58th CONFERENCE OF DIRECTORS GENERAL OF CIVIL AVIATION ASIA AND PACIFIC REGIONS

Dhaka, Bangladesh
15 to 19 October 2023

AGENDA ITEM 3: AVIATION SAFETY

NEED FOR TIMELY VALIDATION OF PROGRESS OF STATE IN USOAP CMA TO MEET THE TARGET OF GASP

(Presented by Nepal)

SUMMARY

The Universal Safety Oversight Audit Program (USOAP) Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) is one of the most successful and visible programs of ICAO. The ICAO Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) 2023-2025, in its target 2.1 under Goal 2, has set target for all States to achieve an EI of 75% by 2024. Such target can be achieved if the progress of States is validated through ICVMs or offsite validation activities of ICAO USOAP CMA program. This DP highlights the need of timely validation activities by ICAO so that States can achieve the above target set in GASP, RASP and NASP.

NEED FOR TIMELY VALIDATION OF PROGRESS OF STATE IN USOAP CMA TO MEET THE TARGET OF GASP

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Universal Safety Oversight Audit Program (USOAP) is one of the most successful and visible programs of ICAO, and effective implementation (EI) score is the globally accepted and standard means to assess safety oversight capability of any State.

1.2 The USOAP program has evolved through the voluntary safety oversight assessment program in 1995 pursuant to ICAO Council decision that was endorsed by 31st Session of ICAO Assembly in 1996. The USOAP program was formally launched in 1998 by ICAO pursuant to Assembly Resolution A32-11 with an objective of monitoring the safety oversight capability of Contracting States to ensure effective implementation of safety-related SARPs.

1.3 The program initially started with the scope of Annex 1-personnel licensing, Annex 6-operation of aircraft and Annex 8- airworthiness of aircraft. Pursuant to Assembly Resolution A33-8, the program was expanded to include Annex 11- Air Traffic Services, Annex 14- Aerodromes and A 13-Aircraft Accident and Incident Investigation.

1.4 The current version of program, namely USOAP Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA), was implemented from 1 January 2013 with two years of transition period from 2011 to 2012. This version of USOAP was endorsed by 37th session of ICAO Assembly.

1.5 ICAO USOAP Continuous Monitoring Manual Doc 9735 in paragraph 3.2.2 states the objective of a USOAP CMA audit is to determine a State's capability for safety oversight by assessing the effective implementation of the CEs of the safety oversight system and the status of the State's implementation of all safety-related ICAO SARPs, associated procedures, guidance material and best safety practices. Audits are tailored to the complexity of the State's civil aviation system.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 In paragraph 3.2.4, the ICAO Doc 9735 highlights the objective of an ICVM as to assess and validate CAPs (or mitigating measures for SSCs) implemented by a State to address previously identified findings, including SSCs. During an ICVM, the ICAO team of SMEs may also provide on-site guidance to the State on resolving findings and deficiencies.

2.2 The Doc 9735 states objective of an offsite validation activity as to assess and validate CAPs implemented by a State to address certain PQ findings without conducting an on-site activity, i.e. an audit or ICVM. CAPs typically addressing PQ findings associated with CEs 1 to 5 (collectively known as "establishment" CEs) are best suited for an offsite validation activity if the State submits evidence of their full implementation. This activity is conducted at ICAO HQ.

2.3 In line with its strategic objective, ICAO has accorded top priority to aviation safety, and Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) has been developed. This triennial plan aims to present international strategy for continuous improvement of aviation safety globally. The plan contains six goals and associated targets.

2.4 GASP paragraph 2.4.2 states, "Goal 2 (Strengthen States' Safety Oversight Capabilities) of GASP is aimed at States individually and seeks to strengthen their safety oversight capabilities. This goal calls for all States to progress in their implementation of the eight critical elements (CEs) and address the organizational challenges they face when implementing a safety oversight system."

2.5 Target 2.1 of above Goal 2 calls for all States to improve their score for the effective implementation (EI) of the CEs of the State's safety oversight system in a progressive manner that would result in incremental increases until a high overall EI score is reached. As part of this target, States should

focus closely on the priority protocol questions (PQs) related to a safety oversight system. The term "priority PQs" refers to PQs that have a higher correlation to operational safety risks. Examples of indicators related to this target include the number of States that have fully implemented the priority PQs and the percentage of required CAPs submitted by States to ICAO via the online framework (OLF) to address findings from Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) continuous monitoring approach (CMA) activities.

2.6 Under Regional Goal II in Target T10 of Asia Pacific Regional Aviation Safety Plan (AP-RASP) 2023-2025 has a provision as "States to progressively enhance safety oversight capability to achieve at least 75% EI in USOAP CMA and to achieve an APAC average overall USOAP EI score higher or equal to the global average by 2024.

2.7 The ICAO publishes electronic bulletin (EB) listing the names of States planned for USOAP CMA activities, including CMA audits, ICAO Coordinated Validation Mission (ICVMs), State Safety Programme Implementation Assessments (SSPIAs), offsite validation activities. Such bulletins are published in January and June each year. The USOAP activities are planned based on various factors that include risk profile of State, last audit date and regional balance, among others.

2.8 The Annual USOAP activities plan at current situation cannot accommodate all States willing to undergo ICVMs or offsite validation activities due to limited resources available with USOAP CMA program.

2.9 Unless the progress of State is validated by ICAO through ICVMs or offsite validation activities, the Goal 2 of GASP cannot be achieved at current situation since many EI scores of many States are below 75% mark. This will present challenge to States to meet this particular goal set in their National Aviation Safety Plans (NASPs) aligned with GASP and Regional Aviation Safety Plan (RASP).

2.10 Timely ICVMs, offsite validation activities or validation of progress through other technical missions of ICAO, like CAT mission, will support States to meet the target 2.1 of goal 2 of GASP and associated NASP target. This will improve national EI, regional EI as well as global EI.

3. ACTION BY THE CONFERENCE

3.1 The Conference is invited to:

a) Urge ICAO for the timely planning of ICVM of the States willing to undergo ICVM so that the progress made by the State is validated that could lead to improved EI score of State to meet the target 2.1 of Goal 2 of GASP, AP-RASP and associated NASP target.

b) Urge ICAO to validate the progress of States by standard offsite validation process of USOAP CMA process to meet the target 2.1 of Goal 2 of GASP, AP-RASP and associated NASP target.

c) Urge ICAO to consider validation of progress through various technical missions like CAT missions so that the States do not have to wait long for an ICVM of offsite validation to meet the target 2.1 of Goal 2 of GASP, AP-RASP and associated NASP target.

— END —