



**WORKING PAPER**

**ASSEMBLY — 40TH SESSION**

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Agenda Item 13: Audit Programmes – Continuous Monitoring Approach**

**CONSIDERATIONS BY THE CUBAN STATE ON THE UNIVERSAL SECURITY AUDIT PROGRAMME – CONTINUOUS MONITORING APPROACH (USAP-CMA) FOLLOWING ITS EXPERIENCE OF THE AUDIT CONDUCTED IN MARCH 2019**

(Presented by Cuba)

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This working paper sets out considerations by the Republic of Cuba on the findings of the last Universal Security Audit Programme – Continuous Monitoring Approach (USAP-CMA) audit, the execution thereof and the methodology used for the USAP-CMA.

**Action:** The Assembly is invited to:

- a) take note of the information contained in this working paper;
- b) request ICAO to consider the aspects included in paragraph 3.2, subparagraphs a) to e), of this working paper in order to revise and improve the USAP-CMA; and
- c) support the ICAO Council's recommendations contained in its Report on the Review of the Scope and Methodology of the Universal Security Audit Programme – Continuous Monitoring Approach (USAP-CMA).

<i>Strategic Objectives:</i>	This working paper relates to Strategic Objective – <i>Security and Facilitation</i> .
<i>Financial implications:</i>	Not applicable.
<i>References:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A39-WP/497, <i>Report of the Executive Committee on Agenda Item 17, Universal Security Audit Programme – Continuous Monitoring Approach (USAP-CMA)</i>.</li><li>• C-WP/14918, <i>Council – 217th Session, Draft Assembly working paper – Report on the Review of the Scope and Methodology of the Universal Security Audit Programme – Continuous Monitoring Approach (USAP-CMA)</i>.</li><li>• A40-WP/32, <i>Report on the Review of the Scope and Methodology of the Universal Security Audit Programme – Continuous Monitoring Approach (USAP-CMA)</i>.</li></ul>

<sup>1</sup>Spanish version provided by Cuba.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The USAP had been organized since its inception as two audit cycles, the first covering 2002-2007 and the second 2008-2013. The audit findings provided ICAO with a holistic view of the aviation security and oversight situation in States, recommendations were made and vulnerabilities were identified, for which actions were taken in order to strengthen the aviation security systems.

1.2 To ensure USAP continuity, on completion of the second cycle at the end of 2013, the inclusion of the risk-based continuous monitoring approach (CMA) was approved. The new working method focused the auditing process on each State's needs and specific characteristics, by providing it with continuous and customized monitoring, which is conducive to greater efficiency in targeting the Organization's support for States that face significant security deficiencies.

1.3 The transition from USAP to CMA was completed at the end of 2014, upon full implementation of the new approach which, after 2015, incorporated elements both of continuing monitoring and of the risk-based approach.

1.4 USAP-CMA promotes new tools and working methods that oblige States to increase preparations for and assimilation of those elements. The new approach focuses on four activities, namely documentation-based audits, oversight-focused audits, compliance-focused audits and aviation security assistance and other monitoring activities.

1.5 ICAO considered that documentation-based USAP-CMA audits would be applied first to States at adequate and advanced levels. The Cuban State underwent this type of activity in August 2015 and, on that basis, the audits conducted by ICAO, both through monitoring visits and through earlier USAP Audit cycles, revealed significant progress in the processing of findings, and Cuba's aviation security system was considered to be advanced and at an adequate level of stability.

## 2. ANALYSIS

2.1 In the 2015 documentation-based audit, Cuba obtained a 99.74% USAP-CMA Protocol Question (PQ) indicator. However, in the last USAP-CMA audit conducted in Cuba in March 2019, many questions were raised about that documentation and the status was found to be non-satisfactory on the basis of the same archive audited in 2015, to which the only changes had been the new amendments to Annex 17 and Annex 9.

2.2 The following irregularities occurred:

- a) the documentation could not be reviewed before the audit began because the ICAO site was not available for a sufficient amount of time;
- b) during the audit, the auditors requested additional information to answer various PQs, which required authorization from the highest authorities of the central organs of the Cuban State; these requests included visits to unscheduled places, which gave rise to procedures outside the term; and
- c) the State replied immediately to many PQs, including the disclosure of documents, which were not taken into account during the audit.

2.3 Some PQs are repetitive and abstract, which generate findings. Similarly, many questions are related in various findings, thus leading to very low marks, as the same issue produces differing effects.

2.4 We could not understand the repeated insistence on seeking findings during the observation of the closed-circuit television system, which we deemed inappropriate and did not yield the objective information sought by the auditor.

2.5 The final report contains Annex 9 area findings that were not discussed with the focal point.

### 3. CONCLUSIONS

3.1 At the ninth meeting of Directors of Civil Aviation, held in Trinidad and Tobago, Cuba voiced discontent with the findings of the USAP–CMA audit conducted in March 2019 and discussed the audit criteria and execution.

3.2 The analysis section of this working paper describes the incongruities and contradictions that emerged during the process; they must be taken into consideration in order to conduct USAP–CMA audits more objectively and precisely, and thus encourage and motivate States to change genuine defects found and to undertake to improve on the results obtained, which implies supporting enhancements and improvement of the USAP–CMA Programme (criteria, guides, methodologies). The following aspects, among others, may be considered in order to revise and improve USAP–CMA auditing:

- a) increase States' readiness through training in the USAP–CMA methodology and protocols;
- b) keep tools available full time on the website;
- c) draw up audit plans in greater detail to permit advance coordination with all national entities to be visited;
- d) revise USAP–CMA PQs to ensure that they are consistent with Annex 17 – *Security: Safeguarding International Civil Aviation Against Acts of Unlawful Interference* and with Annex 9 – *Facilitation*, including the most recent amendments, so that they are sufficiently clear both to the auditee and to the auditors; and
- e) further improve the training of auditors to ensure homogeneity in the interpretation of the standard.

3.3 Cuba can achieve higher scores, within the shortest timeframes, that reflect the aviation security standards that it has achieved.