



ASSEMBLY — 42ND SESSION

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda Item 14: Audit Programmes – Continuous Monitoring Approach

ON ENHANCING INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL SYSTEMS OF CONTROL AND OVERSIGHT OVER THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF ICAO STANDARDS AND RECOMMENDED PRACTICES IN THE FIELD OF AVIATION SECURITY

(Presented by the Russian Federation)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The present document contains information on the need to improve international and national systems of control and oversight over the effective implementation of ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) in the field of aviation security.

Action: The Assembly is invited to:

- support the further development of the Universal Security Audit Programme Continuous Monitoring Approach (USAP-CMA) and, on its basis, the enhancement of national systems of control and oversight over the effective implementation of ICAO standards and recommended practices in the field of aviation security;
- recommend that States and their national aviation security control and oversight bodies, when submitting voluntary annual reports on the implementation of the Global Aviation Security Plan (GASeP), provide data on the implementation of the measures under the corrective action plan (CAP) to be taken into account in the assessment of the level of effective implementation (EI); and
- request the ICAO Secretariat and the ICAO Secretariat Study Group to explore the possibility of setting up a mechanism in the UPAS-CMA system to track implementation of the CAP measures in assessing the EI level of States and in the final assessment of the implementation of GASeP.

<i>Strategic Goals:</i>	This working paper relates to <i>No Country Left Behind</i> .
<i>Financial implications:</i>	Not applicable

¹ Russian version provided by the Russian Federation

<i>References:</i>	Doc 10184, <i>Assembly Resolutions in Force (as of 7 October 2022)</i>. Doc 10118, <i>Global Aviation Security Plan (GASeP)</i> State letter AS 8/1.5-25/53, Muscat Declaration on Aviation Security and Aviation Cybersecurity, dated 22 May 2025. A42-WP/4, <i>Implementation of the ICAO Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) Safety and Security Audit Programmes</i>. A42-WP/11 Revision No. 1, <i>Consolidated Statement on Continuing ICAO Policies Related to Aviation Security</i>. A42-WP/13, <i>Outcome of the High-level Ministerial Segment of the ICAO Security Week 2024 held in Muscat, Oman</i>.
--------------------	--

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The new edition of the ICAO Global Aviation Security Plan (GASeP) identifies six priority areas needed to improve aviation security.

1.2 Among the six priorities identified in GASeP, attention is drawn to the importance of aviation security oversight, which requires States to work actively to implement and adapt ICAO international standards and recommendations in their national oversight systems.

1.3 Given the current threats in the field of civil aviation security, the development of effective national oversight systems integrated with international rules and standards is becoming a critically important task.

1.4 In this context, it is imperative to establish effective monitoring and reporting mechanisms aimed at enhancing the effective implementation of ICAO standards.

1.5 The achievement of the GASeP Global Priorities is continuously monitored by ICAO to ensure that ICAO Member States improve their EI score each year.

1.6 The EI targets identified by GASeP for 2027 (65 per cent of States will attain or exceed an EI score of 75 per cent), 2030 (80 per cent of States will attain or exceed an EI score of 75 per cent) and 2033 (100 per cent of States will attain or exceed an EI score of 75 per cent).

1.7 Effective control and oversight provide the basis for the implementation of all aspects of GASeP and facilitates the direct monitoring of progress in aviation security.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 Effective control and oversight are key to attainment of these objectives, and the Universal Security Audit Programme Continuous Monitoring Approach (USAP-CMA) is an important tool for monitoring implementation of the levels of EI.

2.2 Each State should adapt and implement in its national legislation a system of national control and supervision over the effective implementation of international standards established by ICAO.

This will create a harmonized system in which international and national bodies work synergistically to achieve common goals.

2.3 GAsEP provides a form for annual voluntary reporting by States on the implementation of all six Global Priorities of GAsEP.

2.4 Monitoring of the completion and submission of these reporting forms will clearly also be entrusted to the national aviation security control and oversight bodies.

2.5 Effective arrangements for aviation security oversight that link international standards to national oversight will enable States not only to comply but also to monitor their progress.

2.6 The results of the review of States under USAP-CMA by the ICAO audit team in accordance with the existing Protocol Questions (PQs) will be reflected in the EI indicator level and recommendations for improving the effectiveness of the implementation of ICAO standards.

2.7 The recommendations of the USAP-CMA audit team, issued on the basis of its assessment of the PQs, effectively form part of the system of risk indicators in the field of aviation security.

2.8 The more closely national control and oversight systems are integrated into the international process, the more precise and up to date the resulting recommendations will be, an outcome critical to assisting States in their self-assessment and making necessary adjustments.

2.9 The establishment of risk indicator arrangements at the national level, based on international standards, will enable the more accurate identification of problems and the adoption of action before serious consequences occur.

2.10 In the Russian Federation, in accordance with the Federal Law “On State Control (Oversight) and Municipal Control in the Russian Federation”, a system has been set in place for indicators of the risk of non-compliance with mandatory safety requirements and, if these indicators are triggered, a procedure is followed for the subsequent participation of the national oversight authority in the adoption of response measures.

2.11 The corrective action plan (CAP) for the implementation of the recommendations of the ICAO audit team is an important outcome of the review of States under USAP-CMA.

2.12 Effective implementation of the CAP significantly improves States’ EI score, as the activities included in the CAP have clear deadlines and require confirmation of implementation by ICAO. Implementation of the CAP should be systematically tracked, thereby ensuring more accurate monitoring of the implementation of planned actions.

2.13 In order to ascertain and monitor the real status of implementation of GAsEP in terms of the EI level over time, arrangements should be developed and introduced for the continuous tracking of implementation of the CAP in the final indicators of the EI level for States and GAsEP.

2.14 Particular note should be taken of the successful development of USAP-CMA and its information platform, which takes digitalization to a new and promising level in the international aviation security control system.

2.15 We believe that the new USAP-CMA information platform will enable continuous monitoring of the implementation of the CAP by States and ensure that these changes are taken into account in the EI levels for States and GASeP.

— END —