



**WORKING PAPER**

**ASSEMBLY — 39TH SESSION**

**TECHNICAL COMMISSION**

**Agenda Item 33: Aviation safety and air navigation monitoring and analysis**

**USOAP CMA TOOLS INITIATING BILATERAL AGREEMENTS**

(Presented by Canada)

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Canada is suggesting an approach to use countries' inputs into the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) tools as the first step for requesting bilateral agreements. The USOAP CMA inputs are collected in the On-Line Framework (OLF) and could be compared between the requesting and requested countries. The results could be used on a preliminary basis to understand which areas require more or less investigation and focus when developing an agreement or even in choosing not to develop an agreement.

**Action:** The Assembly is invited to:

- a) recognize the value in the USOAP CMA OLF for more than simply reporting. The reported information can be used for saving time and resources while partnering many states in an effort to support No Country Left Behind (NCLB) initiative; and
- b) acknowledge that there are enhancements that can be made to the USOAP CMA OLF in the way of adding automated comparison tools to make it even more valuable to all states.

<i>Strategic Objectives:</i>	This working paper relates to the Safety and Economic Development of Air Transport Strategic Objectives.
<i>Financial implications:</i>	Unknown costs or time but primarily expected to be in the way of sharing resources in the long term and saving initial travel and evaluation time in the short term. There may be costs associated with enhancements to computer program used for OLF.
<i>References:</i>	USOAP CMA website <a href="http://www.icao.int/safety/cmaforum/Pages/default.aspx">http://www.icao.int/safety/cmaforum/Pages/default.aspx</a>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Given the Global aviation business and the need to encourage the best use of resources bilateral arrangements are clearly seen as a method of maximizing efficiency particularly where state programs are run with sufficiently equivalent methods. Although effective in the long term at sharing resources between authorities, entering into bilateral agreements is time consuming, difficult and very politically based even though the intent is simple – to be more effective and efficient with all of our resources. Oftentimes initiation can be the most difficult part.

1.2 ICAO is a common denominator for all aviation authorities. It is understood that we all have different ways of doing the job and of understanding of each other's programs but we all have the intent of meeting ICAO standards in one manner or another. The USOAP CMA tools identify against the ICAO standards where each authority is with respect to implementation of those standards. The OLF contains information on a state's self evaluation under protocol questions (PQ), the electronic filing of differences (EFOD), audit reports, corrective action plans (CAP), State Aviation Activity Questionnaire (SAAQ) and Significant Safety Concerns (SSC). With the OLF and the concept of CMA these are all available and shared for safety improvements.

1.3 Combining these two demands and utilizing tools already provided, Canada and the other member states can benefit from the data residing in the USOAP CMA tools to save time and resources in the initial evaluation of potential bilateral partners.

## 2. DISCUSSION

2.1 The USOAP CMA has the key elements of ICAO requirements covered in the PQ self assessment, the SAAQ, the EFOD, the CAP and audit information already stored and populated in the system. All countries have access to it. This information could be compared using the common structure of the OLF to determine the similarities and differences between the two or more authorities without having to compare regulatory structures line by line.

2.2 Entering into an agreement in the simplest of senses is about 1) comparing the two systems for common practices to ensure that they are compatible and 2) gaining confidence in each others' programs and conduct with respect to meeting those practices. Once these are established some acceptance of the work of another authority in place of the resident authority can be granted and in time even extended as the experience with 1) and 2) has demonstrated the abilities of each authority.

2.3 While this can demonstrate similarities it will also show and highlight the differences. A simple evaluation of the differences filed in EFOD, in responses to PQs or in responses to audits and CAPs may show sufficient reasoning not to enter into an agreement and save those involved countless person-hours and/or travel costs.

2.4 States that are active and keeping their OLF up-to-date are ready and prepared to be compared and initiate agreements to facilitate the movement of aeronautical services and products. Those that do not keep their information up will not benefit from a quicker processing time. For those states seeking a bilateral agreement or other arrangement the comparison of responses in the OLF would serve as an excellent starting point to evaluate where differences need to be bridged or where an arrangement

would not make sense. Equally the comparison would also hold supporting arguments on similarities where an agreement would be practical.

### 3. **POTENTIAL ENHANCEMENTS TO OLF**

3.1 It would not be a large stretch for ICAO to add tool(s) that will evaluate two countries responses and information for a comparison of similarities and more importantly the items of difference. This would then facilitate the negotiation process by identifying where differences in systems are and what those differences might entail. This initial comparison could almost be automated within the OLF. This would not replace the necessary evaluations and negotiations between states but it would allow for a more focused discussion on the proposals.

3.2 The tasking would be on the ICAO audit group running the OLF to build these comparison tools. It is unknown what costs or time would be needed to make these features available. However the OLF has already built in a number of informative and demonstrative status tools and the data exists in the system so making it available in a comparative tool would seem reasonable.

### 4. **CONCLUSION**

4.1 While this is not a feature currently in the OLF the OLF does provide the ability to states to review manually the information shared in the OLF and allows for those states to engage each other with some known base line information. While confidence building cannot be replaced by such evaluation methodologies these can facilitate two or more states getting to the point of starting the confidence building exercise and easing the regulatory program comparison tasks.

4.2 For countries with fewer resources this is a way to work with those with more resources to enter into agreements where it makes sense for the states to partner while not becoming a huge burden at the initiation stage. Where states are sufficiently similar from responses in EFOD, PQs, SAAQ, CAPs and audit findings and there is mutual benefit in an agreement the initial evaluation could be quite helpful and where the two States are not sufficiently similar this could also be evident in the preliminary assessment saving both time and resources in comparing where there are significant differences in the way the programs are run.