



国际民用航空组织

工作文件

FALP/14-WP/22

18/3/26

第1号修改稿

(Revision No. 1)

21/3/26

简化手续专家组 (FALP)

第十四次会议

2026年4月20日至24日，蒙特利尔

议程项目 3：关于附件 9 — 《简化手续》的修订

机组人员身份识别与简化手续

(由加拿大、联合王国、国际航空运输协会 (IATA)、
航空公司驾驶员协会国际联合会 (IFALPA)、国际运输工人联盟 (ITF)、
全球快递协会 (GEA) 和国际航空货运协会 (TIACA) 提交)

摘要

机组成员证 (CMC) 于 1949 年问世，原意旨在便利机组人员跨越国际边境通行。然而，颁发机组成员证的国家在所有缔约国中为数不多。与此同时，随着运行实践后来的演变，如今更多依靠护照连同航空公司颁发的机组人员身份证件便利机组人员的流动。这一做法不仅证明同样有效，而且接受面更广，行政负担较轻，但提供同等水平的安保保障，这说明应修订附件 9 — 《简化手续》的标准和建议措施 (SARPs)，以反映当前的做法。

简化手续专家组的行动：

请简化手续专家组 (FALP)：

- a) 同意本工作文件附录 A 中所载对附件 9 标准和建议措施的拟议修订。

1. 引言

1.1 根据附件 9 的标准和建议措施，持机组成员证的人比采用其他机组身份证明形式者享有一定的优势 (见附件 9 第 3 章 M 节 3.71、3.71.2)。但在实践中，国际民航组织多数成员国在边境出入境要求上，对护照加其他机组身份证件与机组成员证是同等对待的。因此，现行入境签证考虑制定的标准和建议措施，恐无意中已成为阻碍执勤机组人员无缝高效通行的障碍。在国际民航组织大会第 42 届会议上提交的 WP/285 号工作文件 — 机组人员身份识别与附件 9 规定的框架，以及 WP/323 号工作文件 — 机组人员身份识别与简化手续，旨在促进机组人员身份识别和简化手续方面全球协调一致的、基于绩效的做法，得到了成员国的广泛支持。

1.2 附件 9 和国际民航组织 Doc 9303 号文件《机读旅行证件》，为全球接受护照为主要且最可靠的身份证件确立了法律、技术和操作基础，因而最大化削弱了机组成员证作为机组人员身份证件的历史作用。虽然附件 17 —《航空安保》中载有与核查机组人员身份相关的安保规定，包括通行管制和进入安保限制区时的身份验证，但其中并未提及机组成员证。

2. 讨论

2.1 简化手续目标与附件 9 第 3 章 M 节机组和航空器运营人的其他人员的身份证明与入境中的硬性规定之间存在不一致。标准 3.71 要求各国给予持机组成员证者免签入境待遇。然而，目前颁发机组成员证的仅有 16 个成员国和 1 个特别行政区（SAR）。¹ 不发此证的国家表示实施方面存在财务成本、操作复杂和行政负担障碍。不用机组成员证的多数机组由建议措施（RP）3.71.1 规范，而该建议仅鼓励各国豁免签证要求。不过，目前大多数国家对大多数机组并无签证要求，而是接受护照附带机组身份卡的办法。在此背景下，即便机组成员证系由国家主管部门颁发，但它的身份识别效用似乎并不比大多数国家目前接受机组免签入境来得更大。

2.2 自 1997 年以来，机组成员证预期会以机读卡形式制发，且应符合 Doc 9303 号文件《机读旅行证件》第 5 部分规定的 TD1 型机读官方旅行证件（MROTDs）规范。这些规范近年未作更新，其是否仍完全符合当今的技术能力和简化手续需求还是一个问题。

2.3 各国却优先加强了护照的安保特性，护照仍然是国际旅行中认可度最高、安保性最强、互操作性最大的身份证件。随着 Doc 9303 号文件技术规范的逐步发展，电子护照应运而生，当前被视为最安保的旅行证件。相当一部分机组人员持电子护照。² 因此，曾为机组成员证设想的身份识别功能，实际上已被护照和电子护照更优越的安保特性及广泛的国际认可所取代。

2.4 较之机组成员证，机组身份卡由航空器运营人颁发，机组日常接受背景安保复查，并在出发地点接受系统检查。此类措施由负责监督航空器运营人的国家定期加以实施。根据附件 9 标准 3.70，机组身份卡和机组成员证仅可在相关公共当局或其代表完成背景调查后始得颁发。此要求与附件 17 标准 3.5.2 一致，并须接受普遍安保审计计划 — 持续监测做法（USAP-CMA）项下核查。

2.5 重要的是，机组人员通过履行具体的运行安保职责，直接为保卫民用航空做出贡献。其中包括根据附件 17 标准 4.3.1 进行飞机搜查和起飞前检查；确保按照标准 4.3.3 持续保护飞行驾驶舱；以及运用行为侦测技术观察乘客是否有潜在威胁或扰乱行为的征象。这些职责是航空器运行整体安全和安保不可或缺的组成部分。

2.6 根据国际民航组织旅行者身份识别方案（TRIP）身份证明指南，对身份确认与核查采用的全面、基于风险和分层级方法可同样适用于航空机组，包括使用能达到附件 17 第 4 章标准 4.2.3 和 4.2.4 及相关安保措施规定的同等保障水平的另类形式的机组身份证明。

2.7 下文附录 A 中拟议的修订无意不利于当前颁发并信赖机组成员证的国家，因为此证在这些国

¹ 捷克、埃及、芬兰、法国、德国、中国（仅香港特别行政区）、中国、巴拿马、卡塔尔、沙特阿拉伯、南非、斯里兰卡、瑞士、泰国、土耳其、阿拉伯联合酋长国、越南。此名单可能不完整。

² 根据国际民用航空组织（ICAO）的数据，目前有超过 160 个国家颁发电子护照。

家简化手续框架内仍然发挥着作用。更无意在机组身份识别形式中设立什么等级。其目标所向，是推动附件 9 标准和建议措施的现代化，不再将机组成员证倚作机组身份识别的首要形式，转而采用一种新的模式：将用于出入境及身份识别目的的护照与职业身份卡结合使用，承认其同等效力。

3. 建议

3.1 请简化手续专家组：

- a) 同意本工作文件附录 A 中所载对附件 9 标准和建议措施的拟议修订。

附录 A

关于附件 9 — 《简化手续》的修订提案

第 3 章：人员及其行李的入境和离境

.....

M. 机组和航空器运营人的其他人员的身份证明与入境

.....

3.71 当机组成员以执勤身份随国际航班抵达并寻求在接受国所允许的期限内临时入境时，各缔约国必须接受按照标准 3.68 的要求颁发的机组成员证，使机组成员无需签证即可入境。

3.xx 接受机组成员证免签入境的缔约国，必须同样接受按照 Doc 9303 号文件第 4 部分要求颁发的护照连同机组身份卡一并使用，允许相关机组人员免签入境。

3.71.1 建议措施：对以执勤身份随国际航班抵达并寻求在接受国所允许的期限内临时入境的机组成员，各缔约国应该豁免其签证要求。

3.71.2 建议措施：对出具了机组成员证或护照连同机组身份卡的抵达机组成员，当其使用另一航空器运营人或另一运输模式抵达，并寻求在接受国所允许的期限内临时入境，以便以执勤身份加入其被分派的航班时，各缔约国应该豁免其签证要求。

.....

APPENDIX B
NEW or REVISED SARP PROPOSAL: AMENDMENT, ANNEX 9, CHAPTER 3,
[STANDARD/RECOMMENDED PRACTICE]

IMPACT ASSESSMENT

1. What is the problem that this proposal is designed to address?

<i>Please include specific details</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Modernize SARPs to align with current operational practice and risk-based identity management - Reduce administrative burden without diminishing security - leveraging the passport/ePassport as the primary MRTD and airline crew IDs as occupational credentials.

2. What alternatives to SARPs were considered to solve the problem?

None	Circular	Manual	Policy	<i>Other (please explain)</i>
	X	X	X	Establishing a new working group or task force dedicated to reviewing current SARPs and policies to develop a strategy/policy or best approach forward, in addition to amending the current Annex 9) or tasking the FALP WGA9 to consider all the above.

3a. What is the impact of this proposal on a State?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Implementing this proposal will enhance civil aviation safety	X				

Rationale:
 Implementing this proposal would enhance civil aviation safety by reducing operational delays and administrative burdens associated with crew documentation requirements. In particular, it would alleviate organizational and scheduling challenges for airlines registered in States that do not currently issue Crew Member Certificates (CMCs), while also addressing delays that may arise at airports where crew recognition is limited to those holding a CMC.

By facilitating the recognition of alternative but equivalent crew identification documentation, the proposal would support more predictable and efficient crew processing. This, in turn, helps ensure that qualified crew members are able to perform their operational duties without unnecessary delays or last-minute substitutions, thereby supporting the safe and orderly conduct of flight operations.

Implementing this proposal will increase air navigation capacity and improve efficiency	X				
---	---	--	--	--	--

Rationale:
 Implementing this proposal would improve air navigation capacity and operational efficiency by reducing administrative barriers associated with the recognition of flight crew documentation. By allowing States to recognize crew members using a valid passport in combination with a crew identity card, alongside those holding a Crew Member Certificate (CMC), the proposal would help streamline crew processing at border control points and airports.

Reducing delays linked to documentation recognition would improve the predictability of crew movements and airline scheduling. This would help minimize disruptions such as delayed crew clearance, last-minute crew substitutions, or repositioning of alternate crew, all of which can affect flight departures and the efficient use of airport and airspace capacity.

By facilitating more reliable crew deployment and smoother operational planning, the proposal would contribute to more efficient flight operations and better utilization of available air navigation and airport capacity, thereby supporting the overall efficiency of the global air transport system.

<p>Implementing this proposal will enhance global civil aviation security and facilitation (taking into account impact on human rights, health and privacy, if any)</p>	<p>X</p>				
<p><i>Rationale:</i></p> <p>Implementing this proposal would enhance global civil aviation security and facilitation by clarifying the distinct purposes of travel and crew documentation. Historically, the CMC was meant to serve both as a travel document and as a means of identifying crew members. However, in practice, passports are now widely used to support entry and exit requirements, while crew identity cards serve to verify that an individual is a bona fide crew member. Clearly distinguishing these functions would reduce the risk of inconsistent implementation among States while harmonizing operational practice with the intent of Annex 9.</p> <p>Providing clearer guidance within ICAO provisions would help ensure that crew documentation is recognized and applied appropriately by frontline border and control authorities, thereby improving operational predictability and facilitating legitimate crew movements.</p> <p>The proposal does not introduce new personal data requirements and therefore does not create additional impacts on human rights, health, or privacy. Rather, it improves the clarity and consistent application of existing ICAO provisions, supporting secure, efficient, and predictable international aviation operations.</p>					
<p>Implementing this proposal will foster the development of a sound and economically-viable civil aviation system</p>	<p>X</p>				
<p><i>Rationale:</i></p> <p>Implementing this proposal would support the development of a sound and economically viable civil aviation system by promoting consistency and fairness in the facilitation of international flight crew movements. In particular, accepting the proposal would help ensure a level playing field among Member States with respect to the documentation issued to, and accepted for, flight crew.</p> <p>At present, some States issue Crew Member Certificates (CMCs), while the vast majority rely on alternative documentation such as passports in combination with crew identity cards. Where visa exemptions are granted specifically to crew holding a CMC, States that do not issue such certificates may be inadvertently placed at a disadvantage, despite their crew meeting identification and security requirements by way of a passport and other recognized documents.</p> <p>By allowing States the flexibility to recognize flight crew travelling with a valid passport and crew identity card, alongside those holding a CMC, the proposal would promote greater harmonization in facilitation practices and avoid unintended barriers to international operations. This approach supports operational efficiency for airlines, reduces administrative burdens, and ensures that crew members are treated equitably regardless of the documentation regime used by their State of registry.</p> <p>More broadly, the proposal reinforces ICAO’s objective of facilitating safe, secure, and efficient international air transport by enabling States to implement practical and interoperable documentation arrangements for flight crew.</p>					
<p>Implementing this proposal will minimize the adverse environmental effects of civil aviation activities</p>	<p>X</p>				
<p><i>Rationale:</i></p> <p>By facilitating the recognition of a passport and crew identification documents, the proposal would reduce administrative barriers that may lead to operational delays, crew repositioning flights, or inefficient crew deployment. Improving the</p>					

efficiency and predictability of international flight operations can help minimize unnecessary fuel burn and associated emissions, thereby contributing indirectly to reducing the environmental impact of civil aviation activities.

3b. Do the benefits of this proposal justify the cost of its implementation?

Yes	No	Not sure	Not applicable
			X

4a. What is the impact of this proposal on Industry?

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
Implementing this proposal will enhance civil aviation safety	X				

Rationale:

It would alleviate organizational and scheduling challenges for airlines registered in States that do not currently issue Crew Member Certificates (CMCs), while also addressing delays that may arise at airports where crew recognition is limited to those holding a CMC.

By facilitating the recognition of alternative but equivalent crew identification documentation, the proposal would support more predictable and efficient crew processing. This, in turn, helps ensure that qualified crew members are able to perform their operational duties without unnecessary delays or last-minute substitutions, thereby supporting the safe and orderly conduct of flight operations.

Implementing this proposal will increase air navigation capacity and improve efficiency	X				
---	---	--	--	--	--

Rationale:

Reducing delays linked to documentation recognition would improve the predictability of crew movements and airline scheduling. This would help minimize disruptions such as delayed crew clearance, last-minute crew substitutions, or repositioning of alternate crew, all of which can affect flight departures and the efficient use of airport and airspace capacity.

By facilitating more reliable crew deployment and smoother operational planning, the proposal would contribute to more efficient flight operations and better utilization of available air navigation and airport capacity, thereby supporting the overall efficiency of the global air transport system.

Implementing this proposal will enhance global civil aviation security and facilitation (taking into account impact on human rights, health and privacy, if any)	X				
--	---	--	--	--	--

Rationale:

Annex 9 to be re-equilibrated to reflect the current crew facilitation practice of States and improve crew facilitation across borders. Clear recognition in Annex 9 that the combination of a passport and a crew identity card is equivalent to CMC, which is currently the practice of most States when it comes to visas on crew. With the vast majority of countries not issuing CMCs to their crew (only 17 States do issue CMC) and Annex 9 only mandating visa waiving for crew holding a CMC, Annex 9 has inadvertently become limiting in its facilitation provisions for crew. The proposal aims at correcting the situation to reflect current practice.

Implementing this proposal will foster the development of a sound and economically-viable civil aviation system	X				
---	---	--	--	--	--

<i>Rationale:</i>					
Most States do not currently impose including visas on crew. With this re-equilibration of Annex 9 and broadening the recognition of documents held by crew, will help assisting a more economically viable civil aviation system by avoiding costs and burden such as: cost for obtaining the authorization to travel, delays upon crew arrival impacting crew resting times, administrative cost of managing crew authorizations to travel, limiting the destinations crew can operate to due to authorizations to travel requirement, etc.					
Implementing this proposal will minimize the adverse environmental effects of civil aviation activities			X		
<i>Rationale:</i>					

4b. Do the benefits of this proposal justify the cost of its implementation?

Yes	No	Not sure	Not applicable
X			

5. How long would it take for States and Industry to implement this proposal?

Already implemented	0-1 years	1-2 years	2-5 years	5-10 years	More than 10 years
X					
The proposed changes to the SARPs serve to clarify the legitimacy of already existing practices rather than affect change.					

6. Financial implications of the proposal

<p>The cost impact on States would include:</p> <p>There is no technical impact anticipated. That is specifications (MRZ formats, LDS, biometric encodings, security features, test regimes, are unchanged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Re: Technical impact: There are no technical changes to Doc 9303 specifications required by the Annex 9 amendment itself. It is a facilitation policy change, not a document-format or data-structure change. - Re: Passports: Already governed by Doc 9303 Part 4; the proposed Annex 9 language makes clear that the passport is the MRTD element in the acceptance pathway. - Re: Crew Identity Cards: These are recognized as operational credentials. Their acceptance in combination with the passport is a policy decision under Annex 9, not a change to Doc 9303 technical specs. - Re: CMCs: CMCs will remain MRTDs per Doc 9303 (historically Part 5 TD1-format expectations). The Annex 9 amendment does not alter their technical requirements; it adds equivalency for another accepted pathway. <p>For those States that don't issue CMCs, there is no cost impact anticipated. For those States that only recognize CMC holders as crew, there may be an impact on their processes, to also allow crew that hold a passport and other crew identity cards.</p> <p>With operational communications, States, issuers, airlines, and border agencies will understand that the new Annex 9 equivalency does not trigger redesign of passports or CMCs, but may require changes to digital or electronic Travel Authorizations.</p> <p>The cost impact on the industry would include:</p>

The proposed changes to the SARPs serve to clarify the legitimacy of already existing practices rather than affect change.

IMPLEMENTATION TASK LIST AND OUTLINE OF GUIDANCE MATERIAL

1. IMPLEMENTATION TASK LIST

1.1 Essential steps to be followed by a State in order to implement proposed amendments¹

[SARP/TOPIC]

1.1.1 For States that already [implement the SARP or take action on the TOPIC], no action is necessary. For those that do not, the essential steps are the following:

a) . . .

Legislation, regulations, policies, procedures, training, implementation, modification, supervision, assessment, compliance, gap analysis, consideration,

[Example (for illustration only):

[Assistance to aircraft accident victims and their families

For States that have established legislation, regulations and/or policies in support of assistance to aircraft accident victims and their families, and that are aligned with Doc 9998 and Doc 9973, no action may be required. For those that do not, the essential steps are the following:

- a) identify established legislation, regulations and/or policies;
- b) gap analysis between established legislation, regulations, and/policies, and Doc 9998 and Doc 9973;
- c) decisions on whether to introduce new provision to align with ICAO guidance material;
- d) modification and/or development of provision;
- e) official adoptions of provisions;
- f) implementation of newly adopted provisions by applicable entities;
- g) modification of an oversight framework; and

¹ Amendment of a format or clarification nature are not allowed in this Appendix.

h) supervision by the State of provisions, as appropriate.]

2. STANDARDIZATION PROCESS

2.1 Effective date: [] [Month/Year]: to be completed by Secretariat

2.2 Applicability date: [] [Month/Year]: to be completed by Secretariat

3. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION:

3.1 ICAO documentation:

Title	Type	Publication date
	Manual/Other Guidance Material/Web page	

3.2 External documentation:

Title	External Organization	Publication date

4. IMPLEMENTATION ASSISTANCE TASKS

Type	Global	Regional
[Seminar/Symposium/Workshop/etc.]		

**5. UNIVERSAL SECURITY AUDIT PROGRAMME (USAP)
OR UNIVERSAL SAFETY OVERSIGHT PROGRAMME
(USOAP)**

5.1 [No] [additional] protocol questions required under USAP [USOAP].