



**WORKING PAPER**

**THIRTEENTH AIR NAVIGATION CONFERENCE**

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

**COMMITTEE B**

- Agenda Item 6: Organizational safety issues**  
**6.3 Monitoring and oversight**  
**6.3.1: The evolution of the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) continuous monitoring approach (CMA)**

**SUPPORT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE USOAP  
CMA STRUCTURED REVIEW**

(Presented by Australia and co-sponsored by Canada, Cook Islands,  
Dominican Republic, Fiji, Japan, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic,  
Marshall Islands, Nepal, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Singapore, Samoa,  
South Africa and Timor Leste)

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This paper seeks the Conference support of the thirty seven recommendations made by the Group of Experts for a USOAP CMA Structured Review (GEUSR). The paper notes that some recommendations could be implemented for minimal cost to ICAO and provide an immediate reduction in the burden to Member States, particularly those participating in audit activities during 2019.

**Action:** The Conference is invited to agree to the recommendations in paragraph 3.1:

**1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 The 39th Session of the ICAO Assembly recommended that ICAO undertake a review of the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) methodology, processes and tools to give Member States an opportunity to provide user feedback and enable ICAO to plan improvements to the programme (A39-WP/213 refers).

1.2 At the sixth meeting of its 210th Session held on 3 March 2017 (C-DEC 210/6), the Council directed the Secretariat to establish a Group of Experts for a USOAP CMA Structured Review (GEUSR).

1.3 The group of experts was formed with nominations from Australia, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Finland, Singapore, South Africa, Switzerland, the United States and a representative from the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA). Significant support was provided by ICAO Secretariat.

1.4 The group held three meetings (April 2017, September 2017 and February 2018), conducted five teleconferences and exchanged correspondence throughout the structured review of the USOAP CMA. In addition, the GEUSR launched a high-level survey to receive feedback from Member States on its work and proposed recommendations, receiving favourable responses from 110 Member States. The GEUSR produced a report (C-WP/14757) comprising thirty seven recommendations (Appendix B) to support the USOAP CMA.

1.5 The ICAO Council (C-DEC 2014/5) reviewed and agreed to the thirty seven GEUSR recommendations.

1.6 The Secretariat is taking action to develop a plan for consideration at the 40th Session of the Assembly.

## 2. DISCUSSION

2.1 The implementation of the recommendations by the GEUSR will decrease the administrative burden for Member States fully engaged in USOAP CMA activities. Noting that the ICAO Council has reviewed and agreed to the recommendations, this paper calls on the Conference to support these recommendations.

2.2 The Secretariat is developing an implementation plan for the recommendations and this paper acknowledges that some recommendations will require detailed planning and investment. However, there are opportunities to implement a number of recommendations ahead of the 40th Session of the Assembly.

2.3 The rapid implementation of Group A's recommendations (reproduced in Appendix A) will provide efficiencies for both ICAO and Member States participating in USOAP audits and ICAO Coordinated Validation Missions (ICVMs) over the coming year. This group of recommendations could be implemented at minimal cost and will streamline the number of protocol questions (PQs) and resources that Member States will need to invest in collecting evidence, quality-checking responses for consistency and uploading through the online framework (OLF). Further, this also streamlines the number of PQs that ICAO and Member States will need to review and assess for the thirteen audits and twenty six ICVMs planned in the coming year. The implementation of this group of recommendations could be commenced in parallel with the full implementation plan being developed by the Secretariat.

2.4 Furthermore, the resources saved by the ICAO audit program from a more efficient approach to the audit task per Member State, will release resources that may be used to commence the development of training and guidance materials on the streamlined PQs.

## 3. CONCLUSION

3.1 The recommendations of the GEUSR will support and enhance a successful program while delivering efficiencies in the USOAP CMA methodology, processes and tools. The Conference is invited to agree to the following recommendation:

**Recommendation 6.3/xx — Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP)  
Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA)**

That the Conference:

- a) support the implementation of the thirty-seven recommendations of the GEUSR; and
- b) request ICAO to consider the implementation of Group A's recommendations to provide immediate relief to Member States and ICAO regarding the burden of participating in ICAO audits, ICVMs and off-site validation activities. This includes preparing guidance and training materials to support the implementation of the Group A's recommendations.

— — — — —



## APPENDIX

### USOAP CMA STRUCTURED REVIEW (GEUSR) GROUP A RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Conduct a one-off exercise to identify and remove questions from the USOAP CMA not directly related to safety oversight or accident investigation, for example PQs based on assistance to victims and families, pandemics and environmental aspects of aircraft certification.
- 2) Establish a policy to exclude from the USOAP CMA PQs that reference only Annex 9 — *Facilitation*, Annex 16 — *Environmental Protection* or Annex 17 — *Security*.
- 3) Identify PQs whose meaning is already captured in other existing PQs and combines them as necessary. Repetitive questions should be removed. For some questions (e.g. training), it may be necessary to assess implementation in each operational area. While one implementation PQ is asked for each of OPS, PEL, AIR, AGA and AIG, there may be up to 7 PQs for ANS – one for each ANS sub-area. In such cases, it is recommended that there should be only one implementation PQ for ANS which covers all ANS sub-areas.
- 4) Ensure a balanced distribution/ratio across “establishment/implementation” PQs, audit areas and CEs, which should be maintained going forward for the overall EI score to remain as a useful measure of a State’s safety oversight capability .
- 5) Identify and remove PQs whose requirements extend beyond ICAO Standards, including those based solely on guidance material or Recommended Practice. This also includes PQs whose wording takes them beyond the Standard they are referencing, despite any relevance to safety oversight.
- 6) Aim to reduce the total number of PQs through the PQ rationalization exercise as described in Recommendations 1 to 5 by 10-20%.
- 7) Aim to keep the number of PQs to not more than the number reached after completion of the PQ rationalization exercise recommended in Recommendations 1 to 6 above. This limit in the number of PQs should be maintained going forward.

— END —