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Module objective

At the end of this module the participants will be familiar with the background, objectives, principles and implementation status of the first and second cycles of the ICAO Universal Security Audit Programme (USAP).
Outline

• Facts about ICAO
• Evolution of the USAP
• Objective of the USAP
• USAP characteristics and principles
• Significant Security Concern (SSeC)
• Monitoring and Assistance Review Board (MARB)
• USAP implementation status
ICAO

- UN Specialized Agency
- 191 Member States
- ICAO Headquarters
- Host country: Canada
- Conference facilities, delegations, secretariat
- Around 700 Secretariat staff
- 40+ Resident delegations
**Vision:**
Achieve the sustainable growth of the global civil aviation system.

**Mission:**
The International Civil Aviation Organization is the global forum of States for international civil aviation. ICAO develops policies, standards, undertakes compliance audits, performs studies and analyses, provides assistance and builds aviation capacity through the cooperation of Member States and stakeholders.
Representative bodies of ICAO

Assembly (191 Member States)

Council (36 Member States)

Air Transport Committee

Human Resources Committee

Finance Committee

Air Navigation Commission

Committee on Aviation Environmental Protection

Committee on Unlawful Interference

Committee on Joint Support of Air Navigation Services

Committee on Technical Cooperation

Legal Committee

Committee on Technical Cooperation
Chicago Convention

Annex 19
To the Convention on International Civil Aviation

Safety Management

The 1st edition of Annex 19 was adopted by the Council on 22 February 2013 and becomes applicable on 14 November 2015.

For information regarding the applicability of the Standards and Recommended Practices, see Chapter 2 and the Foreword.

First Edition
July 2013

International Civil Aviation Organization
SARPs

Standard

Any specification for physical characteristics, configuration, matériel, performance, personnel or procedure, the uniform application of which is recognized as necessary for the safety or regularity of international air navigation and to which Contracting States will conform in accordance with the Convention; in the event of impossibility of compliance, notification to the Council is compulsory under Article 38 of the Convention.
Any specification for physical characteristics, configuration, matériel, performance, personnel or procedure, the uniform application of which is recognized as desirable in the interests of safety, regularity or efficiency of international air navigation, and to which Contracting States will endeavour to conform in accordance with the Convention.
Module 2 Page 11

USAP-CMA Regional Seminar

Chicago Convention

Article 37

• Each Contracting State undertakes to collaborate in securing the highest practicable degree of uniformity in regulations, standards, procedures, and organization in relation to aircraft, personnel, airways and auxiliary services in all matters in which such uniformity will facilitate and improve air navigation.

Cooperation, Consensus, Compliance, Commitment

Article 38

• Any State which finds it impracticable to comply in all respects with any such international standard or procedure, or which deems it necessary to adopt regulations or practices differing in any particular respect from those established by an international standard, shall give immediate notification to ICAO of the differences between its own practice and that established by the international standard.
Making an ICAO AVSEC SARP

AVSEC Panel

Committee on Unlawful Interference

Council

Adoption Date

- The Council adopts amendments to Annex 17.
- States are allowed four months to indicate disapproval.

Effective Date

- The amendment becomes effective if a majority of States have not registered disapproval.
- States are allowed three months to notify ICAO of any differences.

Applicability Date

- Four months after the Effective Date.
- States must implement the amendments unless they have notified differences.
Secretariat

Secretary General

Air Navigation Bureau
ANB

Air Transport Bureau
ATB

Bureau of Administration and Services
ADB

Legal Affairs and External Relations Bureau
LEB

Technical Co-operation Bureau
TCB
Aviation Security and Facilitation

Director, Air Transport Bureau (D/ATB)

Deputy Director, Aviation Security and Facilitation (DD/ASF)

Aviation Security
Policy Section (ASP)

Aviation Security Audit Section (ASA)

Implementation Support and Development Security Section (ISD-SEC)

Facilitation Section (FAL)
## ICAO’s Strategic Objectives for 2014-2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A – Safety</td>
<td>Enhance global civil aviation safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B – Air Navigation Capacity &amp; Efficiency</td>
<td>Increase capacity and improve efficiency of the global civil aviation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C – Security &amp; Facilitation</td>
<td>Enhance global civil aviation security and facilitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D – Economic Development of Air Transport</td>
<td>Foster the development of a sound and economically-viable civil aviation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E – Environmental Protection</td>
<td>Minimize the adverse environmental effects of civil aviation activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ICAO Comprehensive Aviation Security Strategy 2011-2016

✓ Addressing new and existing threats;
✓ Promoting innovative, effective and efficient security approaches;
✓ Promoting the sharing of information amongst member states to raise awareness of threats and security trends relevant to civil aviation operations;
✓ Promoting global compliance and establishing sustainable aviation security oversight capability of States;
✓ Improving human factors and security culture;
✓ Promoting the development of mutual recognition for aviation security processes; and
✓ Emphasizing the importance of security amongst States and stakeholders, and within ICAO.
Evolution of the USAP

Voluntary Technical Evaluations AVSEC Mechanism
1989 – 2001
140 Requests
112 Assessments Annex 17

33rd Assembly 2001
High-Level Conference 2002

USAP Cycle I
2002 – 2007
181 Audits
Annex 17 Standards
A35-9

Follow-up Missions
2005-2009
172 Follow-ups
Confidentiality of Audit Results

36th Assembly 2007

USAP Cycle II
2008-2013
178 Audits
Annex 17 Standards
A37-17

States’ AVSEC Oversight System
Limited Level of Transparency SSeC

38th Assembly 2013
USAP CMA
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Annex 17
Objective of the USAP

The objective of the USAP is to promote global aviation security through the auditing of Member States on a regular basis to determine the status of States’ implementation of security-related ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs), and associated procedures.
The primary objectives of an ICAO USAP cycle II audit are to:

- determine the degree of compliance of the State in implementing Annex 17 Standards and security-related provisions of Annex 9;

- observe and assess the State’s adherence to associated security procedures, guidance material and security-related practices;
Objectives of USAP Cycle II Audit

- determine the sustainability and effectiveness of the State’s implementation of a security system, through the establishment of legislation, programmes, regulations and a security authority with control and enforcement capabilities;

- determine the State’s capability for security oversight by assessing the effective implementation of the critical elements of an aviation security oversight system; and

- provide recommendations to States to improve their security systems and oversight capabilities.
USAP Characteristics

✓ Regular, mandatory, systematic and harmonized audits

✓ Evaluation of aviation security in place in all 191 ICAO Member States

✓ Audit security measures at selected airports
USAP Principles

- Sovereignty
- Universality
- Transparency of methodology
- Timeliness
- All-inclusiveness
- Consistency and objectivity
- Fairness
- Quality
- Confidentiality
Confidentiality

- Audit reports are confidential and will only be made available to the audited State and to those with an operational “need-to-know” within ICAO (standard clause in MOU).

- However, States are encouraged to share audit-related information with other States bilaterally (Annex 17 RP 2.4.5).
Confidentiality

• The 36th Session of the Assembly directed the Council to consider the introduction of a limited level of transparency with respect to ICAO aviation security audit results, balancing the need for States to be aware of unresolved security concerns with the need to keep sensitive security information out of the public realm.

• In June 2008, the Council approved a proposal to introduce such transparency with respect to aviation security audits and amended Article 20 of the bilateral MOU between ICAO and audited States to permit such transparency.
Confidentiality

- A chart for each audited State, depicting the level of implementation of the critical elements, is posted on the ICAO secure website:
Significant Security Concern

- On 17 February 2010, the Council approved the definition of a significant security concern (SSeC) and the related mechanism to address in a timely manner such concerns identified during an USAP audit.

- A consequential amendment to the bilateral MOU between ICAO and audited States that addresses an SSeC and the related mechanism was also approved by the Council.
An SSeC occurs when the appropriate authority responsible for aviation security in the State permits aviation activities to continue, despite lack of effective implementation of the minimum security requirements established by the State and by the provisions set forth in Annex 17 — Security related to critical aviation security controls including, but not limited to:

- the screening and the protection from unauthorized interference of passengers, cabin and hold baggage;
- the security of cargo and catering;
- access control to restricted and security-restricted areas of airports; and
- the security of departing aircraft;

resulting in an **immediate security risk** to international civil aviation.
Significant Security Concern

**Preliminary SSeC**
- The Team Leader describes preliminary SSeC identified during the USAP audit to the audited State at the Post-audit Debriefing and provides all information to C/ASA.

**Validation**
- C/ASA reviews preliminary SSeC and presents it to the AVSEC Branch SSeC Validation Committee to confirm its validity within 15 days.

**Notification**
- If valid and confirmed, notification letter is sent to the State to take immediate corrective action within 15 calendar days as of the receipt of notification letter.

**Disclosure**
- Failure to implement corrective action and notify ICAO within 15 calendar days results in posting information on the State with an SSeC on the ICAO secure website.
MARB

Monitoring and Assistance Review Board

✓ High-level Secretariat team chaired by the Secretary General
✓ Deals with both safety and security issues
✓ Purpose: executive oversight of ICAO’s monitoring and assistance programmes
✓ Reviews auditing and monitoring activities and assistance plans in referred States
✓ Closely follows developments in States with SSeCs
✓ Provides timely and effective support for prompt resolution
✓ Proposes a specific course of action and strategy for each State referred to it
MARB – from deficiencies to remedies
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The primary focus of the MARB is to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of monitoring activities and to identify, coordinate and validate assistance strategies.

States that come before the MARB are reviewed on a case-by-case basis and the Board, in each case, decides on appropriate actions within its capacity.

If all realistic options for resolving a situation have been exhausted, the MARB may refer a State to the Council of ICAO for special consideration and possible further action, as appropriate.
Types of cases referred to the MARB under the USAP

✓ A State with one or more SSeCs identified during an audit;

✓ A State that is not responding to monitoring or assistance processes (i.e. rejecting or repeatedly postponing monitoring activities or not providing a Corrective Action Plan (CAP);

✓ State not fulfilling its commitments to implement the CAP.
USAP Cycle I

First-Cycle USAP Audits and Follow-up Visits Completed
USAP Cycle I

Lack of Compliance with Annex 17 Standards

- APAC: 53.1
- ESAF: 64.3
- EUR/NAT: 52.9
- MID: 51.9
- NACC: 60.7
- SAM: 57.4
- WACAF: 52.6
- Regional Average LC: Audits
- Regional Average LC: Follow-up Visits
- Regional Average Progress
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USAP Cycle II

Second-Cycle USAP Audits Completed
Global Average Lack of Effective Implementation of Critical Elements: 30.7%
Regional Average Lack of Effective Implementation of Critical Elements

- APAC: 33.1
- ESAF: 46.3
- EUR/NAT: 13.5
- MID: 31.7
- NACC: 39.2
- SAM: 33.8
- WACAF: 47.4
USAP Cycle II

Global Average Lack of Effective Implementation by Audit Area: 30.00%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEG</td>
<td>23.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRG</td>
<td>32.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCF</td>
<td>43.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>25.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFS</td>
<td>28.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAX</td>
<td>28.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGO</td>
<td>27.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUI</td>
<td>20.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAL</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Average Lack of Effective Implementation by Audit Area

- APAC: 30.93
- ESAF: 44.08
- EUR/NAT: 14.08
- MID: 29.42
- NACC: 38.91
- SAM: 36.01
- WACAF: 46.09
Analysis of Audit Results

Reporting Period:
January 2008 to June 2013

The analysis presented in this final report is based on the results of the aviation security audits of 177 Member States and one Special Administrative Region (SAR) conducted under the second cycle of the Universal Security Audit Programme (USAP).

Fifth Edition — 2013

International Civil Aviation Organization

http://portal.icao.int/
Progress made by States

• Both the follow-up missions and the second cycle of USAP audits revealed that most States have made significant progress in addressing findings from the first cycle of audits.

• However, a substantial amount of work remains to be done by some Member States in order to achieve full compliance with all Annex 17 Standards and to establish comprehensive security oversight systems.
Progress made by States

- As indicated, the global average LEI by the eight CEs of an aviation security oversight system is 30.7 per cent. Approximately 49 per cent of all audited States have average LEI rates above the global average.

- Despite overall improvement in the implementation of aviation security measures worldwide, the results of both cycles of USAP audits indicate that a significant number of Member States continue to have difficulty in meeting their international obligations.
Review

- Facts about ICAO
- Evolution of the USAP
- Objective of the USAP
- USAP characteristics and principles
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- USAP implementation status
ICAO Universal Security Audit Programme

Questions?
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