International Civil Aviation Organization
NORTH AMERICAN, CENTRAL AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN OFFICE
Twentieth Meeting of Directors of Civil Aviation of the Eastern Caribbean (20th E/CAR DCA)
Miami, Florida, United States 4 to 7 December 2006

Agenda Item 5: **Safety Oversight Developments**

REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ICAO UNIVERSAL SAFETY OVERSIGHT AUDIT PROGRAMME (USOAP) UNDER THE COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEMS APPROACH

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY

This paper contains a report on the implementation of the ICAO Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) under the comprehensive systems approach, launched as of January 2005, as per Assembly Resolution A35-6, from January to April 2006. Action by the Council is in paragraph 4.

1.   Introduction

1.1   On 14 March 2006, the Council (C-DEC 177/12) considered C-WP/12614, in which the Secretary General presented a comprehensive report on the overall implementation of the first cycle of audits (1999-2004) conducted under the ICAO Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP). The Council also considered C-WP/12627, which contained the review by the Air Navigation Commission of C-WP/12614.

1.2   The Council noted both the progress made in the implementation of the programme as presented in C-WP/12614 and the comments and recommendations of the Commission, as contained in paragraph 2 of C-WP/12627, and requested the Secretary General, inter alia, to present a further progress report on the implementation of the comprehensive systems approach under the USOAP for Council's consideration during its 178th Session, addressing qualitative issues related to the audit process and taking into consideration the comments and recommendations made by the Commission in this regard.

1.3   In order to address both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the implementation of USOAP, and provide the Council with a tool to measure the performance of the programme and continually assess its benefits, this report has been structured in two parts. Part One aligns the implementation of USOAP with ICAO Strategic Objective A3 and the critical tasks associated with it, as contained in the Organization's Strategic Action Plan. Under this new format, Part Two of the report will cover preliminary audit results and matters requiring the attention of the Council. The period covered by this report is January to April 2006.

2   **Part one: Progress in the implementation of ICAO Strategic Objective A3**

2.1   USOAP is directly related to ICAO Strategic Objective A – *Enhance global civil aviation safety* and, in particular, to Key Activity A3 – Conduct aviation safety oversight audits to identify deficiencies and encourage their resolution by States. This key activity, in turn, calls for the carrying out of a series of critical tasks. The progress of the programme with regard to Strategic Objective A3 and its related critical tasks is as follows:

2.1.1   *Critical task – Complete the audit of all Contracting States in a six-year cycle*

2.1.1.1   All Contracting States scheduled for a safety oversight audit in 2006 and 2007 have been provided with the official audit notification from ICAO, informing them of the proposed dates for the conduct of the audit, and forwarding the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The Safety Oversight Audit (SOA) Section maintains continuous contact with States regarding upcoming audits through the National Safety Oversight Coordinator appointed by each Contracting State.

2.1.1.2   Eight Contracting States were audited and one international organization was visited during the reporting period, bringing the number of States audited under the comprehensive systems approach, as of 30 April 2006, to seventeen. The number of audits conducted will increase once the number of seconded staff originally planned is reached (more information in this regard is presented in Part Two) and the number of approved auditors increases upon completion of their on-the-job training. No requests for audit deferrals were received during the reporting period. The status of audits planned, conducted and deferred is as follows:

	Audits planned	*Audits conducted*	*Audits deferred by States*	*Audits postponed by ICAO*
2005	12	9	3	—
2006	30	8	—	—
2007	30	—	—	—

2.1.1.3   State Aviation Activity Questionnaires (SAAQ) and Compliance Checklists (CCs) submitted by States enable ICAO to conduct the necessary preparatory work for upcoming audits to maintain an up-to-date database on the level of compliance of ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) by States. As of 30 April 2006, 118 SAAQs and ninety-eight CCs have been received from States. In this regard, it should be noted that since the implementation of the dedicated website, which enables States to complete and/or update the required documentation online, the number of submissions has increased. At any given time, the SOA-dedicated website is being used by an average of fifteen States.

2.1.1.4   In accordance with Assembly Resolution A35-6, the full audit final reports are made available in their entirety to Contracting States by posting them on the ICAO secure website, together with relevant information from the Audit Findings and Differences Database (AFDD). As of 30 April 2006, three such reports have been posted. In this regard, it should be recalled that, in accordance with the established timelines, and depending on the exchange of comments between ICAO and audited States and translation requirements, audit reports are due to be posted approximately eight months after the completion of an audit. **Appendix A** to this working paper contains information on the status of audits and reports.

2.1.2   *Critical task – Monitor the level of implementation of State corrective action plans in coordination with the Regional Offices and through correspondence with States*

2.1.2.1   In accordance with Article 17 of the Memorandum of Understanding regarding safety oversight audits signed with ICAO, States undertake to provide, within sixty calendar days from the date the interim safety oversight audit report has been made available to them, a corrective action plan acceptable to ICAO. The action plan should address the findings and recommendations as contained in the report, providing specific actions and deadlines for the correction of the deficiencies identified during the safety oversight audit. As of 30 April 2006, all the corrective action plans due, had been submitted to ICAO, with one of them in partial form.

2.1.3   *Critical task – Ensure the quality of deliverables through maintaining the ISO 9001:2000 certification of the Safety Oversight Audit (SOA) Section*

2.1.3.1   As indicated in the previous progress report (C-WP/12614 refers), SOA was recertified under ISO requirements in September 2005. As part of its ISO quality management system, SOA is required to measure the performance of services it provides to its customers. To this end, a confidential State Audit Feedback Form is presented to States during the audit closing meeting. The purpose of this form is to provide for continuous improvement of the ICAO Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme by gathering feedback from States on the audit process from the initial audit notification to the physical conduct of the audit. The form is divided into three parts: Pre-audit phase, On-site audit activities and General Comments. Once completed, States forward it directly to the Director of the Air Navigation Bureau.

2.1.3.2   As of 30 April 2006, seven such forms have been received from audited States. An analysis of these forms revealed that a total of 119 comments were made, including difficulties encountered and recommendations made by States. Overall, a satisfaction rate of 82 per cent was achieved. Problems reported by States dealt with the completion of the CCs and the need for clarification regarding specific audit activities. As a result of this feedback, SOA made some modifications to the CCs and implemented an online system to facilitate their completion by States. Team leaders have also been briefed on the points which needed to be further clarified to States during the audits, including the intent of industry visits and the nature of the draft findings and recommendations presented to States during the audit closing meeting.

2.1.3.3   In a similar fashion, feedback forms have been completed by all participants on auditor training courses and seminar/workshops conducted by SOA, as a means to determine if the objectives established for these learning activities were achieved and to identify if changes were required in terms of duration, contents or training methodology. Overall, the feedback provided by the participants has been very positive, including many comments and some suggestions for improvement. As a result of this feedback, changes to training materials have been introduced, with a greater emphasis on the provision of exercises and audit simulation activities.

2.1.4   *Critical task – Provide auditor training courses for ICAO staff and seconded officers*

2.1.4.1   As SOA is currently in the process of providing on-the-job training to those participants who completed successfully the auditor course, no regional courses were conducted during the reporting period. An auditor course, however, was conducted at the request of a Contracting State to train its own staff, on a cost-recovery basis. It is worthy to note that many States and international organizations have recognized the value of auditor training courses not only for participation in USOAP audits, but also to train their own inspectorate staff on ICAO's audit practices and methodology and to prepare for an upcoming audit. To date, three States and one international organization have requested ICAO to organize

such courses on a cost-recovery basis. The status of auditor training courses conducted and planned is at Appendix to this working paper.

2.1.5   *Critical task – Provide safety-oversight related seminars and workshops*

2.1.5.1   In response to feedback provided by safety oversight auditor course participants, ICAO Regional Offices and Contracting States, a new seminar/workshop aimed at assisting States in their preparation for an upcoming safety oversight audit is being developed, with the first delivery planned in June 2006, in the ICAO European and North Atlantic regional office in Paris. A second offering of this new seminar/workshop will also take place during 2006.

	Seminar/Workshops planned	*Seminar/Workshops conducted*	*Status*	*Comments*
2005	7	7	Completed	
2006	2	—	On target	
2007	2	—	On target	

3.   **Part Two: Preliminary audit results and matters requiring the attention of the Council**

3.1   **Audit results and areas of concern identified**

3.1.1   With only three audit reports published so far, the sample is not representative enough to present detailed statistical or graphical information. However, the seventeen audits conducted as of 30 April 2006, representing eight percent of ICAO's Contracting States, have allowed SOA to identify preliminary areas of concern – some of them already present during the first cycle of audits, and others particular to audits conducted under the comprehensive systems approach, due to the nature and scope of such audits. Some of these areas of concern are as follows:

3.1.2   In the area of legislation, it has been identified that some States face difficulties in deciding how to introduce ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) into their legal framework, be it through the promulgation of national regulations, the adoption of foreign regulations or the direct adoption of a particular Annex in its entirety. The audits indicate that some States do not have a clear understanding of the implications of these three approaches. Difficulties have also been identified in the establishment by States of a system to keep-up with Annex amendments and notify differences to ICAO.

3.1.3   Many States which have difficulties in attracting and retaining qualified personnel have chosen to delegate certain safety-related oversight tasks to a regional or sub-regional entity, to foreign civil aviation authorities, to private agencies or even to individuals. Agreements established for these delegations often do not address the mechanism to be used by the State to conduct oversight of the delegated tasks and thus ensure that they are conducted by appropriately qualified and trained technical staff and in accordance with established procedures.

3.1.4   Another area of concern is the difficulties faced by States in the establishment of qualifications and experience for technical staff and the development and implementation of training programmes to maintain competency.

3.1.5   Due to the wide range of issues addressed by the Annexes audited under the comprehensive systems approach, it has been identified that, in many instances, the safety oversight activities to be conducted by the State are carried out by various entities. While there is nothing wrong with this approach, a concern emerges when no mechanisms are established to ensure the adequate coordination of the various entities concerned.

3.1.6   In States where the provision of air navigation services and the operation of aerodromes are managed by the State, two different situations, both of concern, may exist. In the first situation, the State may not have any technical personnel identified to perform the safety oversight of the services being provided. In the second situation, the State may have identified personnel responsible for performing safety oversight, but these activities are carried out without a clear separation between the regulatory oversight function and the service provision function.

3.1.7   Several of these concerns point towards the need for ICAO to develop new, or expand existing, guidance material.

3.2   **Deployment of auditor staff**

3.2.1   In response to a State letter distributed in November 2005 inviting States to provide additional nominations for long-term secondment of national experts, positive replies have been received from Switzerland, Malaysia and the United States, which will allow ICAO to reach the number of auditors required at headquarters to conduct the necessary work during the various phases of the audit process and increase the pace of the audits. A number of States also replied to the State letter offering to second experts on a short-term basis. As of 30 April 2006, a total of fifty-five auditors (from ICAO Headquarters, Regional Offices, States and international organizations) have been approved, following their successful completion of the auditor course and on-the-job training.

3.3   **Procedure for transparency and disclosure**

3.3.1   In accordance with the procedure for transparency and disclosure approved by Council (C-DEC 175/13 and 14), follow-up letters were sent to those States which had not replied to the request by ICAO to submit a corrective action plan following a safety oversight audit, or to provide information to ICAO regarding the status of safety oversight in their States. Replies were requested by 28 April 2006. As of 30 April 2006, four replies had been received from the fifteen States concerned. It is worthy to note that six of these States are scheduled for an audit in 2007 (Appendix to this working paper refers).

States that did not submit a corrective action plan		
	Action taken by ICAO	*Action taken by a State*
Central African Republic	Letter sent requesting a corrective action plan	No response
Djibouti	Same as above	ICAO's assistance requested
Equatorial Guinea	Same as above	No response
Guinea-Bissau	Same as above	No response
Micronesia (Federated States of)	Same as above	No response
Nauru	Same as above	No response
Sao Tome and Principe	Same as above	No response

States which submitted a corrective action plan but to which an audit follow-up mission could not be conducted		
	Action taken by ICAO	*Action taken by a State*
Chad	Letter sent requesting a progress report on the implementation of the corrective action plan	No response
Congo	Same as above	No response
Eritrea	Same as above	No response
Kiribati	Same as above	No response
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Same as above	A progress report submitted
Marshall Islands	Same as above	No response
Rwanda	Same as above	A progress report submitted
Swaziland	Same as above	ICAO's assistance requested

3.3.2   As the next step, and pursuant to Article 21 of the *Convention on International Civil Aviation* (Doc 7300), the Secretariat will forward a letter to those States which have not responded, and request them to provide ICAO with detailed information on their aircraft registries. The analyses of this and other information available to ICAO will determine if a fact-finding mission, and not a full audit, should be conducted to these States. In the latter case, funds originally identified for audits might need to be redirected to allow for the conduct of the fact-finding missions.

3.4   **Other issues requiring the attention of the Council**

3.4.1   Following the review by the Council during the 178th Session of the conclusions and recommendations of the Directors General of Civil Aviation Conference on a Global Strategy for Aviation Safety held from 20 to 22 March 2006, the Secretariat will prepare, for the 179th Session, a working paper addressing changes to be introduced to the Memorandum of Understanding on safety oversight audits, the procedure to deal with significant safety concerns in a timely manner, the categorization of audit findings and the actions to be taken regarding the increased transparency, as recommended by the DGCA Conference. It is proposed that regular progress reports be prepared every other Council Session, as was the practice in the past, with additional reports prepared on a need basis.

3.5   **Graphics of Audits conducted under both systems**

3.5.1   **Appendix B** contains graphic comparisons which determine the effect of the new comprehensive audit approach, versus the audits conducted under Annexes 1, 6, 8, and 18.

4.   **Critical elements**

4.1   CE-1 Primary Aviation Legislation

4.1.1   As a basic frame for supporting the DGCA/CAA legislation, and regulations, is still not designed to accommodate rapid changes or to enact regulations as fast as needed for the Safety and Security of the Aviation Industry, which only reaffirms that the DGCA must have economic independence and that the Director General, must be empowered to adapt, cancel, or produce legislation and regulation pertinent to the Aviation Industry, to be able to comply with ICAO SARPs , and to be able to withstand audits such as the ones performed by the FAA or the IASA technical review.

4.2   CE-2

4.1.2   With the expansion of the Annexes in the audits under the New Comprehensive Approach, the need for supporting legislation and standardized procedures is evident, some of the DGCAs/CAAs are still struggling to comply with the Audits under the Eight Critical Elements, being applied to Annexes 1, 6, 8, and 18, and while making some progress, and developing regulations and procedures to keep up with rapid changes of modern aviation, some DGCAs/CAAs of the region were found to be unprepared for the new Comprehensive Approach.

4.3   CE-3

4.3.1   The DGCAs/CAAs must have stated safety regulatory functions, objectives, policies, to support the technical and non technical staff, governing the oversight of all the authorities and separated entities having responsibilities in the State Aviation Systems.

4.4   CE-4 - Technical Personnel Qualification and Training

4.4.1   The establishment of minimum requirement knowledge and experience of the technical personnel performing Safety Oversight Functions, as stated according to Doc 8335, AN/879 – Manual of Procedures for Operations Inspection, Certification and Continued Surveillance., and to maintain and enhance their competencies, to the desired level, with the appropriate compensation and salaries according to the standards of the industries, and the requirements of the DGCAs/CAAs to produce the training on initial, advanced, and recurrent programmes, in Certification, Oversight and Continuous Surveillance, to comply with the Annexes that are now included in the new Comprehensive Systems Approach are a necessity.

4.5   CE-5

4.5.1   The provision and developments of technical guidance, explicative material, processes and procedures, tools (including facilities and equipments) safety critical information, policies, in form of a manual and/or check lists, to enable the technical personnel to perform their safety oversight functions in a standardized manner according to procedures, are now expanded to all 16 Annexes and safety oversight should be conducted in all areas sensitive to safety.

4.6   CE-6 - Licensing, certification, authorization, and/or approval obligations.

4.6.1   The implementation of   processes and procedures to ensure that personnel and organizations performing an aviation activity meet the established requirements before they are allowed to exercise the privilege of a license, certificate, authorization, and/or approval to conduct the relevant aviation activities,   for the DGCA/CAA to conduct oversight and continuous surveillance of these activities.

4.7   CE-7 - Surveillance Obligations

4.7.1   The implementation of processes such as inspection and audits, to proactively ensure the aviation license, certificate, authorization and/or approval of the holder, continue to meet the established requirements and function in a level of competency and safety required by the State to undertake the aviation activity for which they are being licensed, certified, authorized and/or approved to perform. This includes the surveillance of designated personnel who performs safety oversight functions on behalf of the DGCA.

4.7.2   The process to implement an oversight surveillance plan and the proper sequence of inspection and audits is in accordance with Doc 8335 AN 979; this is currently implemented on all Annexes that have an impact on aviation safety.

4.8   CE-8 - Resolutions of safety Concerns

4.8.1   The implementation of processes and procedures to resolve identified deficiencies impacting aviation safety, which may have residing on the system and which have been detected by the regulatory authority or other appropriate bodies, will also include the ability to analyze safety deficiencies, forward recommendations, support the resolution of identified deficiencies, as well as take enforcement action when appropriate.

4.8.2   Under the new comprehensive system approach on two of the audits conducted in the region the most common deficiencies found are related to the implementation of the new Annexes to the structure of the DGCA/CAA.

5.   Conclusion

5.1   The new amendments to Annex 6, Part I, Appendix 5, applicable on 23 November 2006, read that the State of the Operator shall enact and implement laws that enable the State to regulate through a CAA or an equivalent organization established for that purpose. The legislation shall empower the Authority to discharge the oversight responsibilities of the State. The legislation shall provide for the making of regulations, the certification and continued supervision of air operator, and the resolution of safety issues identified by the Authority.

5.2   The primary basic legislation of most of DGCA/CAA States do not allow or empower the Director General, to be able to issue or enact regulations that are supported by National Law. This will considerably delay the compliance with the convention articles and will slow authorities on the implementation of the safety oversight surveillance.

5.3   The SOA audit system designed one Compliance Check list (CC) for every Annex, in order to comply, the State must have the corresponding regulations approved, and be supported by the National Legislation.

5.4   Under the new structure or under the old structure, which entailed never being audited in detail before, the need for a manual on policies and procedures arose, for each and every Annex incorporated to the audit programme. The in-detail procedures and policies should be integrated to existing manual of the DGCA/CAA or be kept as a department procedure manual.

5.5   The need for qualified personnel for the oversight and continuous surveillance, and the implementation of initial, advanced, and recurrent courses, training programme appropriate syllabus, and curricula, procedural guidance, explicative material, and the establishment of a continuous surveillance oversight plan in accordance with Doc 8335, AN 974 for every department currently being audited.

5.6   Some DGCA/CAA still provide aeronautical services, the separation between regulatory and aeronautical services, has to be clearly defined, while it is confusing and time consuming to provide services and oversight at the same time, specially when there is no qualified personnel.

5.7   The concession, transmittal, privatization, or any other form of acquisitions of aeronautical services by any entity that has to be over sighted and which is to be subject of continuous surveillance by the Authority is to be defined, and the responsibilities that each one acquires, should be clearly stated, so there is an outline of the regulatory and service providing functions.

5.8   The increase in deficiencies found in the surveillance obligations are a reflection of the ones found under CE-3, CE-4, and CE-5, the lack of implementation of these critical elements, will have a domino effect, as seen on the graphic depicted before of the sample audit conducted in the region.

6.   Action by the Meeting.

6.1   The Meeting is invited to:

   a)   note the information related to the overall implementation of the comprehensive systems approach as contained in Part one of this report;

   b)   note the information contained in paragraph 3.1 on the audit results and areas of concern identified;

   c)   note the information contained in paragraph 3.2 on the status of secondment of staff to ICAO to support the implementation of the programme;

   d)   note the information presented in paragraph 3.3 regarding the application of the procedure for transparency and disclosure and instruct the Secretariat accordingly; and

   e)   note the information presented in paragraphs 4 and 5 on the application of the critical elements in the USOAP;

— — — — — — —

APPENDIX A

ICAO UNIVERSAL SAFETY OVERSIGHT AUDIT PROGRAMME
UNDER THE COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEMS APPROACH
STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION

No.	State	Audit Dates	Status of the safety oversight audit report	Timelines
**Audits of Contracting States conducted under the comprehensive systems approach as of 30 April 2006**				
1.	Belgium	7 to 16 February 2006	Interim report under production.	On target
2.	**Canada**	**12 to 22 April 2005**	**Final report published on 24 February 2006.**	Completed
3.	**Costa Rica**	**10 to 23 January 2006**	**Interim report sent to the State for comments and submission of the corrective action plan.**	On target
4.	Czech Republic	6 to 15 December 2005	Interim report sent to the State for comments and submission of the corrective action plan.	On target
5.	Egypt	14 to 23 November 2005	Arabic version of the interim report sent to the State for comments and submission of the corrective action plan.	On target
6.	Fiji	17 to 26 January 2006	Interim report sent to the State for comments and submission of the corrective action plan.	On target
7.	Gambia	20 to 29 September 2005	Preparation of draft final report.	On target
8.	Germany	11 to 27 May 2005	Final report published on 28 April 2006.	Completed
9.	Kuwait	27 Nov. to 6 Dec. 2005	Arabic version of the interim report sent to the State for comments and submission of the corrective action plan.	Delayed
10.	Luxembourg	21 February to 2 March 2006	Interim report under production.	On target
11.	Malaysia	28 June to 7 July 2005	Final report published on 24 March 2006.	Completed
12.	New Zealand	14 to 23 March 2006	Interim report under production.	On target
13.	**Panama**	**18 to 27 October 2005**	**Spanish interim report sent to the State for comments and submission of the corrective action plan.**	On target
14.	Senegal	10 to 21 April 2006	Interim report under production.	On target
15.	Solomon Islands	28 March to 6 April 2006	Interim report under production.	On target
16.	Thailand	28 June to 7 July 2005	Final report sent to the State for comments.	On target
17.	Vanuatu	30 Jan. to 7 Feb. 2006	Interim report under production.	On target

	Audits of Contracting States to be conducted under the comprehensive systems approach between May and December 2006	
No.	**State**	**Audit Dates**
1.	Benin	19 to 28 September 2006
2.	Bhutan	26 September to 5 October 2006
3.	Botswana	9 to 18 May 2006
4.	Bulgaria	30 May to 8 June 2006
5.	Cameroon	3 to 12 July 2006
6.	Democratic Republic of the Congo	5 to 14 September 2006
7.	**El Salvador**	**6 to 15 June 2006**
8.	Ethiopia	5 to 14 December 2006
9.	Ghana	20 to 28 November 2006
10.	Greece	16 to 25 May 2006
11.	India	10 to 19 October 2006
12.	Italy	16 to 25 May 2006
13.	Jordan	6 to 14 November 2006
14.	Lebanon	24 October to 2 November 2006
15.	Liberia	15 to 19 May 2006
16.	Namibia	25 April to 4 May 2006
17.	Nigeria	7 to 16 November 2006
18.	Norway	2 to 11 May 2006
19.	Russian Federation	19 September to 4 October 2006
20.	Sierra Leone	8 to 12 May 2006
21.	Sudan	21 to 30 November 2006
22.	Togo	20 to 29 June 2006

	Audits of/visits to international organizations as of 30 April 2006	
No.	**International organization**	**Dates**
1.	European Organisation for the Safety of Air Navigation (EUROCONTROL)	Visited in conjunction with the audit of Germany from 11 to 27 May 2005
2.	European Aviation Safety Authority (EASA)	Audited from 29 November to 2 December 2005; Preparation of draft final report in progress.
3.	**Central American Corporation for Air Navigation Services (COCESNA), including Central American Aviation Safety Agency (ACSA) and Central American Air Navigation Services Agency (ACNA)**	**Visited in conjunction with the audit of Costa Rica** from 10 to 23 January 2006
4.	Agency for Air Navigation Safety in Africa and Madagascar (The) (ASECNA)	Visited in conjunction with the audit of Senegal from 10 to 21 April 2006
5.	Interstate Aviation Committee (IAC) (MAK)	Will be visited in conjunction with the audit of the Russian Federation from 19 Sept. to 4 Oct. 2006

Audits deferred by States as of 30 April 2006			
No.	State	Reason for deferral	Status
1.	Armenia	Changes in the aviation law and regulations.	Scheduled to be audited from 5 to 14 June 2007
2.	Bulgaria	Changes in the aviation law and regulations.	Scheduled to be audited from 30 May to 8 June 2006
3.	Cape Verde	Preparation for approval of ETOPs operations.	Has not been scheduled.
4.	Israel	Conversion of the Civil Aviation Administration to an Authority and related implications.	Scheduled to be audited from 22 to 31 January 2007
5.	**Trinidad and Tobago**	**Preparation for FAA's IASA.**	**Scheduled to be audited from 27 February to 8 March 2007.**

Safety Oversight Auditor Training Courses conducted as of 30 April 2006			
No.	Venue	Dates	Number of participants
1.	Headquarters, Montreal	6 to 15 December 2004	15
2.	Headquarters, Montreal	22 February - 3 March 2005	22
3.	ICAO European and North Atlantic Office, Paris, France	14 to 22 March 2005	22
4.	ICAO Asia and Pacific Office, Bangkok, Thailand	14 to 23 June 2005	22
5.	Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Washington D.C. *	19 to 27 July 2005	23
6.	ICAO Western and Central African Office, Dakar, Senegal	6 to 15 September 2005	24
7.	ICAO South American Office, Lima, Peru	4 to 13 October 2005	25
8.	Department of Civil Aviation of Brazil, Rio de Janeiro *	28 March to 6 April 2006	24
		Total:	**177**
* Safety oversight auditor training courses conducted at the States' request on a cost-recovery basis.			

- A4 -

SOA Seminar/Workshops conducted as of 30 April 2006			
No.	**Venue**	**Dates**	**Number of participants**
1.	ICAO Asia and Pacific Office, Bangkok, Thailand	17 to 19 January 2005	115
2.	ICAO Eastern and Southern African Office, Nairobi, Kenya	26 to 28 January 2005	47
3.	ICAO Middle East Office, Cairo, Egypt	31 January to 2 February 2005	69
4.	ICAO Western and Central African Office, Dakar, Senegal	7 to 9 February 2005	56
5.	ICAO North American, Central American and Caribbean Office, Mexico	9 to 11 March 2005	50
6.	ICAO South American Office, Lima, Peru	14 to 16 March 2005	27
7.	ICAO European and North Atlantic Office, Paris, France	9 to 11 March 2005	73
		Total:	**437**

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

APPENDIX B

GRAPHICS OF AUDITS CONDUCTED UNDER BOTH SYSTEMS

Critical Elements of a Safety Oversight System
Lack of Effective Implementation (%)
Applied to Annexes 1, 6 and 8

Global Initial Audit - 181 Contracting States (32.62%)
Global Audit Follow-up - 181 Contracting States (17.46%)
Initial Audit – 162 Contracting States (29.80%)
Audit Follow-up – 162 Contracting States (13.64%)

Primary Aviation Legislation
Specific Operating Regulations
Civil Aviation System and Safety Oversight Functions
Qualification and Training of Technical Staff
Procedures and Technical Guidance
Licensing and Certification Obligations
Surveillance Obligations
Resolution of Safety Issues

Critical Elements of a Safety Oversight System

(Applied to all Safety related Annexes)

Lack of Effective Implementation (%)

- END -