



THIRTEENTH AIR NAVIGATION CONFERENCE

Montréal, Canada, 9 to 19 October 2018

DRAFT REPORT OF COMMITTEE B ON AGENDA ITEMS 6 (Sub-Items 6.3, 6.3.1 and 6.3.2)

The attached draft report on Agenda Items 6.3, 6.3.1 and 6.3.2 is presented for approval by Committee B for submission to the Plenary.

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 approach (CMA)
6.3.2 Support and the USOAP CMA Online Framework (OLF)

6.3.1 This agenda item addressed ICAO's continuous monitoring activities under the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP), and specifically the evolution of the USOAP Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) to meet the needs of States and ICAO. In order to provide the participants with a better overview and to facilitate the discussion, sub-agenda items 6.3, 6.3.1 and 6.3.2 were addressed together.

6.3.2 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/21 Revision No. 1, presented by the Secretariat, addressing the evolution of the USOAP CMA methodology, processes and tools based on the work undertaken by the Group of Experts for a USOAP CMA Structured Review (GEUSR). The Committee supported the evolution of the USOAP CMA based on the GEUSR recommendations as well as the allocation of the necessary financial and human resources for their implementation. The Committee also agreed that pertinent information should not be lost when reducing the total number of USOAP CMA Protocol Questions (PQs), especially with respect to PQs not directly related to safety oversight, which should be included in the appropriate ICAO monitoring mechanism.

6.3.3 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/79 Revision No. 1, presented by Australia, supporting all GEUSR recommendations and calling for the accelerated implementation of the recommendations regarding the structured revision of the PQs. The Committee noted that the implementation of such recommendations implied the concurrent implementation of the recommendations regarding the identification of 'Priority PQs'. Thus, the Committee supported the accelerated implementation of both sets of recommendations and agreed to request that the Council consider these proposals, taking into account the budgetary implications.

6.3.4 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/44, presented by European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) on behalf of the European Union and its Member States¹, the other Member States of the European Civil Aviation Conference² and by EUROCONTROL, proposing the measures to increase the efficiency of the USOAP CMA. The Committee discussed the proposal made to delegate some ICAO functions and responsibilities under the USOAP CMA to 'safety partners'. The Committee noted the clarification made by European States that the proposal did not include delegation to commercial entities. However, concerns were raised that delegation of some ICAO functions and responsibilities under the USOAP CMA would impact the necessary independence of the programme and the standardization and global acceptance of its results. The Committee agreed that such issues should be addressed as part of the further evolution of the USOAP CMA beyond the GEUSR recommendations. With respect to State safety risk profiles, the Committee noted that ICAO used a set of indicators to determine risk profiles of States for the prioritization of USOAP CMA activities and that the GEUSR had already recognized the need to strengthen this area, making a number of recommendations for the expansion and enhancement of the indicators used by ICAO. Some concerns were raised regarding the public dissemination of the indicators

¹ 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.

² 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.

forming the State safety risk profile. Clarifications were made by the Secretariat that dissemination was only to States through the USOAP CMA Online Framework (OLF).

6.3.5 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/122, presented by Canada, addressing USOAP CMA simulated audits through self-assessments and peer assessments. The Committee recognized the importance of having reliable and up-to-date self-assessments of the USOAP CMA PQs by States and therefore agreed to strongly encourage States to complete their self-assessment of the USOAP CMA PQs in a detailed and reliable manner and to keep them up-to-date, taking benefit of cooperation with other States whenever possible.

6.3.6 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/189, presented by Uruguay, proposing the inclusion of questions regarding fatigue management in air traffic services within the air navigation services (ANS) PQs used in the USOAP CMA to reflect Amendment 50-B of Annex 11 — *Air Traffic Services*. The Committee acknowledged that the review of recent applicable amendments to the ICAO Annexes was a normal part of the process followed by ICAO for the periodic amendment of the USOAP CMA PQs. The Committee therefore agreed to refer the proposal to the Secretariat for assessment as part of the next applicable PQ amendment cycle.

6.3.7 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/217, presented by Kenya on behalf of the AFCAC Member States³, proposing actions to enhance the implementation of USOAP CMA activities in Africa. The Committee recognized the benefits of enhanced cooperation and sharing of experience between States, in particular at regional level. In addition, the Committee recognized that the conduct of an additional number of USOAP CMA activities each year would require the allocation of additional financial as well as human resources, which was already addressed as part of the GEUSR recommendations.

6.3.8 With respect to the future evolution of the USOAP CMA beyond the GEUSR recommendations, the Committee agreed to recommend that ICAO establish a study group to address means to avoid duplication of efforts and find synergies to enhance the efficiency of the USOAP CMA, while maintaining safeguards to guarantee the independence, universality, standardization and global acceptance in the implementation of the programme.

6.3.9 As a result of the discussion, the Committee agreed on the following recommendation:

Recommendation 6.3/1: Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA)

That States:

- a) continue to engage fully in the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA);
- b) complete their self-assessments of the USOAP Protocol Questions (PQs) in a detailed and reliable manner and keep them up-to-date as needed;
- c) enhance cooperation and sharing of experiences in the implementation of USOAP CMA, in particular at regional level;

³ Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cap Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Cote D'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of The Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Republic of Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome And Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic Of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

That ICAO:

- d) continue to evolve the USOAP CMA methodology, processes and tools;
- e) implement the recommendations and observations of the Group of Experts for USOAP CMA Structured Review (GEUSR);
- f) ensure that pertinent information is not lost when reducing the total number of USOAP CMA PQs, especially with respect to PQs not directly related to safety oversight, which should be included in the appropriate ICAO monitoring mechanism;
- g) subject to the availability of the necessary additional resources, implement as a matter of priority the GEUSR recommendations related to the structured revision of the PQs and the identification of 'Priority PQs';
- h) devote appropriate resources to ensure the continuous monitoring of the States remains relevant and up-to-date; and
- i) establish a study group for the further evolution of the USOAP CMA, beyond the GEUSR recommendations, to address means to avoid duplication of efforts and find synergies to enhance the efficiency of the USOAP CMA, while maintaining safeguards to guarantee the independence, universality, standardization and global acceptance in the implementation of the programme.

— — — — —