



ASSEMBLY — 42ND SESSION

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda Item 18: Capacity Development and Implementation Support – Policy and Activities

CAREER PATHWAY FOR CIVIL AVIATION SAFETY INSPECTORS (CASI)

(Presented by the Dominican Republic)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper presents a structured Career Pathway for Civil Aviation Safety Inspectors (CASI), fully aligned with the ICAO Inspector Competency Building Framework (ICBF). The model covers entry requirements, initial training, technical authorization, progression to senior level and eventual transition to technical leadership roles.

The aim is to professionalize the inspector function, harmonize competencies with international standards and strengthen State safety oversight. It is proposed that it be adopted as an institutional model and eventually considered a best practice, contributing to compliance with the State Operational Safety Program (SSP) and the expected outcomes of the ICAO's Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP).

<i>Strategic Goals:</i>	This study note relates to the Strategic Goals: <i>Every Flight is Safe and Secure</i> .
<i>Financial implications:</i>	The activities mentioned in this study note will be subject to the availability of resources from the 2026-2028 Regular Budget, as well as extrabudgetary and/or voluntary contributions.
<i>References:</i>	Document 10070 — <i>Manual on the Competencies of Civil Aviation Safety Inspectors (Disclaimer)</i> Document 8335 — <i>Manual of Procedures for Operations Inspection, Certification and Continued Surveillance</i> Document 9734 — <i>Safety Oversight Manual</i> Document 9859 — <i>Safety Management Manual (SMM)</i> Inspector Competency Building Framework — ICBF Course, ICAO

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This note presents a structured proposal for the Professional Development Pathway for Civil Aviation Safety Inspectors (CASI), based on the Inspector Competency Building Framework (ICBF)

¹ English and Spanish submitted by the Dominican Republic

and ICAO Document 10070. The model covers entry requirements, initial basic training, technical authorization, progressive development to senior levels, and advancement to technical leadership roles.

1.2 This initiative seeks to professionalize the inspection function, align competencies with international standards, and strengthen state oversight of operational safety. It is proposed that it be integrated as an institutional model and potentially adopted as a regional best practice, contributing to compliance with the State Operational Safety Program (SSP) and the expected outcomes of the USOAP.

2. DISCUSSION

Phase 1 – Induction and Training Initial	
Objective (what and why)	To provide new inspectors with the essential knowledge, basic operational skills, and professional attitude necessary to support initial inspections in OPS, AIR, and PEL.
Scope (where applicable)	SARPs , professional ethics, use of the digital surveillance platform, and supervised OJT in the three regulated areas.
Expected impact (why it matters)	• +5 points in CE 4 before 2027. • - 15 % findings due to “ ignorance ” in internal audits.
Applicability (to whom)	Inspectors with < 1 year of experience or transferred from other specialties.
Key activities	1. Training in operational security, SARPs and certification. 2. Specialized training by area (OPS, AIR, PEL). 3. OJT in ≥ 20 real inspections. 4. Training in ethics and digital tools.
Assessments / Indicators	• Theoretical exam ≥ 80 %. • Satisfactory practical observation. • Positive behavioral report.
Duration	18 – 24 weeks ($\approx 4 - 6$ months).
Phase 2 – Authorization as Inspector of Safety	
Aim	Obtain the technical signature to carry out inspections and certifications independently.
Scope	Supervised audits and certifications; advanced risk management and mitigation.
Expected impact	-20 % repetitive findings due to incorrect procedures in the first year after -authorization.
Applicability	Inspectors who completed Phase 1 and have a recommendation from the OJT tutor.
Key activities	1. Active participation in files and audits. 2. Advanced risk management courses. 3. Integrated final evaluation (written exam) + simulated visit)
Assessments / Indicators	• Conformity ≥ 85 % on final check -ride. • Favorable opinion from the authorization panel.
Duration	9 – 15 months (average ≈ 12 months).

Phase 3 – Development towards Inspector Senior	
Aim	Acquire advanced supervisory, technical leadership, and data analysis skills to lead teams and mentor new inspectors.
Scope	Leadership, safety data analysis, advanced SMS management, and international audit simulations.
Expected impact	• +7 points in CE 7 by 2028.
	• - 15 % recurrent findings.
Applicability	Authorized inspectors with ≥ 3 years of experience and outstanding performance.
Key activities	1. Leadership and communication program.
	2. Data analysis workshop.
	3. Mentoring of ≥ 1 inspector (Phases 1 -2).
	4. International audit simulations as team leader.
Assessments / Indicators	• SMS project approved by management.
	• Satisfactory 360° evaluation.
Duration	4 – 6 months (≈ 10 -12 school weeks + application).
Phase 4 – Promotion to Inspector Major	
Aim	Assume a strategic role in state surveillance and international representation.
Minimum requirements	• ≥ 8 years in aviation, 5 as Senior.
	• ICAO English level 4+.
	• Outstanding performance.
Scope	Management of multidisciplinary teams, risk-based surveillance plan, regional coordination, and participation in ICAO committees.
Expected impact	Maintain USOAP ≥ 85 % and raise the maturity of the SSP to a proactive level.
Key activities	1. Leadership of strategic plans and complex missions.
	2. Representation in ICAO forums.
	3. Technical and institutional evaluations.
	4. Coaching Inspectors Senior.
Assessments / Indicators	• Compliance with strategic KPIs .
	• Positive internal and external feedback.
Duration	Continuous process; typical eligibility after 5 – 10 years of total career (average 7 – 9 years).

3. **CONCLUSION**

3.1 Implementing the pathway guarantees the training of highly qualified inspectors, aligned with international standards and committed to continuous improvement. Its implementation directly contributes to strengthening the State Operational Safety Program (SSP) improving USOAP indicators.

3.2 It is recommended that it be adopted institutionally as a technical talent management policy and promoted regionally as a replicable model within the framework of the SRVSOP and other multilateral initiatives.

— END —