



FAL/12-WP/106  
30/3/04

## **FACILITATION (FAL) DIVISION — TWELFTH SESSION**

**Cairo, Egypt, 22 March to 2 April 2004**

### **REPORT OF COMMITTEE 1 ON AGENDA ITEM 2.5**

The attached report on Agenda Item 2.5 is presented for approval by the Plenary.

**Agenda Item 2: Facilitation and security of travel documents and border control formalities**

**2.5: Implementation of aviation security**

2.5.1 The following Working Papers were presented under this agenda item: WP/43 (Secretariat), WP/ 36 (Pakistan), WP/79 (India), WP/ 41 (IATA), WP/55 (IFALPA) and WP/86 (ACI).

2.5.2 In WP/43, the Secretariat gave examples of areas that could be improved to provide a more efficient and less onerous passenger and carry-on baggage security screening process, and so improve passenger flows and the passenger experience at airports. These included provision of well-trained staff, installation of sufficient security equipment, availability of sufficient space, proper queue management, dealing with problem passengers and the introduction of separate security channels for the elderly and passengers with disabilities and those with children.

2.5.3 During the discussion on this paper, some delegations expressed concern with the request to States, in paragraph 3.1, to implement two-tier security screening for passengers, with both low-level and high-level screening being applied at airports. The Secretariat pointed out that this being part of a recommendation which was agreed to by the Council, the concerns expressed by these delegations will be forwarded to the AVSEC Panel for review.

2.5.4 Some delegations felt that there was a need for a facilitation audit of airports, and that facilitation measures should be included in ICAO's safety and security audit programmes.

2.5.5 After some discussion, the Division took note of the following recommendation of the ICAO Council:

States are encouraged to consider appropriate measures to **reduce the number of passengers queuing within terminal buildings**, since they represent a potential target for perpetrators. **Implementation of biometrics** for immigration, **random checks** and **two-tier security screening for passengers** should be studied with a view to reducing the burden of systematic, low-quality security controls applied to passengers while improving the quality and efficacy of high-level security screening only on selected passengers.

2.5.6 In WP/55, IFALPA reviewed steps taken by ICAO, including the development of model legislation, to deal with unruly passengers. IFALPA felt that a combination of legal and preventive measures, encompassing legal, security and facilitation areas, were necessary in order to implement an effective and consistent strategy on the matter internationally. The paper proposed the addition of two new provisions in Annex 9, and the adoption of a B-type recommendation.

2.5.7 There was broad support for the recommendations in the paper. Some delegations emphasized the importance of training of personnel in their relationships with passengers. The Division agreed that aspects of this matter would be included in the planned Facilitation Manual.

2.5.8 After some discussion, the Division agreed to adopt the following recommendations:

**Recommendation No. A/—**

**Add** new Recommended Practices to Chapter 6 as follows:

**6.--- Recommended Practice.**— *Contracting States should take the necessary steps to increase passenger awareness of the unacceptability and consequences of unruly or disruptive behaviour in aviation facilities and on board aircraft.*

**6.--- Recommended Practice.**— *Contracting States should require that training in noting, anticipating, and handling of irate or unruly passenger behaviour, recognition of potentially escalating situations, crisis containment and related issues should be provided to those ground staff at airports who are in passenger contact positions.*

**Recommendation No. B/—**

It is recommended that:

Contracting States should support a zero-tolerance policy regarding unruly passenger behaviour, by enactment of related legislation and by enforcement thereof, taking into account the Model National Legislation developed by ICAO.

2.5.9 The Division considered WP/36, in which Pakistan suggested that States, in order to reduce congestion at departure control points whilst implementing aviation security, address areas such as guidance to passengers on security procedures, the use of modern equipment, continuous traffic flow, secure transportation of baggage, configuration of the terminal building and handling of unruly passengers.

2.5.10 Some States expressed concerns with the suggestion that airlines be responsible for prosecuting unruly passengers. The Division supported the paper, and agreed that it should be forwarded to the AVSEC Panel, and a combined FAL/AVSEC Panel meeting, for consideration.

2.5.11 In WP/79, India analysed the implementation of aviation security standards at airports with the aim of reducing congestion at departure control points and in the interests of improving security by streamlining traffic flows.

2.5.12 During the discussion on this paper, concerns were expressed on some elements of the paper, particularly those relating to carriage of dangerous goods and a suggestion that passengers be allowed to carry only one cabin bag. The Division supported the paper and agreed that it should be forwarded to the AVSEC Panel, and a combined FAL/AVSEC Panel meeting, for consideration.

2.5.13 In WP/41, IATA made suggestions as how States could best implement ICAO's recommendation on 100 per cent hold baggage screening, in order to optimize the security screening of passengers and their baggage accounting for the limitations placed on such operations. Though some delegations disagreed with some elements of the paper, the Division agreed that States would find it

useful, in relation to their 100 per cent hold baggage screening systems.

2.5.14 The Division considered WP/86, presented by ACI which stated that facilitation and security controls should be complementary elements, to ensure a steady flow of passengers through airport controls processes, in order to avoid the risk of international air transport being severely impeded, or unable to operate at a level which satisfies its need for profitability.

2.5.15 Many delegations expressed disagreement with ACI's suggestion that governments should accept the burden of additional costs for new measures, to avoid overly burdening the air transport industry with costs. However, the Division agreed that Governments should be mindful of the burden to the industry when establishing new measures.

2.5.16 The Division was thus able to agree that security measures should be harmonized internationally and designed so as to minimize their negative impact on facilitation, using appropriate technologies to provide that international travel is more secure and easier for passengers.

2.5.17 Under this agenda item 2.5, the following papers were made available for information: IP/4, submitted by the Philippines, IP/14, by Indonesia, IP/20, by Saudi Arabia and IP/38, by France.

— END —