



**WORKING PAPER**

**ASSEMBLY — 39TH SESSION**

**TECHNICAL COMMISSION**

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

**USOAP CMA SELF ASSESSMENT AS AN INTERNAL SAFETY ASSURANCE TOOL**

(Presented by Canada)

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Using the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) On Line Framework (OLF) for performing internal evaluation and quality assurance to meet the requirement of a Safety Assurance system. This concept could help other countries establish and maintain their own safety assurance activities at a fraction of the cost as it would provide easy criteria for which to evaluate against. This could also tie into the No Country Left Behind (NCLB) initiative because it could provide a starting point for developing countries to ensure that their safety assurance activities are relevant and accessible.

**Action:** The Assembly is invited to recognize the value in the USOAP CMA for more than simply reporting. The protocol questions (PQ) information can be used as the state's internal assessment providing evidence for changes and continuous process improvements. Because the system is already established and available to all states it can easily be used, even by those with little financial or human resources helping in an effort to support No Country Left Behind (NCLB) initiative.

<i>Strategic Objectives:</i>	This working paper relates to the Safety and Economic Development of Air Transport Strategic Objectives.
<i>Financial implications:</i>	Should reduce the resources required for establishing or enhancing a state's safety assurance system.
<i>References:</i>	Annex 19 — <i>Safety Management</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 As part of a State Safety Program (SSP) each state is expected to develop their own Safety assurance component for the internal review or assessment of the SSP and its safety policy in order to assure continuous conformance and improvement.

1.2 This component is expected to be independent of the review process and accountable for follow-up action. The State is expected to have established mechanisms to ensure effective monitoring of the eight critical elements of the safety oversight function. The State is also expected to establish mechanisms to ensure that the identification of hazards and the management of safety risks by service providers follow established regulatory controls (requirements, specific operating regulations and implementation policies). These mechanisms include inspections, audits and surveys to ensure that regulatory safety risk controls are appropriately integrated into the service provider's SMS, that they are being practised as designed, and that the regulatory controls have the intended effect on safety risks.

1.3 Establishing an assurance system can be troublesome and time consuming for well-resourced states and even more so for those without great resources of technical specialization.

## 2. DISCUSSION

2.1 While the PQ self evaluation system is not a complete safety assurance system it covers the majority of topic areas and ensures that a state has assessed themselves as to whether or not they are currently meeting the ICAO standards and thereby operating in a safe manner. It is structured in a way that forces a state to probe themselves as to how they are meeting the eight critical elements of the safety oversight function.

2.2 Carrying out the self-evaluation activity in USOAP CMA helps a state demonstrate compliance and identify areas for improvement that can be utilized internally for continuous improvement and linkage to program developments. This concept applies to all member states well-resources or otherwise.

## 3. CONCLUSION

3.1 Utilization and recognition that the 1099 PQ in the USOAP CMA are a valid methodology for a state to conduct an internal assessment of their own ability to carry out and implement the ICAO standards aimed at making all states operate at a safe level. The PQ are set up to specifically check the eight critical elements of the safety oversight function but really demonstrate how effectively the state has implemented safety actions to reduce risk and manage safety.

— END —