COMPREHENSIVE REGIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR AVIATION SECURITY AND FACILITATION IN AFRICA (AFI SECFAL PLAN)

SECOND AFI SECFAL PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

(Montreal, Canada, 27 November 2015)

Agenda Item 5: Needs Assessment

IDENTIFICATION OF AREAS OF ASSISTANCE

(Presented by the AFI SECFAL Plan Secretariat)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In accordance with the activities identified in the AFI SECFAL Plan, this discussion paper provides an analysis of the common areas of concerns within the AFI Region based on the results of the audits conducted under the ICAO Universal Security Audit Programme.

Action: The Steering Committee is invited to:

a) Note the needs analysis contained in this discussion paper; and
b) Agree on the recommendations contained in Paragraph 3 of the paper.

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 The work programme adopted at the first meeting of the AFI SECFAL Plan Steering Committee, held on 18 May 2015 in Maputo, Mozambique, includes the conduct of an assistance needs analysis to determine the resources required to develop and support implementation of assistance strategies.

1.2 The analysis is based on the Universal Security Audit Programme (USAP) second-cycle audit findings for the AFI region[1] due to the fact that audit results from audits conducted under USAP-Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) were not available at the time. However, as audit results are entered, it will be possible to update the analysis to incorporate the latest results.

1.3 As indicated in previous papers and presentations, the average effective implementation (EI) of an aviation security oversight system was at 53.06% in the AFI region at the end of the second cycle of audits, as compared to 69.30% globally. The analysis below addresses the major areas that require attention. **Attachment** to this discussion paper provides the audit results for each protocol question that had an effective implementation level at or below 50 percent. This is intended to supplement the analysis below.

[1] 47 second-cycle audits were conducted in the AFI Region: ESAF (21), WACAF (20), EUR/NAT (3) and MID (3).

2. DISCUSSION

Development and coordination of national aviation security and facilitation programmes

2.1 Although most States have established regulatory frameworks and national aviation systems are in place, there is a general need to improve national programmes. Such programmes include National Civil Aviation Security Programme (NCASPs), National Civil Aviation Security Training Programmes (NCASTPs), National Civil Aviation Security Quality Control Programmes (NQCPs) and National Air Transport Facilitation Programmes (NATFPs).

2.2 It is important to note that while the appropriate authority for aviation security is responsible for developing and updating these programmes, all entities involved in the implementation of aviation security and facilitation, respectively, should participate and provide their inputs. Consequently, strong coordination mechanisms, such as National Civil Aviation Security Committees and National Air Transport Facilitation Committees, are very important and should be integrally involved in the development and updating of these documents.

USAP audit results

2.3 USAP Audit results indicate that in a significant number of States, airports do not have approved Airport Security Programmes (ASPs) that address aviation security requirements at the airport level in sufficient detail to ensure the correct application of all security measures. Furthermore, less than half of the States in the region review and approve ASPs. Similarly, few States review and approve the security programmes of all aircraft operators and other entities responsible for the implementation of security controls, such as catering companies, cargo entities and air traffic service providers, amongst others.

2.4 Another significant challenge to achieving higher levels of implementation is the availability of financial and human resources, both at the national level to meet States' security oversight responsibilities and at the airport level to ensure the adequate implementation of security measures.

2.5 Operationally, few States have reviewed and approved the training programmes for staff performing security function, and only a third of States have established and implemented certification systems for screeners. Similarly, only half of States certify their instructors.

2.6 It is important to note that less than 10 percent of States are implementing appropriate quality control measures. Thus, correcting and tracking the correction of deficiencies is a significant challenge. While the lack of resources available to conduct oversight activities (as described above) is important, so is the lack of national inspectors and procedures related to the conduct of oversight activities and the mitigation of deficiencies that are identified.

2.7 Another area that requires attention is the response to acts of unlawful interference. Specifically, few States have fully developed contingency plans and clear requirements for the availability and training of staff that is responsible for responding to acts of unlawful interference.

Strategies for assistance

2.8 Strategies for assistance should:

a) focus on the need to improve the region's level of compliance with aviation security and facilitation Standards and its oversight capabilities;

b) note that every State has the primary responsibility to promote aviation security and facilitation as one of its main objectives and to pursue continuous improvement initiatives in order to ensure the highest quality in their implementation;

c) encourage States to demonstrate their political commitment by providing the necessary human and financial resources to aviation security and facilitation, as this is vital to achieve success; and

d) identify financial and in kind resources, where needed.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 The AFI SECFAL Plan Steering Committee is invited to:

a) urge States to use USAP-CMA audit outcomes and monitor their own aviation security oversight system to identify deficiencies and implement corrective measures

b) encourage States and donors to develop capacity-building initiatives that provide sustainable solutions to address the deficiencies noted above. After ensuring that resources have been committed, consideration should be given to initially focusing on the development of robust and comprehensive national and airport programmes including, inter alia, NCASPs, NQCPs, NCASTPs, NATFPs, ASPs and AOSPs; and

c) encourage States and donors to coordinate their assistance activities through ICAO to ensure resources are maximized and duplication of efforts are avoided.

— END —