



**WORKING PAPER**

**THIRTEENTH AIR NAVIGATION CONFERENCE**

**Montréal, Canada, 9 to 19 October 2018**

**COMMITTEE B**

**Agenda Item 6.3 Monitoring and oversight**

**6.3.1: The evolution of the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) continuous monitoring approach (CMA)**

**INCREASING THE EFFICIENCY OF USOAP**

(Presented by Austria on behalf of the European Union and its Member States<sup>1</sup>,  
the other Member States of the European Civil Aviation Conference<sup>2</sup>,  
and by EUROCONTROL)

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This paper proposes measures to increase the efficiency of the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) in the light of the limitation of ICAO's own resources: making a greater use of the safety partners, including Regional Safety Oversight Organizations (RSOOs), designees and integration of other recognised monitoring programmes into the USOAP. It also supports the recommendations and observations of the Group of Experts for a USOAP Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) Structured Review (GEUSR) and discusses the need to make the State safety risk profiles visible to States and RSOOs.

**Action:** The Conference is invited to agree to the recommendations in paragraph 3.

**1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Since its inception over twenty years ago the ICAO Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) has proven to be the only objective global tool to measure the safety performance of the oversight systems of ICAO States. It has helped to improve global aviation safety and it is one of the key enablers on which *the Global Aviation Safety Plan* (Doc 10004)<sup>3</sup> is built and provides valuable information to the global community. In particular, USOAP provides the monitored State with an assessment of its level of compliance to the Critical Elements (CE) of their safety oversight system and a clear system for how to address the areas for improvement. Although it is not designed as an assistance tool, it has helped to improve the implementation of CE safety oversight worldwide.

<sup>1</sup> Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom.

<sup>2</sup> Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Republic of Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, San Marino, Serbia, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine.

<sup>3</sup>In particular section 4.3.3.

1.2 By the first quarter of 2018 ICAO, had audited 185 States and one Regional Safety Oversight Organisation (RSOO) at least once. The introduction of the Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) in 2013 has improved the reactivity and relevance of USOAP. However, current available information shows that the audit results for fifty three States is older than five years<sup>4</sup> and for some twenty two States the results date back to 2008 or earlier, therefore questioning their meaningfulness in a continuous monitoring approach.

1.3 The 39th Session of the Assembly mandated ICAO to “perform a structured review to identify adjustments to the USOAP CMA with a view to the further evolution and strengthening of the programme, taking into consideration ICAO’s evolving safety strategy and States’ progress in implementing Annex 19 – *Safety Management*, in particular, State safety programme (SSP) requirements.” Accordingly, ICAO Secretariat established the Group of Experts for a USOAP CMA Structured Review (GEUSR). This group has made a number of recommendations in the areas defined by its terms of reference.

1.4 The *Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme Continuous Monitoring Manual* (Doc 9735) describes the processes for the USOAP and defines roles. It mentions the determination of State safety risk profiles, however, these profiles are not shared with all the States and RSOOs and the way they are used to prioritise USOAP activities remains undefined.

## 2. DISCUSSION

2.1 In order to continue the successful implementation of the USOAP-CMA, the programme needs to keep providing robust and realistic assessments of the actual level of safety oversight in each State. To enable this, the programme needs to be properly resourced. As ICAO resources (both financial and human) to execute CMA activities are limited, it would be wise to use them in States showing a lower Effective Implementation (EI)<sup>5</sup>, and with the greatest risk. Resources are also required to further develop the programme tools, and to support the States. It is therefore of utmost importance that appropriate resources are allocated as a part of the general programme of ICAO.

### 2.2 Safety partners and designees

2.2.1 One solution to the ICAO resource issue would be to make a greater use of safety partners and designees. A safety partner (although not currently defined in the ICAO Documents)<sup>6</sup> is an entity supporting ICAO in its CMA activities (based on an appropriate agreement) and involves the seconding of personnel to perform certain CMA tasks for ICAO.

2.2.2 The scope of the activities performed is currently limited and expanding them to conduct a wider range of CMA tasks could help ICAO to focus its own resources on States and regions with the most urgent needs. Establishing a means to integrate other recognised monitoring programmes into USOAP-CMA should also be considered. This would also make the programme more flexible and provide more up-to-date information, strengthen the risk-based approach and avoid duplication. In particular RSOOs have the ability to play a prominent role in supporting ICAO in the continuous monitoring of their Member States, which is likely to take place more frequently. RSOOs could also in the future perform defined USOAP tasks on behalf of ICAO. Evidently, for this to happen appropriate mechanisms ensuring the quality and reliability of the results of these tasks need to be developed and effective surveillance by ICAO put in place. In order to achieve this, paragraph 4.5.2 (on the roles and

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.icao.int/safety/Pages/USOAP-Results.aspx>

<sup>5</sup> of critical elements of safety oversight

<sup>6</sup> ICAO Council working paper C-WP/14731.

responsibilities of RSOOs) in Doc 9735 should be further developed. It should also define the roles and responsibilities of safety partners and designees.

2.2.3 A designee is an individual who is not a member of the ICAO secretariat staff. The individual has appropriate qualifications and experience, is free of conflicts of interest, and can perform certain tasks for ICAO on an ad hoc basis. A designee could bring the necessary flexibility required when the conducting targeted CMA activities and assist ICAO in performing these activities.

2.2.4 The proposed greater use of safety partners and designees shall be in line with the on-going work of ICAO on the Global Aviation Safety Oversight System (GASOS).

### 2.3 **USOAP tools and process improvement**

2.3.1 In order to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of USOAP and assist all stakeholders in the daily work as a part of USOAP-CMA the recommendations and observations of the GEUSR should be implemented as a matter of priority<sup>7</sup>.

### 2.4 **State safety risk profile**

2.4.1 The State safety risk profile as described in sections 3.5 and 3.6 of Doc 9735 should serve as the basis for the prioritisation of CMA activities. It can also provide valuable information for the programming of assistance actions of ICAO, States, RSOOs and other stakeholders. Some elements of the State safety risk profile are available through iSTARS, however, there is no comprehensive overview of the profile of states. Relying solely on the EI score of a state is not sufficient and can be misleading – the total safety risk profile is required.

2.4.2 Therefore it is recommended that ICAO develops measures to share the latest State safety risk profiles with all States and RSOOs in a transparent manner. This should also show a clear link with CMA activity planning.

### 2.5 **State safety programmes assessment**

2.5.1 The assessment of SSPs, will be introduced by ICAO in 2020. This provides an opportunity to test the proposals and recommendations in this paper and further develop the relationship between ICAO and safety partners, allowing the interchangeability of assessments by ICAO and by safety partners

## 3. **CONCLUSION**

3.1 In order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of USOAP, and to further enhance the robustness and consistency in the assessment of the States, the Conference is invited to agree on the following recommendations:

That the Conference recommend that ICAO:

- a) devote appropriate resources to ensure the continuous monitoring of the States remains relevant and up to date;

---

<sup>7</sup> C-WP/14757

- b) implement as a matter of priority the recommendations and observations of the Group of Experts for USOAP Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) Structured Review (GEUSR)
- c) extend the range of activities that ICAO can delegate to a safety partner, including full and partial audits, and establishes a transparent framework for the accreditation of safety partners and possibly their monitoring programmes and designees in line with the work on Global Aviation Safety Oversight System (GASOS);
- d) as a pilot case, use the opportunity provided by the imminent ICAO State safety assessment programme to test recommendation c) above; and
- e) make available to all States, Regional Safety Oversight Organizations (RSOOs) and safety partners the State safety risk profiles in a transparent manner, showing clear link with CMA activity planning.

— END —