EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper presents an analysis on how the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) to a Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) under a new approach can remove excess costs from operations and improve efficiency, controls and processes, and prevent and detect inefficiencies and safety risks.

Action: The Conference is invited to:

a) study the content of this working paper; and
b) take into account considerations presented in paragraph 3 for collaboration among States.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The constant development and radical changes of the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) to a Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) allows States to collect more constant and definitive information regarding the level of safety oversight provided by those States. Under this new approach, recurrent and periodical audits are replaced by an ongoing process of gathering safety information. This allows States civil aviation systems to base their decisions on the most recent information available.

1.2 In addition to the ever-increasing technology, International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) and States regulatory requirements, many aviation organizations are looking to remove excess costs from operations and improve efficiency, controls and processes, and prevent and detect inefficiencies and safety risks. In supporting an organization's efforts to address these objectives, CMA can offer considerable benefits, such as:
a) delivering regular insight into the status of controls across the South American (SAM) Region;

b) enhancing overall risk and control oversight capability through early detection and monitoring;

c) enables the State reporting system manage occurrence or safety risk;

d) expanding regulatory and legal risk environment through more up-to-date civil aviation legislation, regulations and guidance’s to the aviation industry,

e) the CMA allows for greater audit efficiency and effectiveness, thus enhancing internal controls and improved performance; and

f) States effective implementation of ICAO requirements and higher levels of compliance.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 Guyana, for example, in 2007 after an ICAO audit, its effective implementation was approximately 44 per cent, however, in 2016 and 2020 after two ICAO Coordinated Validation Missions (ICVMs), the effective implementation increased to approximately 64 per cent and 76 per cent, respectively. This enabled the average score of effective implementations of the SAM Region to increase to 80 per cent.

2.2 The ICVM, however, revealed that States, whether in the SAM Region, other regions or individual States need to effectively manage and ensure the success of the USOAP CMA and all components of the programme, including roles and responsibilities of each entity, if they want to be on top of their game and have high standards of compliance with ICAO SARPs. The CMA allows States to evaluate their levels of efficiencies and deficiencies and amend their legislation and regulations to comply with the SARPs.

2.3 Consequently, effective implementation of the USOAP CMA is dependent on the partnerships, communication and exchange of information between ICAO, its Member States and international and regional organizations.

2.4 To this end, the SAM Regional Office has been facilitating Member States with technical help in the form of personnel (subject matter experts) who visited States for short periods of time and reviewed the USOAP Protocol Questions with the aim to develop legislation, regulations, guidance, procedures and processes, as necessary to enhance the State’s effective implementation.

2.5 The SAM Regional Office, even though its aim is to have a common set of regulations and every inspector to be trained to the same level, recognizes that every Member State has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace of its territory and the way they design their legislation and regulations, as long as it is compliant with ICAO SARPs.

2.6 Thus, the SAM Regional Office fully respects every State's responsibility and authority for safety oversight. States decision-making powers regarding the implementation of corrective actions related to identify deficiencies must be paramount. States must continually monitor and evaluate feedback received
from USOAP CMA stakeholders to ensure their ongoing satisfaction and must apply due diligence and judgement in the conduct of USOAP CMA activities.

3. **CONCLUSION**

3.1 The Conference is invited to consider the following actions for collaboration among States:

a) There are commonalities in the aviation system of States, and one State who might be at an advanced level of aviation development can help another State, and instead of reinventing the wheel States can share their aviation experiences, which can be adopted or adapted to their uniqueness.

b) States can engage in partnership arrangements for training and development of personnel.

c) States can engage in visits to look and see how safety oversight is implemented and how the SMS programme is implemented by the pace setters of aviation in another countries and actually learn from them.

d) States can also collaborate with information sharing and exchange of inspectors.
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