



**WORKING PAPER**

**ASSEMBLY — 40TH SESSION**

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Agenda Item 12: Aviation Security – Policy**

**PROPOSAL FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF MATRICES TO DETERMINE THE PRIORITY AND FREQUENCY OF STATE OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES**

(Presented by the Dominican Republic)

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This working paper highlights the need to develop a matrix model for setting out priorities and frequency in respect of State aviation security oversight activities. Such matrices would serve to identify mechanisms and methodologies for orderly and systematic compliance oversight, and ensure effective implementation of the National Civil Aviation Security Programme.

**Action:** The Assembly is invited to develop a matrix model for aviation security oversight that States could use as a reference in determining the priorities and frequency of their respective security oversight system activities.

<i>Strategic Objectives:</i>	This working paper relates to the <i>Aviation Security and Facilitation</i> Strategic Objective.
<i>Financial implications:</i>	Not applicable.
<i>References:</i>	Annex 17 – <i>Security</i> ; Doc 8973 <i>Aviation Security Manual</i> ; Doc 9807 <i>Universal Security Audit Programme Continuous Monitoring Manual</i> ; Doc 10047 <i>Aviation Security Oversight Manual</i> ; <i>No Country Left Behind (NCLB) Initiative</i> ; Doc 10118 <i>Global Aviation Security Plan (GASeP)</i>

<sup>1</sup> English and Spanish versions provided by the Dominican Republic.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 To achieve the standardization of the aviation security oversight system, the State authorities responsible for security need to develop and introduce appropriate planning and programming methodologies that allow for the systematic monitoring of the many entities that make up any given aviation security structure. This includes aircraft operators, airport operators, air traffic service providers (ATSPs), law enforcement authorities and security service providers among others.

1.2 The main aim of this proposal is to collaborate with other States in establishing an appropriate mechanism to maintain and monitor aviation security systems effectively and efficiently, so that States have visibility of the level of compliance under the National Civil Aviation Security Programmes and can prioritize resources for oversight on the basis of risk assessments.

1.3 Such a tool would assist States in targeting their resources to those parts of the aviation security system that need them most, and would offer a systematic and orderly method to expeditiously determine the priority and frequency of aviation security oversight activities. The mechanism would also allow States to take preventive or corrective actions in response to any deficiencies detected.

## 2. DISCUSSION

2.1 Standard 3.4.5 of Annex 17 to the Convention on International Civil Aviation states, “Each Contracting State shall ensure that the implementation of security measures is regularly subjected to verification of compliance with the national civil aviation security programme. The priorities and frequency of monitoring shall be determined on the basis of risk assessment carried out by the relevant authorities.”

2.2 Standard 3.4.6 states, “Each Contracting State shall arrange for security audits, tests, surveys and inspections to be conducted on a regular basis, to verify compliance with the national civil aviation security programme and to provide for the rapid and effective rectification of any deficiencies.”

2.3 To support effective compliance with said Standards, States could develop a mechanism or tool to assist in planning and programming oversight activities for their aviation security system and in systematically monitoring entities responsible for implementing the required security measures, on the basis of established priorities. A master document would serve as a reference for States in preparing a matrix model that would contain all of the parameters required by ICAO.

2.4 The tool would also allow States to more quickly determine priorities and frequency of oversight activities for all of the entities in the aviation security system, and to target oversight resources on the basis of risk assessments.

2.5 A matrix would help States maximize their aviation security oversight efforts and resources by basing decisions on the priorities established by the competent authority. They could focus efforts on those airports and entities that need the most attention. Each State uses different methods to determine the frequency of oversight activities according to their own criteria and procedures. However, there is no detailed guidance from the main organization to assist States in preparing a matrix to improve and standardize oversight processes. For this reason, we urge that this proposal be incorporated in ICAO Doc 8973 *Aviation Security Manual*, so that these procedures may be standardized.

2.6 The matrix would be developed with the following components as a minimum:

- Specific security measures for flights that are high-risk or are on heightened alert for threats;
- Response capacity for acts of unlawful interference;
- Performance of agents implementing security controls;
- Security equipment purchasing needs;
- Condition of existing security equipment;
- Threat and risk assessment reports by resident entities;
- Size of passenger flows;
- Frequency and volume of aircraft operations;
- Volume of mail and cargo, and supply operations;
- Findings from AVSEC quality control activities;
- Record of compliance with national requirements on the part of aircraft and airport operators, as well as any other entity subject to AVSEC quality control;
- New and emerging aviation security needs;
- Reports on security incidents occurring in the previous year and requests from entities involved.

### 3. CONCLUSION

3.1 A matrix model would help States to improve and standardize the processes for determining priorities and frequency of oversight activities and to correctly implement security procedures, enhancing oversight management.

3.2 The matrix model will provide a flexible framework for States to prepare their aviation security oversight system, ensuring that all entities in their respective civil aviation sectors are subject to timely and efficient oversight.

3.3 We request that model matrices be developed for the purpose of determining the priority and frequency of oversight activities, and that said models be incorporated into ICAO Doc 8973 *Aviation Security Manual* so that other States may use them as a reference.

-----



## APPENDIX

### MODEL MATRIX FOR STATE OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

#### 1. OVERSIGHT PRIORITY MECHANISM

1.1 The oversight priority mechanism is defined on the basis of oversight findings in respect of an assessed entity and its capacity to comply with the national requirements, as well as its proposals to correct the deficiencies identified in the course of oversight activities.

**PRIORITY 1:** Major deficiencies identified in the course of an oversight activity and difficulties experienced in the implementation of corrective actions

- **Security audit** once every xxx (xx) months;
- **Security inspection** once every xxx (xx) months;
- **Security test** once every xxx (xx) months;
- **Security survey** once every xxx (xx) months.

**PRIORITY 2:** Deficiencies identified in the course of an oversight activity and minor difficulties experienced in the implementation of corrective actions

- **Security audit** once every xxx (xx) months;
- **Security inspection** once every xxx (xx) months;
- **Security test** once every xxx (xx) months;
- **Security survey** once every xxx (xx) months.

**PRIORITY 3:** Minor deficiencies identified in the course of an oversight activity, or in the timely and proper implementation of corrective actions

- **Security audit** once every xxx (xx) months;
- **Security inspection** once every xxx (xx) months;
- **Security test** once every xxx (xx) months;
- **Security survey** once every xxx (xx) months.

#### 2. CLASSIFICATION OF AIRPORTS AND AERODROMES

2.1 Airports are classified according to passenger flow, as follows:

- **Airport A:** international airports, high flow (xxxx million or more passengers per year);
- **Airport B:** international airports, low flow (less than xxxx million passengers per year);
- **Airport C:** domestic airports, minimal flow.

#### 3. CLASSIFICATION OF CARGO AND PASSENGER AIRCRAFT OPERATORS

3.1 Aircraft operators are classified according to the number of passengers carried, as follows:

- **Operator A:** international passengers, high flow (xxxxxx or more passengers per year);
- **Operator B:** international passengers, low flow (less than xxxxxx passengers per year);
- **Operator C:** cargo and mail only;
- **Operator D:** domestic, not including private.

**4. CLASSIFICATION OF ENTITIES**

**4.1** Entities are classified according to designated functions and responsibilities under the National Civil Aviation Security Programme (NCASP), as follows:

- Competent authority for civil aviation security;
- Airport operators;
- Aircraft operators;
- Aircraft consignees;
- Service providers;
- Companies providing in-flight supplies and services;
- Ground handlers;
- Companies handling mail, parcels and courier items;
- Accredited agents and known consignors of cargo and mail

**5. PRIORITY AND FREQUENCY OF OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES**

<b>AIRPORT OPERATORS</b>						
<b>Airport code</b>	<b>Entity and place</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Frequency/year xxxx – xxxx</b>			
			<i>Audits</i>	<i>Inspections</i>	<i>Tests</i>	<i>Surveys</i>
<b>A</b>		<b>1</b>				
		<b>2</b>				
		<b>3</b>				
<b>B</b>		<b>1</b>				
		<b>2</b>				
		<b>3</b>				
<b>C</b>		<b>1</b>				
		<b>2</b>				
		<b>3</b>				

AIRCRAFT OPERATORS						
Airport code	Entity and place	Priority	Frequency/year xxxx – xxxx			
			<i>Audits</i>	<i>Inspections</i>	<i>Tests</i>	<i>Surveys</i>
A		1				
		2				
		3				
B		1				
		2				
		3				
C		1				
		2				
		3				

COMPETENT AUTHORITY FOR CIVIL AVIATION SECURITY						
Airport code	Entity and place	Priority	Frequency/year xxxx – xxxx			
			<i>Audits</i>	<i>Inspections</i>	<i>Tests</i>	<i>Surveys</i>
A		1				
		2				
		3				
B		1				
		2				
		3				
C		1				
		2				
		3				