

Forum on Regional Safety Oversight Organizations (RSOOs) for Global Aviation Safety

Ezulwini, Swaziland – 22-24 March 2017

Day 1 – Theme **THREE: Practical Aspects of Operating Regional Mechanisms**

OPPORTUNITIES FOR RSOOs IN PROMOTING SAFETY AND EFFICIENCY IN CROSS-BORDER TRANSFERS OF AIRCRAFT

(Panel contribution presented by the Aviation Working Group)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In light of the growing number of cross border transfers of aircraft nationality registrations (**XBTs**), and initiatives of the International Civil Aviation Organization (**ICAO**) in this area (including formation of an XBT Task Force), this paper provides background on XBT issues generally, with emphasis on those of particular relevance to RSOOs. The paper concludes with an analysis of why RSOOs should take special note of the XBT Task Force work on establishing centers of excellence (potentially created by RSOOs) which an RSOO's member states could utilize to help discharge their XBT and other Chicago Convention safety oversight responsibilities.

Specifically, processes, documentation, and reliance on paper records in connection with XBTs reflect an outdated model of international air transport. The increased and still growing number of XBTs necessitated by commercial airline operations has put pressure on regulatory practices resulting in potential adverse implications for safety, unnecessary diversion of scarce regulator resources from initiatives with greater safety impact, and imposition of unnecessary costs on regulators, operators, and, indirectly, the flying public.

The safety rationale, asserted from time-to-time, for the imposition of age- based import restrictions is not supported by type certification data or other evidence. That rationale reflects the foregoing resource strains attendant to existing XBT processes and documentation. Proposed XBT process and documentation simplification and harmonization would substantially reduce such resource strains allowing importation of aircraft for their entire type-certificated useful lives, thereby increasing safety, and benefiting regulators, operators, and customers.

SOMMAIRE

À la lumière du nombre croissant de transferts transfrontaliers de marques de nationalité et d'immatriculation des aéronefs (**transferts transfrontaliers**) et des initiatives de l'Organisation de l'aviation civile internationale (**OACI**) dans ce domaine (y compris la création d'un groupe de travail sur les transferts transfrontaliers), le présent document aborde le contexte entourant les questions générales concernant les transferts transfrontaliers, notamment celles touchant particulièrement les RSOO. Le document conclut avec une analyse des motifs pour lesquels les RSOO devraient porter une attention spéciale aux travaux du groupe de travail sur les transferts transfrontaliers sur l'établissement de centres d'excellence (possiblement créés par les RSOO) que les états membres d'un RSOO pourraient utiliser afin de s'acquitter de leurs obligations relativement aux transferts transfrontaliers et à d'autres responsabilités de supervision de la sécurité aux termes de la Convention de Chicago.

Plus spécifiquement, les processus, la documentation et l'utilisation d'un support papier dans le cadre des transferts transfrontaliers reflètent un modèle dépassé de transport aérien international. Le nombre toujours croissant de transferts transfrontaliers que nécessitent les activités des compagnies aériennes commerciales exerce une pression sur les pratiques des organismes de réglementation qui pourraient entraîner des incidences néfastes pour la sécurité, un détournement injustifié des ressources, déjà rares, des organismes de réglementation d'initiatives ayant un effet plus grand sur la sécurité, et l'imposition de coûts non nécessaires aux organismes de réglementation, aux exploitants et, indirectement, au public voyageur.

L'argument de la sécurité, allégué à l'occasion, pour l'imposition de restrictions à l'importation liées à l'âge n'est pas étayé par les données sur la certification de type ni par une autre preuve. Cet argument reflète les tensions sur

This paper also (i) outlines the interrelated safety and efficiency issues arising from the current complexity of XBT; and (ii) summarizes efforts underway by ICAO, regulators such as the European Aviation Safety (EASA) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and industry groups such as the Aviation Working Group (AWG) and the International Air Transport Association (IATA), to simplify and harmonize XBT processes and documentation.

les ressources susmentionnées inhérentes aux processus et à la documentation en place concernant les transferts transfrontaliers. La simplification et l'harmonisation proposées des processus et de la documentation concernant les transferts transfrontaliers réduiraient considérablement ces tensions sur les ressources en permettant l'importation d'aéronefs pendant toute leur durée de vie utile selon la certification de type, ce qui augmenterait la sécurité, et profiterait aux organismes de réglementation, aux exploitants et aux clients.

En outre, le présent document (i) souligne les questions étroitement liées de sécurité et d'efficacité soulevées par la complexité actuelle des transferts transfrontaliers et (ii) résume les efforts entrepris par l'OACI, les organismes de réglementation, comme l'Agence européenne de la sécurité aérienne (EASA) et la Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), et les groupes industriels, comme l'Aviation Working Group (AWG) et l'Association du Transport Aérien International (IATA), afin de simplifier et d'harmoniser les processus et la documentation concernant les transferts transfrontaliers.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 AWG submits this paper for consideration at the captioned RSOO Forum. AWG membership includes most of the industry's leading aircraft lessors and manufacturers, and, thus, has a great deal of experience with the XBT issues to be discussed at the RSOO Forum.

1.2 The existing XBT regulatory framework and administrative processes were developed when virtually all commercial aircraft were purchased directly by their operators who then retained ownership of such aircraft for most or all of their useful lives. As such, changes of aircraft nationality were not common and the airworthiness oversight of any particular commercial aircraft tended to reside with one jurisdiction for most or all of its useful life.

1.3 By contrast, today a substantial number of XBTs occur in connection with airline sales of owned aircraft due to changes in fleet requirements or ordinary course re-fleeting and as a result of seasonal leases or subleases between air carriers. Coordinated fleet planning among airlines affiliated through alliances has further contributed to the growth of XBTs of aircraft nationality.

1.4 In addition, over the past three decades aircraft operators have realized substantial capital and operational efficiencies by leasing, rather than owning, a portion of their fleets. The percentage of leased commercial aircraft has steadily increased and now represents approximately 40% of the global installed base. Some industry experts predict that as much as 50% of the global installed base will be leased by 2030. Aircraft leases typically have terms of seven to twelve years. At the end of a lease term, the lessor places the aircraft with a new operator, often in a different jurisdiction.

1.5 According to a 2011 study by SGI Aviation commissioned by AWG (2011 SGI Study), international transfers of aircraft averaged 950 per annum between 2007 and 2009. Of those, 55% involved lessors and 45% were between aircraft operators. Thus, responsibility for the safety oversight of a given aircraft is increasingly likely to pass from one airworthiness authority to another numerous times over its useful life.

1.6 This increase in XBT activities has highlighted certain inefficiencies in a global system that was developed when cross-border transfer of aircraft was relatively uncommon. Although countries have a high implementation of XBT-related International Standards and Recommended Practices

(SARPs), there are significant differences in the associated processes which have contributed to the inefficient use of resources, often diverting regulatory resources away from more important safety-related activities. Furthermore, country-to-country variations in regulations, requirements and practices lead to duplications and inefficiencies for all aviation participants, which increase the likelihood of errors and omissions and divert resources from other safety-related activities.

1.7 Another consequence of the complexity and inconsistency of state-to-state XBT processes, documentation and interpretations is the growing frequency with which jurisdictions have resorted to actual or de facto limitations on importation and/or use of aircraft based on calendar age that are more restrictive than the data-driven and approved airworthiness criteria established in the applicable type certification.¹ In light of a study by MIT Professor John Hansman², AWG believes that guidance in ICAO Airworthiness Manuals should expressly support adherence to type certificate criteria and discourage age-based import and use restrictions.

1.8 That being said, AWG consultations suggest that age-based limitations reflect concerns by importing countries about having resources sufficient to assess the accuracy and completeness of historical records kept under the supervision of the applicable exporting jurisdiction and other previous jurisdictions in which an aircraft has been registered. Such age-based import restrictions, in effect, serve as a stop-gap measure against the potential deficiencies and costs created by the complexity and inconsistency of current XBT procedures which can accumulate over time. As more fully discussed in Sections 2.3 to 2.5 below, every element under consideration in connection with improving XBTs will directly address those underlying concerns by driving simplification through consistency and standardization, expanding use of electronic records, and facilitating processes that enable states to meet their Chicago Convention oversight responsibilities. The last listed item, importantly, may be supported, if agreed by states, though delegation mechanisms related to certain XBT functions and duties.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 Safety and Economic Benefits of Harmonization Are Well-Accepted in Aviation

2.1.1 A fundamental concept of the Chicago Convention is that a state's laws and regulations apply to all aircraft operating in its territory, regardless of nationality. However, Article 37 of the Convention implicitly recognizes that because aircraft routinely cross borders during operations, complying with widely different laws and regulations would be detrimental to a safe and efficient international civil aviation system and thus encourages harmonization of applicable regulatory regimes by setting universal standards for safety and security, including the technical requirements for international transfers of air transport aircraft set forth in Annex 6, Part 1 (Operation of Aircraft) and Annex 8 (Airworthiness of Aircraft).

2.1.2 Similarly, Article 33 of the Convention requires international recognition, without further action, of certificates and licenses in international civil aviation provided that the requirements under which they were issued are equal to or above the minimum standards of the Annexes.³

¹ See Annex A hereto, "Commercial Aircraft Age Restrictions" prepared by Ascend Research, Flightglobal Consultancy, December 16, 2014. Used by permission.

² An AWG-commissioned study by Professor Hansman, "Analysis of Impact of Aircraft Age on Safety for Air Transport Jet Airplanes", concludes that there is no correlation between "fatal accident rates and aircraft age up to 27 years of age for commercial jet aircraft" and "the evidence does not support age-based import restrictions as an effective measure to increase aviation safety" assuming proper regulation.

³ See Atwood, Mark W., "The Chicago Convention" in Aviation Regulation in the United States (2014). Eds. David Heffernan and Brent Connor. *of this Annex through compliance with the appropriate airworthiness requirements. (emphasis added)*

Certificates of airworthiness and certificates of competency and licenses issued or rendered valid by the contracting State in which the aircraft is registered, shall be recognized as valid by the other contracting States, provided that the requirements under which such certificates or licenses were issued or rendered valid are equal to or above the minimum standards which may be established from time to time pursuant to this Convention. (emphasis added)

2.1.3 Annex 8, paragraph 3.2.4, extends the same principle to transfers from one state's register to another, but only on a permissive basis:

When an aircraft possessing a valid Certificate of Airworthiness issued by a Contracting State is entered on the registrar of another Contracting State, the new State of Registry, when issuing its Certificate of Airworthiness may consider the previous Certificate of Airworthiness as satisfactory evidence, in whole or in part, that the aircraft complies with the applicable Standards

2.1.4 ICAO considers the consistency and harmonization obtained from multinational recognition of certificates and licenses to be a basic foundation of improving international civil aviation safety⁴, however in connection with XBTs, certificate holders must comply with processes and procedures that vary from country to country and involve inconsistent forms, definitions of terms and guidance materials.

2.1.5 We note that a number of leading aviation states have turned to Bilateral Airworthiness Agreements (BAAs) and Bilateral Aviation Safety Agreements (BASAs) in lieu of reliance on the Convention/Annex recognition regime. In effect, states are using BASAs and BAAs to assure consistency and efficiency between themselves. See, for example, the 2011 U.S.-Europe Aviation Safety Agreement at www.state.gov/documents/organization/169475.pdf.

2.2 XBT Cost and Complexity Does Not Promote, and Likely Detracts From, Safety

2.2.1 The 2011 SGI Study concluded that, over a 20-year period, the cost of dissimilar but not safety-related regulatory requirements impacting cross-border transfer of aircraft may exceed USD 7.2 billion. Moreover, this figure does not include the funds diverted, arguably unnecessarily, by state airworthiness authorities to administer such requirements instead of being applied to other safety-related tasks and projects.

2.2.2 The complexity and resulting cost of existing XBT processes would be well-justified if they led to better assurance of compliance with ICAO airworthiness standards, but concerns have been raised that the variability at best has no meaningful safety benefit and is actually more apt to raise the probability of errors, incompleteness and misinterpretations of aircraft records with the potential to bear adversely on airworthiness and safety.

2.2.3 The "Working Paper on recognition and validation of approvals and certifications issued by other states" (HLSC 2010-WP/9) submitted to the 2010 ICAO High Level Safety Conference observed that country-to-country variations in re-registration procedures and requirements resulted in no significant added safety value.

⁴ The safety benefits of harmonization are also recognized in the regulation establishing EASA, which charges EASA with "ensuring a high and uniform level of safety in civil aviation by implementing common safety rules (emphasis added). See Jennison, Michael, "International Air Safety Regulation", in Heffernan and Connor, p. 46 citing article 2(1) of European Community Regulation (EU) No. 1592/2002 (15 July 2002; ref. today article 2(1) in Regulation (EU) No. 216/2008 (20 February 2008).

2.2.4 Indeed, at the core of numerous quality assurance systems is the demonstrated principle that process complexity and variation introduce a higher probability of error.⁵

2.3 Simplifying XBT Through Standardization, Digitization and Delegation

2.3.1 AWG believes that an enhanced international framework for XBTs, centred on best practices and transparency, is required to establish and maintain the highest safety standards that underpin the entire commercial airline industry and to eliminate the perceived need for aged-based restrictions on aircraft importation and use. As discussed more fully below, achieving such a framework involves (I) standardization of XBT rules and processes, and to the greatest degree possible the relevant documentation; (II) digitization of such documentation to reduce errors in and loss of important records; and (III) enabling delegation, when deemed appropriate by an airworthiness authority in helping to perform certain Chicago Convention tasks... RSOOs are well-positioned to drive and benefit from each of these three elements.

2.3.2 A readily-achievable first step towards standardization would be establishment of a globally-accepted list of the documents and information to be required by an importing state in connection with processing an application to register an aircraft and issue a certificate of airworthiness.⁶ The next step would be standardizing the content and form of such documents, particularly export certificates of airworthiness and release certificates. In many cases such enhancements can be rapidly accomplished through applicable industry trade associations. For example, AWG has worked with ICAO and IATA on a transfer document list for proposed inclusion in the ICAO Airworthiness Manual and AWG and IATA have each published model aircraft and engine incident and clearance statements.

2.3.3 The global aviation industry lags in digitization and use of electronic records. Acceptance of analog records scanned or otherwise stored in an electronic format would be a relatively simple beginning. Wider adoption of purely electronic records using compatible systems, common data fields and a limited number of formats would address language, legibility, record completeness and other current difficulties encountered during XBTs of aircraft⁷ and greatly reducing the diversion of time, money and personnel from airworthiness authority resources. Such acceptance by regulators would remove a barrier to greater use of electronic records by operators, which constrains their ability to realize the safety benefits and cost efficiencies throughout their operations (i.e., not just in connection with XBTs). Full realization of such benefits and efficiencies will also require development of protocols allowing records to be efficiently interchanged between different electronic systems.

2.3.4. Standardization and digitization would yield benefits to all airworthiness authorities by reducing the time required to review records and conduct other due diligence associated with placing an aircraft onto a register and issuing a certificate of airworthiness, but members of RSOOs may particularly benefit from development of procedures that allow (but not require) a given airworthiness

⁵ Simplification and standardization, including the use of common checklists by aircraft crews, has been an important element of assuring operational aircraft safety since 1935 (See, A. Gawande, *The Checklist Manifesto*, 2009, citing P.S. Mellinger, "When the Fortress Went Down", *Air Force Magazine*, October 2004, pp. 78-82). Former ICAO legal director Dr. Michael Milde has written that "[c]ivil aviation could not have evolved without worldwide uniformity in regulations, standards and procedures in relation to air navigation." (M. Milde, "Enforcement of Aviation Safety Standards – Problems of Safety Oversight", 45 *Ger. J. Air & Space L.* 1996, p. 6) and the same principle would apply equally to cross-border transfer processes.

⁶ Although exceptions would be discouraged, a state would be expected to timely post its additions or exceptions to the database of import requirements maintained by ICAO under Circular 95.

⁷ Increased use of electronic records in the medical field has reduced errors previously attributable to illegible handwriting, incomplete records and difficulty cross-checking various drug- interactions. <http://www.exscribe.com/orthopedic-e-news/meaningful-use/ehrs-shown-to-improve-patient-safety-and-reduce-medical-errors>

authority to utilize delegation mechanisms to help discharge certain of its Chicago Convention oversight responsibilities. AWG supports exploring the feasibility of allowing an RSOO itself to be centrally involved in the delegation mechanism, thus becoming centers of excellence. Such would permit the efficient pooling of resources, reducing the need for each member state to deploy the substantial resources needed to have all XBT-related capacities, which, presently, diverts from other safety-related, pending commitments.

2.3.5 Simplification of XBT processes would also benefit the operator constituencies of RSOO member states. Those operators would be better positioned to sell, lease, and sublease aircraft for fleet management purposes. Such operators would have wider access to safe, reliable, and more capital-cost efficient aircraft to the extent that standardized XBT processes, more reliable electronic records and the ability to delegate functions to RSOOs (or qualified others) were to lead to easing or eliminating aged-based import restrictions. Clearer import/export procedures and documentation would be attractive to lessors, thereby making lessor-owned aircraft of all ages more available to operators.

2.4 ICAO XBT Task Force

2.4.1 For several years ICAO has been working on numerous initiatives that directly and indirectly contribute to improving XBT processes, including development of a globally harmonized approach to approved maintenance organizations (AMOs), electronic aircraft maintenance records, development of a manual covering Article 83*bis* practices and others.

2.4.2 Prompted in part from interest generated in 2015 and early 2016 by extensive AWG consultations with ICAO, certain member states and international organizations such as IATA, ICAO convened an XBT experts meeting in Montreal on 8/9 June 2016. The 34 national and organizational participants at the meeting agreed on the conclusions and recommendations set forth in Annex B hereto which are consistent with and expand upon the analysis, principles, and projects described in this paper.

2.4.3 The ICAO 39th Assembly, held from 27 September to 7 October 2016, supported actions proposed in working papers on XBT submitted by AWG and the United States (and related working papers submitted by France and IATA), including AWG's proposal to accept the conclusions and recommendations of the 8/9 June XBT experts meeting. Such recommendations contemplate, among other things, the formation of an ICAO Secretariat XBT Task Force to coordinate numerous existing and proposed ICAO, industry and other stakeholder activities related to enhancing the safety and efficiency of the XBT process.

2.4.4 A second, and in this case preparatory, ICAO XBT experts meeting was held on 12/13 December 2016. The second XBT experts meeting formulated proposed Terms of Reference for the XBT Task Force, subject to ICAO approval, consisting of the following five Workstreams and their related Tasks:

WS1 Review of XBT processes, and associated issues, responsibilities and impediments

WS2 Development and enhancement of ICAO provisions related to XBT

WS3 Development of guidance material on importation of aircraft based on airworthiness

WS4 Recommendations on electronic tools and mechanisms

WS5 Facilitate the delegation of functions and duties related to XBT

2.4.5 In March 2017, the ICAO Council accepted the Assembly's recommendations, including formation of an XBT Task Force and the Terms of Reference therefor. The XBT Task Force will be comprised of a cross-section of states and other organizations. The first meeting of the XBT Task Force is currently scheduled for 31 July to 4 August at ICAO Headquarters in Montreal.

2.5 RSOOs and Their Members Can Benefit Greatly from XBT Improvements, Especially Facilitation of Delegation Being Considered in Workstream 5

2.5.1 All airworthiness authorities will benefit from implementation of XBT document and process simplification and harmonization, and RSOOs and their member states may be particularly well-positioned to leverage the potential from pooling and delegation contemplated by Workstream 5 of the XBT Task Force ("Facilitate the delegation of functions and duties related to XBT").

2.5.2 The European approach (by which EASA establishes a unified set of standards for all European Union (EU) countries while reserving ultimate responsibility for implementation to the member state aviation organizations) may provide a model for RSOOs for XBT purposes. EASA advises that due to harmonization of standards on various matters among its member states, intra-EU transfers of aircraft registration are now materially simpler. Although no precise calculation of EASA's cost savings has been attempted, the 2011 SGI Study estimated potential average per transfer direct cost savings of US\$263,000 and indirect cost savings of US\$117,900.⁸

2.5.3 Currently, each country's airworthiness authority must be prepared to process applications for registrations and certificates of airworthiness. In most cases, the applicable domestic operator requests that the application be handled as a matter of urgency. Resourcing applications in jurisdictions that have a steady and predictable annual base load of transfers is less problematic, but in the 2007-09 period, only 15 country pairs (with EU member states treated as a single jurisdiction) averaged 7 or more transfers per year.⁹

2.5.4 By contrast, most countries are in the more difficult position of seeing increased volumes of XBTs – yet still an insufficient number to justify dedicating resources to be available at any time and on short notice. Thus, applications often strain resources and divert attention from other responsibilities. Where transfers are episodic rather than steady, personnel are understandably less familiar with processes, protocols, and documentation originating in the relevant exporting countries, impacting the speed and cost of processing. By pooling resources into centers of excellence (as contemplated by Workstream 5) and harmonizing standards and guidance materials among an RSOO's member states, a critical mass of transfers can be achieved and then processed using common documentation and standards. At a minimum, EASA's example testifies to the potential for simplification of intra-RSOO transfers. The XBT Task Force is premised on the view that maximizing global standardization and harmonization has the potential to maximize similar savings while maintaining or even improving safety.

2.5.5 Importantly, variations in XBT documentation and practices may have safety-related consequences. The so-called "focused factory" phenomenon (overall better results are achieved through specialization) has long been recognized in other fields.¹⁰ Workstream 5 will examine how this concept can be applied in the XBT context.

⁸ The 2011 SGI Study identified 29 areas of dissimilar, non-safety-related requirements leading to unnecessary direct costs in connection with XBTs. The Study grouped these areas into four categories: duplications, differences arising from varying safety objectives, differences arising from differing means of implementation of the same safety objectives and non-safety instigated regulatory differences. The Study also estimated indirect costs resulting from longer downtimes.

⁹ 2011 SGI Study.

¹⁰ Skinner, Wickham, "The Focused Factory", Harvard Business Review, May 1974. Skinner argues for "learning to structure basic . . . policies and supporting services so that they focus on one explicit . . . task instead of on

2.5.6 Of special interest to RSOOs, Workstream 5 will consider how RSOO member countries could pool resources to create centers of excellence to help discharge Chicago Convention responsibilities bearing on XBT processes. In particular, certain XBT-related tasks and underlying documentation requirements and prerequisites now handled separately by each county in an RSOO could be performed by, or assigned or delegated to, RSOO-managed entities or individuals that obtain certification and quality assurance oversight. That could result in meaningful improvements in efficiency, cost, and safety quality.

3. CONCLUSION

RSOOs and their constituent members stand to benefit materially from, and could materially contribute to, the XBT initiatives endorsed by the ICAO 39th Assembly, particularly the undertaking in Workstream 5 to establish procedures enabling the creation, certification, and use of entities (which may include RSOOs) and individuals to conduct certain aspects of XBT record review and other due diligence. Consideration should be given to putting in place an efficient mechanism for RSOOs – or any coordinated RSOO informational platform – to stay apprised of and/or contribute to the ICAO XBT Task Force, with particular attention to its Workstream 5.

ATTACHMENTS ANNEX

ANNEX A – Country Aircraft Age Restrictions

ANNEX B – Conclusions and Recommendations of ICAO XBT Experts Meeting, 8/9 June 2016

----- END -----

many inconsistent, conflicting, implicit tasks”. Skinner concentrates on manufacturing, but the principles have been extended to other fields such as hospitals. See, e.g., Shactman, David, “Specialty Hospitals, Ambulatory Surgery Centers and General Hospitals: Charting A Wise Public Policy Course” at <http://content.healthaffairs.org/content/24/3/868.full> which notes that by specialization, providers “claim that they can achieve higher quality, greater efficiency and lower cost than general hospitals

COUNTRY AIRCRAFT AGE RESTRICTIONS

*Prepared by Ascend Research, Flight Global
Consultancy
December 16, 2014. Used by
permission.*

Country	Age Restriction (years)	Type of Restriction	Comments
Algeria	12	Importation	No used imports allowed for freighters
Congo Brazzaville	16	Importation	
Egypt	15	Importation	
Ethiopia	12	Importation	Case by case exceptions appear allowable
Ghana	25	Importation	
Libya	25	Importation	
Mauritania	10	Importation	
Nigeria	22	Importation	
Sudan	20	Importation	
Bangladesh	15	Importation	
China	10	Importation	Passenger aircraft, 15 years for Freighters
India	15	Importation	Passenger aircraft, 20 years for Freighters
Indonesia	20	Importation	or 50,000 cycles
Japan	10	Importation	
Kazakhstan	20	Importation	
Kyrgyzstan	25	Importation	
Mongolia	15	Importation	Restriction not yet in place
Myanmar	20	Importation	Aircraft in service must be no older than 25 years
Nepal	14	Importation	
Pakistan	25	Importation	
South Korea	10	Importation	
Sri Lanka	15	Importation	
Thailand	14	Importation	
Vietnam	15	Importation	
Belarus	22	Importation	
Russia	15	Importation	
Turkey	15	Importation	
Bolivia	25	Importation	
Brazil	15	Importation	Passenger aircraft, 20 years for Freighters
Ecuador	20	Importation	
Mexico	15	Importation	
Peru	20	Importation	
Venezuela	12	Importation	
Bahrain	15	Importation	
Iran	10	Importation	
Iraq	15	Importation	
Jordan	15	Importation	
Kuwait	5	Importation	
Lebanon	15	Importation	
Oman	15	Importation	
Saudi Arabia	21	Importation	
Syria	20	Importation	
UAE	20	Importation	

**Way forward identified in the conclusions and recommendation of the
Cross-border transferability (XBT) Experts Meeting Montréal,
Canada – 8 to 9 June 2016**

The meeting *recognized* and *concluded* that:

- a) the current XBT process has a good level of safety for the aviation industry;
- b) there is a need to ensure that future XBT activities, including the substantial increase of cross border aircraft transfers, do not compromise the current level of safety;
- c) there is a need to improve the efficiency of the XBT process while retaining the highest level of safety;
- d) the benefits of improving the XBT process include:
 - 1) increased accessibility, accuracy, completeness and transparency of information and data related to the XBT process which will assist in the prevention of errors and the identification of risks associated with the XBT process;
 - 2) balancing resource requirements with an effective safety oversight;
 - 3) increased economic efficiency and costs savings; and
 - 4) a harmonized global regulatory framework applicable to the XBT process;
- e) the ICAO initiatives regarding the development of a globally harmonized approach to approved maintenance organizations (AMOs), electronic aircraft maintenance records (EAMR) and other ICAO initiatives will significantly contribute to the XBT process;
- f) the practice of delegating functions and activities to entities or individuals, present in some regulatory frameworks, facilitates the XBT process; and
- g) there is a need to generate exposure and raise awareness in the aviation community with respect to the conclusions and recommendations of this meeting.

The meeting *recommended*:

- a) the enhancement of relevant guidance material, including standardizing transfer-related documents and forms;
- b) the identification of ICAO provisions that need to be enhanced to ensure harmonized regulations and processes to facilitate, simplify and otherwise improve the XBT process;
- c) development of guidance material for the removal of aircraft calendar age limits related to the XBT process, taking into account best practices;
- d) development of a global mechanism that would facilitate a State's ability to delegate functions and duties to entities or individuals with a view towards standardizing and enhancing the efficiency of the XBT process;
- e) that ICAO establish a working group to coordinate activities related to enhancing the XBT process;
- f) that ICAO continue to enhance and develop, together with its safety partners, tools and mechanisms that facilitate the XBT process;
- g) that ICAO develop an enhanced information system relating to the XBT process which integrates and further develops current initiatives;
- h) that ICAO progress the work on AMOs, EAMR and other initiatives, taking into account the facilitation of the XBT process; and
- i) that meeting participants promote the conclusions and recommendations of this meeting in international fora.