



International Civil Aviation Organization

WORKING PAPER

A42-WP/388¹
EX/167
29/7/25

ASSEMBLY — 42ND SESSION

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda Item 14: Audit Programmes – Continuous Monitoring Approach

SHARING OF INSIGHTS FROM THE USOAP AND SSP-IA PROGRAMMES TO EVOLVE ICAO SARPs

(Presented by the International Air Transport Association (IATA) and
International Business Aircraft Council (IBAC))

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Universal Safety Oversight and Audit Programme (USOAP) was established to monitor the fulfilment of safety oversight obligations by states, including the assessment of the implementation of Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) and guidance material. The State safety programme – implementation assessment (SSP-IA) is a complementary programme which assesses the effective implementation of a SSP by a State.

An effective risk-based surveillance programme takes the outcomes from surveillance activities as a source of intelligence to feed back into the programme to support its evolution, including the drafting of provisions.

There is a lack of visibility of insights gained from both the USOAP and SSP-IA for the expert groups (panels) charged with the drafting ICAO SARPs and guidance material. Consequently, an opportunity is missed to evolve provisions that take into consideration surveillance outcomes from USOAP and SSP-IA.

Actions: The Assembly is invited to:

- a) recognize the importance of enhancing the visibility and timely accessibility of insights derived from the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) and the State safety programme - implementation assessment (SSP-IA) mechanism to ICAO expert groups, particularly panels;
- b) task ICAO with exploring enhancements to the governance of relevant programmes, with a view to enabling expert groups to respond more effectively to data-driven intelligence, thereby strengthening the evidence-based foundation of standard-setting activities; and
- c) task ICAO with developing a structured mechanism to ensure that expert groups, including panels responsible for the development and initial drafting of Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs), are systematically informed by relevant safety intelligence - particularly outcomes from the USOAP and SSP-IA activities—thereby providing data-driven information to the ICAO standard-setting process.

¹ English, Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian and Spanish versions provided by IATA.

<i>Strategic Goals:</i>	This working paper relates to the Strategic Goals <i>Every Flight is Safe and Secure; and Aviation Delivers Seamless, Accessible and Reliable Mobility for All.</i>
<i>Financial implications:</i>	It is not expected that there will be significant financial implications to ICAO, given this work can be developed by the existing working bodies. IATA is ready to support the developments required for addressing the proposed actions.
<i>References:</i>	Annex 19 — <i>Safety Management</i> , Amendment 2 Doc 9859, <i>Safety Management Manual (SMM)</i> , 4th Edition

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Universal Safety Oversight and Audit Programme (USOAP) was established to monitor the fulfilment of safety oversight obligations by states, including the assessment of the implementation of standards, recommended practices and guidance material.

1.2 The State safety programme – implementation assessment (SSP-IA) is a complementary programme which assesses the effective implementation of a State safety programme (SSP) by a State.

2. A RISK-BASED APPROACH

2.1 Risk-based surveillance is widely recognised as a progressive approach for undertaking surveillance activities, with an associated standard in Annex 19 — *Safety Management* requiring states to implement such an approach: “*States shall establish procedures to prioritize surveillance activities towards those areas of greater safety concern or need*” [Annex 19, Amendment 2].

2.2 Surveillance outcomes can provide an indication of weak areas of provision implementation, that the provision was not well developed and requires evolution, or that enhanced guidance is required to support implementation.

2.3 An effective risk-based surveillance programme takes the outcomes from surveillance activities as a source of intelligence to feed back into the programme to support its evolution, including its provisions.

2.4 In the USOAP/SSP-IA setting, this translates into the findings and observations from the programmes being made available as part of the process for the drafting of Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs), and supporting guidance material, resulting in continuous improvement.

3. IMPROVED VISIBILITY

3.1 The initial drafting of SARPs is typically undertaken by subject matter experts participating in ICAO expert groups (panels), prior to the eventual adoption by the ICAO Council.

3.2 The details of USOAP findings and SSP-IA observations are made available to the state who received the audit, and in a de-identified format, to other member states. Additionally, the lack of effective implementation (LEI) of critical elements scores are made available on ICAO website.

3.3 However, the detailed outcomes of surveillance (in an appropriately de-identified format) are not provided to the expert groups who undertake the initial drafting of SARP provisions.

3.4 Consequently, the drafting of provisions does not take into consideration real world safety management implementation challenges identified for service providers and states that are highlighted through the USOAP and via an SSP-IA.

3.5 ICAO provisions can only be evolved to their greatest potential if the expert groups charged with their drafting are furnished with insights obtained from the USOAP and SSP-IA.

4. EVOLUTION OF ICAO PROVISIONS

4.1 Prescriptive provisions provide a baseline level of risk mitigation. However, the benefits of performance-based provisions are widely recognised; where, instead of specifying a prescriptive means to meet an outcome or objective, the outcome is specified, where the service provider or state is free to determine the most effective and appropriate means to deliver this outcome.

4.2 Providing insights from the USOAP, SSP-IA programme and de-identified differences filed by Member States – Electronic Filing of Differences (EFOD) would provide enhanced information to identify the prescriptive based provisions which are suitable candidates to be evolved to be performance-based.

5. CONCLUSION

5.1 There is a lack of visibility of insights gained from both the USOAP and SSP-IA for the expert groups (panels) charged with the drafting ICAO SARPs and guidance material.

5.2 Consequently, an opportunity is missed for the evolution of ICAO SARPs to take into consideration surveillance outcomes from USOAP and SSP-IA.

5.3 Providing insights from the USOAP and SSP-IA would support to movement towards a greater number of provisions becoming performance based, rather than prescriptive.

— END —