



International Civil Aviation Organization

WORKING PAPER

A41-WP/379¹
EX/173
2/8/22

ASSEMBLY — 41ST SESSION

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda Item 15: Audit Programmes – Continuous Monitoring Approach

MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF STATE CORRECTIVE ACTION PLANS IN THE USOAP CMA ONLINE FRAMEWORK

(Presented by Cameroon)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This working paper assesses the review by ICAO of information entered by Member States in the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) online framework (OLF) regarding their corrective action plans (CAPs). A random sample of Member States in different regions shows significant time lags between the most recent updates in the OLF by States and review thereof by ICAO, in some cases several years. This state of affairs reveals dysfunction in the monitoring and evaluation of State CAPs submitted in the OLF.

Action: The Assembly is invited to:

- a) take note of the information in this working paper;
- b) request the Secretariat of ICAO to improve its mechanism for the monitoring and evaluation of CAPs, and validation of implementation thereof by States in the USOAP CMA OLF to allow for a timely response; and
- c) urge States to continue submitting updates in the USOAP CMA OLF on the progress achieved in improving their safety oversight systems.

<i>Strategic Objectives</i>	This working paper relates to the Strategic Objectives of Safety and of Air Navigation Capacity and Efficiency.
<i>Financial implications</i>	The activities referred to in this working paper can be undertaken within the resources available in the 2023-2025 Regular Programme Budget and/or from extra budgetary contributions.
<i>References</i>	Doc 10140 – <i>Assembly Resolutions in Force (as of 4 October 2019)</i> Doc 10137 – <i>Assembly Fortieth Session, Montréal, 24 September – 4 October 2019, Technical Commission Report</i> Doc 9735 – <i>Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme Continuous Monitoring Manual</i>

¹ French version provided by Cameroon.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) was launched more than two decades ago. In January 2013, USOAP transitioned to the continuous monitoring approach (CMA), becoming a data-driven, risk-based and outcome-oriented programme.

1.2 By signing the USOAP CMA Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), each Member State undertakes to fully participate, taking part in all activities and committing to provide information on the creation and implementation of its safety oversight system on an on-going basis, using the CMA OLF where possible.

1.3 The OLF offers ICAO, Member States and other authorized users a suite of web-based applications enabling continuous monitoring and submission of safety information and documentation from multiple sources. Member States use dedicated modules of the OLF to provide ICAO with information on progress achieved in implementing their safety oversight systems.

1.4 The CAP module was designed to allow States to submit their CAPs for addressing findings of USOAP CMA audits. According to paragraph 5.2.2 of Doc 9735 - *Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme Continuous Monitoring Manual*, this module is intended to be used by ICAO to evaluate the CAPs and determine whether they offer an acceptable remedy. When a State indicates that a CAP has been fully implemented and supplies supporting documentation to that effect, ICAO then uses the module to validate the evidence and completion of the CAP.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 To meet the obligations mentioned in paragraph 1.2 above and comply with ICAO Assembly Resolutions, Member States deploy considerable efforts to regularly report on CAP implementation in the OLF. However, they do not always receive a response from ICAO within a reasonable timeframe.

2.2 In the course of an OLF update, we found that the last review by ICAO of the information provided by Cameroon in the CAP module occurred more than four years ago. This finding prompted us to conduct a study in which 20 States in different regions were randomly selected to measure the time lag between their latest CAP update and the ICAO review. The data used, dated 20 June 2022, were taken from the OLF State Dashboard module.

2.3 The table below gives a summary of the results. The States have been anonymized for reasons of confidentiality.

#	RASG	CAP Progress made by State, Last update	CAP reviewed by ICAO, Last update	#	RASG	CAP Progress made by State, Last update	CAP reviewed by ICAO, Last update
1.	RASG-AFI_1	17/07/2019	18/10/2017	11.	RASG-EUR_2	23/03/2020	01/06/2015
2.	RASG-AFI_2	09/06/2022	21/05/2021	12.	RASG-EUR_3	19/05/2022	15/07/2016
3.	RASG-AFI_3	23/05/2022	28/01/2015	13.	RASG-EUR_4	13/06/2016	01/03/2017
4.	RASG-AFI_4	01/02/2022	19/06/2014	14.	RASG-MID_1	01/09/2020	19/06/2014
5.	RASG-AFI_5	22/03/2021	18/10/2017	15.	RASG-MID_2	13/02/2022	18/10/2017
6.	RASG-APAC_1	24/11/2020	18/10/2017	16.	RASG-MID_3	20/06/2019	09/03/2018
7.	RASG-APAC_2	02/06/2022	30/07/2018	17.	RASG-PA_1	01/02/2019	18/10/2017
8.	RASG-APAC_3	24/04/2022	31/05/2021	18.	RASG-PA_2	20/02/2020	18/10/2017
9.	RASG-APAC_4	10/06/2022	23/03/2021	19.	RASG-PA_3	20/05/2022	30/09/2016
10.	RASG-EUR_1	13/12/2017	19/06/2014	20.	RASG-PA_4	11/06/2022	20/05/2018

2.4 The study showed that the most recent updates in the OLF by selected States were entered after the latest reviews by ICAO, with the exception of one State. On average, 1256 days (nearly three and a half years) elapsed between the date of the most recent review by ICAO and the update by a Member State. The largest gap identified was 2784 days (more than seven and a half years), and the smallest was 328 days (nearly one year), with the exception mentioned.

2.5 Analysis of the results of this study reveals dysfunctions in the execution of the tasks of monitoring and evaluating CAPs submitted by States in the OLF. A larger study sample could well yield a similar finding.

2.6 Therefore, it is important for ICAO to do its utmost to identify the causes and take the necessary action to follow up on State updates in the OLF within a reasonable timeframe. Such action might include increasing the resources for CAP review with the help of Regional Offices and USOAP CMA experts in States.

3. CONCLUSION

3.1 The launch of the USOAP CMA nearly one decade ago marked a major change in the way ICAO keeps track of the implementation of ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) set out in the Annexes to the *Convention on International Civil Aviation*. The USOAP CMA OLF is a constantly evolving platform that remains the best way for ICAO and Member States to share information.

3.2 Although some problems were observed in the first years after its rollout, Member States still endeavour to use the OLF to the best of their abilities in reporting to ICAO the progress achieved in strengthening their safety oversight systems. To support these efforts, ICAO should improve its mechanism for monitoring and evaluating CAP implementation by States in the OLF, in order to provide a timely response.