



THIRTEENTH AIR NAVIGATION CONFERENCE

Montréal, Canada, 9 to 19 October 2018

REPORT OF COMMITTEE B TO THE CONFERENCE ON AGENDA ITEM 6

The attached report has been approved by Committee B for submission to the Plenary.

Mr. Simon Allotey
Committee Chairperson

*Note.— After removal of this covering sheet, this paper should be inserted in the appropriate place in the Report Folder.**

* (1 page)

Agenda Item 6: Organizational safety issues
6.1 Strategic Plan
6.1.1 Vision and Overview of the Global Aviation Safety Plan (Gasp), 2020-2022 Edition
6.1.2 Enabling Safety Performance Monitoring; Goals, Targets and Indicators in the 2020-2022 Edition of the Gasp

6.1.1 This agenda item introduced the draft 2020-2022 edition of the *Global Aviation Safety Plan* (GASP, Doc 10004). To provide the participants with a better overview and to facilitate the discussion, working papers submitted under sub-agenda items 6.1, 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 were addressed together.

6.1.2 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/29 Revision No. 1, presented by the Secretariat, containing a comprehensive strategy for aviation safety. The working paper presented the third edition of the revised *Global Aviation Safety Plan* (GASP, Doc 10004) for agreement, in principle, by the Committee. The draft 2020-2022 edition of the GASP sets forth ICAO's Safety Strategy in support of the prioritization and continuous improvement of aviation. The plan guides the implementation of regional and national aviation safety plans. The global aviation safety roadmap, presented in the draft 2020-2022 edition of the GASP, serves as an action plan to assist the aviation community in achieving the GASP goals.

6.1.3 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/123, presented by the United States, AN-Conf/13-WP/43, presented by Austria on behalf of the European Union and its Member States¹, the other Member States of the European Civil Aviation Conference²; and by EUROCONTROL, AN-Conf/13-WP/135, presented by Brazil on behalf of the South American (SAM) States³, AN-Conf/13-WP/139, presented by the People's Republic of China, AN-Conf/13-WP/66, presented by Uruguay, and supported by SAM States (except Chile), AN-Conf/13-WP/65, presented by the United States, and AN-Conf/13-WP/186, presented by the Airports Council International (ACI) regarding comments on the draft 2020-2022 edition of the GASP. The Committee agreed on the need to continue implementation efforts under the umbrella of the GASP, focusing on safety performance, regional mechanisms, safety risk management and national/regional safety planning. The Committee expressed wide support for the draft 2020-2022 edition of the GASP and agreed on the need for the GASP Study Group to re-examine the appropriate use of the safety oversight margin, in preparation for subsequent endorsement of the GASP at the 40th Session of the ICAO Assembly. The Committee noted the progress of the ACI Airport Excellence (APEX) in Safety programme, along with the need for national airport operators to participate in the programme, and expressed support for States providing peer-to-peer assistance to airports on operational safety management and facilitating compliance with regulations.

6.1.4 The Committee noted the need to promote improved integration and coordination between planning and implementation regional groups (PIRGs) and regional aviation safety groups (RASGs) while ensuring that the working arrangements at the regional level reflect the needs and priorities of each region. The Committee also agreed that the Council should be requested to continue the

¹ Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, 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 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.

³ Supported by 13 Contracting States (Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)).

development of performance-based Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) to complement prescriptive requirements, as appropriate, taking into account the budgetary implications.

6.1.5 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/142, presented by the People's Republic of China, on the experience gained in China with implementing global aircraft tracking and operating surveillance. The Committee also reviewed two papers presented by Trinidad and Tobago: AN-Conf/13-WP/227 on considerations for revisiting the Chicago Convention with a focus on domestic aviation and a review of the ICAO Annexes and AN-Conf/13-WP/228 on alternative means for States struggling to meet ICAO requirements in Annex 13 — *Aircraft Accident and Incident Investigation*, Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) and Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA). The Committee acknowledged that existing ICAO provisions in Annex 13 and related guidance materials on regional investigation systems already provide the tools necessary for States, lacking sufficient resources to carry out investigations, to delegate their investigation function to other States or regional accident and incident investigation organizations (RAIOs).

6.1.6 As a result of the discussions, the Committee agreed on the following recommendation:

Recommendation 6.1/1 — Draft 2020-2022 Edition of the Global Aviation Safety Plan (Doc 10004, GASP)

That States:

- a) agree in principle with the draft 2020-2022 edition of the *Global Aviation Safety Plan* (GASP, Doc 10004), with the inclusion of GASP goals and targets; and

That ICAO:

- b) take into consideration input from the Conference, the questionnaire and the future work of the GASP Study Group for subsequent endorsement of the 2020-2022 edition of the GASP at the 40th Session of the ICAO Assembly.

Agenda Item 6: Organizational safety issues

6.1.3 Global Aviation Safety Oversight System (GASOS)

6.1.7 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/17, presented by the Secretariat, describing the new global aviation safety oversight system (GASOS). The working paper sets forth ICAO's objective of strengthening State safety oversight and safety management capabilities by enabling the delegation of safety oversight functions, as needed, by States to competent Regional Safety Oversight Organizations that have been assessed and recognized by ICAO; and by strengthening existing RSOOs to make them more effective and efficient in supporting States. The paper describes GASOS as a voluntary standardized assessment and recognition mechanism for State civil aviation authorities (CAAs), regional safety oversight organizations (RSOOs) and other regional State-based mechanisms. The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/78 presented by Australia with the support of New Zealand and Singapore, AN-Conf/13-WP/188 presented by Bolivia with the support of the SAM States⁴, AN-Conf/13-WP/124 presented by the United States and AN-Conf/13-WP/224 presented by 54 Contracting States, Members of

⁴ Supported by thirteen Contracting States (Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)).

the African Civil Aviation Commission (AFCAC)⁵ and agreed on the need to address the challenges and issues expressed therein as a matter of priority.

6.1.8 The Committee acknowledged the specific concern regarding the commercialization of safety oversight and the inclusion of private entities and agreed on the need to limit the scope of the GASOS Programme to State CAAs, RSOOs and other regional State-based mechanisms such as Cooperative Development of Operational Safety and Continuing Airworthiness Programmes (COSCAPs). The Committee requested ICAO to address concerns in three main areas including liability, governance and cost-benefit analysis to support progression of the programme and noted the request for the ICAO Legal Bureau to be involved in finding the solutions for the legal and transfer of risk issues. The Committee also recommended to ensure that the current membership of the GASOS–Study Group (SG) will be reviewed to ensure access to the expertise and regional perspectives needed to progress the programme. The Committee also recognized the need to ensure that adequate guidance material is developed, supporting the implementation of GASOS. The Committee also recognized the need to align the GASOS programme with related tools and initiatives, to avoid duplication of efforts.

6.1.9 The Committee noted the support for GASOS by Agency on Aeronautical Safety for Central America (ACSA) and Transport Canada as the first RSOO and State involved in the GASOS pilot projects, highlighting the importance of this assessment in strengthening their safety oversight capabilities, enabling improvement of their performance and recommended that other similar organizations apply for an assessment as part of the GASOS trial period.

6.1.10 As a result of the discussions, the Committee agreed on the following recommendation:

Recommendation 6.1.3/1 — The global aviation safety oversight system (GASOS)

That States:

- a) support the development of a global aviation safety oversight system (GASOS);

That ICAO:

- b) continue developing an ICAO GASOS comprised of voluntary and standardized competency assessments of safety oversight organizations for recognition of safety oversight functions provided to States, including its legal framework and assessment mechanisms while ensuring those States maintain their obligations and responsibilities under the *Convention on International Civil Aviation* (Doc 7300);
- c) develop appropriate guidance for States to support the delegation of safety oversight functions and monitoring of safety oversight organizations accepting delegations;
- d) design adequate interfaces between GASOS and other ICAO programmes and to avoid duplication of activities between GASOS and the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme Continuous Monitoring Approach (USOAP CMA);

⁵ 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, Ethiopia, Eswatini, 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.

- e) present GASOS for endorsement at the 40th Session of the ICAO Assembly if the liability, governance and cost-benefit analysis issues and other concerns raised by the Committee have been addressed; and
- f) encourage safety oversight organizations, including regional safety oversight organizations (RSOOs), State civil aviation authorities (CAAs) and other regional State-based mechanisms, to participate in GASOS in order to expand and enhance the safety oversight support provided to States.

— — — — —

Agenda Item 6: Organizational safety issues
6.2 Implementation of safety management

6.2.1 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/28, presented by the Secretariat, summarizing some important recent ICAO initiatives including the launch of the safety management implementation (SMI) website, which complements the fourth edition of the *Safety Management Manual (SMM)* (Doc 9859) and the delivery of four Regional Safety Management Symposia and Workshops. The working paper also suggests some areas where further work is needed to support the implementation of effective State safety programmes (SSPs) and safety management systems (SMSs). The Committee expressed support for the recommendations identified in the Secretariat working paper. Additional emphasis was made and supported by the Committee on the need to develop robust hazard identification and risk management processes taking into account the evolution, sometimes rapid, of the industry and operating environments.

6.2.2 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/117, presented by Canada, which promoted increased visibility and use of the SMI website and noted wide support for continued development, promotion and maintenance of the website, including support for all ICAO working languages, and encouraged States to contribute their practical examples and supporting rationales.

6.2.3 As a result of the discussions, the Committee agreed on the following recommendation:

Recommendation 6.2/1 — Supporting Effective Safety Management Implementation

That States and international organizations:

- a) identify focal points for the submission of practical examples and tools to be reviewed, validated and posted on the ICAO safety management implementation (SMI) website as a means of sharing successful experiences with the aviation community;
- b) support the ICAO SMI website by providing practical examples of their respective safety management practices, methodologies and tools for the purpose of sharing with other Member States;

That ICAO:

- c) commit to the ongoing development, promotion and maintenance of the safety management implementation (SMI) website in order to ensure active use of the tool and relevance of content to the aviation community;
- d) devise strategies to support the submission and validation of practical examples for the SMI website in the six ICAO working languages (English, Arabic, Chinese, French, Spanish, and Russian) and ensure the translation of the content posted on the website into the six ICAO working languages;
- e) develop initiatives tailored to each region with inputs from the regional aviation safety groups (RASGs) in support of the goals and targets of the Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) and Global Air Navigation Plan (GANP) with a focus on the effective implementation of State safety programmes (SSPs) and safety management systems (SMSs) at the State and service provider levels, respectively, including the

development of the required safety management competencies and/or the delegation to States, regional safety oversight organizations (RSOOs) and regional accident and incident investigation organizations (RAIOs);

- f) further support the development of appropriate harmonized safety performance indicators (SPIs) at the regional, State and service provider levels and explore the development of means to monitor the effectiveness of SSP and SMS on a more real-time basis;
- g) in collaboration with States, RSOOs and industry explore more powerful methods of identifying hazards and managing risk, suitable for complex socio-technical systems such as aviation and adaptable, regardless of the type of risk;
- h) in collaboration with States, RSOOs and industry explore the benefits of a unified framework for integrated risk management (safety, security, environment, etc...) taking into account the evolution of ISO management standards; and
- i) update, for adoption by the 40th Session of the ICAO Assembly, Assembly Resolutions related to safety management to reflect Amendment 1 to Annex 19 — *Safety Management*, as well as Amendment 15 to Annex 13 — *Aircraft Accident and Incident Investigation*, with consideration given to an overarching safety management Assembly Resolution to complement Assembly Resolution A39-12, Appendices A and B, related to the Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) and Global Air Navigation Plan (GANP) in order to focus the attention of States on key aspects of achieving effective SSP implementation.

Agenda Item 6: Organizational safety issues

6.2.1 State safety programmes (SSPs)

6.2.4 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/77 Revision No. 1, presented by Australia and New Zealand, and AN-Conf/13-WP/134, presented by Brazil, related to the process for the development and implementation of ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) and the benefits of using a risk-based approach to achieve a target level of safety. In addition, AN-Conf/13-WP/134 suggested States share studies or data that could be used to conduct risk assessments in support of this approach. The Committee agreed that the Council should be requested to explore the use of a risk-based approach based on a target level of safety performance in the SARPs development and implementation process, where appropriate, taking into account budgetary implications.

6.2.5 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/116 Revision No. 1, presented by Australia, Austria on behalf of the European Union⁶ and its Member States⁷, the other Member States of the

⁶ In the European Union, State obligations are discharged to a large extent on the basis of EU law and as such States refer to EU legislation in their State safety programmes

⁷ 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.

European Civil Aviation Conference⁸ and by EUROCONTROL, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Dominican Republic, New Zealand, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa and International Federation of Air Traffic Controllers' Associations (IFATCA), outlining challenges faced by States in interpreting the concept of acceptable level of safety performance (ALoSP) and suggesting further work is required in this area. The Committee expressed strong support for ICAO to further review this concept taking into consideration the experience of States.

6.2.6 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf-WP/147, presented by the Dominican Republic, highlighting the importance of change management which was also mentioned and supported in AN-Conf/13-WP/28. The Committee agreed on the need for capacity building at the State level in this regard to ensure the successful implementation of the global plans.

6.2.7 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/155, presented by the Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and supported by SAM States⁹, which presented the status of a pilot project including eleven South American (SAM) States, with the support of the ICAO SAM Regional Office, for the implementation of SSP. The Committee noted the benefits of this project in addressing the goal of No Country Left Behind (NCLB) and agreed that other regions could benefit from a similar approach.

6.2.8 The Committee reviewed AN-Conf/13-WP/239, presented by Republic of Korea, which addressed the need for ICAO to consider civil-military coordination and cooperation in the effective implementation of safety management. The Committee noted the work done by ICAO during the past decade with regard to civil-military cooperation to enhance air navigation safety capacity and efficiency. The attention of the Committee was brought to the ongoing work to update Annex 11 — *Air Traffic Services* relating to the conduct of safety risk assessments for activities potentially hazardous to civil aircraft, and its relationship to the *Safety Management Manual* (Doc 9859). The Committee agreed that civil-military cooperation should be addressed as part of the implementation of SSP.

6.2.9 Information papers presented by Algeria (AN-Conf/13-WP/216), Brazil (AN-Conf/13-WP/132), Indonesia (AN-Conf/13-WP/277 and AN-Conf/13-WP/278), People's Republic of China (AN-Conf/13-WP/204) and United Arab Emirates (AN-Conf/13-WP/164), were noted.

6.2.10 As a result of the discussions, the Committee agreed on the following recommendation:

Recommendation 6.2.1/1 — State safety programmes (SSPs)

That States:

- a) identify and address the need to build capacity at the State level for the management of change; and
- b) share their experiences in civil-military cooperation for State safety programmes (SSPs) implementation in conferences, meetings and/or on the safety management implementation (SMI) website;

⁸ 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.

⁹ Supported by 13 Contracting States (Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)).

That ICAO:

- c) review the acceptable level of safety performance (ALoSP) concept taking into consideration the experience of States;
- d) review the need for additional guidance on the management of change at the State level; and
- e) ensure that appropriate emphasis is placed on safety management in the update of Appendix I, Coordination and cooperation of civil and military air traffic, of Assembly Resolution A38/12, *Consolidated Statement of continuing ICAO policies and associated practices related specifically to air navigation*.

Agenda Item 6: Organizational safety issues

6.2.2 Safety management systems

6.2.11 The Committee noted the progress made by People's Republic of China in implementing SMS and in developing methods for their assessment and performance evaluation reflected in AN-Conf/13-WP/146.

6.2.12 AN-Conf/13-WP/152, presented by the Dominican Republic, highlighted the benefits of requiring the air navigation service provider (ANSP) in the Dominican Republic to complete a formal SMS acceptance process, including the sharing of experiences on how to measure different safety performance indicators and the use of the collected safety information to validate the reports of other service providers as part of the SSP. The Committee was reminded that SARPs for air traffic services providers to implement SMS were initially introduced in Annex 11 — *Air Traffic Services* and became applicable in November 2006. The Committee agreed that States should ensure that the latest SMS SARPs for air traffic services providers, as indicated in Amendment 1 to Annex 19 — *Safety Management*, have been implemented.

6.2.13 An information paper presented by United Republic of Tanzania (ANConf/13-WP/289) was noted.

Agenda Item 6: Organizational safety issues

6.2.3 Developing safety intelligence

6.2.14 With respect to the development of safety intelligence, AN-Conf/13-WP/300 was presented by International Air Transport Association (IATA), International Federation of Air Line Pilots' Associations (IFALPA) and IFATCA. The paper expressed support for States to use industry/State collaboration models for the exchange of safety data and safety information in establishing a safety data collection and processing system (SDCPS) as required by Amendment 1 to Annex 19 to capture, store, aggregate and enable the analysis of the safety data and safety information. The Committee expressed strong support for the actions contained in the paper, which reiterated the provisions in Amendment 1 to Annex 19 and highlighted that there may be some specific circumstances where the safety data may be used by States, in specific contexts and where appropriate, as long as the protection principles are applied. The Committee also recognized that implementation of the protective provisions in Appendix 3 to Annex 19 is challenging for States with right-to-know laws. Additional discussions related to the development of safety intelligence can be found under Agenda Item 7.1.

6.2.15 An information paper presented by People's Republic of China (AN-Conf/13-WP/203) was noted.

6.2.16 As a result of the discussions, the Committee agreed on the following recommendation:

Recommendation 6.2.3/1 — Developing safety intelligence

That States and international organizations:

- a) collaborate for the development of trust sharing networks and adhere to the protective provisions as provided in Amendment 1 to Annex 19 — Safety Management; and

That ICAO:

- b) support States with right-to-know laws in addressing the provisions for the protection of safety data, safety information and related sources in Amendment 1 to Annex 19.

— — — — —

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 audit 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 Austria on behalf of the European Union and its Member States¹⁰, the other Member States of the European Civil Aviation Conference¹¹ and by EUROCONTROL, proposing the measures to increase the efficiency of the USOAP CMA. The Committee discussed the proposal to delegate some ICAO functions and responsibilities under the USOAP CMA to 'safety partners'. Concerns were expressed regarding the lack of definition of 'safety partners' and 'designees' in WP/44. Concerns were also expressed that safety partners might include commercial entities, and that the delegation of some ICAO functions and responsibilities under the USOAP CMA might impact the necessary independence of the programme and the standardization and global acceptance of its results. Poland, speaking on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, clarified that the proposal in AN-Conf/13-WP/44 did not include delegation to commercial entities. The Committee discussed the recommendation in paragraph 3.1.c) of AN-Conf/13-WP/44 which was not fully supported. Therefore, the Committee agreed that the delegation of some functions and responsibilities should be addressed as part of the further evolution of the USOAP CMA beyond the GEUSR recommendations as a matter of priority and suggested that ICAO gives consideration in referring the

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ 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.

issue to a study group. 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 forming the State safety risk profile. Clarifications were made by the Secretariat that the indicators forming part of the State safety risk profile would be shared with all 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. In addition, the Committee discussed the possibility of giving credit to experts having participated in peer assessments of other States to enhance the timeliness of USOAP auditor training.

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 the 54 Contracting States, Members of the African Civil Aviation Commission (AFCAC)¹², 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.

¹² 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.

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;

That ICAO:

- d) continue to evolve the USOAP CMA methodology, processes and tools;
- e) as a matter of priority, implement the recommendations and observations of the Group of Experts for USOAP CMA Structured Review (GEUSR) and, in particular, make available to States the set of indicators forming part of the State safety risk profile;
- 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 audit mechanism;
- g) implement as a matter of priority the GEUSR recommendations regarding the structured revision of the PQs (Group A recommendations) and the identification of 'Priority PQs' (Group B recommendations);
- h) ensure the continuous monitoring of the States remains robust, 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.

— — — — —