



**WORKING PAPER**

**ASSEMBLY — 40TH SESSION**

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Agenda Item 13: Audit Programmes – Continuous Monitoring Approach**

**SUSTAINABILITY OF AN EFFICIENT STATE SAFETY OVERSIGHT SYSTEM  
AS A STATE AND A USOAP – CMA OBJECTIVE**

(Presented by Venezuela and sponsored by the following ICAO SAM States  
and LACAC States)<sup>2</sup>

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This working paper outlines challenges to and strategies for the sustainability of State safety oversight systems integrated into State safety programmes (SSP), which should be considered in developing global safety improvement strategies in order to draw support from favourable results of effective Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) implementation and contribute to the achievement of goals relating to the effective implementation of Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) State safety programmes.

**Action:** The Assembly is invited to:

- a) take note of the information presented in this working paper; and
- b) take these considerations into account in developing and applying GASP strategies and activities for its effective implementation.

<i>Strategic Objectives:</i>	This working paper relates to the Safety Strategic Objective.
<i>Financial implications:</i>	Not applicable
<i>References:</i>	

<sup>1</sup> Spanish version provided by Venezuela.

<sup>2</sup> Belize, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Sustainability of a State safety oversight (SSO) system that ensures positive safety objectives and impacts, which permits sustainable development after its establishment, is a challenge of interest to States.

1.2 This concern has grown commensurately with the establishment with the ICAO Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP), which was first implemented in States through regular, mandatory, systematic and harmonized audits under Annexes 1 — *Personnel Licensing*, 6 — *Operation of Aircraft* and 8 — *Airworthiness of Aircraft*, subsequently broadened in scope to include the remaining safety Annexes under the comprehensive systems approach (CSA) and, later on, took the form of the continuous monitoring approach (CMA).

1.3 The result obtained provided a measurable initial reference framework for the SSO system through the eight critical elements (CE) and instructions on critical areas or points of interest that must be considered as part of safety oversight capacity.

1.4 Following the identification of links between the eight CEs of an SSO system and the elements detailed in the SSP framework, an amendment to Annex 19 — *Safety Management*, describing CEs integrated into an SSO system as elements of the SSP framework, was proposed and adopted.

## 2. CONSIDERATIONS ON THE PATH TO SUSTAINABILITY OF SSO CEs INTEGRATED INTO THE SSP FRAMEWORK

2.1 The results and progress achieved from ICAO-coordinated audits and validation visits enabled States to establish the initial bases of their SSO and, consequently, the initial development of SSP framework elements.

2.2 A prescriptive approach is taken to the results obtained, as they are assessed in terms of “accomplishment” at the time of activity assessment, rather than in terms of “performance”, which would measure the CE continuously and yield tangible safety results in maintaining said accomplishment.

2.3 Results are not even comparable among States that have the same effective implementation level according to which, applying the principle of scale, there are groups of major complex States, while others are medium-sized and less complex, and others are small. The acceptance criteria for audit protocol questions (PQs) do not take this criterion into consideration.

2.4 Improvement in the State’s implementation level should be selected as one of the SSP objectives, the measurement of effective implementation as the SPI and its achieved value as the reference point for its goals (improvement or maintenance of an acceptable level).

2.5 Achievement of this objective, the SPI and these goals should demonstrably have a favourable impact on other SSP objectives associated with the results.

2.6 Framed by States in these terms, CE sustainability would be approached in the light of the State’s objectives, rather than that of meeting USOAP obligations.

2.7 To achieve sustainability of SSO CEs integrated into the SSP framework, internal State audits are a useful mechanism for covering the SSP in State safety performance assessment.

2.8 The results of internal audits, supported by assessment instruments such as USOAP audit protocols and the complementary application of performance assessment instruments (State risk profile, management performance assessment, among others) should effectively identify problems/concerns in State areas and elements, as well as State resource allocation priorities (driven by the potential risk inherent in part or total non-accomplishment).

2.9 With regard to the sustainability of regulatory aspects, procedures and work aids for Civil Aviation Authorities, models that meet those needs are currently available in alternative regulatory frameworks and documents. For example, the Venezuelan State draws on the harmonization of the Model Latin American Aeronautical Regulations (LAR) generated by the ICAO South American Region through the Regional Safety Oversight Cooperation System (SRVSOP).

2.10 As to sustainability in the exercise of each safety function, staff competencies must first be well defined, and skill sets, knowledge and specific abilities must be determined. Training needs and their prioritization in organizations' training plans will thus be addressed more efficiently. Collaborative training activities that provide opportunities for the exchange of knowledge and experience must continue to be encouraged through the ICAO Regional Offices, States and industry. Each State and its industry must set training objectives and guide instructors, as multiplier elements, in order to ensure continuity in training current staff and new entrants. As an aid in obtaining results favourable to safety objectives, it is important to create and apply mechanisms that ensure effectiveness in the lessons taught to operational staff.

2.11 Sustainability in the application of certification and oversight processes has been supported over the years by planning, monitoring and control tools adaptable to the real-life situation of each organization, State and industry that has strengthened safety management with an initial vision of SARP implementation. Following the implementation of the SSP, once the CEs have been established and initially implemented, it is vitally important to collect and analyse process-specific results, data and information in order to identify improvements achieved, areas critical or of interest to safety, hazards and associated safety risks, which would contribute to data- and information-driven decision making.

2.12 Demonstrating achievement of effective implementation through USOAP and internal audit mechanisms in each State's SSP framework must be seen as "a means and not an end" in safety improvement.