



WORKING PAPER

ICAO HIGH-LEVEL CONFERENCE ON AVIATION SECURITY

Montréal, 12 to 14 September 2012

Agenda Item 4: The evolution of the aviation security audit process – transparency

AVIATION SECURITY

(Presented by the European Union and its Member States¹ and by the other Member States² of the European Civil Aviation Conference)

SUMMARY

This working paper on aviation security considers pertinent issues to Agenda Item 4: The evolution of the aviation security audit process – transparency. This item was considered by the Aviation Security Panel at its last meeting in March 2012 which has facilitated and advised upon the way forward.

Action by the High-level Conference on Aviation Security is in paragraph 2.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The effective implementation of ICAO Standards is often a challenging task for ICAO Member States. As such, a number of tools is required to support Member States' efforts in ensuring that international rules are applied in a wide and effective manner.

1.2 ICAO's Universal Security Audit Programme (USAP) is an effective means of monitoring the implementation of ICAO Standards and requiring corrective action to be taken where necessary. However, with the future of the USAP under discussion for the forthcoming third cycle of security audits, it is important to build upon experience accrued to date. The USAP should become an even more effective tool for overseeing implementation of international Standards by designing its activities in such a way as to better target capacity building initiatives. Such a goal would mean sharing information on implementation challenges faced by ICAO Member States.

1.3 Furthermore, the next cycle of USAP audits, which is due to start in 2014, should be conducted in a manner that is risk-based, and reflects the oversight capability of individual States and regions. In principle, it should be characterised by a combination of: (i) security audits to be conducted on-site directly by ICAO; and (ii) continuous monitoring by ICAO Member States which would report on their oversight activities to ICAO.

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

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

1.4 The programme of audits and continuous monitoring would be achieved by applying criteria to measure the risk in any given State with respect to, for example, oversight capabilities, compliance history (i.e. the findings from the first two cycles of the USAP security audits), the commonly understood nature of the threat, and the effectiveness of any corrective action taken following previous audits.

1.5 However, in advance of application, the details of these elements (e.g. the selection criteria to determine which States will be subjected to audits and those for which the continuous monitoring approach will apply) would need to be developed in consultation with ICAO Member States. Experience from ICAO's Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) should be taken into account, in particular with regard to its efficiency and effectiveness.

2. ACTION BY THE CONFERENCE

2.1 The Conference is invited to:

- a) request the Council to conceive the next cycle of the USAP in a manner that assists capacity building initiatives target their efforts; and
- b) invite the Council to ensure that the next cycle of the USAP is characterised, in principle, by on-site audits on the one hand and continuous monitoring on the other hand, in order to reflect in a risk-based manner, the implementation and oversight capability of individual States and regions.

— END —