**Ninth Meeting of the North American, Central American and Caribbean Directors of Civil Aviation (NACC/DCA/09)**

Port-of-Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, 25 to 27 June 2019

**Agenda Item 3:** **Accountability Report of the ICAO NACC No Country Left Behind (NCLB) / Systemic Assistance Programme (SAP)**

**3.2** **Analysis and Status of the Effective Implementation (EI) of the States´ Safety Oversight Systems [in relation with the ICAO Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA)]**

**PROJECT PROPOSAL: IMPROVEMENT OF THE SAFETY OVERSIGHT SYSTEM (SOS) ASSISTANCE TO THE NACC STATES**

(Presented by the Secretariat)

| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | |
|---|---|
| During the last missions of support to the NACC states and due to the experience gathered as part of USOAP activities within the region, a lack of sustainability on the capacity of the states to provide an acceptable level of Safety Oversight was identified. The states do not follow up and implement on the lessons learned during the audits and as NACC office we have part of the responsibility in these problem.<br><br>Even though States are audited by ICAO, several NACC states are being audited by international entities and organizations like EASA and FAA with unsatisfactory results due to the lack of preparedness and supervision from the ICAO NACC regional office. A Project Proposal for the improvement of the State Safety Oversight is made for State Approval. | |
| *Strategic Objectives:* | Safety |
| *References:* | ICAO NACC Systemic Assistance Programme |

— — — — — — — — — — —

**APPENDIX**
**PROJECT PROPOSAL:**
**IMPROVEMENT OF THE SAFETY OVERSIGHT SYSTEM ( SOS ) ASSISTANCE TO THE NACC STATES**

## 1. Background

1.1     During the last missions of support to the NACC states and due to the experience gathered as part of USOAP activities within the region, a lack of sustainability on the capacity of the states to provide an acceptable level of Safety Oversight was identified. The states do not follow up and implement on the lessons learned during the audits and as NACC office we have part of the responsibility in these problem.

1.2     Even though States are audited by ICAO, several NACC states are being audited by international entities and organizations like EASA and FAA with unsatisfactory results due to the lack of preparedness and supervision from the ICAO NACC regional office.

1.2     Majority of NACC States are heavily dependent on tourism for sustainability and growth of their economies and in turn for meeting the UN Sustainable Development Goals. This is especially, and detrimentally, true for our Small Developing Island States (SDIS) of the Caribbean, but applies also to Central America.   While there is only one global Standard, ICAO, for international Aviation the fact is that there are 192 member States each with their own methodology of meeting those ICAO Standards.   In addition to the different methodologies for compliance there are different methodologies of validating such compliance with ICAO SARPs. While most states rely on ICAO Audit results some States have individual mandates from their governing bodies, to conduct their own validations of such compliance.   Often much to the detriment of our States his has led to various Audit systems that our States are subject to beyond USOAP (if they wish to operate to US or Europe and vice versa), such as FAA IASA program, and European EASA oversight program. All these programmes are mainly focused on ICAO Annexes 1, 6 and 8.

**Identified problems:**

- Lack of Sustainability of State Safety Oversight System
- Perceived Lack of Objectivity of Safety audits
- Methodological differences between Audit systems (organizations)
- Lack of comprehensive SOS assistance mechanism
- Lack of funds. We recognize that there are very good and effective contractors and consultants available and sometimes needed, especially in our region.  However we also recognize that the cost incurred by States are often well in excess of hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of US dollars.  Leading States to choose between acquiring needed personnel, strengthening their infrastructure, and capacity, or resolving the immediate EASA, IASA, or USOAP need as well as as possibly promote lack of State ownership of their own responsibility to sustain their system and SARP compliance.

- Lack of CAA institutional strength. SDIs/SDS Limited budget and resources may be better use to strengthen the institutions (CAAs) implementation of solutions with stronger state ownership and thus stronger opportunities for their own ability for sustain their system of compliance.

**Project Objetives**

1. Make sure that the NACC member states develop the capacity to maintain and adequate level of Safety Oversight (**Sustainability).**
2. Support the establishment a comprehensive SOS System that ensures global confidence and validation of NACC State`s SOS regardless of entity or methodology of reviewing the system.
3. Develop a cross reference mechanism of the different USOAP, IASA and EASA Audits
4. Ensure State ownership of their role and responsibility to provide safe secure efficient and internationally compliant aviation system as ICAO Member States.
5. Provide an opportunity for SDIS, and SDSs that have limited budget and resources to overcome the challenge which continues to leave them behind in obtaining ICAO compliant SOS

**Main Goal and Scope**
The Goal of the project is to increase the safety oversight level within the states and establish a permanent and robust monitoring system as part of the SAP (specifically Sustainability Phase of the SAP) The Project scope is for all NACC States

**Work programme/ Timeframe**

|  | Task | Start and End Dates | Responsibles |
|---|---|---|---|
| Phase One | Kick off Meeting<br><br>Establishment of the Go Team:<br>• The experts shall be proposed by the states.<br>• The minimum requirement of experience should be, no less than 10 years of experience, participation on certification processes, participation on special operations approvals, knowledge of ICAO annexes and docs, USOAP qualified, among others.<br>• The CV's of the proposed staff will be filtered by the NACC office.<br>• Each state should propose at least 2 experts by area | Month 1 to month 3 | ACSA experts, experts provided by the states and the NACC office |

| Phase Two | Training of the candidates:<br>The experts shall receive training on USOAP, FAA, EASA and IATA (IOSA) Methodolgies and the correlations of each to ensure that by meeting the ICAO SARPs the State will be compliant regardless of other methodologies used | Month 3 to month 6 | ICAO/ FAA/ EASA/ IATA |
|---|---|---|---|
| Phase Three | Development of a cross reference between the different standards of Audits and methodologies. | Month 6 to month 12 | 1 ACSA Expert/ ICAO NACC |
| Phase Four | Arrangement of the different groups of experts establishment of the dedicated SO work program the frequency of the on site verifications/ assistance will be based on mutual NACC and State agreement, but no less than bi-annually based on verified continual State progress. | Month 12 | Project Members |
| | SO assistance activities- GoTeam Missions | Month 12 to month 18 | ACSA/ RSOO |

**Project Budget**

**Funds for missions:** : 50,000 US$
Funds for training: TBD

Existing contribution mechanisms (EU/EASA, Member States, Industry, NGOs, ICAO SAFE program, NACC Regional MCAP, in-kind Support from the NACC Champion States Etc.
Possible Agreements with air operators and Maintenance organizations (to be reviewed by ICAO Headquarters Legal Bureau)
- COCESNA/ACSA
- CASSOS
- FAA
- EASA
- TCB IVPA

**Key Stakeholders:**

| Client | NACC STATES (initially) |
|---|---|
| Sponsor | NACC OFFICE (initially) |
| Project manager | NACC Safety Officer (Marcelo Orellana) |

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

The monitoring of the activities is responsibility of the NACC office taking into consideration the results and progress of the states after the evaluation of the "Go Team" based on the deadlines previously agreed with the states. The performance of the "Go Team" members will be supervised by the ICAO NACC Flight Safety Implementation Officers (FS1 and FS2).

- END -