



## **Possible Objectives for COSCAP-SA Phase IV**

**Note:** The activities required to achieve the Objectives would need to be developed further and included in the Project Document for review of the Steering Committee.

### **IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVES**

1. The establishment of a dedicated forum/organization to facilitate dialogues and exchange of information and experience on aviation safety matters among COSCAP-SA members and promote solutions to common problems as well as provide a vehicle for the harmonization of policies, regulations and procedures related to aviation safety oversight.

#### **Activities to continue in Phase IV**

The Steering Committee constitutes the forum and will continue to:

- 1.1 Identify the issues related to safety oversight which can effectively be addressed on a sub- regional basis and establish an agenda for dealing with those issues.
- 1.2 Promote the regional harmonization of regulations, policies and procedures related to the surveillance certification and supervision of operators, manufacturers, and maintenance facilities.
- 1.3 Enable SARAST to support RASG/APRAST in development of Safety Enhancement Initiatives (SEI) and assist Member States with the implementation of SEIs.

**Comment:** This is an Objective that would be common to all Member States.

2. Ensuring a coordinated, cost-effective approach for obtaining technical assistance in the field of aviation safety oversight, by minimizing duplication of efforts and allowing the sharing of available resources to the maximum extent. Promoting a comprehensive system approach for the conduct of safety oversight activities, focusing on effective implementation of Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs), the efficient oversight capability of Member States and on assisting COSCAP-SA Members in the effective implementation of the critical elements of safety oversight as identified by ICAO.

#### **2.1 Activities to continue in Phase IV**

- 2.1.1 Ensure that ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) are being effectively implemented by COSCAP-SA Members.
- 2.1.2 Using all available information, including USOAP audit reports, update data concerning specific safety deficiencies within Member Administrations.
- 2.1.3 Evaluate existing and proposed safety-related technical assistance programmes within the South Asia area to identify objectives, activities and resources and promote full collaboration as deemed necessary.

- 2.1.4 Merge the information acquired in the course of the preceding activities and construct a Work Plan which takes into account all available and pending resources both within and outside of COSCAP-SA and present to each Steering Committee Meeting for approval.

**Comment: This is an Objective that would be common to all Member States. As new ICAO requirements are introduced and/or as States strengthen their safety oversight system, then the Steering Committee can essentially add additional objectives and adjust the annual Work Plan each year.**

3. Enhancing the knowledge and skills of the aviation safety professional personnel of COSCAP-SA Members, through a variety of formal training courses and on-the-job training.

**Comment: COSCAP-SA has provided a significant amount of training over the initial three Phases and would continue to do so in the future. Some of this training would be related to new initiatives but some may be refresher or initial training for new staff. The training related to new requirements would be required for all Member States while refresher and training for new staff would be dependent on the capabilities of State's to impart training to their staff. While this objective would be applicable to all States, the needs will vary between States.**

4. Using Programme personnel, personnel seconded from other COSCAP-SA Members or ICAO Staff, undertake missions to COSCAP-SA Member States to maintain liaison and augment the resources of those member administrations.

#### **4.1 Ongoing activity**

- 4.1.1 For States who require such support, complete certification, inspection and/or surveillance of air operators, aerodromes or service providers.
- 4.1.2 Other activities to be determined by the Steering Committee.

**Comment: The needs for this Objective would vary but would be especially important for States with a shortage of inspectorate staff. States which have a full complement of trained inspectors may not need support in this area.**

- 5.0 Assisting within available resources COSCAP-SA Members in rectifying deficiencies identified by USOAP audits on aspects covered by Annexes 1, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13 and 14. Support States in implementation of CMA processes and States who may be audited under the CMA.

**Comment: The needs for this Objective would vary. States with high LEI, who have not fully implemented their Corrective Action Plan would require considerable support in this area.**

6. Supporting Member States to establish an effective Safety Management Systems in the area of Aircraft Operations, Aerodromes and Air Traffic Management.

**Activities 6.1**

Regulations, standards and guidance material may need to be developed by Member States to implement ICAO SARPs requiring air operators and service providers to implement Safety Management Systems.

**Activity 6.2**

Training programmes, seminars and evaluations of SMS are conducted to assist CAAs, air operators and service providers with the implementation of Safety Management Systems.

**Comment: The needs for this Objective would vary as the level of effective implementation of SMS would vary between States. It is recognized that it will take some period of time to achieve effective implementation of SMS. Evaluation of the implementation of SMS will require inspectors to develop new skills.**

**7. Supporting Member States in establishing an integrated State Safety Programme by identifying the gaps in States SSP and develop an action plan to address the gaps.**

**Comment: It should be recognized that the SSP encompasses component/elements that a State should have in place to ensure a continuous improvement of safety. Many of the elements of the SSP such as regulations, effective safety oversight may already be in place and effective. However, aspects such as safety promotion, risk management, acceptable levels of safety, indicators, etc. will require development or enhancement in all States. Based on a gap analysis, COSCAP would identify the shortfalls on a sub-regional basis and acquire expertise to address the gaps.**

Note: The following cost data was used to determine the number of inspectors person days that would be available when comparing the various options.

- A Regional Expert would cost approximately \$55,000 annually.
- A full time International expert in year 1 would cost approximately \$200,000
- An international expert under SSA would cost \$450 a day plus the cost of transportation to/from the sub-region. The cost of tickets would be expensive for an expert beyond 9 hours flight time, so assuming 50% of the experts are from outside the Region and that they are engaged for 2 month periods, then the cost for this period would be \$23,800 (44 days X \$450, plus \$4000). Note: Two month period is selected for costing purposes but the period would be adjusted based on the work to be achieved.
- While engaging international experts who are more expensive will result in fewer person days of staff, it is expected that when they are engaged for short periods they will travel extensively. Therefore, the cost of transportation/DSA within the sub-region is assumed to be the same for both regional and international experts so this does not need to be considered for the purposes of comparing the various options.
- The total funding available to the COSCAP-SA programme based on the 2012 budget as outlined in DP3 is approximately \$480K. The total funding available to engaged staff whether national or international is approximately \$275K. The options below indicate the number of person years and/or months that could be available within this amount.

Option	Staffing	Advantages/Disadvantages	Annual Staff Cost
OPTION 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One RPC and Four Regional Experts (RE) , Flight Operations, Airworthiness, Aerodrome, ATM – Status Quo</li> </ul>	<p><b>Advantages</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides broader range of functional support</li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not provide resources to engage short term experts to address needs outside of the capabilities of the Regional Experts</li> <li>• Assumes the needs in the area of Flight Operations, Airworthiness, Aerodromes and ATM are equal</li> </ul>	Staff - \$275K

OPTION 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One RPC and two RE (Flight Operations and Airworthiness)</li> <li>International experts under short term SSA with four - two month periods – or other durations provided the total does not exceed 8 months</li> </ul>	<p><b>Advantages</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full time Regional Experts available in the areas of Flight Operations and Airworthiness</li> <li>Flexibility to engage international expertise to address particular needs</li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full time Regional Experts not available for ATM and Aerodromes</li> <li>No OJT being provided to RE</li> </ul>	<p>Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$165k</li> <li>\$110</li> </ul>
OPTION 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full-time International Expert as PC</li> <li>Two full-time RE(s), Flight Operations and Airworthiness</li> </ul>	<p><b>Advantages</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Benefit of full time international expert to guide the Project and provide technical support</li> <li>OJT being provided to the REs. This will ensure stronger capacity building</li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full time international expert expensive</li> <li>Full time Regional Experts not available for ATM and Aerodromes</li> <li>Does not provide resources to engage short term expertise to address needs outside of the capabilities of the Regional/International Experts</li> </ul>	<p>Staff -\$310k</p> <p>Travel cost reduced to \$85k, as there would only be three full time staff so comparable in total budget cost with Option 1.</p>
OPTION 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two full time RE – no RPC</li> <li>International experts under short term SSA with seven two month periods – or other durations provided the total does not exceed 14 months</li> </ul>	<p><b>Advantages</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greatest flexibility to engage short term expertise to address particular needs</li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full time Regional Experts not available for ATM and aerodromes and full time RPC not available</li> </ul>	<p>Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$110k</li> <li>\$165k</li> </ul>

Option 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One full time International Expert</li> <li>• International expert or short term RE under SSA up to \$85K available</li> </ul>	<p><b>Advantages</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benefit of full time international expert to guide the Project and provide technical support</li> <li>• Flexibility to engage short term expert to meet ever changing needs</li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full time international expert expensive</li> <li>• Full time Regional Experts not available for ATM and Aerodromes</li> </ul>	<p>Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$200k</li> <li>• \$75k</li> </ul>
----------	---	--	--