



NOTA DE ESTUDIO

AVSEC/FAL/RG/5 — WP/09
28/05/15

**FIFTH MEETING OF THE AVIATION SECURITY AND FACILITATION REGIONAL
GROUP (AVSEC/FAL/RG/5)**

ICAO SAM Regional Office, Lima, Peru, 3 to 5 June 2015

Agenda item 4: Programmes and Projects - Aviation Security (AVSEC)

**REPORT ON THE COORDINATION PROGRAM BETWEEN STATES TO STANDIZE THEIR
AVIATION SECURITY SYSTEMS AUDIT PROCEDURES PROGRAMME**

(Presented by Brazil)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
This Working Paper sets out the results from the studies developed in the Working Group of Audit Protocols established in the AVSEC/FAL/RG/4 meeting, concerning the development of harmonized protocols to be used during the security audit activities.	
Action:	The suggested action is presented in Section 7.
<i>Strategic Objectives:</i>	Security and facilitation
<i>References:</i>	. Annex 17 . Letter LS8/21-SA095 . USAP Audit Procedures

1 Introduction

1.1 Taking into account the importance of the proposal from Argentina presented in WP/16 during the AVSEC/FAL/RG/4, States have endorsed the creation of a Working Group aimed at proposing harmonized protocols to be used during the security audit activities undertaken in states of the N South American (SAM) and North American, Central American, Caribbean (NACC) regions. Brazil was thus nominated coordinator state of this initiative.

1.2 The coordination between states to standardize their aviation security systems audit procedures has the following main goals:

- . To develop harmonized audit protocols (quality control) that can be used by states as a tool to audit their national aviation security systems; and
- . To standardize the results from AVSEC/FAL/RG member states audits similar to the results from the USAP audits.

1.3 The proposed working plan was:

- . Assessment of audit protocols currently used by member states;
- . Development of a model for audit protocols for states;
- . Required instruction activities;
- . Practical exercises of implementation; and
- . Future activities.

1.4 The expected results are:

- . Better identification and correction of noncompliance
- . More efficient corrective action plans;
- . Indicators comparable to USAP; and
- . Results comparable to the findings of USAP audits.

2 The contributing states indicated in AVSEC/FAL/RG4 were: Brazil, Argentina, Caymans Islands, Cuba, Jamaica, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Trinidad y Tobago and United States. January 15th was the agreed deadline to have the works ended.

3 Development of activities

3.1 Initially, the development of models for AVSEC audit protocols was suggested in order to achieve the first objective and to carry out activities related to the assessment and comparison of audit protocols used by the states members of the subgroup (second objective). Thus the following schedule was proposed:

- a) Drawing up a questionnaire on states' AVSEC audits – deadline August 30th 2014;
- b) Answering the questionnaire by states, which includes sending the audit protocols - deadline September 30th 2014;
- c) Assessing the answers to the questionnaire and the protocols models, comparing them and trying to find out patterns, including the USAP protocol model – deadline October 30th 2014;
- d) Writing a summary of the answers, containing suggestions on follow-up activities – deadline for approval November 15th 2014;
- e) Implementation of a new working proposal – from December 15th 2014 on.

3.2 Taking into account that the coordinator state has not received the answers for the questionnaire from all states members of the Working Subgroup, and aiming at guaranteeing the follow-up of activities, the LACAC Secretariat sent the Letter LS8/21-SA095, settling March 2nd 2015 as the deadline for answering the questionnaire.

4 The coordinator state received answers from 15 states, and the audit protocols of quality control from 04 states. Based on these answers, the following study was elaborated.

5 Assessment of protocols and the questionnaires answered by states

5.1 Based on the answers received, a conclusion that be drawn is that most states have carried out audits in their AVSEC systems in a separated way. In other words, different audits in airlines and airports were performed. Some states have also included: cargo agencies, *courrier*, accredited agents, business aviation, private agents services enterprises, among others. We highlight that, based on the questionnaire, there was no special or significant attention drawn on AVSEC instruction, even though this is one of the subject evaluated in the USAP.

5.2 Almost all states informed that they use their Nacional Security Programmes (NCASP), their National Quality Control Programmes (NQCP), as well as the security programmes from the regulated sector as a baseline and they also take into account the regulations and guidelines of each state. Nevertheless, in general terms, states have not carried out internal audits aimed at assessing the applicability of Annex 17 in the national level. This implementation would allow a better assessing and addressing of the noncompliance indicated in the USAP audits. Only one state informed its initiative of implementing an internal audit system with a national focus on Annex 17, and maybe it could be shared with the subgroup in case there is a follow-up in the activities.

5.3 Given the small number of protocols received by the coordinator state (only 4), the assessment of the audit aspects was undermined.

5.4 In general terms, based on the answers to the questionnaires, it can be inferred that the audit process in states follows these steps:

- a) Preparation – collecting of information regarding the audited body, and in some states the last performed audit is also evaluated.
- b) Execution – assessment *in loco* of the compliance to NCASP and state internal requirements;
- c) Report – drawing up the report. Not all states declared to perform assessment and overseeing activities in order to address the noncompliance indicated in the audit.

5.5 Two aspects must be taken into account, in case of follow-up work:

- . One of the States uses risk assessment to each indicated noncompliance. In other words, a cause and effect evaluation is performed seeking a better way to mitigate risks.
- . Another state uses pre-questionnaires filled in by the audited body in advance. The competent authority only confirms the answers *in loco*, allowing a stronger commitment of the audited body. This also represents an economy on human and financial resources to the state.

5.6 The small sample was not enough to identify the indicators that are more frequently used by states. Nonetheless, in the simple, it can be noticed that some states use double or multiple indicators and others seems to only take into account the inspector's remarks. In this case, it is not possible to assess if there are further indicators to assess each requirement.

6 Assessment of the questions on the USAP questionnaires related to states' obligations on quality control

6.1 Taking into account that the assessment was undermined by the small number of protocols received, and having in mind the progress in the work of the Subgroup, the coordinator state evaluated some questions on the USAP audit protocols related to the Critical Element 7 (obligations on quality control).

6.2 According to the Subgroup proposal, we can identify states' need for guaranteeing the effective implementation of requirements of item 3.4.6 of Annex 17, through audits, inspections and security tests, in a systematic and frequent way. It also aims at assuring that stakeholders comply with the requirements established by the state, which includes the personnel involved in overseeing activities on behalf of the national authority.

6.3 Furthermore, it also aims at assuring controls related to:

- . tests and maintenance of inspection equipment;
- . effective applicability of security programmes;
- . hold baggage reconciliation vehicles and persons access control;
- . aircraft inspection;
- . acceptance of inspection procedures on passengers, cargo and hold baggage, between states, and
- . overseeing on training and services of AVSEC personnel, in order to identify noncompliance in the process.

7 Conclusions

7.1 Based on what ICAO expects from states on quality control, it is possible to establish a common protocol so that states can assess the applicability of Annex 17 and also know the individual noncompliance on quality control systems.

7.2 In this regard, a common audit protocol is proposed, based on the PQs of CE 7 and on each state's protocols. This common protocol should sets out requirements to: airlines, airport operators, AVSEC instruction and cargo. If the state authority uses the common protocol with the same indicators of the USAP audit, then the objectives of item 1.4 will be accomplished. As a result, sufficient evidence can be provided to ICAO regarding the implementation of AVSEC quality control. Besides, overseeing procedures on the implementation of corrective action can be suggested.

7.3 Furthermore, the *standard* protocol for states can be reflected on efforts to assess the quality control systems and to interchange information between states so as improve the levels of compliance to Annex 17.

7.4 Therefore, it is possible to accomplish improvements on the compliance level to CE-7 of the state with an AVSEC national regulation that sets out the adoption of a common protocol of minimal standards. Benefits are expected even though compliance to items may differ between states, taking into account differences in the national regulations.

8 Proposed action

8.1 States are invited to:

- a) take note of the presented information and suggest actions considered important;
 - b) support the follow-up of the planned activities of the Working Group;
 - c) urge states that have not yet sent their audit protocols to do so;
 - d) to the members of the Working Group, to reaffirm their participation, and to invite other states to join.
-

APPENDIX

**QUESTIONNAIRE SENT BY THE COORDINATOR STATE TO THE STATES MEMBERS OF THE
SUBGROUP WHICH WAS HELD RESPONSIBLE TO DRAW UP STANDARD AUDIT
PROTOCOLS**

1 – The AVSEC audits undertaken in your state are, in any way, divided into more than one audit activity or there is a single activity for this? If there is more than one activity, which are they and how are they carried out?

2 – Is the regulation and quality control process carried out by the state subject to audits to assess the compliance with the requirements from Annex 17 to the Chicago Convention?

3 – What are the documents used in the audits to define compliance?

4- Please, inform how the audit process is carried out in your state.

5 – Present the audit protocols (checklist) and the audit report used in the AVSEC audits. Is there any indicator used to assess the results?
