- ICAO's Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) was initially launched in response to widespread concerns about the adequacy of aviation safety oversight around the world. The ultimate goal of USOAP is promoting global aviation safety through regular audits of safety oversight systems in all ICAO Member States.
- USOAP audits focus on a State's capability in providing safety oversight by assessing whether the State has effectively and consistently implemented the critical elements of a safety oversight system and determining the State's level of implementation of ICAO's safety-related Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) and associated procedures and guidance material.

- USOAP-CMA Protocol questions (PQs) are the main instrument for assessing the level of Implementation of a State/Aerodrome safety oversight system are based on:
  - SARPs, PANSs, documents and other guidance material of ICAO, taking into account the Critical Elements.
- Protocol Questions can be used by a State for their safety oversight Audit of their Aerodromes
- An Aerodrome Operator can use PQs for self-auditing his Aerodrome

According to the USOAP CMA Reports, between 2014 and 2016, the audit process detected 5 critical issues at Aerodromes:

- Implementation of requirements of aerodrome certification (and issue of exemptions)
- Ensure that an Aerodrome Operator receiving international flights has an SMS acceptable to the State (aeronautical studies, safety risk assessments and safety mitigation measures)
- Certified Aerodrome continued Surveillance (policy, programme and plans)
- Implementing Track Safety Measures (Records, exchange oof information)
- Aerodrome data quality system (quality, accuracy and integrity)
- Resolution of safety concerns on a timely manner (Enforcement)

- Evidences
- On site (State) verifications
- Aerodrome visits

Each unsatisfactory PQ Will Create a Finding

That needs a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) fully address it with time frame and defined responsible entity(ies)

Implementation of each CAP should be satisfactory
State action for un-resolved safety concerns
ICAO Action for Significant Safety Concerns (SSCs)

- Each CAP shall address one Finding
- Each finding will have references Chicago Convention, SARPs, Manuals, PANS,...)
- Each CAP shall have actin item(s)
- Each Cap shall have an estimated date for implementation
- Implementation should be satisfactory to the Auditor in accordance with the Regulations and Procedures set force.
- Actions for unresolved safety concerns.
- All documented

As a guidance for Auditees and Auditor;

For each protocol question

A minimum list of evidences and verifications required for the satisfaction of a PQ is indicated

State National Safety Oversight Coordinator

**ICAO Secured website** 

On-line Framework (OLF)

https://soa.icao.int/CMAUnifyLogin/Index.aspx?

**ICVMs** 

Partial USOAP Audit (limited Areas)

Full scope USOAP Audit (All 8 Areas)

Annual Schedule of USOAP Activity Plan - Electronic Bulletins

**Examples** 

- The RASG/MID/6 meeting (Bahrain, from 26 to 28 September 2017) urged States to fulfil their obligations under the USOAP CMA Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and to take actions as needed to provide up-to-date information on their safety oversight systems; and reiterated the RASG-MID/5 Conclusion 5/1 on the subject.
- CONCLUSION 5/1: ICAO USOAP-CMA IMPLEMENTATION
- That, States:
- a) be urged to priorities and take action as needed to improve their safety oversight system, with particular attention to:
- i. the implementation of Corrective Action Plans (CAP) and reporting the progress on the On-line Framework (OLF); and
- ii. the completion of the self-assessments and uploading of the relevant evidences on the OLF;
- b) are encouraged to request assistance from ICAO, as required.



#### ICAO CAPACITY & EFFICIENCY

#### NO COUNTRY LEFT BEHIND





