



ASSEMBLY — 41ST SESSION

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda Item 15: Audit Programmes – Continuous Monitoring Approach

EVOLUTION OF THE UNIVERSAL SAFETY OVERSIGHT AUDIT PROGRAMME
CONTINUOUS MONITORING APPROACH (USOAP CMA)

(Presented by the African Civil Aviation Commission (AFCAC) on behalf of 54 African States¹)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This working paper highlights observations made by African States under the AFCAC in respect of the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) Advisory Group (USOAP-AG) regarding:

- a) data, information and intelligence in support of the USOAP CMA;
- b) the validation by USOAP of outputs from stakeholders' audit and assessment programmes;
- c) coordination mechanism and consultation platform;
- d) manage requests for postponements or cancellations, including enhanced transparency;
- e) human resources;
- f) long-term considerations to continue evolving USOAP; and
- g) the implications of such recommendations on States and the need to minimise adverse effects of such implications, which may erode gains made in enhancing aviation safety.

Action: The Assembly is invited to:

- a) request ICAO to validate the data and information collected from the stakeholders and industry prior to any subsequent decisions based upon such data and information;
- b) direct ICAO not to penalize States that request, due to unforeseen circumstances, a postponement or cancellation within 120 days before the USOAP CMA scheduled activity published in the June edition of the newsletter on USOAP activities;
- c) direct ICAO not to make public any reason for postponement or cancellation of a USOAP CMA scheduled activity without express permission of the State concerned; and
- d) direct ICAO not to issue a Mandatory Information Request (MIR) and subsequently a Significant Safety Concern (SSC) based on the postponement or cancellation.

<i>Strategic Objectives:</i>	This working paper relates to the Strategic Objectives of Safety and of Air Navigation Capacity and Efficiency
------------------------------	--

¹ English and French versions provided by AFCAC.

¹ Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe

<i>Financial implications:</i>	None
<i>References:</i>	Recommendations of the Ad Hoc USOAP CMA Advisory Group (USOAP-AG) as agreed by the Council Doc 9735 – <i>Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme Continuous Monitoring Manual</i>

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The USOAP-AG was established to review the USOAP CMA and develop a framework to facilitate the enhancement and improvement of the programme to ensure efficiency and effectiveness.

1.2 The USOAP-AG developed a host of recommendations that were circulated to Member States by way of State letter for consideration and comments before the final recommendations were prepared for consideration and approval by the ICAO Council.

1.3 During regional consultations, Member States affiliated to AFCAC expressed concerns in respect of a number of the recommendations, their implementation approach and impact to Member States. Concerns centred on the changes that would have adverse effects to Member States and thus negative effects to the programme.

1.4 This working paper therefore highlights the concerns raised and proposes resolutions to address such concerns in order to ensure that the USOAP is strengthened as these recommendations are taken on board.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 Seven (7) observations have been made by African States under the AFCAC in respect of the forty-three (43) recommendations of the USOAP-AG. These observations were pertaining to recommendations A4, A7, A9, D2, D3, D4 and D11.

2.1.1 Industry audit and assessment programmes, and use of data and information under USOAP.

2.1.2 Publish postponements or cancellations of USOAP CMA activities and the corresponding reasons in the USOAP CMA Activity Plan and consider ways to communicate this information to the public.

2.1.3 States are urged to send requests for postponement or cancellation to Monitoring and Oversight (MO) as soon as possible and no later than 120 days before the scheduled activity published in the June edition of the newsletter on USOAP activities.

2.1.4 Consider an escalation process for States requesting postponement or cancellation, which may include sending a Mandatory Information Request (MIR) and subsequently establishing a Significant Safety Concern (SSC), if applicable.

2.1.5 Hiring of States' USOAP qualified retired officials to perform USOAP CMA activities on short-term secondments.

2.1.6 MIR and subsequently an SSC against any State based only on the request for deferral and that the issuance of a MIR or SSC must comply with the provisions of Doc 9735.

3. CONCLUSION

3.1 In order to ensure that the USOAP CMA continues to achieve the desired effects and in accordance with the objectives of the programme, it is important that the recommendations of the USOAP-AG are aligned to the aspirations of the programme.

3.2 In addition, there may be need to review the USOAP CMA Memorandum of Understanding to address the changes to the programme that will be occasioned by the adoption of the recommendations of the USOAP-AG. This is aimed at addressing the structural changes with implications to Member States that have been introduced in the programme by way of the recommendations.

— END —