



## COMPREHENSIVE REGIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR AVIATION SECURITY AND FACILITATION IN AFRICA (AFI SECFAL PLAN)

### SECOND AFI SECFAL PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

(Montreal, Canada, 27 November 2015)

#### Agenda Item 5: Outcome of the needs analysis study on training

*(Presented by AFI SECFAL Plan Secretariat)*

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This discussion paper presents the outcome of the survey carried out in compliance with decision of the 1st AFI SECFAL Plan Steering Committee meeting, in order to identify the training needs in the field of aviation security and facilitation in Africa.

**Action:** The Steering Committee is invited to:

- a) Note the summary of findings contained in this discussion paper; and
- b) Consider and provide guidance on the recommendations contained in Paragraph 3.

## 1. BACKGROUND

### 1.1 Decision of the AFISECFAL Steering Committee

During the first meeting of the AFISECFAL Steering Committee (Maputo, 18 May 2015), a decision was taken to carry out an analysis of the aviation security and facilitation training needs as part of the activities to be undertaken in the short term implementation phase. The Steering Committee also requested that consideration be given to increasing the number of Aviation Security Training Centers, based on the outcome of the analysis.

### 1.2 Methodology of survey carried out

The Study's aim is to further develop a training strategy in the fields of facilitation and aviation security within the AFI Region. It was carried out by the Global Aviation Training Office of ICAO (GAT), in close cooperation with the Air Transport Bureau Implementation Support and Development – Security (ISD) Section and Regional Offices of ICAO accredited to AFI States.

The study consisted of on-site visits to a number of AFI States, AFCAC, Sub-regional organizations and ASTCs, as well as a detailed questionnaire that was sent out to all AFI States (53 out of 54 replied), whilst letters were sent to all organizations and donor States, and members of the AFISECFAL Steering Committee, inquiring about training needs and possibilities for contributing to assistance activities. The result of the questionnaire is reflected in Appendix 1 to this discussion paper. The results were generally consistent with the results of the Universal Security Audit Programme (USAP), save for some exceptions.

## 2. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

### 2.1. Findings related to ICAO SARPS

2.1.1. With regard to development and implementation of National Civil Aviation Security Training Programmes (NCASTP) (Annex 17, Standard 3.1.6) it was revealed that:

- Although 79% of the AFI States stated that they have an NCASTP in place, the majority indicated that they would still benefit from receiving assistance in further enhancing their NCASTP.
- USAP audit results confirm that in numerous cases the requirements are insufficiently detailed in these programmes.

2.1.2. On development and implementation of Airport and Airline Security Training Programmes (Annex 17, Standard 3.1.7), it was observed that:

- The same finding mentioned under 2.1.1 also applies to the Airport and Airline Security Training Programmes and
- There is need for a more detailed approach is confirmed by the percentage of States (60%) requesting assistance to further develop those programmes

2.1.3. With respect to Training and Certification of Aviation Security Instructors (Annex 17, Standard 3.1.7) it was found that:

- Whilst 55% of AFI States stated that they have established a programme to certify national aviation security instructors, there seem to be important challenges in implementing these certification systems.
- Most States (70%) indicated the need for assistance to develop an instructor certification system including assistance in establishing selection and qualification criteria.

2.1.4. Concerning appropriate training of persons implementing security controls (Annex 17, Standard 3.4.2), the study indicated that:

- Whilst 88 % of the AFI States replied in the questionnaire that they fulfilled the training requirement, audit findings indicated that only 15 % of States meet the subject requirement.
- This difference may be explained by among other factors, a possible lack of full understanding of the related standard 3.4.2 which applies to all staff implementing security controls, including for instance airport, airline, handling personnel.

2.1.5. Regarding Screeners training and certification (Annex 17, Standard 3.4.3) it was noted that:

- Most States (73 %) stated that they have a certification programme for screeners; however, a majority of States (68 %) is asking for assistance in developing a screener's certification programme (including guidance on selection and qualification criteria, and CBT tools).
- Audit results indicate that only 37 % of the AFI States are in compliance with Standard 3.4.3.

2.1.6. Regarding Training of National Aviation Security Inspectors (Annex 17, standard 3.4.7) it was shown that:

- Whilst 82 % of the AFI States confirm that they have a training programme in place for national AVSEC Inspector, a majority (80 %) requested assistance in further developing and improving their training programmes. This need is confirmed by the audit results.

## **2.2. Other Findings**

### **2.2.1 Aviation Security Training facilities**

The four regional ASTCs existing in Africa indicated that they are largely underused (in 2014, 122 participants to ICAO sponsored courses; and approximately 500 participants to other courses at ASTCs, mostly, from appropriate authorities). Nevertheless, some States indicated their willingness to host another ASTC.

The study also unveiled that the training capacity within the States is largely insufficient (lack of dedicated AVSEC training infrastructure, specific training programmes at training centres not certified by authorities, national instructors not certified, sometimes no approved NCASTP, lack of course developers, no quality control of training activities).

### **2.2.2 Computer Based Training (CBT) and blended learning**

Many States (84%) expressed interest in further exploring the possibilities of blended traditional training methods and CBT for screener and inspector certification, and e-learning AVSEC awareness training for airport and airline personnel. Most States (91%) requested ICAO's assistance in this respect.

### **2.2.3 New courses and workshops**

According to the Study, States requested ICAO to look into further development of courses and workshops. The detailed requests will be further analyzed by the GAT and ISD in cooperation with all partners involved (see recommendation below).

### **2.2.4 Regional Cooperation**

It appears that some Regional Safety/Security Oversight Organizations (RSOOs), such as BAGASSO, UEMOA and CASSOA, may be able to provide a platform for cooperation in the field of AVSEC oversight and training; however they seem to lack their proper dedicated human resources in the field of aviation security.

### **2.2.5 Donor States and organizations**

The survey highlighted that contributions by donor states are very much appreciated; however the survey also indicated that these contributions seem to be concentrated on a limited number of States whilst their content is not always adapted to national needs and requirements.

## **2.3. Facilitation – Approved NATFTP**

Only 21 % of States confirm they have an approved NATFTP. Almost all States indicated the need for assistance in this regard with priority on developing their NATFTPs in the first instance, which programmes would thereafter be supported by training strategies.



#### **2.4. Human resources development**

Mindful that the objective of training is to support capacity building and human resource development strategies of AFI States to ensure that they have access to a sufficient number of qualified and competent personnel, related training programmes and initiatives should include a component on aviation security and facilitation. The Human Resource Development Fund (HRDF) launched in Maputo during the May 2015 AFI Aviation Week is one of such programmes that can be employed to achieve this purpose.

### **3. RECOMMENDATIONS**

3.1 States should develop, review and update their national Civil Aviation Security Programmes as necessary, and implement certification systems for instructors, screeners and Inspectors in line with the short-term deliverables for AFI SECFAL Plan;

3.2 ASTCs should increase capacity of their centres in terms of infrastructure development, sub-regional cooperation, curriculum development and introduction of online and computer based training;

3.3 ICAO should work with States to develop strategies to explore possibilities of integrating security and facilitation in human resource development initiatives at regional or sub regional level.

-----