



**CANSO Position Paper on
Safety Performance Indicators for the
second reference period**

CANSO European Regional Office 23.01.2012



canso

civil air navigation services organisation

CANSO European Regional Office

Wetstraat 82 Rue de La Loi, 1040 Brussels, Belgium.

Tel: +32 (0)2 255 1090 Fax: +32 (0)2 203 8916 email: europa@canso.org

Introduction

The Performance Review Body (PRB), European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) and European Commission (EC) will be organising a Safety Expert Workshop on the "Development of Safety performance indicators for the second reference period (RP2)". This workshop is being held as part of a Performance Review Board (PRB)/EASA ongoing work on the development of Safety PIs.

The Performance Regulation (EU) No 691/2010 establishes a new mechanism to improve the safety performance of National Supervisory Authorities (NSAs), Organisations and network functions through target setting and continuous monitoring at national/Functional Airspace block (FAB) and EU-wide level. Current regulation and its amendment defines Safety Performance Indicators (SPIs) that should be monitored at both European and national/FAB levels and used for the safety performance assessment during the first Reference Period (RP1).

Based on the current regulatory proposal in place and the three safety performance indicators, the EC expects that by the end of RP1 Europe will benefit from improved and harmonised reporting in the Air Navigation Service (ANS)/Air Traffic Management (ATM) and for the first time an initial safety picture (with regards to ATC safety performance) at the EU level will be available.

Since the main safety objective of RP1 was to improve and harmonize reporting across Europe, EC believes the logical step in RP2 would be the improvement of risk management. Therefore, they want a framework for the development of performance indicators and targets for RP2 to allow continuous improvement of safety in the European ANS/ATM system.

To support the proposed framework and the general approach for the development of SPIs, as well as future target setting, the investigation of potential indicators is needed to identify "tools" that will allow steering of safety behaviour in the right direction.

CANSO Guidance

CANSO supports the introduction of Safety Performance Indicators¹ as a means to improve safety performance, since it will lead to a more informative and correct safety picture due to better standardisation of performance across the network.

The understanding of safety indicators when used in this document should be:

Safety Indicators - counting events that happen, the entity may or may not have any influence.

Safety Performance Indicators – counting or measuring performance. The measure can be directly related to an effort by the entity.

¹ To develop the CANSO guidance, two definitions of the article 2 of the 691/2010 regulation have been taken as a reference : (c) 'Performance indicators' means the indicators used for the purpose of performance monitoring, benchmarking and reviewing; and (d) 'Key performance indicators' means the performance indicators used for the purpose of performance target setting";

Key Performance Indicators - if an SPI is considered a key indicator for the reference period, it becomes a KPI. It may or may not have a target.

CANSO urges the PRB, EASA and the European Commission to consider the following issues when setting and monitoring Safety Indicators, Safety Performance Indicators and Safety Key Performance Indicators:

1. SPIs should be effective as a means used in improving safety, to achieve this they should be simple, easy to measure, repeatable and meaningful across all states and within FABs
2. KPIs should only be defined and accepted for monitoring or measuring when it can be demonstrated how this will improve the overall safety performance.
3. Targets may be set to KPIs when it is clear how the indicators can be meaningfully influenced and managed, i.e. the causal relation between measures and indicators must be understood. For example setting target on the EoS maturity (leading).
4. Target setting on safety KPIs is not meaningful if it is not understood (or accepted) how the target setting will or may influence KPIs in other domains.
5. An overall framework or process for balancing safety against other key performance parameters (most notably capacity and cost) is required to be in place before meaningful targets can be set on safety.
6. Targets must not drive inappropriate behaviour or affect safety culture or reporting culture.
7. Targets on lagging indicators should not introduce a negative effect on safety, for example on the reporting of occurrences.
8. Lagging indicators should be defined and monitored as Safety Indicators.
9. Leading indicators should be defined and monitored as Safety Indicators and Safety Performance Indicators.
10. Leading SPIs will cover pro-active measures, like implementing mitigation measures or improving SMS. Some of these measures will be a direct result of the trend analysis based on monitored lagging SIs.
11. Targets on leading SPIs may not be numerical and may be based on action plans.
12. Trend analysis can be based on leading and lagging indicators. Lagging indicators can be based on specific types of common occurrences, differentiated in severity categories.
13. Targets may be relative and set for each entity.
14. Each entity may have focus on tackling the most significant risks for them or for the total ATM safety performance.

15. In order to aggregate, or compare, risk (at an organisation, State, FAB or EU level) it is necessary to have a common means of measuring and assessing risk.
16. Certain types of risks are not always within the control of a single organisation (e.g. airspace infringements) and require a collective response at the State or EU level.
17. The difficulty with setting targets at any level other than at the organisational level is that the targets would have to be apportioned in a meaningful way.
18. We need a consistent and enhanced RAT. Currently the RAT only produces SIs for Separation Minima infringement, Runway Incursions and ATM Specific Technical Events. The measurable occurrences for RP2 should be based upon experiences collected of the usage on RAT during RP1 so that no incoherence's exists between service providers in the way of interpretation.
19. It should be recognised that it becomes increasingly more difficult (and costly) to improve when at the higher levels of maturity.
20. RP2 SPIs setting should depend on the level of maturity achieved for RP1 indicators that represent a precursor for the definition of new SPIs.

* * *

CANSO – The Civil Air Navigation Services Organisation – is the global voice of the companies that provide air traffic control and represents the interests of Air Navigation Services Providers worldwide. CANSO members are responsible for supporting over 80% of world air traffic, and through our Workgroups, members share information and develop new policies, with the ultimate aim of improving air navigation services on the ground and in the air. CANSO also represents its members' views in major regulatory and industry forums, including at ICAO, where we have official Observer status.

For further information please contact:

Guenter Martis
Director European Affairs
CANSO Regional European Office in Brussels
Wetstraat 82 rue de la Loi
1040 Brussels

Tel : + 32 (0) 2 255 1090
Fax : + 32 (0) 2 203 8916
europe@canso.org