SMS Best Practice/Good Practice Submission			
State whether this is a Best or Good Practice:		To be determined by CANSO	
ANSP	ANA, Luxembourg	Date of submission	04 Jul 2024
SoE Study Area	SA4, SMS Documentation		
BP/GP title	Safety documentation review process		
In use since	March 2023		
ANSPs using this practice (for BP specifically)	None		
Key Words	Safety documentation		

See continuation next page

1. **Safety Documentation Review Process**
ANA has developed and implemented a Safety Documentation Review Process and herewith would like to present it as good/best practice in order to share it with other ANSPs.

2. Why the process was developed :
- to provide a centralized overview of all safety documentation, safety-related documentation and interaction between linked documents ;
- to be able to keep all safety documentation up-to-date ;
- to ensure compliance with legal requirements (EU373, EU376, ICAO, EOSM, etc).

3. Why the process is believed to be a good/best practice :

3.1 Safety documentation is a huge, ever-growing process : therefore, the aim was to create a very extensive and detailed process, which would cover all aspects of safety documentation, providing a centralized and accurate overview.

3.2. The procedure was designed to be as complete as possible in its scope : all documents are included, both from Safety Department internally and from other Departments, to avoid that some documents are forgotten.

3.3 The procedure was designed to be as efficient as possible in its quality : all steps of what needs to be reviewed/checked are listed, to avoid that only a partial review is carried out, or to avoid that two different users would perform the review with different standards.

3.4 The procedure was designed to be as robust and "self-correcting" as possible : all required crosschecks are part of the process. The procedure does not only review documents individually, but also checks the interactions between linked documents. Should a required update be missed in one document, it can still be detected in a linked document.

3.5 The procedure was designed to be as user-friendly as possible for its direct Users, but also as understandable as possible for its Readers (Management, Auditors, etc.).

3.6 The procedure comes along with a checklist that encompasses all the aspects of the procedure, making. The practical application of the procedure is actually the proceeding through the checklist, so only one document only is required for completion of the whole procedure.

3.7 The procedure was designed along a self-tracking linear timeline (i.e. the checklist) : therefore it can be started, interrupted and resumed at convenience. This is a useful aspect for a such process, which is somehow time consuming in its entirety : it can be fully integrated in any working schedule, with maximum flexibility for the User, and with full traceability if someone else has to take over the process for some reason.

3.8 The checklist was also designed in such a way to serve as a working document while the procedure is being carried out, and also as one same finalized document, which can be used as evidence for completion of the process (for audit purposes for example).

3.9 Last but not least, the procedure, although completely "manual" at this stage, can serve as a basis to build up a future fully integrated document management system. Because it already contains the basis for such a future system :
- which documents need to be reviewed ;
- who needs to review / endorse which document ;
- which review/checks needs to be performed ;
- which documents interact with each other.

See continuation next page

4. Description of how the process was developed :

The process was developed along the following steps :

4.1 Preparation :

Define the scope : i.e. make an inventory of all safety documentation (within the Safety Department), and all safety-related documentation (in all other Departments).
Define the responsibilities : document ownership for changes / endorsement.
Check the storage location of all safety and safety-related documentation.
Streamline and centralize the storage location(s), to ensure a more efficient documentation review procedure later, (as documentation is not scattered in several places).

4.2 Process design :

Then the design of the process was started, with the aims and requirements described in details in above paragraphs 3.1 – 3.8 and summarized again here below :

- centralized process ;
- extensive and accurate scope ;
- quality and efficiency of the review ;
- robustness and error likelihood minimisation ;
- user friendliness and comprehensibility ;
- self-tracking linear time process, for easy inclusion in daily working schedule ;
- documents proactive design for several purposes, to avoid minimum number of documents.

4.3 Process practical application :

A procedure was drafted. Based on the procedure, a checklist was then created, encompassing all aspects of the procedure, enabling its users to just go along the checklist, with the assurance that the whole process is covered.

4.4 Process implementation and continuous improvement :

Use of the checklist revealed some required improvements, fine-tuning, user-friendliness issues, etc. The checklist is a living document, designed for a quick and flexible update, whenever required.

5. Process creation - dedicated resources and duration :

The process was developed by the Safety Expert in charge of Safety Documentation (1 person). The total workload for the project only was approx. one full month (spread over several months).

6. Process contribution to safety performance and/or understanding of safety in the organisation :

6.1 An up-to-date safety documentation is a direct contribution to safety in itself, because it conveys accurate and correct information to all Users.

6.2 Same for a consistent safety documentation system overall, as it avoids contradictory / overlapping information in different documents.

6.3 The process enables to clean any documents which are no longer required, no longer up-to-date, duplicated elsewhere, etc., on a regular basis.

6.4 The process, with its systematic yearly review enables a minimum yearly “refresher” of each document to its Owner. This is particularly important for documents which are stored, but not used very often, and which would be more likely to be overlooked in ad hoc documentation updates. Same “refresher” advantage for all the Users of the documents : updates are done more frequently, and as a result, they are usually smaller. Therefore, updates are easier to assimilate by the Users. And at each update, the document is also re-circulated to all its Users, which is optimal for gradual memorization with constant refresher information.

6.5 The process gives our NSA Auditors more confidence, as it is a systematic process.

6.6 The process also shortens audit workload and duration : audit preparation, desktop audits, on-site audits, evidence provision, etc. Auditors do not need to check for document review steps and evidences everywhere, they just need to check one document.

7. Attachments :

- ANA - Safety Documentation Review – Procedure
- ANA - Safety Documentation Review – Checklist – Filled out (as a practical example)
- ANA - Safety Documentation Review – Checklist – Blank Template.

By submitting this document, your organisation is willing for the proposed Best or Good Practice to be shared with other ANSPs.

For Best Practices, this document should be sent together with the SoE in SMS questionnaire, to: soe_2024@eurocontrol.int **by 30th June 2024 at the latest**.

Submissions for consideration as Good Practices may be sent by the above date. They may also be identified during the survey interview sessions with the assessment team, following which a Good Practice submission document will be requested.