and reduced costs, and by having certifying authorities share best practices in addressing import requirements by SoR.

7.4 The Committee also reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/129, presented by the United States, which discussed international collaboration on integrated safety assessment models and the cooperation between the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and EUROCONTROL in the development of a shared web-platform providing an integrated aviation risk model for safety performance evaluation. The Committee noted that the harmonized models – Integrated Safety Assessment Model (ISAM) for FAA and Integrated Risk Picture (IRiS) for EUROCONTROL, recognized the importance of global concepts, implementation of safety risk assessment regionally and locally, and cost-effective development of robust safety analysis tools.

7.5 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/148, presented by the Dominican Republic, on a methodology for gathering and analysing safety data. Namely, the first steps in gathering and analysing safety data for decision-making and safety risk assessment in a context of increasingly complex and automated programmes and applications, in support of State safety programme (SSP) implementation. The Committee recognized the need for more awareness in States about change in organizational culture, as well as guidance and uniform yet simple processes in States that promote the sharing of safety data in support of SSP and SMS implementation.

7.6 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/231 Revision No. 1, presented by China, Indonesia, Japan, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, International Air Transport Association (IATA) and Flight Safety Foundation (FSF), highlighting the progress of an initiative in the Asia Pacific Region to establish a collaborative regional data sharing mechanism in support of safety risk management also known as the AP-SHARE Demonstration Project. This initiative integrated and analysed operational data from various sources in support of safety awareness and improvements and demonstrated the value of data-driven analysis to address a particular safety issue. The Committee acknowledged the governance, cost-sharing and safety analysis modalities of the AP-SHARE and called for regional groups to share their experience in regional data sharing mechanisms in support of the regional aviation safety groups (RASGs).

#### ***Other safety intelligence initiatives***

7.7 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/141 Revision No. 1, presented by China, and noted the positive result of the application of risk management systems for air carriers in China. Those systems were applied either as a reminder and assistance to first-line operational control personnel or to provide data support and the basis for decision-making in other work. The Committee agreed that China's experience in building an operational risk management system should be shared with other regions and took into consideration the recommendation for this working concept for incorporation into Annex 6 — *Operation of Aircraft* to be forwarded to the appropriate technical panel.

7.8 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/185, presented by Airports Council International (ACI), which provided an overview of the array of ACI activities and initiatives related to aerodrome safety, including runway safety, safety data, SMS implementation and aerodrome certification, some of them in collaboration with ICAO. The paper, which expressed support for ICAO activities and strategic objectives in this area, also discussed emerging issues in relation to aerodrome safety, notably the use of lasers and drones in the vicinity of aerodromes. The Committee noted and supported the information highlighted in the paper and acknowledged the valuable contribution of the presented activities to aerodrome safety.

7.9 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/280, presented by Nicaragua on behalf of Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras which highlighted the progress made by the Central American Safety Agency (ACSA) on implementing the Central American Safety Events Analysis Programme (PASOC). The Committee noted the value of PASOC in assisting the Central American States in implementing SSP by addressing the requirement for establishment of safety data collection and processing systems (SDCPS), in establishing alliances to improve the quantity and quality of data collected, in acquiring tools to support safety data analysis and safety risk management, and in working to put a mechanism in place for the protection of the data and its related sources. The Committee recognized the valuable role regional safety oversight organizations (RSOOs) could play in supporting States to address their capacity needs in regard to safety data collection and analysis to achieve effective SSP implementation.

7.10 Information papers provided by Brazil (AN-Conf/13-WP/130 and AN-Conf/13-WP/131) were noted.

7.11 Based on the discussion, the Committee agreed to the following recommendations:

**Recommendation 7.1/1 — Data-driven decision-making**

That States:

- a) implement data-driven decision-making processes, taking into account the ICAO safety and air navigation indicators, within their safety and air navigation activities and to build data analysis capacity;
- b) consider using ICAO's air navigation analysis solutions, especially during the initial development of their State safety programmes (SSPs), and joining the ICAO Safety Information Monitoring System (SIMS) project to better utilize their stored data;
- c) exchange safety and air navigation information with other Member States through data analysis tools such as SIMS in support of safety risk management;
- d) continue joint development of safety risk assessment models that support and enable baseline risk quantification, safety risk assessment and forecasting to support risk-based decision making, accident and incident modeling, barrier analysis, sensitivity, and "what if?" analyses to ensure that primary safety considerations are addressed within the integrated safety risk assessment models;
- e) together with industry stakeholders, support regional mechanisms and platforms for greater data sharing and alignment of safety priorities;

That ICAO:

- f) further develop and promote iSTARS and SIMS and other analysis solutions, and conduct regular iSTARS User Group Meetings so as to continually adapt to the changing safety environment;
- g) encourage activities that facilitate global reporting of safety events and vulnerabilities to assure that the necessary safety data is available;
- h) review and develop guidance to further facilitate the sharing of safety data between operators and those responsible for the type design and manufacture of aircraft;
- i) raise awareness in States on the importance of initiating SSP and SMS implementation with simple processes that optimize resources to demonstrate benefits and develop momentum required to achieve the needed change in the organizational culture;
- j) take action to foster the creation of uniform processes in States that promote the sharing of safety data;

- k) encourage States to use the ICAO Safety Management Implementation website as an information sharing platform to facilitate the exchange of experience in regional data sharing among regional groups; and
- l) support regional mechanisms and platforms that enable States and industry stakeholders to share and align safety priorities in support of the RASGs.

**Recommendation 7.1/2 — Standardized risk-based decision making policies and best practices for validation of foreign products**

That States:

- a) support ICAO's work, through the appropriate group of experts to determine the need for developing new materials to support further reduction in duplicated certification activity, by conducting a feasibility study for developing common standards and recommended best practices for recognizing the capabilities of SoD certification systems (including design approvals/design organization recognition);
- b) support the development of ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs), guidance material and manuals that Member States use to issue certificates for products, and complement them with guidance for best practices in conducting validation activities;

That ICAO:

- c) continue to encourage the reduction of duplicate certification action conducted by Member States that offers no commensurate increase in safety; and
- d) review and develop materials for inclusion in the *Airworthiness Manual* (Doc 9760), *Safety Management Manual (SMM)* (Doc 9859), Annex 8 — *Airworthiness of Aircraft*, and/or Annex 19 – *Safety Management*, for States of Registry (SoR) to determine the appropriate level of involvement in validation/recognition principles for States of Design (SoD) approvals.

**Agenda Item 7: Operational safety risks**

**7.2: Operational safety risks at the global, regional and national levels, and the role of RSOOs and RASGs in achieving the GASP goals**

7.12 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/127, presented by the United States, on the importance of maintaining the regional aviation safety groups (RASGs) safety framework in support of the GASP. The Committee highlighted the need to proceed with caution in considering the restructuring of the RASGs and the planning and implementation regional groups (PIRGs), and the importance of consulting States to ensure that the RASGs remain focused on building upon their successes in improving safety within their respective regions.

7.13 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/158, presented by the Interstate Aviation Committee (IAC)<sup>2</sup>, on the importance of reinforcing and recognizing RSOOs. The Committee acknowledged that RSOOs had a key role to play at the regional and global level to support States with the challenges they were facing to discharge their safety responsibilities, provided they were adequately empowered and resourced. The Committee agreed that States and RSOOs should actively continue to pursue their efforts for the strengthening of RSOOs and for their recognition within the ICAO safety system.

7.14 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/63 Revision No. 2, presented by the United States on behalf of Airports Council International (ACI), Civil Air Navigation Services Organisation (CANSO), Flight Safety Foundation (FSF), International Air Transport Association (IATA), International Council of Aircraft Owner and Pilot Associations (IAOPA), International Business Aviation Council (IBAC), International Coordinating Council of Aerospace Industries Associations (ICCAIA), International Federation of Airline Pilots' Associations (IFALPA), and International Federation of Air Traffic Controllers' Associations (IFATCA), which expressed concerns with runway safety events, particularly runway excursions and incursions, which remain among civil aviation's top safety risk categories. Since 2011, ICAO and the runway safety programme (RSP) partners had been working together to minimize and mitigate the risks of runway excursions, runway incursions and other events linked to runway safety. The Committee supported the activities of the ICAO-led RSP and the launch of the Global Runway Safety Action Plan (GRSAP).

7.15 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/179, presented by Colombia and supported by the SAM States<sup>3</sup>, on the need to address the issue of bird strikes and their impact on operational safety. The Committee agreed on the need to include safety enhancement initiatives aimed at preventing bird strikes in the draft 2020-2022 edition of the GASP, which was captured in Recommendation 6.1/1: *Draft 2020-2022 Edition of the Global Aviation Safety Plan (Doc 10004, GASP)*. The Committee also agreed on the need to integrate statistics related to bird hazards in iSTARS and to explore potential tools to support safety information analysis by States as part of the revision of the GASP.

7.16 Information papers provided by IAC (AN-Conf/13-WP/81 and AN-Conf/13-WP/159) were noted.

7.17 Based on the discussion, the Committee agreed to the following recommendation:

**Recommendation 7.2/1 – Strengthening RSOOs**

That States:

- a) further support the strengthening of regional safety oversight organizations (RSOOs) by engaging actively in the development of their RSOO, by securing adequate and

<sup>2</sup> On behalf of Autorités Africaines et Malgache de l'Aviation Civile (AAMAC), Agencia Centroamericana para la Seguridad Aeronáutica (ACSA), Agence Communautaire de Supervision de la Sécurité et de la Sureté de l'Aviation Civile (ACSAC), Agence de Supervision de la Sécurité Aérienne en Afrique Centrale (ASSA-AC), Banjul Accord Group Aviation Safety Oversight Organization (BAGASOO), East African Community Civil Aviation Safety and Security Agency (CASSOA), Civil Aviation Safety and Security Oversight System (CASSOS), Eastern Caribbean Civil Aviation Authority (ECCAA), the European Union (EU), Interstate Aviation Committee (IAC), Interim Southern African Development Community Aviation Safety Organization (iSASO), Pacific Aviation Safety Office (PASO), Regional Safety Oversight Cooperation System (SRVSOP)

<sup>3</sup> Supported by 13 Contracting States (Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)).

sustainable RSOO funding mechanisms, and, as appropriate, by further delegating safety oversight functions to the RSOO;

That ICAO:

- b) recognize that RSOOs have an important role to play in carrying out safety oversight functions on behalf of their Member States and, within the Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) framework, in addressing safety issues at the regional level;
- c) support better alignment and harmonization between PIRGs and RASGs while maintaining the safety framework of the RASGs through consultation with Member States;
- d) further support the strengthening of RSOOs and their recognition within the ICAO safety system by facilitating access to technical support, facilitating the sharing of experience and knowledge between RSOOs through the RSOO Cooperative Platform, establishing the proposed Global Aviation Safety Oversight System (GASOS) and by reinforcing direct cooperation between ICAO and RSOOs in the framework of the GASP; and

That RSOOs:

- e) continue to engage in the RSOO Cooperative Platform and engage actively in the establishment of the proposed GASOS by supporting its implementation and, where applicable, by taking steps towards recognition and in strengthening their safety oversight capabilities.

**Recommendation 7.2/2 — ICAO Runway Safety Programme — Global Runway Safety Action Plan**

That States:

- a) recognise that runway safety-related accident categories, particularly runway excursions and incursions, continue to be a global safety priority for aviation stakeholders as determined by a risk-based analysis;
- b) urge runway safety stakeholders, including aircraft operators, air navigation service providers, aerodrome operators, aerospace industry, and regional aviation safety groups, to implement the actions in the GRSAP to reduce the global rate of runway excursions and runway incursions;
- c) continue to establish requirements and activities aimed at improving runway safety through State runway safety programmes;
- d) encourage aerodrome operators to establish effective runway safety teams and encourage all runway safety stakeholders to actively participate in established runway safety teams; and



That ICAO:

- e) continue to lead and coordinate the runway safety programme with its partner organizations to work together to mitigate runway safety-related risks.

**Agenda Item 7: Operational safety risks**  
**7.3: Other implementation issues**

*Global and regional initiatives*

7.18 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/30, presented by the Secretariat, which underlined the global and regional implementation strategies for enhancing the implementation of ICAO air navigation and safety provisions and alignment of the States' national planning frameworks with the regional and global plans (Global Air Navigation Plan (GANP) and Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP)). The paper described how the complexity of worldwide air navigation systems called for dynamic and multidisciplinary project management processes to address the development and timely implementation of ICAO provisions. The Committee supported the paper and acknowledged the value of the global and regional implementation strategies to address State and regional implementation goals, targets and performance objectives. The Committee also agreed that linkage should not be limited to the GANP and GASP but should also include the Global Aviation Security Plan (GASeP). The Committee furthermore agreed that RSOOs should also be involved in the provision development process, provided that RSOOs were further improved.

7.19 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/76 (Revision No. 1 in English only), presented by Australia and co-sponsored by Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Marshall Islands, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Singapore, and Timor Leste, and discussed challenges the ICAO Asia Pacific Regional Office (APAC) was facing in delivering its mandate of providing assistance to the accredited thirty-nine Member States<sup>4</sup>. The Committee noted that it was particularly true considering the limited connectivity and accessibility to States, largely due to its geographical spread, as well as a large number of developing States, including small island developing States (SIDS). That spread put APAC States at a disadvantage in regard to timely assistance from the Regional Office. The Committee emphasized the need to strengthen the ongoing engagement within the region and emphasized that due consideration should be given in the allocation of resources.

7.20 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/213 (Revision No. 1 in English only), presented by the United Kingdom on behalf of Canada, China, France, Japan, Malaysia, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Singapore, Togo, African Civil Aviation Commission (AFCAC), European Union (EU)<sup>5</sup>, Airports Council International (ACI), Civil Air Navigation Services Organization (CANSO), International Air Transport Association (IATA) and World Bank, which highlighted the work of the Aviation Safety Implementation Assistance Partnership (ASIAP) to facilitate coordination and

<sup>4</sup> Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, China, Cook Islands Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Viet Nam

<sup>5</sup> The EU body involved in the work of ASIAP is the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA).

cooperation on technical assistance activities in order to further advance aviation safety implementation assistance capacity in the aviation community. The Committee widely supported the working paper, in particular the greater involvement and participation of States in ASIAP. The Committee noted the extensive work of the ASIAP partners to foster coordination and collaboration of assistance activities, promoting transparency and the reduction in the duplication of efforts and resources. The Committee acknowledged the importance of coordinating and cooperating on technical assistance activities and encouraged States, international organizations, industry, financial institutions and ICAO to continue to actively share information and resources in order to promote greater efficiency in the implementation of technical assistance. The Committee urged the partners to strive for greater commitment and participation in the ASIAP Programme and to invite other States and international organizations that could provide technical assistance to States to join the partnership.

7.21 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/221, presented by 54 Contracting States, Members of AFCAC<sup>6</sup>, which supported the continuation of the Africa-Indian Ocean (AFI) Plan. In light of a successful implementation of the Plan and, as a result, achieving a great safety improvement in the region since its onset, the Committee, in principle, agreed on the way forward with a view to maintaining the momentum of improvement in the coming years.

7.22 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/225, presented by 54 Contracting States, Members of AFCAC<sup>7</sup>, which described the revised approach and strategies for monitoring and measurement of implementation of the Abuja Safety Targets (ASTs) and air navigation services (ANS) performance indicators. The Committee noted that AFCAC had developed a monitoring and measuring mechanism for implementation of the ASTs by Member States. The mechanism was an information gathering, sharing and feedback system to encourage Member States to implement the ASTs and provision of technical assistance to ensure implementation where there was limited capacity. The Committee agreed that initiatives such as the aforementioned should be encouraged and other data collection, collation, analysis methods should be shared by stakeholders.

### ***Other implementation issues***

7.23 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/45 (Revision No. 1 in English only), presented by Austria on behalf of the European Union and its Member States<sup>8</sup>, other Member States of the European Civil Aviation Conference,<sup>9</sup> and EUROCONTROL, and supported by Australia and Malaysia, which acknowledged and supported the ICAO work programme on conflict zones. The working paper received wide support from the Committee. It highlighted the need to devote increasing efforts to further develop risk management capabilities for Member States, operators, air navigation service providers (ANSPs) and industry parties, as well as multilateral arrangements for the sharing of

---

<sup>6</sup> Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cap Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Cote D'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of The Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Republic of 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, Zimbabwe.

<sup>7</sup> Same as footnote No. 6.

<sup>8</sup> Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom.

<sup>9</sup> Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, San Marino, Serbia, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine.

risk information and (regional) contingency planning related to civil aircraft operations over or near conflict zones and implementation. The Committee agreed that for the sharing of conflict zone information, full advantage should be taken of developing provisions for system-wide information management (SWIM), flight and flow information for a collaborative environment (FF-ICE), air traffic flow management (ATFM) and civil-military cooperation. The Committee noted that the definition of conflict zone in the *Risk Assessment Manual for Civil Aircraft Operations Over or Near Conflict Zones* (Doc 10084) only captured the areas of armed conflict. The Committee also agreed that efforts and items related to conflict zones affecting multiple domains be included in the GASP, GANP and Global Aviation Security Plan (GASeP).

7.24 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/72, presented by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), which described operational and safety impacts caused by the suspension of commercial aviation services (SADIS, SITA, Jeppesen and Collins). The Committee was informed that a continuing dialogue had taken place between ICAO, the DPRK and other parties to support safe operation of international civil aviation, and the progress on any significant developments on this matter had been reported to the Council of ICAO. The Committee was also informed that ICAO maintained coordination with the United Nations (UN) to ensure that any assistance to DPRK rendered by ICAO would not be in violation of relevant UN Security Council resolutions.

7.25 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/94, presented by the United Arab Emirates, which outlined the anticipated shortage of air traffic control officers and the need to develop strategies to promote more productive recruitment, training and retention programmes. The Committee was informed that a State letter (AN 12/59.1-18/77) with a proposal for the amendment of the *Procedures for Air Navigation Services — Training* (PANS-TRG, Doc 9868) had been circulated to Contracting States and international organizations for comments on 29 August 2018. The proposal included new enhanced provisions related to ANS personnel training. The proposed amendment to the PANS-TRG was envisaged for applicability on 5 November 2020. The participants were encouraged to review and provide their comments on the amendment proposal by 29 November 2018. The Committee also noted that a State Letter (SL 2018/95) had been issued in September this year, informing of the expanded scope of ICAO's Next Generation of Aviation Professionals (NGAP) Programme and encouraged the engagement of States and all partners in the programme.

7.26 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/120, presented by Australia and Canada, which described the important progress made by the global civil aviation community to implement Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) and reiterated the need to continue improving the SARPs process. The Committee noted the challenges faced by States in implementing SARPs, including the increasing rates of adopted SARPs; short timelines provided to Member States to implement SARPs; and barriers faced by States, industry and others seeking to access SARPs and other ICAO guidance materials. The Committee agreed with the actions proposed in the working paper and supported the need to continue improving the process of SARPs development and implementation. The Committee reiterated the importance of having guidance material in all working languages of ICAO in a timely manner. With respect to the proposal to provide free public web access to ICAO documents, as provided in action 3.2 d), the Committee was informed that, as per decision of the ICAO Assembly (A39-WP/501, paragraph 28.14 refers) the proposal was currently under consideration by the Council. It was agreed that the outcome of the Council decision would be reported to the 40th Session of the Assembly.

7.27 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/133, presented by Brazil, which proposed an alternative model to Article 83 *bis* of the *Convention on International Civil Aviation* (Doc 7300) in order to allow airlines from different States to carry out aircraft interchange operations in which both civil

aviation authorities, from the States of primary and secondary operators, had similar responsibilities. It was noted that in accordance with Annex 8 — *Airworthiness of Aircraft*, the State of Registry, unless otherwise transferred under Article 83 *bis*, was responsible for ensuring that the aircraft, and any modification to it, complied with an approved design. Furthermore, Annex 6 — *Operation of Aircraft* stated that the State of the Operator should ensure that its actions were consistent with the approvals and acceptances of the State of Registry. Therefore, the Committee recommended that ICAO refer the proposal outlined in this working paper to an appropriate group of experts for further careful review and consideration.

7.28 Information Papers provided by the Secretariat (AN-Conf/13-WP/33) and by the United Arab Emirates (AN-Conf/13-WP/264) were noted.

7.29 Based on the discussion, the Committee agreed to the following recommendations:

**Recommendation 7.3/1 – ICAO implementation strategies**

That ICAO:

- a) strengthen the linkage between the Global Air Navigation Plan (GANP), the Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) and the Global Aviation Security Plan (GASeP) to achieve an integrated implementation approach;
- b) take into account implementation support needs when developing provisions;
- c) further improve the planning and implementation regional group (PIRG) and regional aviation safety group (RASG) mechanisms to enhance the coordination and alignment of implementation between regions;
- d) consider the development of a global collaboration mechanism to facilitate interregional alignment, harmonization, and sharing of best practices and lessons learned;
- e) support the development of a flexible, progressive and risk-based strategy to improve global implementation of Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs);
- f) request an appropriate group of experts to further review and explore a process that would facilitate short-term (successive) aircraft interchange operations; and
- g) further develop risk management capabilities and facilitate implementation of multilateral arrangements for the sharing of risk information and (regional) contingency planning related with civil aircraft operations over or near conflict zones.

**Recommendation 7.3/2 — Aviation Safety Implementation Assistance Partnership (ASIAP)**

That ICAO:

- 
- a) continue to develop the prioritization of States and areas of technical assistance criteria in order to achieve appropriate and transparent prioritization;

That ASIAP Partners:

- b) strive for greater commitment to, and participation in, the Aviation Safety Implementation Assistance Partnership (ASIAP) Programme, and invite other States and international organisations that can provide technical assistance to States to join ASIAP;
- c) and other stakeholders providing technical assistance (including States, regional safety oversight organisations (RSOOs), international organisations, industry and financial institutions) coordinate their technical assistance activities and make use of the online Project Database (<https://www.icao.int/safety/ASIAP/Pages/Tools.aspx>) in order to reduce duplication of activities and effort;
- d) apply the Project Outcome Indicators (POIs) to their projects and review the measurable results in coordination with each other; and
- e) including ICAO, States, international organizations, industry and financial institutions provide funding to support technical assistance activities.

#### **Recommendation 7.3/3 — State national planning framework**

That States:

- a) reaffirm support for the fundamental roles and responsibilities of Contracting States, Council and the Air Navigation Commission, as provided in the *Convention on International Civil Aviation* (Doc 7300), for the development of quality and timely Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs);
- b) enhance their involvement in all stages of the provision development process and encourage RSOOs and other aviation stakeholders to do the same;
- c) support the ICAO Next Generation of Aviation Professionals (NGAP) Programme in light of the international need to address the existing aviation personnel shortages and to ensure a competent workforce capable of meeting the needs and challenges of the global aviation community into the future; and
- d) share best practices on applied strategies to promote more productive recruitment, training and education, development and retention programmes.

#### **Recommendation 7.3/4 –Regional Office Resources for implementation activities**

That ICAO:

- a) give due consideration in the allocation of resources to regional offices for the support of implementation activities; and

- b) support the Asia Pacific (APAC) Region in the implementation of Beijing Declaration and progress towards ICAO global targets.

**Recommendation 7.3/5 — Support for the continuation of the Comprehensive Regional Implementation Plan for Aviation Safety in Africa (AFI Plan)**

That States:

- a) support the continuation of AFI Plan activities and the project-based approach;
- b) request ICAO, international organizations and industry partners to support the AFI Plan and its associated projects;
- c) consider adopting an approach similar to the AFI Plan to address safety deficiencies and challenges in their region; and

That ICAO:

- d) extend the AFI Plan in order to enable it to accomplish its objectives.
-