

Safety Key Performance Area

José Luis Garcia-Chico Gomez, EASA

Stakeholder Workshop

Brussels, 16 January 2019



Proposed EU-wide Safety targets for RP3

Effectiveness of Safety Management		
EoS M Component (Management Objectives)	ANSP	State (NSA)
	EU-target (2024)	EU-target (2024)
Safety Policy and Objectives	D	C
Safety Risk Management	E	C
Safety Assurance	D	C
Safety Promotion	D	C
Safety Culture	D	C

Application of the Risk Analysis Tool		
Categories		Proposed EU-target (2024)
Reporting on Separation Minima Infringements	Ground	100%
	Overall	80%
Reporting on Runway Incursion	Ground	100%
	Overall	80%
Reporting on ATM Specific Occurrences	Overall	100%

SAF1: Target setting process

Main stakeholder comments

- General: Support for the proposed target was missing
Lack of adequate process description
Concerns over interdependencies
Consideration to additional Performance Indicators

SAF1: Target setting process

The PRB/EASA response

- Aim at improving the management of safety-related processes
- Account of other developments during RP3 (e.g. Regulation COM(2018)373)

SAF2: RP3 KPI and associated guidance

Main stakeholder comments

- General: Target setting process should be reconsidered once acceptable means of compliance (AMC) are published
Difficult to plan without AMC

SAF2: RP3 KPI and associated guidance

The PRB/EASA response

- Original target set using RP2 indicators
- Map existing RP2 AMC to new RP3 AMC
- The indication is that
 - Level E target will be changed to Level D in Safety Risk Management
 - Level D to Level C in all other Management Objectives

SAF3: Target for EoSM

Main stakeholder comments

- General: The proposed target generates disproportionate cost
Excessive and unrealistic
Target based on Level D already reached
Some stakeholders support for the target set on Safety Risk Management

SAF3: Target for EoSM

The PRB/EASA response

- Current performance used to assess realism of target
- Eight ANSPs have already reached Level E
- Level E will not bring significant additional workload or cost

SAF4: Compliance versus continuous improvements

Main stakeholder comments

- General: Compliance-based regulation is different to continuous improvement
Continuous improvements are difficult to assess
Difficult to demonstrate compliance with target

SAF4: Compliance versus continuous improvements

The PRB/EASA response

- Regulatory compliance with Commission Implementing Regulation 2017/373 is the minimum level
- Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/373 supportive of target
- Some ANSPs are already at Level E

SAF7: Level of uncertainty on effort implementing 2017/373

Main stakeholder comments

- General: New requirements
 Level of uncertainty

SAF7: Level of uncertainty on effort implementing 2017/373

The PRB/EASA response

- Additional cost marginal
- Pro-active and forward-looking management of safety risks
- Countermeasure for unintended effects

Proposed EU-wide Safety targets for RP3

Based on approved in RP3 legal text, target is limited to one single KPI: new EoSM_{ANSP} indicator

EoSM: Effectiveness of safety management of ANSPs	
EOSM Component	EU-target (2024) based on RP3 questionnaire
Safety policy and Objectives	C
Safety Risk Management	D
Safety Assurance	C
Safety Promotion	C
Safety Culture	C

THANK YOU

