



WORKING PAPER

ASSEMBLY — 41ST SESSION

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda Item 14: Aviation Security – Policy

DESIGN OF A MECHANISM TO EVALUATE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL AVIATION SECURITY PLAN (GASeP)

(Presented by Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and supported by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Panama and Uruguay)²

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Global Aviation Security Plan (GASeP) provides the basis for States, industry, stakeholders and ICAO itself to work in concert to strengthen aviation security at the global, regional and national levels. To measure and monitor performance in its implementation, the GASeP refers to the use of different sources to identify the level of implementation of the priority principles, which include the findings of the Universal Security Audit Programme (USAP) audits and validation missions, and reports by the Regional Offices, including reports of existing Regional AVSEC Groups. The global targets of the GASeP are set out in the Roadmap, including percentages of Effective Implementation (EI) reached, as recorded by USAP audits of States. However, these EI levels are not designed to take into account the implementation of measures/tasks that are assigned to ICAO or industry in the Roadmap, or tasks considered to be of global responsibility and involving ICAO, States and industry.

Action: The Assembly is invited to:

- a) Request the Council to design and develop measurement mechanisms that are able to identify the contributions that ICAO, States and Industry make to the level of implementation of the GASeP and that that implementation level not be based exclusively on the EI percentages of States recorded in the Universal Security Audit Programme – Continuous Monitoring Approach (USAP-CMA) audit findings, and
- b) Given that the GASeP Roadmap is a “living” document and that there is a possibility for it to be periodically reviewed and adjusted as necessary, that it be found necessary to analyse the desirability of designing new parameters to measure the global aspirational targets in the GASeP.

<i>Strategic Objectives:</i>	This working paper relates to the <i>Security and Facilitation</i> Strategic Objective.
<i>References:</i>	Annex 17 – <i>Aviation Security</i> Doc 10118, <i>Global Aviation Security Plan (GASeP)</i> Doc 9807, <i>Universal Security Audit Programme Continuous Monitoring Manual</i>

¹ Spanish version provided by Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

² Member States of the South American Region (SAM) and the Latin American Civil Aviation Commission (LACAC) (Argentina, Aruba (Kingdom of the Netherlands), Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)).

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) agreed at its 39th Session (2016) to accelerate the development of the Global Aviation Security Plan (GASeP) as a future aviation security policy and programme framework.

1.2 The GASeP was designed to provide the foundation for States, industry, stakeholders and ICAO to work together to enhance aviation security, with measures to be taken at the global, regional and national levels to raise the level of implementation of Annex 17 – *Aviation Security* to protect civil aviation against acts of unlawful interference.

1.3 Among the principles for measuring and monitoring States' implementation of the GASeP, Chapter 5 (Implementation, Monitoring and Review) mentions that different data sources will be used to determine the level of implementation of the priority principles set out in the GASeP; these sources include data from USAP audits and validation missions, reports by the Regional Offices, and reports of existing Regional AVSEC Groups.

2. ANALYSIS

2.1 At the 40th Session of the ICAO Assembly (2019), Working Paper A40-WP/25 on the implementation of the Global Aviation Security Plan was presented, showing the levels of Effective Implementation (EI) compared to the aspirational targets set for 31 May 2019, as well as global and regional trends. The level of implementation was based on data from the States audited to date (181 States) and exceeded the target of 65 per cent EI.

2.2 The global aspirational targets for the GASeP are set out in the Roadmap of the Global Aviation Security Plan (Appendix A), in which it is estimated that by 2020, 80 per cent of States will exceed 65 per cent EI, by 2023, 90 per cent of States will exceed 80 per cent EI and by 2030, 100 per cent of States will achieve over 90 per cent Effective Implementation.

2.3 To achieve these global GASeP targets, five (5) priority outcomes are described, with thirty-two (32) accompanying actions supported by ninety-four (94) tasks, which are to be carried out basically by three (3) major components, identified as “**ICAO**”, “**States**” and “**Industry**”.

2.4 In some cases, the specific tasks mentioned in the Roadmap are to be carried out by two (2) of these components (for example, “**ICAO**” and “**States**” or “**States**” and “**Industry**”), and in the event that three components are related to the same task, it is understood to be a “**Global**” responsibility.

2.5 As is clearly referred to in Chapter 5 of the GASeP, the USAP audit findings applied to the States are to be used as one of the methods of monitoring and reviewing implementation, and thus it is understood that the estimated global targets set out in the GASeP Roadmap are based on the percentages of Effective Implementation (EI). This recognizes EI as the measure (expressed as a percentage) of a State's aviation security monitoring and compliance capabilities, calculated for each critical element, each Standard of Annex 17 and the Standards of Annex 19 related to security, in accordance with the *Universal Security Audit Programme Continuous Monitoring Manual* (Doc 9807).

2.6 However, when USAP audits identify States' levels of Effective Implementation, they are not designed to take into account the implementation of the specific measures or tasks assigned in the GASeP Roadmap to the “**ICAO**” and “**Industry**” components or the tasks assigned to the “**Global**” component, which involves “**ICAO**”, “**States**” and “**Industry**”.

3. CONCLUSION

3.1 In view of the analysis above, we consider it appropriate that measurement mechanisms should be designed that make it possible to identify the percentage of contributions that the “**ICAO**”, “**States**” and “**Industry**” components (or a combination of them) make to the level of implementation of the GAsEP, and that such implementation should not be based exclusively on the EI of States shown in USAP audit findings.

3.2 Similarly, it is important to be able to analyse the desirability of designing new parameters to measure the global aspirational targets in the GAsEP, considering that the Roadmap is identified as a “living” document and that there is the possibility for it to be periodically reviewed and adjusted, as necessary.

— END —