| **Finding No. 01** | **Finding Priority:** | **Audit Area: LEG** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority** | **SARP** | **CE** | **PQ** | **ICAO RECOMMENDATION** | **COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS** | **CORRECTIVE ACTION(S) PROPOSED** | **ACTION OFFICE(S)** | **ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION DATE(S)** |
| Usapia should:  | **Starting****Date**  | **Completion****Date** |
|  | **3.1.1** | **1** | **1.050** | 1. establish in the national documentation a clear requirement for the development of a written NCASP;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **3.1.1** | **2** | **1.060** | 1. urgently revise the draft NCASP to ensure that it is consistent with the current status of aviation security in the State. The NCASP should accurately reflect all national aviation security requirements and procedures, as well as all Annex 17, Amendment 13, Standards with sufficient accuracy, clarity and detail to facilitate their implementation. Relevant national requirements detailed in other national-level documentation should be clearly referenced in the NCASP;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **3.1.1** | **5** | **1.070** | 1. establish sufficient guidance, performance criteria and/or procedures to ensure efficient, effective and consistent application of the NCASP;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **3.1.1** | **2** | **1.055** | 1. approve and implement the NCASP; and
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **3.1.9** | **5** | **1.080** | 1. ensure that pertinent portions of the NCASP are disseminated to all aviation security stakeholders, including foreign aircraft operators, to enable these entities to develop and implement security programmes that are consistent with national requirements.
 |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Finding No. 02** | **Finding Priority:** | **Audit Area: TRG** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority** | **SARP** | **CE** | **PQ** | **ICAO RECOMMENDATION** | **COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS** | **CORRECTIVE ACTION(S) PROPOSED** | **ACTION OFFICE(S)** | **ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION DATE(S)** |
| Usapia should:  | **Starting****Date** | **Completion****Date** |
|  | **3.1.6** | **2** | **2.010** | 1. establish in the national documentation a clear requirement for the development of a written NCASTP;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **3.1.6** | **2** | **2.015** | 1. revise the draft NCASTP in order to clearly set out national policy requirements and procedures regarding the training of all categories of personnel involved in the implementation of aviation security measures. Once that the NCASTP has been approved, ensure that all relevant aviation security stakeholders receive the relevant portions in order to ensure that all the entities concerned understand and comply with the minimum training standards;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **3.4.7** | **4** | **2.025** | 1. revise the NCASTP to clearly specify function-specific training requirements, including, but not limited to, initial, on-the-job and recurrent training criteria for the personnel responsible for the implementation of oversight activities;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **3.4.7** | **4** | **2.030** | 1. ensure that personnel responsible for the conduct of oversight activities are subject to the training criteria established in the national documentation; and
 |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Finding No. 03** | **Finding Priority:** | **Audit Area: QCF** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority** | **SARP** | **CE** | **PQ** | **ICAO RECOMMENDATION** | **COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS** | **CORRECTIVE ACTION(S) PROPOSED** | **ACTION OFFICE(S)** | **ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION DATE(S)** |
| Usapia should:  | **Starting****Date** | **Completion****Date** |
|  | **3.4.5** | **5** | **3.055** | 1. develop a risk assessment methodology to determine the priorities and frequency of national quality control activities;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **3.4.6** | **7** | **3.060** | 1. develop and implement a formal schedule for the different types of quality control activities to asses compliance for those aviation security stakeholders responsible for the implementation of security measures as required by the national documentation;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **3.4.6** | **7** | **3.065** | 1. ensure that all aviation security stakeholders are subject to oversight activities; and
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **3.4.5** | **7** | **3.070** | 1. ensure that the priority and frequency of national quality control activities under the oversight programme are established on the basis of a risk assessment. Such activities include the conduct of aviation security audits, inspections, covert tests and surveys, on a routine basis, at both the national and airport levels.
 |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Finding No. 04** | **Finding Priority:** | **Audit Area: OPS** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority** | **SARP** | **CE** | **PQ** | **ICAO RECOMMENDATION** | **COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS** | **CORRECTIVE ACTION(S) PROPOSED** | **ACTION OFFICE(S)** | **ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION DATE(S)** |
| Usapia should:  | **Starting****Date** | **Completion****Date** |
|  | **4.2.1** | **6** | **4.125** | 1. ensure that tenants of facilities which provide access from landside to airside adopt adequate measures to prevent unauthorized access through their facilities;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **4.2.1** | **8** | **4.140** | 1. ensure that the above mentioned airport tenants are subjected to oversight activities by the airport operator to ensure compliance with the airport-level requirements in order to identify deficiencies in the implementation of security measures;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **4.2.2** | **6** | **4.165** | 1. ensure that the airport-level documentation includes provisions regarding those airport tenants of facilities which provide access from landside to airside. In this regard, all tenants of facilities which have access from landside to airside should enter into formal agreements with the airport operator regarding access control measures; and
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **4.2.2** | **8** | **4.170** | 1. ensure that deficiencies are properly addressed and corrective actions are duly implemented to prevent unauthorized access from landside to airside.
 |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Finding No. 05** | **Finding Priority:** | **Audit Area: IFS** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority** | **SARP** | **CE** | **PQ** | **ICAO RECOMMENDATION** | **COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS** | **CORRECTIVE ACTION(S) PROPOSED** | **ACTION OFFICE(S)** | **ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION DATE(S)** |
| Usapia should:  | **Starting****Date** | **Completion****Date** |
|  | **4.3.1** | **2** | **5.035** | 1. establish a clear requirement in the national and airport documentation regarding the implementation of aircraft security checks or searches of originating aircraft to be performed based upon a security risk assessment;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **4.3.1** | **3** | **5.040** | 1. clearly identify in the national documentation the entity responsible for the implementation of aircraft security checks and searches in order to reflect current practices;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **4.3.1** | **5** | **5.045** | 1. develop a security risk assessment methodology to determine if an aircraft security check or search is appropriate for individual commercial air transport operators and/or an individual flight;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **4.3.1** | **5** | **5.050** | 1. establish clear criteria to ensure that aircraft security checks or searches, as appropriate, of originating aircraft are properly conducted;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **4.3.1** | **6** | **5.055** | 1. ensure that aircraft operators include in their security programmes the criteria related to aircraft security checks and searches;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **4.3.1** | **8** | **5.060** | 1. conduct oversight activities of aircraft operators to ensure compliance with aircraft security checks and searches;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **4.3.4** | **6** | **5.075** | 1. ensure that the relevant entities/aircraft operators have developed procedures to ensure that an aircraft subject to a security check or search is protected from unauthorized interference, from the time the aircraft check or search has commenced, until the aircraft departs; and
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **4.3.4** | **8** | **5.080** | 1. conduct oversight activities of aircraft operators to ensure compliance with national requirements.
 |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Finding No. 06** | **Finding Priority:** | **Audit Area: PAX** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority** | **SARP** | **CE** | **PQ** | **ICAO RECOMMENDATION** | **COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS** | **CORRECTIVE ACTION(S) PROPOSED** | **ACTION OFFICE(S)** | **ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION DATE(S)** |
| Usapia should:  | **Starting****Date** | **Completion****Date** |
|  | **4.5.2** | **6** | **6.185** | 1. ensure that national- and airport-level procedures related to protecting hold baggage from unauthorized interference include actions to be taken in the event that baggage has been left unattended or when there is sufficient evidence that its integrity has been compromised. Such procedures should require that hold baggage be re-screened; and
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **4.5.2** | **8** | **6.190** | 1. ensure that protection of the hold baggage are included in the appropriate authority's oversight activities in order to identify deficiencies and take remedial actions.
 |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Finding No. 07** | **Finding Priority:** | **Audit Area: CGO** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority** | **SARP** | **CE** | **PQ** | **ICAO RECOMMENDATION** | **COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS** | **CORRECTIVE ACTION(S) PROPOSED** | **ACTION OFFICE(S)** | **ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION DATE(S)** |
| Usapia should:  | **Starting****Date** | **Completion Date** |
|  | **4.6.1** | **2** | **7.001** | 1. ensure that national- and airport-level documentation clearly establish the minimum requirements (acceptable security controls) for both cargo and mail include screening by technology or other form of active security control, e.g. a regulated agent and known consignor regime and/or supply chain security process;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **4.6.1** | **3** | **7.005** | 1. identify in the national- and airport–level documentation the entity responsible for the implementation of security controls for cargo and mail in order to reflect current practices;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **4.6.1** | **5** | **7.010** | 1. develop specific procedures addressing security controls for cargo and mail. Such procedures should address the security of consignments that cannot be x-rayed or otherwise actively screened;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **4.6.1** | **5** | **7.015** | 1. establish, in conjunction with equipment manufacturers, SOPs for the minimal detection settings and operation of all cargo aviation security screening equipment;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **4.6.1** | **8** | **7.025** | 1. ensure that daily operational tests of all equipment should be conducted based upon specific, established criteria, using approved objects that adequately measure the detection capability of the equipment; and
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **4.6.1** | **8** | **7.030** | 1. ensure that cargo security measures are included in the appropriate authority's oversight activities.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Finding No. 08** | **Finding Priority:** | **Audit Area: AUI** |
| **Priority** | **SARP** | **CE** | **PQ** | **ICAO RECOMMENDATION** | **COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS** | **CORRECTIVE ACTION(S) PROPOSED** | **ACTION OFFICE(S)** | **ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION DATE(S)** |
| Usapia should:  | **Starting****Date** | **Completion****Date** |
|  | **3.4.8** | **2** | **8.200** | 1. establish a written requirement to re-evaluate security controls following an act of unlawful interference and to notify ICAO on actions taken to prevent reoccurrence;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **3.4.8** | **3** | **8.205** | 1. identify the entity responsible for the conduct of investigations following an act of unlawful interference;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **3.4.8** | **8** | **8.210** | 1. ensure the introduction of measures to remedy weaknesses so as to prevent recurrence of an act of unlawful interference. National and airport documentation should include the specific procedures for the evaluation including, but not limited to, the maximum time frame for evaluations;
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **5.3.1** | **3** | **8.220** | 1. identify the entity that is responsible for notifying ICAO of an act of unlawful interference, and by what means, as soon as practicable after the act is resolved; and
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **5.3.1** | **5** | **8.225** | 1. include the minimal contents of the report system. The *ICAO Security Manual (Doc 8973)* provides model report forms that may be used for this purpose.
 |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Finding No. 09** | **Finding Priority:** | **Audit Area: FAL** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority** | **SARP** | **CE** | **PQ** | **ICAO RECOMMENDATION** | **COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS** | **CORRECTIVE ACTION(S) PROPOSED** | **ACTION OFFICE(S)** | **ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION DATE(S)** |
| Usapia should:  | **Starting****Date** | **Completion****Date** |
|  | **A9****8.17** | **2** | **9.001** | 1. develop, approve and implement an NATFP based on the facilitation requirements of the Chicago Convention and of Annex 9 - *Facilitation* thereto, with the objective of adopting all practicable measures to facilitate the movement of aircraft, crews, passengers, cargo, mail and stores by removing unnecessary obstacles and delays. The NATFP should clearly establish national policies related to facilitation issues and provide sufficient guidance to ensure their effective implementation. Attachment 2 of ICAO Doc 9957 - *The Facilitation Manual*, 1st Edition, provides a model NATFP that may be used for this purpose; and
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **A9****8.19** | **3** | **9.005** | 1. consider establishing a policy for close coordination, adapted to circumstances, between civil aviation security and facilitation programmes. To achieve this objective, Usapia should establish a National Air Transport Facilitation Committee (NATFC) and should also make necessary arrangements to ensure appropriate cross representation between the NATFC and the NCASC.
 |  |  |  |  |  |