HIGH-LEVEL CONFERENCE ON AVIATION SECURITY (HLCAS)

Montréal, 12 to 14 September 2012

Agenda Item 5: Capacity-building and technical assistance

A PROPOSED FRAMEWORK FOR AVIATION CAPACITY BUILDING

(Presented by Australia and the United States of America)

SUMMARY

This working paper on capacity building proposes a new model which is regionally based, recognizes the key role played by donor states, and more closely involves ICAO and relevant industry groups in its coordination and implementation to provide for a targeted approach.

Action: The High-level Conference on Aviation Security is invited to endorse the actions proposed in paragraph 3.

1. **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The Northwest Airlines flight 253 non-metallic improvised explosive device (IED) incident of 25 December 2009 and the October 2010 Yemen based air cargo IED plot highlighted the continuing threat to aviation posed by terrorists around the globe.
- 1.2 Since these incidents occurred, Contracting States have sponsored a number of regional ministerial meetings during which the issue of aviation security (AVSEC) capacity building has been discussed. AVSEC capacity building has been recognised as one of the key elements necessary to improve the standard of aviation security on a global level.
- 1.3 AVSEC capacity building is limited in its effectiveness at present for a range of reasons, including:
 - minimal visibility of individual ICAO audit outcomes by potential donor states;
 - a lack of transparency and coordination regarding extant bilateral capacity building efforts;
 - the need to further expand the efforts of the aviation industry to mentor less experienced industry participants; and
 - less than optimal approaches to capacity building taken by donor nations and other agencies.
- 1.4 These are all factors which inhibit current capacity building efforts and limit the effectiveness and sustainability of the outcomes achieved.
- 1.5 We therefore propose that an alternative "framework for AVSEC capacity building" be developed in conjunction with ICAO, relevant industry groups, and Contracting States. In doing so we

note the inherent attractiveness of current bilateral arrangements, driven in large measure by donor states' national interests and priorities, the lack of transparency/visibility of "problem areas" identified by ICAO through the Universal Security Audit Programme (USAP), and the current limitations on coordination of capacity building.

2. AN ALTERNATIVE FRAMEWORK

- 2.1 Many security experts suggest that any improved capacity building regime will need to:
 - be regionally based,
 - recognize the key role played by donor states, and
 - more closely involve ICAO and relevant industry groups in its coordination and implementation.
- Any new arrangements must recognize that many donor states engage in AVSEC capacity building for specific national interest reasons, generally related to the nature of flights into donor states. This is understandable and, in fact, is a concept which drives many bilateral AVSEC efforts across the globe. In encouraging this capacity building to continue, the proposed framework seeks to better coordinate and inform its development by building on existing and future Government-to-Government arrangements with targeted industry-to-industry capacity building efforts, and using ICAO-sponsored capacity building where regional "gaps" in bilateral, multilateral and industry capacity building efforts are identified.
- 2.3 The proposed framework envisages that ICAO regional offices would provide an information coordination role, and building on their understanding of areas of weakness across the region (following USAP audits) would seek to identify, in cooperation with donor nations, where weaknesses are being addressed on a bilateral and multilateral capacity building basis. Any residual "gaps" in capacity building should be identified and where these cannot be addressed by bilateral or multilateral arrangements, ICAO should undertake to lead capacity building efforts in these countries.
- 2.4 To complement the work of donor nations and efforts through multilateral arrangements (such as those conducted under the auspices of APEC), we propose that international and regional industry groups have a role to play through encouraging the mentoring of airports and airlines by more experienced industry participants within a regional network. Industry should play a complementary role to that of governments and other multilateral bodies in ensuring the security of regional aviation networks.
- 2.5 This proposed framework does not advocate that ICAO should dictate where Contracting States allocate funds/resources or priorities we believe that such decisions will always remain a nation State's prerogative but we believe ICAO can be far more effective by serving as an information coordinator to identify where there may be "gaps" (based on USAP audit outcomes), and where known bilateral, multilateral or industry-based capacity building endeavours are underway or proposed.
- We believe that international and regional industry associations can also play a role in targeting specific high priority problem areas (through airline and airport mentoring arrangements and specific security initiatives). ICAO capacity building should target "high" risk areas in each region not being covered by other bilateral/multilateral capacity building efforts. This would reduce unnecessary duplication of effort, maximize the use of limited resources, and ensure a greater reach and better coordination of capacity building efforts worldwide.
- 2.7 Finally, AVSEC capacity building requires a long-term commitment and should be focused on "regular/repeated engagement", rather than the provision of one-off courses on an irregular

basis. Effective capacity building takes years and will only succeed when issues of trust, mutual respect and culture are addressed and fostered on an ongoing basis.

3. ACTION BY THE HIGH-LEVEL CONFERENCE ON AVIATION SECURITY

- 3.1 The HLCAS is invited to:
 - a) consider the information provided in this Paper; and
 - b) encourage ICAO, all Contracting States, and relevant industry associations to contribute to the development of a more coordinated, targeted and effective AVSEC capacity building framework including to consider the proposed arrangements as outlined in paragraph 2.1 of this working paper.

— END —