
ICAO

International Civil Aviation Organization

COUNCIL — 211TH SESSION

Montréal, 9 May 2017
and 5 — 23 June 2017

SUMMARY MINUTES WITH SUBJECT INDEX



2017

Montréal

Canada

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE FIRST MEETING	1
Welcome to new Representative on the Council	3
Threat of artfully concealed improvised explosive devices in large portable electronic devices – Restrictions in the cabin and their impact on safety	3
Any other business.....	21
Appointment of new Members on the Committee on Aviation Environmental Protection (CAEP)	21
Appointment of an Alternate on the Air Navigation Commission (ANC)	22
Appointment of an Alternate on the Air Transport Committee (ATC), the Finance Committee (FIC) and the Working Group on Governance and Efficiency (WGGE)	22
Request from the European Union (EU) to participate as Observer in closed meetings of the Council on aviation security	22
Meeting schedule for the current (211th) session of the Council	23
C-DEC 210/5 and State letter SMM 1 /4 -17/51 dated 5 May 2017 relating to the discontinuation of the Conflict Zone Information Repository (CZIR)	23
President’s missions during the recess.....	24
SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE SECOND MEETING	25
World Environment Day	27
Schedule for consideration of items during the 211th Session	27
Recommendations of the Joint Support Committee Related to Items under the Danish and Icelandic Joint Financing Agreements Reviewed during the 211th Session.	27
Financial Year 2016 - Report on the carry-over	28
Proposal for settlement of arrears of contributions by Turkmenistan / Proposal for settlement of arrears of contributions by Grenada.....	29
Report on Technical Cooperation Programme development in 2016 and update of Administrative and Operational Services Cost (AOSC) income and expenditures for 2017	30
Report on the mechanisms and activities implemented by the Technical Cooperation Bureau to promote the benefits of its services.....	35
Pricing Policy for the Global Aviation Training Activities	36
Customer Satisfaction Survey on the Global Aviation Training Office (GAT) activities	41
SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING	45
Financial Statements and Report of the External Auditor for the financial year 2016	47
Report on the performance of revenue-generating activities in 2016, with audited financial figures of the Ancillary Revenue Generation Fund (ARGF)	50
Appointment of Members of the Evaluation and Audit Advisory Committee (EAAC)	53
Report on Publications for 2016	55
Secretary General’s Sessional Progress Report	58
Draft communication to States on the appointment of the Secretary General	63
Status of the ICAO workforce for 2016	64
Any other business.....	70
Appointment of new Member and Alternates on the ATC, FIC, HRC, JSC, UIC, and RHCC Committees	70

C-WP/14625 — Financial situation of the Organization and level of the Working Capital Fund (WCF)	70
C-WP/14627 — Report of the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) for 2016 and programme of work for 2017	70
C-WP/14628 — Report of the JIU entitled ‘Evaluation of the contribution of the United Nations development system to strengthening national capacities for statistical analysis and data collection to support the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and other internationally-agreed goals	70
C-DEC 210/9 relating to the revised Charter for the Evaluation and Internal Audit Office (EAO)	70
Regional Ministerial Conference on Aviation Security in Africa and the Middle East Regions /Third ICAO World Aviation Forum (IWAF/3).....	71
SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE FOURTH MEETING	73
Status of the ICAO workforce for 2016	75
Report of the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) entitled ‘Fraud prevention, detection and response in United Nations system organizations’	83
ICAO Industry High Level Group (IHLG)	86
Membership of the Committee on Aviation Environmental Protection (CAEP).....	90
Environmental protection - Recent developments in ICAO and other United Nations bodies and international organizations.....	90
Development of a regional Aviation Security and Facilitation Plan for the Middle East Region	94
Update on the implementation of the Universal Security Audit Programme Continuous Monitoring Approach (USAP-CMA)	97
Report on the ICAO Technical Assistance Programme.....	97
ICAO Council Visit - Ecuador (13 to 17 March 2017).....	99
Political developments in the Middle East region impacting air traffic management – Request by Qatar for the intervention of the Council	102
SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE FIFTH MEETING	105
Consolidated report on Planning and Implementation Regional Groups (PIRGs) and Regional Aviation Safety Groups (RASGs) for 2016.....	107
ANC Work Programme for the 206th Session.....	112
Progress report on the ICAO web library of risk-based information.....	113
Report on the Forum on Regional Safety Oversight Organizations (RSOs) for Global Aviation Safety	116
Report on the ICAO Cyber Summit and Exhibition.....	117
Report on the High-level Ministerial Conference on Search and Rescue.....	119
SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE SIXTH MEETING	121
Report of the First Meeting of the Multidisciplinary Cargo Safety Group.....	123
Proposed amendment to the <i>Technical Instructions for the Safe Transport of Dangerous Goods by Air</i> (Doc 9284)	132
Report of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth AFI Plan Steering Committee Meetings	136
Proposal for an ICAO Crisis Response Policy and Disaster Risk Reduction Strategy.....	142
Any other business	144
Appointment of Members on the Air Navigation Commission (ANC).....	144
Settlement of Differences: Brazil and the United States (2016).....	144

Political developments in the Middle East Region impacting air traffic management – Request by Qatar for the intervention of the Council	144
SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE SEVENTH MEETING (CLOSED)	147
Review of the Report of the Twenty-eighth Meeting of the Aviation Security Panel (AVSECP/28) (Montréal, 29 May – 2 June 2017).....	149
SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE SEVENTH MEETING (OPEN)	159
Adoption of Amendment 26 to Annex 9	161
Report of the Fourth and Fifth Meetings of the AFI SECFAL Plan Steering Committee.....	163
Report on the Review of the <i>ICAO Policy on Secondment</i>	170
Any other business	172
Political developments in the Middle East region impacting air traffic management – Request by Qatar for the intervention of the Council.....	173
SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE EIGHTH MEETING	175
Convening of the 37th Session of the Legal Committee.....	177
Progress achieved by the Committee on Relations with the Host Country (RHCC).....	180
Review of the Terms of Reference of Evaluation and Audit Advisory Committee (EAAC).....	181
Approval of the ICAO Position for the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) World Radiocommunication Conference (2019) (WRC-19) and Updates to the ICAO Frequency Policy Statements	182
Programme of ICAO meetings for 2018 and Tentative Programme of Meetings for 2019-2020 ...	183
Request from the Aviation Accreditation Board International (AABI) to be included in the <i>List of international organizations that may be invited to attend suitable ICAO meetings</i>	184
Any other business.....	184
Settlement of Differences: Brazil and the United States (2016)	184
Request by Qatar pursuant to Articles 54 n) and 84 of the Chicago Convention	186
SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE NINTH MEETING (CLOSED)	189
Settlement of Differences: Brazil and the United States (2016) - Preliminary Objection stage	191
SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE TENTH MEETING (CLOSED-AM)	211
Settlement of Differences: Brazil and United States – preliminary objection stage	213
Item under Article 54 n) of the <i>Convention on International Civil Aviation</i>	214
SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE TENTH MEETING (CLOSED-PM)	229
Work programmes of the Council and its Committees for the 212th Session	231
SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE TENTH MEETING (OPEN)	243
Minute of silence and condolences.....	245
Proposal for an ICAO Crisis Response Policy and Disaster Risk Reduction Strategy.....	245
Update on work on a Global Market based Measure (GMBM) Scheme	247
Progress report on the ICAO web library of risk-based information.....	255
Elections by the Council	258
Any other business	260
Ballistic Missile launches	260
Rules of Settlement of Differences.....	261
United Nations meetings.....	261
Activities during the recess.....	261

	<i>Page</i>
Farewell to Council Representatives and Alternates	262
SUBJECT INDEX TO THE SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE 211TH SESSION.....	263
LIST OF WORKING PAPERS CONSIDERED	267

COUNCIL — 211TH SESSION**SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE FIRST MEETING****(THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, TUESDAY, 9 MAY 2017, AT 1000 HOURS)****OPEN MEETING**

President of the Council: Dr. Olumuyiwa Benard Aliu

Secretary: Dr. Fang Liu, Secretary General

PRESENT:

Algeria	— Mr. A.D. Mesroua	Kenya	— Ms. M.B. Awori
Argentina	— Mr. G.E. Ainchil	Malaysia	— Mr. Y.-H. Lim
Australia	— Mr. S. Lucas	Mexico	— Mr. D. Méndez Mayora
Brazil	— Mr. O. Vieira (Alt.)	Nigeria	— Mr. M.S. Nuhu
Cabo Verde	— Mr. C. Monteiro	Panama	— Mr. G.S. Oller
Canada	— Mr. M. Pagé	Republic of Korea	— Mr. J. Hur
China	— Mr. Shengjun Yang	Russian Federation	— Mr. A.A. Novgorodov
Colombia	— Mr. A. Muñoz Gómez	Saudi Arabia	— Mr. S.A.R. Hashem
Congo	— Mr. R.M. Ondzotto	Singapore	— Mr. T.C. Ng
Cuba	— Mrs. M. Crespo Frasquiere	South Africa	— Mr. M.D.T. Peege
Ecuador	— Mr. I. Arellano	Spain	— Mr. V.M. Aguado
Egypt	— Mr. A. Khedr	Sweden	— Ms. H. Jansson Saxe
France	— Mr. P. Bertoux	Turkey	— Mr. A.R. Çolak
Germany	— Mr. N. Naoumi (Alt.)	United Arab Emirates	— Miss A. Alhameli
India	— Mr. A. Shekhar	United Kingdom	— Mr. M. Rodmell
Ireland	— Mrs. A. Smith Floch	United Republic of Tanzania	— Mr. R.W. Bokango
Italy	— Mr. M.R. Rusconi	United States	— Mr. S. Kotis (Alt.)
Japan	— Mr. S. Matsui	Uruguay	— Mr. M. Vidal

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. H. Yoshimura	— President, ANC
Dr. N. Luongo (Alt.)	— Argentina
Mrs. M.F. Loguzzo (Alt.)	— Argentina
Mr. L. Sacchi Guadagnin (Alt.)	— Brazil
Mr. G. do Prado Lima (Alt.)	— Brazil
Mr. R. da Rosa Costa (Alt.)	— Brazil
Mr. R. Filippi Pecoraro (Alt.)	— Brazil
Mr. F. Neubauer (Alt.)	— Canada
Mr. Chunyu Ding (Alt.)	— China
Mr. M. Millefert (Alt.)	— France
Mr. M. Usami (Alt.)	— Japan
Mr. K.A. Ismail (Alt.)	— Malaysia
Mrs. D. Valle Álvarez (Alt.)	— Mexico
Mr. S. Kim (Alt.)	— Republic of Korea
Mr. K. Lee (Alt.)	— Republic of Korea
Mr. D. Subbotin (Alt.)	— Russian Federation
Mr. A. Korsakov (Alt.)	— Russian Federation

SECRETARIAT:

Mrs. J. Yan	— C/OSG
Mr. B. Djibo	— D/ATB
Mr. S. Creamer	— D/ANB
Mr. C. Radu	— DD/SAF
Mr. S. Lefoyer	— DD/ASF
Mr. S. Berti	— C/ASP
Dr. K. Rooney	— C/CSS
Mr. J. Lamosa	— C/ASA
Mrs. E. Gnehm	— SAF
Mr. A. Doazan	— ASP
Miss L. McGuigan	— CSS
Miss S. Black	— Précis-writer

ALSO PRESENT (CONTINUED):

Mr. M.S. Habib (Alt.)	— Saudi Arabia
Mr. S. Vuokila (Alt.)	— Sweden
Mrs. K.L. Riensema (Alt.)	— United Kingdom
Mr. W. Voss (Alt.)	— United States
Mr. J. Méndez (Alt.)	— Uruguay

Representatives to ICAO

Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
Cyprus
Ghana
Greece
Lebanon
Libya
Peru
Sudan
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Airports Council International (ACI)
European Union (EU)

Welcome to a new Representative on the Council

1. On behalf of the Council, the President extended a warm welcome to Mr. Martial Pagé, the newly-appointed Representative of Canada.

Subject No. 52: Unlawful interference with international civil aviation and its facilities

Threat of artfully concealed improvised explosive devices in large portable electronic devices – Restrictions in the cabin and their impact on safety

2. Tabled for the Council's consideration was C-WP/14636 Revised, in which the Secretary General presented updated information on the threat that had led to additional security measures by various Member States, including recent restrictions requested by the United Kingdom and the United States on the carriage of certain electronic devices in the aircraft cabins on flights on certain routes, and the need to address the potential impact on safety of those restrictions. The paper outlined ICAO actions taken and proposed in response to the security threat and to the safety implications of the imposed restrictions.

3. In introducing the paper, the Secretary General highlighted that over the past few weeks, the Secretariat had held discussions with the Member States concerned and experts from relevant ICAO technical panels, in order to identify possible other security measures and to reduce the safety risk posed by storing a great number of large portable electronic devices (PEDs) in the cargo hold of passenger aircraft. Due to the multidisciplinary nature of the issue, and based on security measures having an operational impact on safety, the Secretary General was proposing a number of actions aimed at ensuring effective coordination in addressing the current security restrictions. The Council was therefore invited to note the information provided in C-WP/14636 Revised and to endorse the recommendations proposed in paragraph 6.1, with a view to addressing the threat posed by large PEDs and the operational implications thereof, through a collaborative, cross-cutting and functional approach.

4. It was recalled that an informal briefing on this subject had been given to the Council on 24 April 2017, during which factual elements relating to security and safety considerations had been presented and Council Members, as well as the Observer from the International Air Transport Association (IATA), had expressed their views, which had been duly noted (cf. PRES OBA/2635 dated 13 April 2017 with links to the Secretariat's two presentations). Further to the informal briefing, the Council had agreed to a request made by some Member States to add this subject as a supplementary item to its Work Programme for the current (211th) Session (C-WP/14581 Revised) (cf. President of the Council's e-mail dated 28 April 2017).

5. The President of the Council emphasized the need for Council Members to take into account the background information provided during the informal briefing in endeavouring to find solutions going forward.

6. Referring to the comments which he had made during the informal briefing, the Representative of Egypt reiterated his State's deep respect for the principle of State sovereignty which was highlighted in the Preamble to the Chicago Convention. Egypt was, however, concerned over the potential risk to flight safety arising from the imposition of the said security restrictions. He underscored that, if a large number of lithium batteries contained in PEDs transported in the aircraft hold were exposed to high temperatures, then there would be a heightened risk of fire and/or explosion, which would pose a serious threat to the safety of the passengers and crew. Recalling a video clip presented previously by the Representative of the Russian Federation showing the destructive impact of a single exploding lithium battery, the Representative of Egypt emphasized that such an explosion in the cargo hold could set off

thermal runaway, causing other lithium batteries contained in PEDs to explode one after another, creating an extremely dangerous situation and increasing the risk of a catastrophic event. He stressed, in this context, that the Organization's main goal was to safeguard the lives of the passengers and crew.

7. The Representative of Egypt reiterated that the said security restrictions ran counter to the global nature of civil aviation as they targeted specific airports in specific Member States. He averred that the restrictions were not an appropriate way in which to mitigate the threat and risk arising from the artful concealment of improvised explosive devices (IEDs) in large PEDs carried on board passenger aircraft as they merely transferred that threat and risk from one place to another and did not eliminate them: terrorists could circumvent the restrictions by simply going to an airport that was not covered thereunder and plant the IED-laden PED in an aircraft on a stopover or a direct flight to one of the Member States which had imposed the security restrictions, or to any other Member State. The Representative of Egypt maintained that the ideal solution to combat any such global IED-PED threat and risk would be the universal harmonized implementation of the Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) contained in Annex 17 – *Security*. He re-emphasized the need to amend those SARPs in order to effectively resolve the said safety concerns arising from the carriage of increased numbers of lithium battery-powered PEDs in the cargo hold of passenger aircraft.

8. In underscoring that the said security restrictions had created market distortions, the Representative of Egypt noted that they had harmed the commercial interests of the affected airlines while benefitting the commercial interests of other airlines. He highlighted that the restrictions had led to an increase in the theft of, and damage to, passenger's checked baggage, which had resulted in even more problems for passengers as their insurance often did not provide full compensation for the lost or damaged belongings.

9. Recalling that the comments made by the Observer from IATA at the informal briefing had received broad support, the Representative of Egypt noted that the latter had referred to other negative impacts of the said security restrictions which compounded those which he had described, including: operational impact (flight delays, missed connections); cost impact (higher airfares due to increased costs incurred by the affected airlines relating to additional processing time, staffing, packaging for PEDs, etc.); and commercial impact (disproportionate effect on the individual affected airlines which impacted their ability to compete in the marketplace and which had led one IATA Member airline to cancel some of its routes into North America). Observing that C-WP/14636 Revised did not address those extremely important economic and commercial impacts, which were related to the Organization's Strategic Objective *Economic Development of Air Transport*, he expressed the hope that they would be covered by the action taken by the Council. The Representative of Egypt further hoped that the imposed security restrictions were only temporary and that the said IED-PED threat and risk would be quickly and effectively mitigated. In concluding, he suggested that experts from the affected Member States be invited to serve as Members of the proposed multidisciplinary cargo safety group.

10. In expressing appreciation for the convening of the Council meeting during the Committee phase of the session, the Representative of Turkey underscored that it was very timely and served to highlight the importance of the matter now under discussion. In voicing full support for the remarks made by the Representative of Egypt, he emphasized that Turkey was committed to honouring and fulfilling the foundational principles of the Chicago Convention in every aspect, including the aspects of security, safety and facilitation, which were all inter-connected. Averring that the Member States which had imposed the said security restrictions had unfortunately not complied with Standard 2.4.1 of Annex 17 – *Security* and had not shared with the affected Member States the pertinent technical threat information, the Representative of Turkey noted that that lack of information had led to speculations that the said restrictions had been introduced mainly due to economic and political considerations. He stressed that if information on the perceived security threat had been shared with Turkey, then customized

measures to mitigate that risk would have been developed and implemented.

11. Turning to the paper, the Representative of Turkey sought clarification regarding the meaning of the term “artfully concealed” and the various techniques of concealment of IEDs in PEDs beyond simply opening up a device such as a laptop, placing the IED inside, and closing it. He maintained that the carriage of PEDs in the aircraft cabin was much safer and more secure than carriage in the cargo hold of a passenger aircraft due to the human intervention i.e. the screening by security personnel of carry-ons and the possible intervention by the crew if a situation involving a PED were to arise in the aircraft cabin. The Representative of Turkey averred that it was very difficult to detect IEDs concealed in checked baggage using only security screening equipment. Referring to the incident that had occurred on 7 March 2016 in which an IED concealed in a laptop had exploded and wounded six people at a security screening area in Beledweyne Airport in Somalia (cf. paragraph 2.3), the Representative of Turkey indicated that the security personnel had probably discovered what was transpiring and tried to intervene.

12. Affirming that Ataturk International Airport in Istanbul was one of the most secure airports in the world, the Representative of Turkey noted that stringent measures were regularly enforced with the highest commitment to national and international security. Indicating that security measures were also customized in full cooperation and consultation with the authorities of any requesting Member State in accordance with Standard 2.4.1 of Annex 17, he highlighted that for more than a decade flights from the United Kingdom and the United States had been subject to distinct procedures as requested by those two Member States. It had thus been expected that there would have been similar cooperation in the process leading up to the imposition of the said security restrictions by those and other Member States. The Representative of Turkey reiterated the concerns expressed previously by the Observer from IATA regarding the restrictions’ various impacts.

13. In expressing support for the actions recommended in paragraph 6.1 of the paper, the Representative of Turkey noted that while useful, they related to the Organization’s routine work as carried out by experts. He therefore proposed, in addition to those actions, the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee comprised of Council Members to promptly start addressing the issue. Its purpose would be as follows: to demonstrate the highest level of solidarity with global civil aviation in combatting this threat to aviation security worldwide; to constitute an immediate proactive position against this threat with a common mindset; to combine shareable technical threat information (i.e. not specific intelligence acquired by governments) through multilateral communication and cooperation; to conduct a holistic risk assessment based on such technical threat information; to develop additional security measures with full utilization of existing technologies for security screening and behaviour detection; to mitigate the assessed risk; and to implement the mitigation measures in a collective, integrated and precise manner so as to surround and contain the threat instead of relocating the problem from the aircraft cabin to the cargo hold and creating adverse effects and implications for safety and facilitation without eliminating the root cause.

14. The Representative of the United Kingdom noted, from paragraph 2.1 of the paper, that the risk of an IED artfully concealed in a passenger’s personal belongings or on his/her body had been consistently assessed by the Aviation Security Panel’s Working Group on Threat and Risk (AVSECP WGTR) as the greatest security risk to aviation since the *ICAO Aviation Security Global Risk Context Statement* (RCS) had first been published in 2012 and that for the last two years it had been at the highest level of risk ever recorded in the RCS. He emphasized that while it was always a difficult situation to be in when considering responses to that kind of risk, it was better for the Council to be meeting to discuss how to head off that risk and the potential consequence of any security measures proposed than for it to be meeting in the aftermath of a successful attack on international civil aviation. To that extent, the present meeting was a timely one.

15. In observing that the paper's narrative was in many ways a familiar one in aviation security, the Representative of the United Kingdom noted that work often began with the development of security measures aimed at combatting the threat. All such measures had a certain degree of practical impact and often entailed trade-offs with safety, such as had been the case with the Annex 17 SARPs relating to the reinforcement of the flight crew compartment door in passenger aircraft to resist penetration by small arms fire and grenade shrapnel, as well as forcible intrusions by unauthorized persons. They also entailed additional costs and inconveniences. The Representative of the United Kingdom highlighted, in this regard, that as the airlines operating in his State were the most numerous worldwide, they were affected the most by such security measures. Noting that the second phase in developing a response to a security threat was the consideration of ways to minimize disruption, he underscored that the actions described in the paper as having already taken place, as well as the actions recommended in paragraph 6.1, went a long way in bringing some order to that process.

16. Drawing attention to paragraph 6.1 d), the Representative of the United Kingdom suggested that the reference made to "alternative" security measures be amended to read "other options of" security measures to clarify that such measures were not mutually exclusive. In welcoming the establishment of a multidisciplinary cargo safety group as recommended in sub-paragraph g), he recalled that he had often highlighted the need for ICAO to deal with matters relating to flight operations, dangerous goods, airworthiness, aerodromes, safety management, and security and facilitation in a multidisciplinary way. Observing however, that there was no indication of the nature and status of the group, the Representative of the United Kingdom suggested that as it seemed to be experimental, a time limit should be established for the completion of its task relating to lithium batteries in the Council's current decision. Following consideration of the multidisciplinary group's envisaged report thereon, the Council could decide whether or not it should become a permanent body.

17. Subject to the above, the Representative of the United Kingdom endorsed the recommendations contained in paragraph 6.1, affirming that they represented a logical course of action in relation to measures to address the said IED-PED threat.

18. With regard to the proposal made by the Representative of Turkey to establish an Ad Hoc Council Committee, the Representative of the United Kingdom cautioned against setting up a structure whereby non-expert Council Members would attempt to cut across, and prejudge the conclusions arising from the technical work being carried out concurrently by ANC panel experts. He underscored the need to respect the current procedure, whereby the ANC presented the results of its panels' technical work to the Council for consideration.

19. The Representative of China noted that the said imposed restrictions involved various areas, including security, facilitation and safety, and impacted the international air transport of the affected Member States. Questions remained, however, regarding their use as long-term solutions, their ability to achieve the desired and expected outcome, the broadening of their scope of application to include other airports, their duration and the existence of other solutions. Emphasizing that ICAO was the multilateral forum in which to address matters relating to international civil aviation, he stressed the need for it to fulfill its global leadership role and to initiate its response to this emerging issue as soon as possible by formulating the terms of reference (TOR) of the proposed multidisciplinary cargo safety group that encompassed the areas of flight operations, dangerous goods, airworthiness, aerodromes, safety management, and security and facilitation. The Representative of China indicated that once the group's composition had been determined, its Members should be informed of the date of the first meeting and be provided with a work plan for harmonizing the security- and safety-related international Standards applicable to lithium batteries. He underscored the need for the group to undertake that work as soon as possible. In concluding, the Representative of China voiced support for the actions recommended in paragraph 6.1 of the paper.

20. In likewise supporting those actions, the Representative of the United Arab Emirates endorsed the comments made by the Representative of Egypt, particularly those in support of the statement made by the Observer from IATA at the informal briefing, and his proposal that experts from the affected Member States be invited to participate in the proposed multidisciplinary cargo safety group. She underscored the need for the latter to consider the potential operational impact of any actions it proposed relating to lithium batteries.

21. Recalling the intervention which he had made during the informal briefing, the Representative of France reiterated that the French authorities, while aware of the specific security restrictions recently introduced by the United States and the United Kingdom on the carriage of certain PEDs in the aircraft cabins on flights on certain routes, had decided not to make any changes to France's conditions for the carriage of PEDs taking into account ICAO's recommendation to the effect that lithium battery-powered devices should not be concentrated in a single location in the cargo hold of passenger aircraft in order to prevent an uncontrollable fire and/or explosion. The French authorities were instead focusing on: the strengthening of the inspection/security screening procedures for cabin baggage at security checkpoints in airports; and the general improvement of training for the security personnel responsible for implementing those procedures. The Representative of France highlighted that, in a spirit of dialogue and cooperation, the French authorities were engaging in bilateral contacts with their counterparts in a number of Member States regarding the appropriate inspection/security screening procedures for cabin baggage, in particular, PEDs.

22. In expressing support for the actions recommended in paragraph 6.1 of the paper, the Representative of France indicated that in light of the urgent need to take action to address the issue of lithium batteries he accepted the proposal to convene the multidisciplinary group's first meeting on 5-6 June 2017 after AVSECP/28. He nevertheless sought clarifications regarding the group's mandate, TOR, rules of procedure, reporting line and status (e.g. Panel, Secretariat Study Group, Task Force, etc.), as well as regarding how the group would interact with the existing panels which were already addressing various aspects of the lithium batteries issue. Recalling that there had been an informal discussion between ANB and the ANC a few months earlier on how ICAO's expert groups could be organized in the future, the Representative of France underscored the importance of not prejudging the outcomes of the ANC's and the Council's possible consideration of any reforms proposed by ANB. While he could agree to the multidisciplinary group's establishment on an experimental i.e. temporary basis, he emphasized the need for the Council to discuss whether the group, and the type of work it would be undertaking, would be institutionalized i.e. made permanent. In highlighting the importance of the ANC reviewing the outcomes of the group's work before they were presented to the Council for consideration, the Representative of France enquired as to the ANC's views on C-WP/14636 Revised.

23. Noting that the Secretariat had had an initial discussion regarding the creation, membership, working methodology and reporting line of the proposed group, the Secretary General invited D/ANB to outline the preliminary plan, indicating that she welcomed any comments and advice that Council Members might wish to offer.

24. Recalling that the issue of cargo safety and the risks associated with the transport of lithium batteries by air had been on the ANC and AN Work Programmes and on the agenda of the Dangerous Goods Panel (DGP) for many years, D/ANB underscored that ICAO thus had a longstanding familiarity with the challenge. Work to develop risk mitigations which could be applied globally, particularly with regard to the transport of lithium batteries as cargo on commercial aircraft and a performance-based packaging standard for lithium batteries, was being carried out by a multidisciplinary group of experts from the DGP, the Airworthiness Panel (AIRP), the Flight Operations Panel (FLTOPS), the battery industry and packaging manufacturers, with the cooperation of SAE International.

25. The new aspect of the challenge, the increase in the potential risk arising from increased numbers of lithium batteries carried in the cargo hold of passenger aircraft, needed to be addressed in a comprehensive and expeditious manner. For that reason, following the imposition of the said security restrictions, ICAO had issued Electronic Bulletin EB 2017/23 dated 31 March 2017 to provide guidance to regulators and affected Member States, as well as Member States having operations connecting through affected flights, so that they could begin to interact with the aviation industry, notably IATA, and with their airlines to provide guidance and/or a regulatory framework. As more work clearly needed to be done, the Secretariat would be presenting, for the ANC's consideration during its meeting that afternoon, AN-WP/9174 on proposed amendments to the *Technical Instructions for the Safe Transport of Dangerous Goods by Air* (Doc 9284) to address the safety impact of the said security restrictions on PEDs and other emerging issues, which also contained a draft report thereon to the Council. While those proposed amendments would address the said new risk in the near term, in an interim way, it would not achieve the desired level of enhanced coordination. Hence the Secretary General's recommendation that a multidisciplinary cargo safety group be established to address the specific problem of higher concentrations of lithium battery-powered devices being introduced into the cargo hold [cf. paragraph 6.1 g) of the paper].

26. In elaborating thereon, D/ANB noted that the intent was essentially to create a Secretariat Study Group that would work in a Task Force manner to develop recommendations which would be reported through the Secretary General to the Council for appropriate action. As it would be a large multidisciplinary group, with between 14 to 20 experts, including some from the areas of security and facilitation, inter alia, the Secretary General had considered it important to propose the group's establishment to the Council for its endorsement. He indicated that following such endorsement, the Secretariat would enlist the appropriate experts from the relevant panels, taking into account the views expressed during the present meeting. D/ANB noted that there were multiple experts from the region affected by the said security restrictions who could also be called upon to serve as members. He recommended: that the group be allowed to develop its own TOR based upon its evaluation of the problem; and that its reports be referred to the ANC for comments which would be submitted with the group's reports to the Council. ANB would serve as Secretary to the group and would assume responsibility for the Secretariat work in collaboration with the Air Transport Bureau (ATB) to ensure that the group's reports properly covered all technical disciplines. The expectation was that the group would cease to exist after the resolution of this particular problem in the near term. D/ANB reiterated that the ANC would be intimately involved in the group's work and would review the results thereof prior to their presentation to the Council.

27. Responding to a point raised by the President of the Council, D/ANB affirmed that the inclusion of the AVSECP and the Facilitation Panel (FALP) in that review process would be an excellent additional step. It would be necessary, however, to take into account that more time might be required for the panels' review of the group's reports as neither panel was a standing body at ICAO Headquarters in Montréal.

28. The President of the ANC highlighted that the Commission had met informally the previous day, 8 May 2017, to discuss the establishment of the multidisciplinary group as recommended in paragraph 6.1 g) of the paper. Furthermore, as mentioned by D/ANB, the ANC would, that afternoon, urgently review AN-WP/9174 containing the said proposed amendments to the Technical Instructions (Doc 9284) relating to PEDs in checked baggage on board commercial aircraft and other urgent matters, which originated from a recent working group meeting of the DGP (DGP-WP/27) (Montréal, 24-28 April 2017). In view of the urgency of the said lithium batteries issue, the ANC supported the group's establishment, whose work was related to that being carried out by five existing ANC panels [DGP, FLTOPS, AIRP, Aerodromes Panel (AP) and Safety Management Panel (SMP)], as well as the AVSECP

and the FALP. It was the ANC's understanding that at the first meeting, envisaged to take place from 5-6 June 2017, the group would discuss its TOR, the problem statement, members' required competencies, and the work plan. The Commission recommended that the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson of the said five ANC panels participate in the group's first meeting, either in person or remotely, to assist in the definition of its TOR. Thus in line with D/ANB's intervention, the ANC would review the report on the outcomes of that initial meeting, including the TOR, and present its comments and recommendations to the Council, as it would do for future reports of the group.

29. Referring to the actions recommended in paragraph 6.1, the Representative of Colombia sought information on the intent and capacity of an individual or group to carry out an attack in the near future using IEDs in PEDs transported on board passenger aircraft. Noting that the associated risk would vary depending on whether the PEDs were in cabin baggage or in the cargo hold (in checked baggage or as cargo), he enquired whether the said security restrictions appropriately addressed all potential threat types. The Representative of Colombia emphasized that if the said restrictions were considered appropriate, then ICAO, as the UN Specialized Agency responsible for ensuring aviation safety, should take action to ensure that they were applied worldwide in an equitable manner. He spoke in favour of establishing an Ad Hoc Council Committee in light of the additional political and socio-economic issues that needed to be addressed as outlined by the Representative of Turkey in putting forward his proposal. The Representative of Colombia emphasized that such a multidisciplinary approach would give the Council a complete picture of the situation and enable it to provide the expected global response.

30. Responding to an additional query by the Representative, Deputy Director, Aviation Security and Facilitation (DD/ASF) clarified that the security threat under discussion solely pertained to IEDs and was not related to cyber threats.

31. The Representative of Mexico indicated that although he considered that the actions recommended in paragraph 6.1 of the paper were reasonable and represented an orderly approach that would enable the issue to be addressed in a holistic manner, he was concerned that they would require too much time to implement for such an urgent issue. He suggested that the Council endorse the proposals made by the Representative of Egypt and take into account the statement made by the Observer from IATA at the informal briefing, as well as its related letter sent beforehand, and invite experts from the Member States affected by the security restrictions to participate in the work of the multidisciplinary group. Availing that the said recommended actions did not resolve the current situation confronting the affected Member States, the Representative of Mexico emphasized that the Council should be able to take a decision in that regard during the present (211th) session on the basis of clearly identified risks to security that would include mitigation measures to be implemented by the affected Member States. That would be in addition to the said recommended actions and might have a longer duration.

32. Reiterating that some of the affected Member States had achieved good USAP CMA audit results prior to the imposition of the security restrictions, which might suggest that the audits had not served their purpose, the Representative of Mexico underscored the need to review the Programme to determine what, if anything, had gone wrong. Emphasizing that Member States were supposed to be able to put their full trust and confidence in the USAP-CMA, he stressed that if some element thereof had failed, then the Council would need to strengthen the Programme to ensure that such a situation did not arise again.

33. DD/ASF underscored that there was no direct link between Member States' respective USAP-CMA audit results and how their national aviation security systems could be affected by terrorists. He noted that the audits assessed whether Member States each had an effective aviation security oversight system, in particular, if they each had in operation the regulatory framework, procedures and security measures called for primarily in Annex 17. While it was good for Member States to achieve a high

effective implementation (EI) rate in their audits, that was not sufficient. As terrorists were constantly challenging national aviation security systems, it was necessary for each Member State to conduct threat and risk assessments on an ongoing basis and to perform continuous risk management.

34. The Representative of the Russian Federation endorsed the comments made by the Representatives of Egypt, Turkey, France, the United Arab Emirates, China, Colombia and Mexico. Referring to paragraph 2.1 of the paper, he noted that the risk associated with IEDs in hold baggage was medium (cf. RCS, 5th edition, April 2016). The Representative of the Russian Federation underscored that although the *Technical Instructions for the Safe Transport of Dangerous Goods by Air* (Doc 9284) did not prohibit the carriage of lithium battery powered PEDs in checked baggage in the cargo hold, that was based on the assumption that there would be an extremely low concentration of such devices in the latter. However, with the imposition of the said security restrictions, there was a greater number of such PEDs in checked baggage and containers in the cargo hold. The Representative of the Russian Federation averred that transporting PEDs in the cargo hold did not reduce the security risk as terrorists could use a remote control to trigger a thermal runaway of a lithium battery contained in a PED in the cargo hold, causing a fire and/or explosion, igniting lithium batteries contained in other PEDs and giving rise to the risk of a catastrophic event. He stressed the need to respect each Member State's sovereign right to take appropriate measures to protect the safety and security of its own citizens, as well as its national security. Recalling the comments made by the Representative of China, the Representative of the Russian Federation re-emphasized the need for ICAO to exercise its global leadership role and to provide guidance to enable Member States to conduct risk assessments.

35. The Representative of the Russian Federation then drew attention to the recommended actions set forth in paragraph 6.1 of the paper, which were supported by the majority of speakers although many questions remained with regard to the establishment of the multidisciplinary group. With a view to enhancing efficiency, he proposed an alternative formulation process for the group's TOR, whereby the latter would be drafted by the Secretariat, with the support of the ANC and the Air Transport Committee (ATC), and presented to the Council for review and approval, during an additional meeting if necessary. Thereafter a State letter or individual letters would be issued inviting Member States to nominate suitably-qualified experts to serve as group Members. In understanding the interest of the Member States affected by the imposed security restrictions in participating in the group's work, the Representative of the Russian Federation indicated that while his State's aviation security experts would likewise be interested in participating therein, they would be unable to attend the group's first meeting, proposed to be held from 5-6 June 2017, as it overlapped with the conduct of a USAP CMA audit of the Russian Federation from 5-13 June 2017. He stressed that IATA, ACI and other representatives of the aviation industry had an extremely important role to play in supporting the group's work.

36. Referring to the intervention by the President of the ANC, the Representative of the Russian Federation stressed the need for the proposed amendments to the Technical Instructions (Doc 9284) to address the safety impact of the said security restrictions on PEDs and other emerging issues (AN-WP/9174) to be based on a risk assessment. While noting that the said IED-PED threat was a real one that could affect all Member States, as highlighted by the Representative of Colombia, he emphasized that the requisite screening technologies for the detection of explosives as described the *Aviation Security Manual* (Doc 8973 Restricted) were already available. Although acquiring and deploying security screening technology would necessitate financial investment on the part of Member States and the aviation industry, it was necessary to resolve the safety and security issues relating to the carriage of PEDs.

37. Drawing attention to paragraph 2.1 of the paper, the President of the Council noted that the RCS had initially been developed in the context of the *ICAO Comprehensive Aviation Security*

Strategy (ICASS). Highlighting that there was now an interplay with the safety risk associated with the transport of dangerous goods by air, he enquired whether, in addressing the issue of IEDs artfully concealed in PEDs, a review of the RCS would be conducted to take into account that interdependence.

38. In noting that the RCS was about to be revised, DD/ASF indicated that the AVSECP's WGTR had been requested to address the said IED-PED issue and to verify whether an update of the RCS was necessary. He underscored that although the RCS only dealt with security risks, whenever new Annex 17 SARPs were developed an impact assessment was done of their overall impact: on ICAO's Strategic Objectives relating to safety, efficiency, security and facilitation, and the environment; and on resources (financial, personnel, etc.) of Member States and the aviation industry. DD/ASF further emphasized that the security perspective regarding the IED-PED issue would be taken into account by the multidisciplinary group through the participation of an AVSECP expert(s).

39. Responding to the point raised by the Representative of the Russian Federation regarding the formulation process for the group's TOR, D/ANB clarified that the Secretariat's intent was to provide a draft proposal, based upon the outcomes of the Council's discussion, to the group at its first meeting for consideration in evaluating the problem statement and developing a work plan. The Chairpersons and Vice-Chairpersons of the said five ANC panels would participate in that meeting to ensure a comprehensive review of the TOR. The group's report would be referred to the ANC for comments and thereafter to the Council for approval before the end of the current (211th) session. D/ANB indicated that should the Council wish to entertain a different process, then it might be possible to have the ANC and the Council review the draft TOR. However, the group would be unable to commence its work until after that process had been completed. Consequently, it would probably not meet until July 2017, which was a difficult time for many experts from the region of the world that was most affected by the security restrictions because of the season. D/ANB confirmed that it was envisaged that representatives of the aviation industry [IATA and Airports Council International (ACI)] would be invited to participate in the group's work.

40. The President of the Council noted that the process outlined by D/ANB would afford the group the opportunity to propose amendments to its draft TOR for the Council's approval. Maintaining that it should be possible, with the said process, to finalize the TOR later in the current session and to convene the group's first meeting from 5-6 June 2017, he underscored that he would be concerned if the meeting were rescheduled to a later date given the urgency of the lithium batteries issue on which the group was to place initial focus.

41. The Representative of Canada indicated that he would await the details of the group's TOR before commenting thereon. In then referring to paragraph 6.1 b) of the paper, he sought clarification as to how the WGTR, of which his State was a Member, would be able to provide the requested advice to AVSECP/28 when its next meeting was planned to take place from 11-13 July 2017.

42. DD/ASF noted that the Secretariat had previously asked the Chairperson of the AVSECP to request the WGTR to undertake a further assessment of the specific IED-PED issue and that the Working Group had accordingly commenced that work at the end of March 2017, conducting it by exchange of correspondence. Efforts were being made to organize a teleconference to enable the Working Group Members to discuss their work. It was expected that the WGTR would present a paper at AVSECP/28 proposing some initial elements. Those proposals and the Panel's related recommendations, would be reflected in the Secretary General's paper *Review of the Report of the Twenty-eighth Meeting of the Aviation Security Panel (AVSECP/28)* (C-WP/14593 Restricted), to be considered by the Council later in the current session.

43. The Alternate Representative of the United States voiced support for the recommended actions set forth in paragraph 6.1 of the paper. While noting that, in the interest of brevity, he would not repeat the comments he had made during the informal briefing, he underscored that they still stood. The United States still considered that there were many opportunities for bilateral discussions with any Member State that wished to discuss the security restrictions which it had imposed on the carriage of certain PEDs in the aircraft cabins on flights on certain routes. The Alternate Representative of the United States emphasized that although those restrictions had been imposed in response to specific concerns, his State viewed ICAO as an important partner in promoting aviation security practices that met the dynamic threat environment. He affirmed the United States' interest in working with ICAO to develop its global aviation security strategy and support its capacity development activities in that area.

44. Endorsing the process described by D/ANB for the establishment of the multidisciplinary group and its TOR, as well as the timeline, the Alternate Representative of the United States expressed the hope that there would continue to be a productive and constructive dialogue in addressing this issue. In emphasizing that there could and should be discussions about the additional security measures that various Member States had decided to take, and the views of other Member States thereon, he stressed the need to bear in mind that all Member States were combatting threats against international civil aviation and working to keep aircraft and their passengers and crew flying safely.

45. Reiterating that it was the sovereign right of all Member States to take appropriate measures to protect the safety and security of their own citizens, as well as their national security, the Representative of Saudi Arabia noted that they all considered that safety and security were of paramount importance. For that reason, he supported the recommended actions set forth in paragraph 6.1. The Representative of Saudi Arabia underscored the need for clarity in the multidisciplinary group's TOR, including with regard to its relations with the Council and the ANC, as well as in its work plan, including the timeline for its completion. In endorsing the Representative of Egypt's suggestion that experts from the Member States affected by the imposed security restrictions be invited to serve as group Members, he reiterated a proposal that he had made earlier in a meeting with ANB staff that representatives of the electronics industry, such as Apple and Samsung, be invited to participate in its work, in addition to representatives of the aviation industry. The Representative of the Russian Federation endorsed this proposal.

46. In also voicing support for the paper and its recommended actions, the Representative of Australia noted that it clearly and rationally set out the background for Member States' legitimate extra security measures beyond the Annex 17 baseline, and identified the risks that those measures could then themselves raise that needed to be managed effectively within the global aviation system. He affirmed that the recommended actions for ICAO, some of which were new and some of which were already underway or planned, represented a sensible way forward for the international aviation community. The Representative of Australia cited, in particular, those actions' focus on sharing threat information and helping Member States improve their own risk and threat assessment processes into the future to aid in their own assessments of what measures they might need to take beyond the Annex 17 baseline. He stressed that in addressing those issues it was very important that the Council allow the technical experts in the technical groups to do their technical work and provide their technical advice to the Council and to Member States. The Representative of Australia did not support the Council trying to address those issues without receiving that technical advice from the experts in those fields.

47. In noting that initially he had had some uneasiness with regard to the proposed multidisciplinary group, particularly as he did not consider that a permanent new body was necessary, the Representative of Australia voiced support for the suggestions made by the Representative of the United Kingdom that a time limit should be established for the completion of its task relating to lithium batteries and that the Council decide whether or not it should become a permanent body following consideration of

the group's envisaged report thereon. The Representative of Australia appreciated the Secretariat's clarifications regarding how the new multidisciplinary group would operate and considered that it would be a good experiment for ICAO in addressing the said task in a cross-cutting manner. He looked forward to seeing ICAO present to the Council and to Member States one consolidated voice across safety and security issues, instead of speaking with two separate voices. He emphasized that that was what Member States needed to hear from ICAO, not two voices that came through different channels, at different times, on different subjects.

48. The Representative of Spain observed that the Council was close to reaching agreement on the recommended actions set forth in paragraph 6.1 of the paper, aside from a few small details. He highlighted that the Spanish authorities, after having assessed the threat posed by artfully concealed IEDs in large PEDs and exchanged views thereon with other Member States, had decided not to impose any additional security restrictions for the time being. They considered that at the present time it was indicated to increase vigilance and promote the training of relevant personnel. The Spanish authorities were closely monitoring the situation, however, and would also pay close attention to the AVSECP/28 conclusions, to be presented for the Council's consideration later in the current session. They would accordingly re-assess whether the imposition of any new security restrictions is needed.

49. While essentially agreeing with the actions recommended in paragraph 6.1, the Representative of Spain reiterated the need for urgent action and emphasized the consequent need to set target dates for completion of the actions set forth in sub-paragraphs b) and c). With regard to the latter, he queried whether the AVSECP's recommendations would be provided in the said AVSECP/28 report or whether the Council would have to wait until the end of the year to receive them. The Representative of Spain suggested that Secretariat provide Representatives with an indication of the AVSECP's calendar of current and future activities to assist them in determining whether any of those activities could be accelerated in view of the urgency of the situation.

50. The Representative of Spain considered that it would be timely and appropriate for the proposed multidisciplinary group to meet from 5-6 June 2017, particularly as it would provide AVSECP experts who would be present at ICAO Headquarters for the Panel's Twenty-eighth Meeting the opportunity to participate in the discussion. However, in light of the concerns expressed by the Representative of the Russian Federation and others, he suggested that it be constituted as an ad hoc meeting (rather than as the first meeting), at which the group's experts would review the TOR and related governance issues, as well as the problem statement and work plan and make recommendations for the Council's consideration. In that manner, the Council would not need to take a decision at the present time regarding the group's status (e.g. Secretariat Study Group, Task Force, etc.) and could instead resolve that issue at a future meeting.

51. The Representative of Spain observed that the recommended actions contained in paragraph 6.1 did not include encouraging bilateral discussions between the Member States affected by the said security restrictions and the Member States which had imposed them, an issue highlighted by the Alternate Representative of the United States. He emphasized that such bilateral discussions should take place as they could resolve, to a large extent, the problems being encountered with the said security restrictions. Referring to the comments made by the Representative of Mexico, the Representative of Spain indicated that, notwithstanding the clarifications provided by DD/ASF, it was necessary to pay closer attention to the effectiveness of the audits conducted under the USAP-CMA, as well as those conducted under the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme Continuous Monitoring Approach (USOAP CMA).

52. D/ANB noted that he was not concerned about the name of the multidisciplinary group's initial meeting so much as about ensuring the participation therein of the best experts in order for the

Council to receive the most comprehensive recommendations possible for addressing the risks associated with the transport of lithium-powered PEDs in the aircraft cabin or in the cargo hold. With regard to the proposal to re-schedule that meeting so that it would take place prior to AVSECP/28, he indicated that it would be possible to advance it to 1-2 June 2017, which would overlap with the last days of AVSECP/28 and thus enable the necessary Panel member(s) to participate in the group's discussion. Preparation and consideration of the group's report would be fast-tracked, with it being presented to the ANC for review at the end of its current session and subsequently submitted to the Council for discussion at the end of its present session, together with the ANC's comments thereon.

53. D/ANB underscored that audits conducted under the USOAP-CMA and the USAP CMA were a necessary part of ICAO's toolkit to ensure that the environment was available to mitigate safety and security risks and thus ensure the safety and security of international civil aviation. In reiterating that a high EI level did not eliminate risk, he emphasized that it simply reflected the audited State's capacity to regulate with the highest probability of eliminating risk through implementation of its regulations. It was the operation of the Member State's aviation system that was the determining factor of the presence of risk. D/ANB noted that the reason why there was a much higher level of aviation safety now compared to 20 years ago was not due to the increased stringency of regulations but rather to the introduction of safety management within the aviation industry. Thus Representatives should not equate the said two audit Programmes directly with the implementation of risk mitigation measures in the areas of safety and security. D/ANB recalled, in this context, that there had been four major hull losses of Boeing 777s in the last six to seven years, all of which aircraft had been operated by Member States with very high EI levels. He noted that fortunately the four hull losses had only resulted in a very low number of fatalities due to the implementation of safety management principles, as well as the design principles and the airworthiness of the aircraft. D/ANB underscored that the audit processes of the USOAP CMA, as well as the USAP-CMA, were thus not necessarily a problem.

54. Referring to the Council's previous consideration of C-WP/14559 (*Review of Assembly resolutions and decisions – Safety and Air navigation capacity and efficiency*) (210/6), the President of the ANC noted that in accordance with the decision of the 39th Session of the Assembly (cf. A39-WP/512, paragraph 33.28; P/6) a temporary group of experts (GE USR) had been established to conduct, under the ANC's guidance, a structured review of the USOAP CMA, including its processes and methodology, to identify adjustments to the Programme with a view to its further evolution and strengthening. The GE USR had held its first meeting two weeks ago, from 25-27 April 2017. Other meetings were planned to take place from 19-21 September 2017 and from 7-9 November 2017. Under the Commission's guidance, the group would complete its work by the end of 2017. The outcomes of the group's said structured review would be submitted to the Council in the form of a working paper, through the ANC, no later than at the 214th Council Session in June 2018. Any proposed enhancements to the USOAP CMA would be presented to the envisaged Thirteenth Air Navigation Conference (AN-Conf/13) in the Fall of 2018.

55. Recalling the comments made by the Representative of Australia, the President of the Council reiterated that safety and security issues should always be considered in a cross-cutting manner. He noted that in addition to the said USOAP CMA review, a comprehensive review of the scope and methodology of the USAP-CMA was being carried out by a Secretariat Study Group pursuant to Assembly Resolution A39-18 (*Consolidated statement of continuing ICAO policies related to aviation security*), Appendix E, Operative Clause 4. The President emphasized that since the USOAP CMA and the USAP-CMA were based on the same principles and modus operandi, it was necessary to share best practices and lessons learned arising from each Programme's implementation and continue to update the USOAP CMA and the USAP-CMA with a view to enhancing their effectiveness.

56. The Representative of Ecuador underscored that while the said security restrictions

clearly did not impinge upon State sovereignty, they did affect certain States. In concurring with the Representative of Spain that bilateral discussions between the latter and the States which had imposed the security restrictions could help resolve the problems being encountered, he underscored that they could also promote better implementation of Annex 17 SARPs worldwide.

57. With respect to the multidisciplinary group, the Representative of Ecuador agreed with Representatives of Egypt, the United Arab Emirates and others that it should include experts from the affected Member States. In affirming that its work on lithium batteries should be accorded high priority, he emphasized the need to tackle the root of the problem and find a solution. The Representative of Ecuador stressed the need for ICAO to demonstrate leadership in addressing that issue, particularly in view of the said security restrictions' economic and operational impacts and impact on air connectivity.

58. While welcoming and supporting all of the recommended actions to enhance security as set forth in paragraph 6.1, the Representative of Ecuador queried how they would address the impacts currently being experienced by the said affected Member States, which was the crux of the matter. Recalling the comments made by the Representative of France, he averred that lithium battery-powered PEDs should not be concentrated in a single location in the cargo hold of a passenger aircraft as that would pose a very high risk of an uncontrollable fire and/or explosion. The Representative of Ecuador indicated that that issue should consequently be the first to be addressed by the multidisciplinary group. He agreed with the Representatives of the Russian Federation and France on the need to improve security screening procedures and technologies for cabin baggage. In also endorsing the comment made by the Representative of Mexico regarding the USAP CMA, the Representative of Ecuador affirmed that the Programme was an essential tool to assess Member States' implementation of security-related SARPs. In highlighting the need to take into account emerging issues when conducting future audits, he stressed that that would benefit not only ICAO but also the audited Member States. Concluding, the Representative of Ecuador expressed his wholehearted support for the interventions by the Representatives of Egypt, the United Arab Emirates, Spain and Mexico.

59. While taking careful note of the concern expressed by the Representative of the Russian Federation regarding the originally-intended scheduling of the multidisciplinary group's First Meeting [cf. paragraph 6.1 g)], the Representative of Japan accepted the clarifications provided by the President of the Council, as well as by D/ANB and the President of the ANC. He then suggested that paragraph 6.1 f) be amended by adding after the words "imminent threats" the words "of artfully concealed IEDs in large PEDs" for greater clarity.

60. In underscoring that the said imminent threats were not limited to the particular IED-PED threat and encompassed all threat types, including new and emerging ones, the President of the Council proposed that the existing text of paragraph 6.1 f) instead be retained in its present general form, and that the following phrase be inserted at the end in light of the comments made by many Representatives: "and encouraged continuous consultation and collaboration among Member States on threat and risk mitigation."

61. In voicing support for this proposal, the Representative of Japan endorsed the other recommended actions set forth in paragraph 6.1.

62. The Representative of Cabo Verde noted that his State, like the rest of the international community, was paying close attention to the evolution of terrorist threats around the world. Cabo Verde was taking mitigation measures commensurate with the known threats, conscious of the fact that in the face of the terrorists' creativity, no mitigation measure adopted by any Member State would ever be sufficient to limit or completely eliminate such illegitimate actions, in particular the use of civil aviation as a means to achieving unlawful ends. Member States must constantly be aware of their respective

vulnerabilities. Cabo Verde supported legislative solutions at both the domestic and international levels and was promoting reforms and adjustments to existing mitigation measures with a view to addressing new types of threats which posed a risk to air transport activities and aviation safety. It was in that context that Cabo Verde viewed the said security restrictions imposed by certain Member States as identified in the paper. It considered that when put into practice, those restrictions had a negative impact on aviation safety. In Cabo Verde's view, since PEDs were powered by lithium batteries, they constituted dangerous goods as described in the ICAO *Technical Instructions for the Safe Transport of Dangerous Goods by Air* (Doc 9284). Recognizing the need to protect both ICAO Strategic Objective *Safety* and ICAO Strategic Objective *Security & Facilitation*, aware of the concerns expressed by the Observer from IATA at the said informal briefing, and noting the clarifications provided during the present meeting, Cabo Verde fully supported the recommended actions set forth in paragraph 6.1, as amended by the President of the Council.

63. While likewise endorsing the recommended actions, the Representative of Singapore suggested the following additional changes: that the first sentence of paragraph 6.1 d) be amended by adding after the words "request the Secretariat" the phrase "to work with the AVSECP", in view of the inputs to be provided by the Panel as referred to in sub-paragraphs a) to c); that the second sentence of sub-paragraph d) be amended by adding, at the end, a reference to best practices by Member States and the aviation industry" as other security measures that could be considered; and that the order of sub-paragraphs e) and f) be reversed to reflect the sequence of the actions set forth therein. In fully supporting sub-paragraph g), the Representative of Singapore reiterated the urgency of the work to be undertaken by the multidisciplinary group and suggested that the latter's terms of reference be cleared before the group's first meeting so as to avoid having too much of its time taken up in discussing the TOR.

64. In recognizing the high risk of a person-borne IED i.e. carried on the person or in cabin baggage, such as a large PED, the Representative of the United Republic of Tanzania expressed support for the work that had been done thus far in response thereto and accepted the need to continue to address that security risk. He looked forward to the said security risk being addressed in a global context, taking into account cooperation among Member States and industry partners in updating relevant Annex 17 SARPs to ensure effective measures for identifying risks, as outlined in the paper.

65. Responding to a question then raised by the Representative, the President of the Council clarified that the AVSECP would present recommendations to address that security risk after its Twenty-eighth Meeting, enabling the Council to take immediate action for the short-term. As the multidisciplinary group, which would include AVSECP members, would carry out its work over a greater period of time, it was anticipated that it would propose more conclusive, long-term solutions for the Council's consideration and approval. D/ANB confirmed that that was the expectation.

66. In voicing support for the recommended actions contained in paragraph 6.1, the Representative of Argentina affirmed that the establishment of the said multidisciplinary group, whose members would have a wide range of expertise, would enrich the handling of this complex issue. Underscoring the need for expeditious action, under the authoritative banner of ICAO, to guide Member States in taking the necessary measures, he stressed the importance of initiating and prioritizing the group's work on lithium batteries.

67. The Representative of Algeria also endorsed the recommended actions. He reiterated the importance of having experts from the Members States affected by the imposed security restrictions participate in the multidisciplinary group's work as proposed by the Representative of Egypt and supported by the Representatives of Turkey, the United Arab Emirates and others. The Representative of Algeria also emphasized the need to establish a time limit for the completion of its work relating to lithium batteries given the need for the Council to take action as expeditiously as possible.

68. The Representative of Ireland stressed the importance of: acknowledging the threat posed by IEDs artfully concealed in PEDs and more generally, any artfully-concealed IEDs as clearly illustrated in Section 2 of the paper; and understanding that that issue needed to be addressed both multilaterally, at the level of ICAO, where relevant, as well as bilaterally, between implementing and affected Member States. In affirming that a positive dialogue at both levels was essential to effectively deal with the said security threat, she expressed pleasure that the Council was conducting its dialogue in a very positive spirit.

69. Referring to paragraph 6.1, the Representative of Ireland voiced support for recommended actions a) and b). In so doing, she underscored the importance of the AVSECP's role in examining the issue and providing recommendations to the Council and its interaction with the multidisciplinary group. With regard to the possible Annex 17 amendments referred to in recommended action c), the Representative of Ireland highlighted that the AVSECP's Working Group on Annex 17 had already developed some provisions on screening technologies that would be considered at the upcoming Panel meeting. In emphasizing that any such proposal to amend Annex 17 should be carefully considered by the AVSECP and should be the ultimate goal, she suggested that other measures also be considered in this particular case. The Representative of Ireland noted that her State's experts had also emphasized the importance of a holistic risk assessment and had suggested that perhaps Annex 17 could be improved in that regard as well. Those experts had made several suggestions as to how that might be done, including: a requirement for impact assessment before the implementation of security measures; and/or a requirement for coordination between security and safety departments before such measures were introduced. The Representative of Ireland hoped that all of those suggestions would be fully considered by AVSECP/28 and looked forward to the results of the Panel's deliberations.

70. The Representative of Ireland also endorsed recommended actions d), e) and f), as amended during the discussion, as well as recommended action g). With regard to the latter, she expressed full support for a multidisciplinary approach to all issues, particularly in the present case given the safety and security aspects. The Representative of Ireland voiced appreciation for the clarification that the said group was a temporary one which would report to the ANC and the Council after its first meeting on its TOR, problem statement and work plan before moving forward. Noting that Members of the ABIS Group that she represented (Australia, Belgium, Croatia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal and Switzerland in addition to Ireland) had expressed interest in participating in the multidisciplinary group, she enquired as to the procedure for nominating experts to serve as group Members.

71. Recalling the comments made by the Representative of Mexico regarding USAP-CMA audit results, the Representative of South Africa sought clarification as to the meaning of an EI level of 95 per cent. In supporting the interventions that called for the Secretariat to prepare the draft terms of reference for the multidisciplinary group, he enquired as to what the TOR would encompass, bearing in mind the related work being carried out by the five existing ANC panels (DGP, FLTOPS, AIRP, AP and SMP), as well as the AVSECP and the FALP. The Representative of South Africa noted, in this regard, that a leading professor on the IED-PED issue had highlighted in a recent article that it did not match a conventional threat, and that an IED artfully concealed in a large PED would work just as well in the cargo hold of a passenger aircraft as in the cabin. He underscored that, in respecting the sovereign right of all Member States to take appropriate measures to protect the safety and security of their own citizens, as well as their national security, ICAO should continue to address global problems with global solutions.

72. Noting that ACI conducted its Airport Excellence (APEX) in Safety Programme and was piloting its APEX in Security Programme, and that IATA conducted its IATA Operational Safety Audit (IOSA) Programme, the Representative of South Africa enquired whether those organizations, and others such as the Civil Air Navigation Services Organisation (CANSO), were on board with the action being

undertaken to address the IED-PED issue.

73. Responding to the Representative's first question, DD/ASF explained that an EI level of 95 per cent reflected the level of compliance of the audited Member State with the eight critical elements (CEs) of an aviation security oversight system as described in the *Aviation Security Oversight Manual* (Doc 10047). It meant that there was a good result in terms of the audited Member State's regulatory framework, oversight organization, provision of training to security personnel, and effective implementation of security-related SARPs contained in Annex 17 – *Security* and Annex 9 – *Facilitation*, inter alia. That did not prevent the Member State from conducting a risk assessment to determine if its security threat level was low, medium or high, or from considering new and emerging security threats and discussing the associated threat and risk levels with other Member States. DD/ASF emphasized that while the Secretariat encouraged all Member States to make every effort to increase their EI level, it was necessary for them to also conduct threat and risk assessments on an ongoing basis and to perform continuous risk management.

74. DD/ASF noted that the Secretariat Study Group on the Universal Security Audit Programme would present a report to AVSECP/28 on the outcomes of its first meeting on the comprehensive review of the Programme's scope and methodology. Those outcomes would thereafter be presented to the Council, later in the current session, in the Secretary General's paper *Review of the Report of the Twenty-eighth Meeting of the Aviation Security Panel (AVSECP/28)* (C-WP/14593 Restricted). DD/ASF indicated that if the Council so wished an informal briefing could be given on the USAP-CMA to explain in greater detail the requirements against which State compliance is measured and the graphical presentation of audit results, inter alia. This was noted.

75. Replying to the Representative's last question, the President of the Council noted that IATA had already stated its position at the said informal briefing. He reiterated that IATA and ACI would be invited to provide experts to support the multidisciplinary group's work.

76. To an additional point raised by the Representative, DD/ASF clarified that C-WP/14636 Revised exceeded the four-page maximum as the Secretariat had been requested to present a single paper covering both the security threat posed by IEDs artfully concealed in PEDs and the safety implications of the imposed restrictions. Future papers would comply with the Council's four-page policy.

77. Expressing general support for the recommended actions set forth in paragraph 6.1, the Representative of India stressed the importance of striking the right balance between security and facilitation. He requested that the Council be informed of the composition and TOR of the multidisciplinary group at an early date.

78. In likewise endorsing the recommended actions, the Representative of Uruguay reiterated the need to deal with this issue in a comprehensive and expeditious manner. He also highlighted that in order to mitigate the potential risk of new terrorist attacks, it was necessary to exert greater control over airport ground personnel who handled checked baggage and cargo, including dangerous goods (e.g. flammables).

79. The Representative of Nigeria also spoke in favour of the recommended actions contained in paragraph 6.1. He concurred with the Representative of the Russian Federation on the need to prepare the multidisciplinary group's TOR before its first meeting in order to enhance the efficiency of its work. In supporting the amendments to sub-paragraph d) suggested by the Representative of Singapore, the Representative of Nigeria noted that very important steps were to be taken in the near term to address the issue, such as the provision by the Secretariat, working with the AVSCEP, of guidance to enable Member States to conduct risk assessments in order to determine what, if any, other options of security measures

could be introduced, as well as in the long term, by the multidisciplinary group and relevant panels. He agreed with the Representative of Egypt and others that experts from the affected Member States should participate in the group's work as those Member States would be the first to implement whatever recommendations or SARPs resulted therefrom. In affirming the high importance of the active involvement of industry partners in that work, the Representative of Nigeria expressed satisfaction that IATA and ACI would also be invited to participate therein.

80. To a question then raised by the Representative, the Chief, Aviation Security Audit Section (C/ASA) confirmed that the USAP-CMA did evaluate the audited Member State's ability to perform continuous risk assessment/management in accordance with all of the relevant security-related SARPs. He noted that that was covered in various components of a risk management process, including the threat assessment, the vulnerability assessment and the risk management assessment.

81. The Representative of Turkey indicated that while he had listened very carefully to the interventions by other Representatives, the main cause of the problem had not changed: the Member States which had imposed the security restrictions had not complied with Standard 2.4.1 of Annex 17 and had not shared the pertinent technical threat information with the affected Member States. He understood the challenge facing the Secretariat as it was the prerogative of sovereign States to impose security measures that they deemed necessary to protect the safety and security of their own citizens, as well as their national security. The Representative of Turkey observed that while in the present case the risk which had led to the imposition of security restrictions was undefined and unshared, all seemed to understand its magnitude. Noting that Section 2 of the paper only provided a couple of examples of the same type of threat, IEDs artfully concealed in large PEDs, he underscored that those cited had occurred in 2016 in conditions that were not very secure due to events in the region concerned. In recognizing that there was no direct link between Member States' respective USAP-CMA audit results and how their national aviation security systems could be affected by terrorists, as indicated by DD/ASF, the Representative of Turkey emphasized that the audit results' credibility was contingent upon a lack of security incidents at the Member States' airports.

82. Relating to the Electronic Bulletin EB 2017/23 dated 31 March 2017, the Representative of Turkey averred that the Bulletin, which had been issued in a hasty manner, lacked clarity and did not properly reflect ICAO's expertise. He stressed the need for the multidisciplinary group's recommendations to be clearer and to be targeted on solving the problem. Under these circumstances, the Representative of Turkey requested the Member States which had imposed the said security restrictions to be more flexible in sharing pertinent technical threat information, including with ICAO, to facilitate the future work of the multidisciplinary group and enable a quick and easy solution to be found. In concluding, he affirmed that Turkey's experts would do their best to contribute thereto.

83. Recalling the comments made by the Representative of the Russian Federation, the Representative of Egypt underscored that the multidisciplinary group should also take into consideration, and assess, the risk of terrorists using a remote control to detonate IEDs in PEDs in the cargo hold of passenger aircraft as the resultant fire and/or explosion would be difficult to control, jeopardizing the safety of the passengers and crew and the aircraft itself. In addition, he requested that the Council's decision be issued as soon as possible so that Representatives could transmit it to their national administrations for implementation.

84. The Council noted the additional information and clarifications provided during the discussion.

85. The President of the Council emphasized the need for ICAO to provide leadership and global coordination in all aviation matters, including in the one under consideration. It was also necessary

for the Organization to promote the sharing of threat information among Member States and to encourage increased and continuous consultation and collaboration, at both the bilateral and multilateral levels, to address threat and risk mitigation. Noting that while the Council bore the overall responsibility for adopting ICAO SARPs, it based its decisions on the work carried out by ICAO's experts, he underscored that in the present case it was similarly advisable to utilize, to the fullest extent possible, the best advice that could be obtained from the Organization's experts. That being said, the matter at hand was highly multidisciplinary in nature, in terms of not only its technical aspects, but also its aspects relating to facilitation and the efficiency of air transport for Member States as well as for the aviation industry. Consequently, while the proposed multidisciplinary group would function similar to a Secretariat Study Group but in a Task Force manner, its work would have greater visibility: its final recommendations would be presented to the Council for consideration through the Secretary General, along with the results of a prior review by the ANC, the AVSECP and the FALP.

86. In taking the action recommended in paragraph 6.1 of C-WP/14636 Revised, as amended by the President in light of the discussion, the Council:

- a) requested that the AVSECP include the issue of the Threat of artfully concealed improvised explosive devices in large portable electronic devices – Restrictions in the cabin and their impact on safety as the opening topic of the first Agenda Item of the Panel's forthcoming Twenty-eighth Meeting (AVSECP/28) (Montréal, 29 May – 2 June 2017);
- b) requested, through the AVSECP, that the said WGTR provide advice on that issue for consideration by AVSECP/28;
- c) requested that the AVSECP provide recommendations to the Council that may include:
 - i) actions to be taken by ICAO, including possible amendments to Annex 17 – *Security* and updates to the *ICAO Aviation Security Global Risk Context Statement*; and
 - ii) actions to be taken by Member States and the aviation industry;
- d) requested the Secretariat to work with the AVSECP to provide guidance to enable Member States to conduct risk assessments in order to determine what, if any, other options of security measures could be introduced to mitigate the identified threat and risk. Such measures to be considered could include, inter alia, technology-based screening and/or behaviour detection options, enhanced and targeted training, as well as other best practices by Member States and the aviation industry;
- e) requested that Member States, to the extent practicable, communicate information concerning imminent threats through the ICAO Aviation Security Point of Contact (PoC) Network, and encouraged continuous consultation and collaboration among Member States on threat and risk mitigation;
- f) requested that Member States, to the extent practicable, share details of their screening equipment through AVSECPaedia, in order that other Member States may be aware of the types of screening technologies currently deployed, and which may be taken into account when considering the need for enhanced security measures when a new threat is identified; and

- g) agreed on the establishment of a temporary multidisciplinary cargo safety group with experts from the areas of flight operations, dangerous goods, airworthiness, aerodromes, safety management, and security and facilitation, whose role will be, inter alia, to ensure the prioritization and consolidation of ICAO's cargo safety-related tasks, with an initial focus on lithium batteries.

87. With regard to paragraph 86 g) above, the Council noted that the draft TOR for the multidisciplinary group would be prepared by the Secretariat, taking into account the views expressed, and circulated to Council and ANC Members for any comments by Friday, 12 May 2017. The revised draft TOR, as well as a draft problem statement prepared by the Secretariat in consultation with the ANC, would subsequently be provided to the multidisciplinary group for review and comments when determining its work plan at its first meeting, which was envisaged to take place at ICAO Headquarters in Montréal from 1-2 June 2017, concurrently with AVSECP/28. As recommended by the ANC, the Chairpersons and Vice-Chairpersons of the said ANC panels would be invited to attend that initial meeting. The group would be provided with a copy of the summary minutes of the present Council meeting to facilitate its deliberations.

88. It was further noted that the multidisciplinary group would comprise approximately 20 experts drawn from the relevant panels (DGP, FLTOPS, AIRP, AP and SMP, AVSECP and FALP). Once the draft TOR was finalized in light of comments received from the Council and the ANC Members, the Secretariat would send invitations to prospective group members from the said panels. In addition, Council Members were invited to submit nominations of suitably-qualified experts. In constituting the group the Secretariat would make every effort to ensure that all of the said areas of expertise were covered and that the various interest groups were represented, including the Member States affected by the said security restrictions. The aviation industry (IATA and ACI) and the electronics industry [International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC)] would also be invited to provide experts to support the group's work.

89. The President of the Council emphasized that there should be close coordination between ANB (safety) and ATB (security and facilitation) in providing support to the multidisciplinary group, as well as close coordination between the Secretariat and the ANC, the AVSECP and the FALP, to the maximum extent possible, regarding those bodies' review of the group's reports. The report on the outcomes of the group's first meeting would be presented by the Secretary General for the Council's consideration later in the current (211th) session, following a review by the ANC, the AVSECP and the FALP. The President would decide whether any comments thereon received from the said two panels would be presented to the Council directly or through the ATC.

90. The President suggested that the Secretariat work expeditiously with the multidisciplinary group with the aim of possibly having its final report presented for the Council's consideration during the next (212th) session, at which time the latter would determine the extent to which the issue had been resolved and what further action, if any, was required.

91. In assuring the Council that the Secretariat would expedite the process and mobilize the human and financial resources required to deal with this matter as a priority, the Secretary General confirmed that work to prepare the group's draft TOR would commence immediately, with a view to the TOR's finalization at the group's first meeting, a report on which would be presented to the Council later in the current session. It was noted that the Council would also be considering during this session the item *Review of the Report of AVSECP/28*, on the basis of C-WP/14593 Restricted presented by the Secretary General and related oral reports by the ANC and the Committee on Unlawful Interference (UIC).

Any other business**Subject No. 50: Questions relating to the environment****Appointment of new Members on the Committee on Aviation Environmental Protection (CAEP)**

92. In the absence of comments by 11 April 2017 and 24 April 2017 to his e-mail messages dated 30 March 2017 and 5 April 2017, respectively, the President, on behalf of the Council, has approved the nominations of: Mr. Curtis Holsclaw as the new CAEP member from the United States, to replace Dr. Lourdes Maurice with effect from 12 April 2017; and Mr. Daniel Ramos Longo as the new CAEP member from Brazil, to replace Mr. Alexandre Rodrigues Filizola with effect from 25 April 2017.

Subject No. 6.3: Election of Chairmen and Members of subsidiary bodies of the Council**Appointment of an Alternate on the Air Navigation Commission (ANC)**

93. In the absence of comments by 21 April 2017 to the e-mail message from the President of the Council dated 19 April 2017, the Council has agreed to waive Rule 24 a) of the *Rules of Procedure for the Council* (Doc 7559) and to suspend that part of paragraph 1 of Appendix D thereof which reads “and, unless waived by unanimous agreement of the Members represented at the meeting, shall be by secret ballot” and has appointed Mr. Mark Reeves, nominated by the United States, to succeed Mr. Dan Vaca as Alternate to Mr. William Voss on the ANC with effect from 1 April 2017.

Appointment of an Alternate on the Air Transport Committee (ATC), the Finance Committee (FIC) and the Working Group on Governance and Efficiency (WGGE)

94. In the absence of comments by 1 May 2017 to his e-mail message dated 26 April 2017, the President, on behalf of the Council, has appointed Mr. Subramanian Swaminathan, Technical Expert, Delegation of India, as Alternate to Mr. Alok Shekhar, the Representative of India, on the ATC and the FIC in accordance with paragraph 3 of the Special Provisions applicable to the ATC and paragraph 6 of the Special Provisions applicable to the JSC, FIC, HRC, UIC and TCC of the *Rules of Procedure for Standing Committees of the Council* (Doc 8146), and has appointed Mr. Swaminathan as Alternate to Mr. Shekhar on the WGGE, with immediate effect.

Subject No. 10: ICAO relations with the United Nations, the Specialized Agencies and other international organizations**Request from the European Union (EU) to participate as Observer in closed meetings of the Council on aviation security**

95. In the absence of comments by 4 May 2017 to the e-mail message from the President of the Council dated 25 April 2017, and in accordance with Rule 32 a) of the *Rules of Procedure for the Council* (Doc 7559), Mr. Christopher Ross, Head of Office, Office of the European Union (EU) in Montréal, has been invited to participate as Observer on behalf of the EU during the 211th Session of the Council's consideration, in closed session, of all items related to aviation security.

Meeting schedule for the current (211th) session of the Council

96. It was noted that subsequent to the issuance of PRES OBA/2626 Revised dated 26 April 2017 setting forth the amended meeting schedule for the current (211th) Council session, it was decided

to give an informal briefing to the Council on the *Status of preparatory activities for the implementation of the Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation (CORSA)* on 8 June 2017 at 1430 hours. A President's memorandum providing details thereon would be issued shortly, as would a revised meeting schedule.

Subject No. 14: Subjects relating to air navigation

C-DEC 210/5 and State letter SMM 1 /4 -17/51 dated 5 May 2017 relating to the discontinuation of the Conflict Zone Information Repository (CZIR)

97. The Representative of Mexico recalled that on 26 April 2017 he had submitted a proposal to amend paragraph 5 e) of draft C-DEC 210/5, which had been circulated in all language versions to Representatives for comment under cover of an e-mail dated 17 March 2017, as follows: that a new second sentence be inserted reading "The information provided by Member States, through their links, should be related entirely to risks to civil aviation arising from conflict zones.". He had cautioned that there could be potential political ramifications if such links did not refer exclusively to risks to civil aviation operations arising from conflict zones. The proposal had been supported by 22 Representatives, which constituted a majority of Council Members. While not wishing to re-open the debate on this matter, the Representative of Mexico considered that his proposal should be taken on board for further consideration. He therefore suggested that a corresponding supplementary item be added to the Council's Work Programme for the current session in accordance with Rule 24 a) of *Rules of Procedure for the Council* (Doc 7559) and that it be considered in conjunction with the Secretary General's *Progress report on the ICAO web library of risk-based information* (C-WP/14611). The Representatives of Cuba, Egypt and the Russian Federation endorsed this suggestion.

98. Indicating that he did likewise did not wish the Council to re-open the debate, the President of the Council indicated that as the said proposal to amend paragraph 5 e) of draft C-DEC 210/5 had been received after the expiry of the three-working day timeframe for comments provided for in Rule 57 a) of the said Rules of Procedure (Doc 7559), it could not be accommodated. He highlighted that Representatives will have the opportunity to raise any concerns they might have regarding the web library when the Council considered above-mentioned C-WP/14611 later in the current session. This was noted.

99. The Representative of Mexico encouraged the Secretariat to comply with the five-working day timeframe for the circulation of draft C-DECs to Representatives for comments also set forth in Rule 57 a), which it seemed had not been observed on a number of occasions. He pointed out that if the said timeframes specified in Rule 57 a) of the Rules of Procedure were inadequate, then they should be reviewed and revised so as to enhance efficiency and effectiveness and enable Representatives to provide their comments and suggested amendments. This was noted.

100. In providing clarifications with respect to State letter SMM 1 /4-17/51 dated 5 May 2017, D/ANB indicated that it had been issued in order to be able to enact the Council's decision C-DEC 210/5 and remove the CZIR from the ICAO public website. That had been accomplished over the past weekend, 6-7 May 2017. He underscored that the existing and currently published website did not include an ICAO repository for conflict zones; rather, it included a prospective library of links to Member States' own sources of aeronautical information related to risks to civil aviation operations over or near conflict zones, as described in the said State letter. D/ANB further emphasized that all of the links which had previously existed had been removed and at the present time there were no links on the website. The Secretariat was awaiting nominations by Member States for their links before taking action to restore the previously-existing links.

101. The Representative of Cuba highlighted the non-correspondence of the text circulated to Member States in State letter SMM 1 /4-17/51 dated 5 May 2017 with the text of the Council-approved C-DEC 210/5, specifically the use of the expression “aeronautical information related to risks to civil aviation operations over or near conflict zones”, which was not consistent with the expression “risk-based information” concerning operations over or near conflict zones used in Council-approved C-DEC 210/5, paragraph 5 c), d) and e). In averring that they did not have the same meaning, she emphasized that the use of two different expressions could cause confusion, particularly for those Member States which were not themselves represented on the Council, although the latter represented all ICAO Member States. The Representative of Cuba indicated that her State’s views on this matter would be explained in its reply to the Secretary General’s said State letter and during the Council’s consideration of the *Progress report on the ICAO web library of risk-based information* (C-WP/14611) later in the current session.

102. D/ANB’s above clarifications were noted, as was the point made by the Representative of Mexico regarding the potential political ramifications if the said links did not refer exclusively to risks to civil aviation operations arising from conflict zones, which would be taken into account by the Secretariat in considering proposed links for posting in the web library.

President’s missions during the recess

103. In informing the Council of his planned missions during the upcoming recess, the President indicated that he would be in Kyrgyzstan from 18-21 May 2017, Ukraine from 21-25 May 2017 and Georgia from 25-27 May 2017 for bilateral meetings with senior government officials. While in Ukraine, the President would be presented with an Honorary Doctorate from his Alma Mater, the National Aviation University of Ukraine. This was noted.

104. The meeting adjourned at 1310 hours.

COUNCIL — 211TH SESSION

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE SECOND MEETING

(THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, MONDAY, 5 JUNE 2017, AT 1430 HOURS)

OPEN MEETING

First Vice-President of the Council: Miss A. Alhameli, Representative of the United Arab Emirates

Secretary: Dr. Fang Liu, Secretary General

PRESENT:

Algeria	— Mr. A.D. Mesroua	Malaysia	— Mr. Y.-H. Lim
Argentina	— Mr. G.E. Ainchil	Mexico	— Mr. D. Méndez Mayora
Australia	— Mr. S. Lucas	Nigeria	— Mr. M.S. Nuhu
Brazil	— Mrs. M.G. Valente da Costa	Panama	— Mr. G.S. Oller
Cabo Verde	— Mr. C. Monteiro	Republic of Korea	— Mr. J. Hur
Canada	— Mr. M. Pagé	Russian Federation	— Mr. A.A. Novgorodov
China	— Mr. Shengjun Yang	Saudi Arabia	— Mr. S.A.R. Hashem
Colombia	— Mr. A. Muñoz Gómez	Singapore	— Mr. T.C. Ng
Congo	— Mr. R.M. Ondzotto	South Africa	— Mr. M.D.T. Peege
Cuba	— Mrs. M. Crespo Frasquiere	Spain	— Mr. V.M. Aguado
Ecuador	— Mr. I. Arellano	Sweden	— Ms. H. Jansson Saxe
Egypt	— Mr. A. Khedr	Turkey	— Mr. A.R. Çolak
France	— Mr. P. Bertoux	United Arab Emirates	— Mr. M. Salem (Alt.)
Germany	— Mr. U. Schwierczinski	United Kingdom	— Mr. M. Rodmell
India	— Mr. A. Shekhar	United Republic of Tanzania	— Mr. R.W. Bokango
Ireland	— Mrs. A. Smith Floch	United States	— Mr. S. Kotis (Alt.)
Italy	— Mr. M.R. Rusconi	Uruguay	— Mr. D. Amado (Alt.)
Japan	— Mr. S. Matsui		

ALSO PRESENT:

Dr. N. Luongo (Alt.)	— Argentina
Mrs. M.F. Loguzzo (Alt.)	— Argentina
Mr. N. Castro da Silva (Alt.)	— Brazil
Mr. R. da Rosa Costa (Alt.)	— Brazil
Mr. D.A. Tavares Taufner (Alt.)	— Brazil
Mr. P. Langlais (Alt.)	— Canada
Mr. Chunyu Ding (Alt.)	— China
Mr. M. Millefert (Alt.)	— France
Mr. N. Naoumi (Alt.)	— Germany
Mr. M. Usami (Alt.)	— Japan
Mr. K.A. Ismail (Alt.)	— Malaysia
Mrs. D. Valle Álvarez (Alt.)	— Mexico
Mr. S. Kim (Alt.)	— Republic of Korea
Mr. K. Lee (Alt.)	— Republic of Korea
Mr. D. Subbotin (Alt.)	— Russian Federation
Mr. M.S. Habib (Alt.)	— Saudi Arabia
Mr. S. Vuokila (Alt.)	— Sweden
Mr. Ö. Doğrukol (Alt.)	— Turkey
Mrs. K.L. Riensema (Alt.)	— United Kingdom
Mr. J. Méndez (Alt.)	— Uruguay

SECRETARIAT:

Mrs. J. Yan	— C/OSG
Mr. V. Smith	— D/ADB
Mr. R. Bhalla	— C/FIN
Mr. M. Belayneh	— C/GAT
Mr. R. Macfarlane	— DD/AN
Mr. T. Hasegawa	— DD/ECD
Mrs. J. Zorbas	— FIN
Mr. A. Larcos	— ACC
Mrs. C. Schultheiss	— Précis-writer

Representatives to ICAO

Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

Chile

Cyprus

Ghana

Greece

Lebanon

Libya

Paraguay

Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Airports Council International (ACI)

European Union (EU)

World Environment Day

1. A statement was delivered by the First Vice-President on the occasion of World Environment Day 2017. She noted the importance of World Environment Day, held every year since it had been established by the United Nations in 1972 and celebrated this year on 5 June. She also highlighted the significance of this annual commemoration through which the UN stimulates worldwide awareness and encourages related action on behalf of global citizens and stakeholders.
2. The theme for 2017, *Connecting people to nature* invited citizens to re-connect with the earth's ecology and appreciate how intimately we depend on it. The year 2017 was designated by the UN General Assembly as the *International Year of Sustainable Tourism for Development* emphasizing how transport, eco-tourism and national parks are closely inter-related. Subsequent to the Council's special visit to the State of Ecuador, the importance of fully integrating air transport facilities and adhering to clear environmental protection policies and practices became evident while the visit to the Galapagos Islands underscored the importance of achieving a balance between preservation priorities and the positive economic and social impacts of tourism.
3. Lastly, the First Vice-President extended, on behalf of all Council Representatives, her sincere thanks to the Delegation of Canada for serving as global host country for World Environment Day as well as to the ICAO Environment Branch for its participation in hosting the reception in celebration of this day.

Subject No. 13: Work programmes of Council and its subsidiary bodies

Schedule for consideration of items during the 211th session

4. The Council noted the meeting schedule for the 211th Session presented in the President's memorandum PRES OBA/2626 (Revision No. 2), dated 9 May 2017, on the understanding that an additional informal briefing on the status of Preparatory Activities for the Implementation of the Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation (CORSIA), would be held on 8 June 2017 at 1430 hours. The Council also noted the schedule for consideration of items during the 211th Session as set forth in the President's memorandum PRES OBA/2628, dated 12 May 2017.

Subject No. 17.1: Joint Financing Agreement with Iceland

Subject No. 17.5: Joint Financing Agreement with Denmark

Recommendations of the Joint Support Committee Related to Items under the Danish and Icelandic Joint Financing Agreements Reviewed during the 211th Session.

5. The Council considered this item on the basis of C-WP/14596, which provided the Council with an overview of the items under the Danish and Icelandic Joint Financing Agreements (JFAs) that were considered by the Joint Support Committee (JSC) during the 211th Session.
6. The working paper was presented by the Chairperson of the Joint Support Committee, (Representative of Singapore). He noted that working papers JS-WP/2045 and JS-WP/2046 had been reviewed at the first meeting of the JSC. The Secretary of the Committee had presented ten-year historical data on service provider costs, charges, crossings, assessment and the ICAO administrative fee. Key performance indicators on safety, service level, cost efficiency, productivity and equipment performance were reviewed and the KPI status updated.
7. The Committee had also noted that crossings within the region had increased tremendously in recent years and recommended that the Secretariat be instructed to invite non-Contracting States with a high level of crossings within the North Atlantic Region to become parties to the Joint Financing Agreements.

8. The Chairperson also highlighted the fact that no meetings in the joint support field are planned for the year 2018 nor are any currently planned for 2019 and 2020.

9. Responding to the enquiry of the Representative of South Africa, the Deputy Director, Economic Development (DD/ECD) advised that Turkey and the United Arab Emirates were among the non-contracting States with high crossing numbers.

10. The Representative of Turkey informed the Council that his State had already initiated the process to join the Agreements and that it was a matter of finalizing the administrative arrangements.

11. Following consideration, the Council:

- a) noted that in undertaking the annual review of the programme of meetings for planning and budgetary purposes, no meetings were being planned for the year 2018 in the joint support field and likewise no meetings were envisaged for the years 2019 and 2020;
- b) requested the Secretariat to invite non-Contracting States of the Joint Financing Agreements (JFAs) with a high level of crossings within the North Atlantic region to become parties to the JFAs.

Subject: 18.1 Annual Budget

Subject: 18.2 Transfers from one Major Programme of the budget to another

Financial Year 2016 – Report on the Carry-Over

12. The Council considered this item on the basis of information paper C-WP/14613, which provided the status of authorized appropriation of the Regular Budget for the financial year 2016 and which was based on audited expenditure for the year. An oral report thereon from the Finance Committee was also presented for consideration.

13. The Chairperson of the Finance Committee (FIC) (Representative of the United Kingdom) noted that as this was an information paper, no action was required by Council. During its consideration of the working paper at its meeting on 2 May 2017, the Finance Committee had noted that under Financial Regulation 5.6, the carry-over was left to the discretion of the Secretary General. However, as suggested by the external auditors, from next year onwards, the Secretariat would provide a breakdown on the total amounts to be carried over and for which activities they would be used. The Committee had also noted that the carry-over statement had been audited.

14. Endorsing the Oral Report and speaking as a member of the Finance Committee, the Representative of Spain remarked that the references in the oral report relating to the questions that had been raised in the Committee concerning the use of the carry-over appeared to suggest that this line of questioning had not been in the spirit of Financial Regulation 5.6. In this connection, the Representative indicated that he was of a rather different view in that it was certainly within the purview of Council to request such information from the Secretariat. However, as recommended by the External Auditor, the breakdown of the information on this item would henceforth be provided to Council, which was something that the Representative welcomed.

15. In response to the preceding intervention, the Chief, Finance Branch (C/FIN), clarified that the comment that had appeared in the oral report in relation to the carry-over and Financial Regulation 5.6, sought only to address the suggestion that Council should review how carry-over amounts were to be utilized. In any case,

the Secretariat would be implementing the recommendation of the External Auditor and the relevant information would be provided to Council.

16. While thanking C/FIN for the clarification, the Representative of Spain indicated that he would have nevertheless preferred that this comment had been expressed differently in the Oral Report.

17. In concluding its consideration on this item, the Council noted that information concerning actions taken on transfers of appropriations between Strategic Objectives and Supporting Implementation Strategies and the carry-over of appropriations would be provided to the next ordinary session of the Assembly, as required under Financial Regulation 5.9.

18. It was further noted that, as suggested by the External Auditors, from next year onwards, the Secretariat would provide information to the Council on the total amounts to be carried-over for deferred activities; for outstanding commitments; and for existing programmes and new initiatives that are mission-critical and /or mandatory in nature.

Subject: 18.4 Contributions by Member States and Methods of Assessment
Proposal for Settlement of Arrears of Contributions by Turkmenistan
Proposal for Settlement of Arrears of Contributions by Grenada

19. The Council agreed to consider these two items together on the basis of C-WP/14631 (Turkmenistan) and C-WP/14635 (Grenada). An oral report thereon from the Finance Committee was also presented for consideration.

20. The Chairperson of the Finance Committee (FIC) (Representative of the United Kingdom) recalled that under Assembly resolution A39-31, operative clause 3, the Council had been authorized to conclude agreements with States whose contributions were in arrears for three years or more. Both States had had their voting rights suspended at the 39th Session of the Assembly. The Secretary General had duly informed each State, in writing, that they were at risk of losing their right to vote and provided payment options. The Chairperson stressed that the Secretariat seizes every opportunity to communicate with States in arrears, including via electronic monthly statements.

21. With regard to the agreements being concluded on a ten-year basis, the Secretariat noted that Assembly Resolution A39-31 operative clause 4b) allowed for ten-year agreements and in special cases agreements with a maximum duration of 20 years. Both Grenada and Turkmenistan had indicated that they wished to settle their balance over a period of ten years.

22. Following consideration, the Council:

- a) approved the proposal by Turkmenistan for the settlement of its arrears of contributions over a period of ten years as outlined in paragraph 2.1 of C-WP/14631 and restore Turkmenistan's voting rights in accordance with Assembly Resolution A39-31, Operative clause 9; and
- b) approved the proposal by Grenada for the settlement of its arrears of contributions over a period of ten years as outlined in paragraph 2.1 of C-WP/14635 and restore Grenada's voting rights in accordance with Assembly Resolutions A39-31, Operative clause 9.

Subject No. 42: Technical Cooperation**Report on Technical Cooperation Programme Development for 2016 and Update of Administrative and Operational Services Cost (AOSC) Income and Expenditure for the Year 2017**

23. The Council considered this item on the basis of information paper C-WP/14597, which presented a report on the financial and operational performance results of the Technical Cooperation Programme for the year ending 31 December 2016. A joint oral report from the Finance Committee and the Technical Cooperation Committee was also presented for consideration.

24. The Oral Report was presented by the Chairperson of the Finance Committee (Representative of United Kingdom) who recalled that C-WP/14597 had been considered during the joint meeting of the FIC and the TCC. The working paper presented audited financial and operational results of the Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) for the period 1 January to 31 December 2016, as well as an update of the AOSC Fund budgetary estimates for 2017. In 2016, 138 States and 10 organizations had benefitted from the Technical Cooperation Bureau's (TCB) services. A discrepancy in implementation volume between geographical regions was underscored, as the Americas and Africa regions continued to show higher implementation results than the Asia Pacific, Europe and Middle East regions. However, it was also noted that ultimately, it was directly dependent on the States' priorities regarding their Civil Aviation Programmes and their necessity to avail themselves of the services provided by the TCB. The Committees were reassured of TCB's continued efforts to promote its services equally to all regions.

25. The Committees had noted that the AOSC positive results in the last five years had been achieved while maintaining the administrative fees charged to technical cooperation projects at a minimum (approximately 6 per cent in 2016 versus 7 per cent charged by the Regular Programme to activities funded by the ICAO voluntary funds). Moreover, as approved by the Assembly and as part of the AOSC triennial budget for 2017-2019, a yearly amount of CAD 210,000 (or CAD 30,000 each) would be allocated to ICAO's regional offices for quality assurance services and other support to technical cooperation projects.

26. The necessity to clarify the terminology in the working paper in order to distinguish concepts such as "programme implementation" and "total programme" was also highlighted as this would improve future reporting. The Committees also called for further segregation by geographical region in the data presented in Table 3 of the working paper to facilitate further analysis. While noting that a decision had been made in the last Council session that a re-categorization of the Americas region into North and South America was not necessary (C-DEC 210/3), two members suggested that the Council revisit the issue.

27. Considering the strength of the AOSC's recent results, a member of the Committee had reiterated the need for establishing a ceiling for the accumulated reserve fund. This issue had already been discussed at length in the previous Council session and the Committees cautioned that due to the volatility of the different economies and the potential risks to the AOSC fund, it was necessary to retain a sufficient reserve. Moreover, it had been decided that Council would only revisit this subject in the event that the financial position changed significantly (C-DEC210/6).

28. Expressing his approval of the working paper as a member of the FIC, the Representative of Mexico underscored the importance of tracking allocations to various regions and the necessity to reallocate unutilized funds.

29. The Representative of Saudi Arabia suggested that in order to ensure transparency, there should be a distinction between the amounts reported for North and South America and with regard to the question of whether a ceiling should be established for the Accumulated Reserve Fund (ARF), he observed that for many

States it would not be acceptable for surpluses generated by projects in developing countries to be used for the Regular Programme.

30. Responding to the requests made in previous interventions by the Representatives of Mexico and Saudi Arabia, the Director, Technical Cooperation Bureau (D/TCB) confirmed that with regard to tracking the amounts allocated, this type of reporting could be implemented by next year. With regard to differentiating the amounts between the regions of North and South America, he observed that this combined area currently incorporated North, Central and South America as well as the Caribbean Region. Therefore, it seemed to him that as there were no projects in Canada or the United States, the segregation exercise would have no benefit since all the TCB projects were in Latin America. During C-210 it had been agreed that should there be any project in Canada or the United States, it would be reported separately. He also underscored that the Accumulated Reserve Fund (ARF) was not a surplus per se. At the end of the year if the results were positive, this was considered a surplus; if negative, a deficit. The ARF was created to cope with deficits. Although there had been surpluses during the past five years, the situation could easily change. In the event that no funds would be available in the ARF, any deficit would have to be covered by the Regular Programme Budget.

31. Expressing his support for the proposal put forward by the Representative of Mexico with regard to the tracking of allocations to the regions and D/TCB's confirmation that this could be done, the Representative of Spain also referred to a previous intervention by the Representative of Saudi Arabia with regard to the need to establish a ceiling for the ARF. Although this could be considered by Council, he suggested proceeding with caution based on the crises that had been faced in the past. The Representative also underscored the necessity of aligning terminology as well as clarifying accounting data in all documentation presented to the Council. He noted for example that data that had presented to the FIC earlier that day indicated that the terminology contained in the Technical Cooperation report had not been consistent with the report of the External Auditor.

32. Recalling that the technical cooperation projects had experienced deficits for a period of seven consecutive years, the Representative of Colombia agreed that it was important to have a reserve fund to cover for such cases of shortfall. However, he questioned whether the surplus was not in fact the accumulation of administrative fees charged to various projects and whether it would instead be possible to utilize the funds and increase the type of projects offered by TCB, since the ultimate purpose was to facilitate SARP implementation rather than the accumulation of financial reserves.

33. Addressing the proposal put forward by the Representative of Colombia, the Director, Technical Cooperation Bureau (D/TCB), recalled that the practice of cross-financing and payments between the Regular Budget and the AOSC fund had been authorized by the Assembly for the current triennium. Any change to this would require the approval of the Assembly in order to be reflected in the next budget.

34. With regard to the remarks on the accounting data highlighted by the Representative of Spain, the Chief, Finance Branch (C/FIN) noted that this was indeed the case as TCB reported implementation in two different ways; firstly, in the case where TCB acted on behalf of a State and the expenditure was met by the State, the expenditure did not appear in the financial records and implementation was considered upon the issuance of the purchase order by the State. Secondly, there was the case of progressive payment: upon the issuance of the purchase order, TCB would consider this project as implemented whereas FIN would only report the figures once the payment of the purchase order had been made. Notwithstanding this, he confirmed that reconciliation of the figures could easily be effected.

35. In sharing the views expressed in previous interventions, the Representative of Cuba also expressed her support to the Representative of Mexico with regard to the tracking of allocations to the regions and the necessity to reallocate unutilized funds as well as D/TCB's engagement to update the TCC regularly on the use of the funds. Referring to the possibility evoked by C/FIN of implementing dashboards to present the accounting information, thus eliminating the ambiguity of the concepts of total programme and programme

implementation, she underscored the importance of a reporting system that would be easily understood by all. She also supported the proposal of moving forward and establishing a ceiling for the reserve fund, as this issue had often been deferred citing reasons of global economy. In addition to the assessments contributed to the Regular Budget, developing and least developed countries also signed onto technical cooperation programmes and had certain expectations in that regard. It would be only logical therefore that they their funds should be reinvested into other projects and initiatives. Speaking not only as Representative of Cuba but also as Chair of the TCC, she suggested that the Secretariat be asked to address this issue at the next committee meeting. Finally, with regard to the segregation of information between North and South America, she proposed that the Representative of Saudi Arabia discuss this matter with the Latin American representatives in order to reach an understanding on how best to proceed.

36. In also endorsing the views expressed on the separation of data according to region, the Representative of South Africa suggested that as presented, the figures seemed to favour one region over the others and this was not in line with the NCLB initiative.

37. Referring to the request to report the information on the Americas separately, the Representative of Argentina noted that while this could easily be achieved in the future, the reported figures included monies contributed by countries participating in projects and thus explained the perceived differences between regions.

38. The Representative of Saudi Arabia, agreed that the Secretariat had an obligation to provide any information requested by Council. For the sake of transparency he suggested it would be useful to add a footnote to the documentation indicating the amount for the projects implemented in North America so as to make it clear that all the funds expended on projects in the region had in fact been expended in Latin America. He also agreed with the idea of imposing a ceiling on the reserve fund and suggested instead using the funds to provide assistance to developing countries or possibly waiving the administrative fees. In agreement with setting aside an amount to protect against unforeseen future events, he nonetheless supported setting a maximum amount.

39. Addressing questions posed by the First Vice-President (Representative of the United Arab Emirates), the Chairperson, FIC (Representative of the United Kingdom) confirmed that the addition of a footnote to indicate the difference on expenditure on projects implemented in the Americas region would represent a simple solution to the concerns raised. However, on the question of the reserve fund he recalled that extensive discussions had taken place on this matter in previous sessions both in the Committee and in Council and that it would be prudent to wait before re-opening this issue. Although the surplus could be attributed in part to improved financial management, it was mainly a result of currency fluctuations. Matters could easily go the other way and, in the event a ceiling was established, would result in a liability that would need to be addressed by the regular budget. He also remarked that the suggested ceiling amount of 2 to 3 million dollars had in the past represented one year's deficit and left very little room to manoeuvre. Only in the event the surplus would be created as a result of action of the Organization would there be a reason to reopen the issue. Since a decision on this matter had been reached at the last Council session, he suggested waiting at least one year and even two before re-examining the issue.

40. In response to the First Vice-President's question as to whether any regulations or policies existed governing the reserve fund and a ceiling, the Chief, Finance Branch confirmed that while there was no policy per se, there were regulations that applied to the AOSC and the reserve fund. He cited as an example the Assembly Resolution that outlined the applicable action to be taken in the event of a deficit in the AOSC fund. The efficiency fund was created as a result of a Council decision as was the special reserve fund that was used to repay the Regular Budget for overhead charges. However, he also reminded Council that in the event there would be a deficit followed by a decision to increase the overhead recovery rate, it would take the AOSC at least two years to recover the overhead recovery rate. Projects already in progress would remain at the old rate while the new rate would be applied to new projects only. Therefore, it would take at least two to three years before the AOSC fund would once again generate a surplus.

41. Agreeing with the comments made in the previous interventions by the Representatives of Cuba and Argentina, the Representative of Uruguay recalled that the TCB projects were in great part funded by States and not funded with ICAO funds. Using his country as an example, he remarked on the effort being made by Uruguay to secure the funding necessary to undertake TCB projects and how vital these projects were to address the concerns faced by his country. He extended an invitation to his Council colleagues to discuss the efforts being made in his region directly with the GRULAC group. The developing Latin American countries as well as the Caribbean States were undertaking all efforts to improve and implement SARPs effectively.

42. As a member of the FIC, the Representative of Germany expressed his support of the report of the FIC and his agreement with the remarks of C/FIN in explanation of why the current situation existed vis-a-vis any proposed ceiling of the reserve fund. The Representative favoured retaining the current arrangement. Recalling that the AOSC funds represented charges paid by States on projects and that it was up to ICAO to cover costs that could potentially end in a surplus or a deficit, he did not see the logic of refunding States in the event there was a surplus but using ICAO funds in the event there was a deficit. This issue had been discussed previously at length on many occasions with decisions taken so he would not support re-opening the matter again at this point.

43. In also voicing support to the comments expressed by the Representative of Germany in the previous intervention, the Representative of France strongly urged letting some time pass to see whether the decision taken by Council had been effective in order to then assess the need for further action.

44. The Representative of Egypt agreed with the proposal for a footnote to be incorporated in future reports to the effect that no projects in the Americas region were being implemented in Canada and the United States. Bearing in mind that the funds in the reserve fund belonged to developing States, he also suggested instructing the TCB and Finance to prepare a proposal on the options available for a ceiling and to report back to Council on this matter.

45. The Representative of Australia recalled that according to C-DEC 210/6 the subject of the ceiling would be reopened only in the event that there had been a change in the financial position and enquired whether this was now the case.

46. Confirming that there had been no significant change in the financial situation of the AOSC that would warrant reopening the issue and, in reply to the suggestion that the Secretariat prepare a study on the impact of the reserve fund, the Director, Technical Cooperation Bureau, noted that such studies took time and were a drain on resources and proposed instead undertaking such a project only if and when the financial situation of the AOSC fund would change.

47. The First Vice-President then suggested that one option could be for the Secretariat to provide to the Council whatever information was required as per the existing Assembly Resolutions, Financial Regulations or policy documents in this regard. This would go some way to address the concerns of Council Representatives and at the same time avoid imposing an in-depth study on the Secretariat at this time.

48. In response to the proposal, Chairperson of the Finance Committee recalled that the Secretariat had at the last session, prepared a working paper that contained detailed information and enquired whether there would be any use in carrying out the same work again. He also underscored the importance of maintaining an emphasis on the need to only re-examine this issue in the event of a significant change occurring in the financial situation. This would mean that this would be the primary reason to reopen the issue.

49. The Representative of Mexico suggested that consideration could also be given to including this issue as an agenda item for the Assembly session in 2019.

50. Enquiring on the financial resources necessary in order to complete the study discussed in previous interventions, the Representative of Germany questioned the wisdom of diverting valuable resources from TCB projects to carry out any such study.

51. Echoing the views expressed in previous interventions, the Representative of Turkey agreed that since there had been no significant change in the financial situation, there was at present no need to reopen this issue.

52. The Representative of Singapore suggested that reviewing the question of the ceiling for the accumulated reserve fund could be useful but that it should be revisited in the next triennium only. He also proposed that the Secretariat put together a package of information that included all the existing references to the AOSC fund, whether they were in Assembly Resolutions or Financial Regulations.

53. Following consideration, the Council:

- a) requested that future reports on Technical Cooperation Programme development include additional precision with respect to the terminology as indicated in paragraph 5 of the oral report;
- b) requested that future reports consider a breakdown into geographical regions of the Programme implementation results by component, commencing with the year 2017;
- c) notwithstanding a previous decision of the Council against re-categorizing the Americas region into two separate regions of “North America” and “South America” (C-DEC 210/3 refers), agreed that the report at Table 2 of C-WP/14597 would henceforth incorporate a footnote to indicate if any projects had been implemented in North America (Canada and the United States);
- d) requested that in relation to the funds being allocated to the seven ICAO Regional Offices on a yearly basis for quality assurance services and other support technical cooperation projects, that the outcomes of projects undertaken as a result would be evaluated with the requirement that those evaluation reports would be made available to Council Representatives in the 212th Session; and
- e) requested that consideration be given to presenting to the Council further detailed information in relation to the technical cooperation projects implemented by region, as indicated in Table 2 of C-WP/ 14597, in the form of introducing online dashboards during the 212th Session so that the Council would be able to better access such information.

54. In relation to the issue of whether or not to establish a ceiling for the AOSC Accumulated Reserve Fund, the Council re-affirmed the previous decision it had taken in this regard (C-DEC 210/6 refers), whereby it was agreed that the Council could, at any time it chose in the future, re-consider the subject of establishing a ceiling in the event that the financial position significantly changed, bearing in mind that the approval of the Assembly would be required for the establishment of any such ceiling. In this regard, the Secretariat was requested to circulate to Representatives background information that provided the overall policy context for this subject as referenced in related documentation, including, inter alia, relevant Assembly Resolutions and provisions of Financial Regulations.

Subject No. 42: Technical Cooperation**Report on the Mechanisms and Activities Implemented by the Technical Cooperation Bureau to Promote the Benefits of its Services**

55. The Council considered this item on the basis of information paper C-WP/14598, which provided information on the mechanisms and activities implemented by the Technical Cooperation Bureau to promote the benefits of its services and suggested improvements to its communication and public outreach strategy. An oral report thereon from the Technical Cooperation Committee was also presented for consideration.

56. The Oral report was presented by the Chairperson of the Technical Cooperation Committee (Representative of Cuba). She noted that the TCC considered C-WP/ 14598, which presented the mechanisms and activities implemented by the TCB to promote the benefits of its services, during its second meeting of the 211th Session. The Committee acknowledged that the TCB, throughout its history, had used every opportunity available to promote its value to States, service providers, donors, financial institutions and the private sector. Members recalled that technical cooperation projects were entrusted to the Bureau on the basis of priorities identified and financially supported by States and other entities seeking to benefit from the favourable and cost-effective conditions offered through the Technical Cooperation Programme, the strict neutrality, objectivity and transparency observed by the Bureau in all of its undertakings and the credibility it afforded to its clients. Despite the geographical imbalance, it was recognized that 72 per cent of ICAO Member States; approximately 138 countries, currently used TCB to implement projects.

57. The Committee also examined the aspect of State satisfaction with the TCB's services and recommended that a third-party customer satisfaction survey be conducted, in addition to a review by the Evaluation and Internal Audit Office (EAO) of selected projects implemented by TCB. The importance of the Regional Offices in the promotion of the Technical Cooperation Programme as well as in the recruitment and selection of TCB experts, particularly those nationals from their regions of accreditation, was also recognized. It was also recalled that the Regional Office Manual (ROM) Chapter V was currently being updated to better reflect the roles, responsibilities, processes of the Regional Offices related to quality assurance and the promotion of TCB services.

58. In order to attract a greater and more diverse number of clients, the Committee was informed that activities were planned including the second Global Aviation Symposium that would be held in Greece in October 2017, a CANSO-organized World ATM that had taken place in March in Madrid and another event for which the details had not yet been confirmed but that would target airport authorities and related stakeholders, such as concession operators.

59. The Chairperson also informed the Council that the Committee had agreed that a promotional package would be prepared by the TCB and distributed to all Representatives on the Council and Representatives to ICAO to assist in promoting the benefits of the TCB's services in the States and Regions they represent.

60. In conclusion, the Committee commended TCB's efforts, in spite of the various external constraints, to develop and implement outreach mechanisms and undertake activities to increase the awareness amongst States of the possibilities and advantages of ICAO's Technical Cooperation Programme. The need to evaluate the possible reduction of administrative costs charged to projects with a view to encouraging greater participation of least developed States and the strengthening of TCB's capacities to support the growing number of projects, were identified as future challenges for TCB.

61. Thanking the TCC for its report, the Representative of Mexico suggested that the promotional material referred to should also be sent to regional civil aviation authorities and included in ICAO's publications on the subject.

62. In also thanking the Chairperson of the TCC for the thorough report, the Representative of Saudi Arabia noted that during the AFI Aviation Week Meeting held in Botswana, he had observed a willingness on the part of organizations such as the FAA and Airbus to provide assistance to a number of African States. He noted that the Deputy Director of the TCB was also present at this meeting and had discussed ICAO efforts and training. What he found lacking however, was the dissemination of information on how assistance from the TCB can be obtained and optimized. Rather than have the States approach ICAO for assistance, he suggested it would be beneficial for ICAO to reach out to the States and propose projects. The TCB could also seek financial assistance from external sources in order to assist poor and developing countries to implement projects.

63. The Representative of the United Republic of Tanzania enquired as to whether the update of the ROM would be undertaken and/or impacted by the establishment of the new Strategic Planning, Coordination and Partnership Office (SPCP), which had recently created as part of the Office of the Secretary General. He specifically sought further information on when the updated manual would be ready.

64. The Director, Technical Cooperation Bureau (D/TCB) confirmed that the suggestion made by the Representative of Mexico, could be implemented. Already, the first issue of the periodical on the Technical Cooperation Programme had been circulated free of charge to all States and the second issue would shortly be distributed. While he had personally been unable to attend the AFI Week in Botswana, the TCB had been represented by the Deputy Director and two other officers who met bilaterally with a number of countries to promote TCB services. He agreed that the TCB should be an integral part of the AFI week and would suggest that a separate agenda item henceforth be devoted to the TCB. With regard to the ROM, it was expected that the first draft would be ready for consideration by the Secretary General by the end of June with a publication date expected at the end of July 2017.

65. Following consideration, the Council commended the Technical Cooperation Bureau (TCB) for its efforts, in spite of the various external constraints, to develop and implement outreach mechanisms and undertake activities to increase the awareness among States of the possibilities and advantages of the ICAO Technical Cooperation Programme for the implementation of their civil aviation programmes.

66. In relation to the promotional packages that would be prepared by the Secretariat and distributed to all Council Representatives, it was agreed that these packages would also be provided to regional civil aviation entities by way of assisting efforts to promote the benefits of TCB services in States and regions.

67. The Council also noted that future challenges included a need to evaluate the possible reduction of administrative costs charged to projects with a view to encouraging greater participation of least developed States in the Technical Cooperation Programme, while taking into account the need for strengthening the Bureau's administrative abilities to support the growing number of technical cooperation projects.

Subject No. 14.3.8 Aviation Training

Pricing Policy for Global Aviation Training Activities

68. The Council considered this item on the basis of C-WP/14600, which presented the Pricing Policy for the Global Aviation Training (GAT) activities. An oral report thereon from the Implementation, Strategy and Planning Group (ISPG), was also presented for consideration.

69. It was recalled that during the 210th Session of the Council, the ISPG presented an oral report on *Review of Issues Relating to the ICAO Aviation Training Policy*. In that report, the ISPG had indicated that a comprehensive Pricing Policy for GAT activities would be presented to the Council at the current (211th) session

to provide more transparency and visibility on training fees, and would be aligned to the cost-recovery nature of GAT activities.

70. The Oral Report was presented by the Chairperson of the Implementation, Strategy and Planning Group (C/ISPG), (Representative of Australia). The Group had considered C-WP 14600 on the Pricing Policy for Global Aviation Training at its first meeting during the 211th Session of the Council and had noted that the Pricing Policy had been formulated to give effect to the ICAO Civil Aviation Training Policy approved by Council. Under this Policy, the activities of the TRAINAIR PLUS Programme (TPP) operated on a cost-recovery basis and any surplus generated remained within and was used solely for TPP whereas any surpluses generated by other revenue-generating training activities could be used to support organizational priorities and Strategic Objectives. The ISPG endorsed this approach and the draft pricing policy in general, subject to a number of observations and amendments. Recognizing the principle that ICAO should not seek to generate revenue from Member States, the ISPG requested that the policy include a provision permitting price discrimination in favour of government trainees and organizations versus those originating from the private sector and that such pricing flexibility would be introduced via the regular and routine approval of pricing by the Secretary General, according to the Pricing Policy, and reviewed periodically. The ISPG also welcomed the establishment of a reserve fund that would ensure continuity of GAT activities, that would cover contingencies and that would support Member States through scholarships for trainees.

71. Secretariat Administrative Instructions would include the selection criteria for scholarships and the selection process would be undertaken jointly with Regional Offices. Moreover, the ISPG recommended flexibility in the scholarship scheme and the involvement of Regional offices, that would also allow recipients from States with EI rates above 60 per cent to be included in order to support capacity-building. The ISPG also noted that the number of scholarships had been projected to be two per State with EI rates below 60 per cent however, this rate could be increased based on the evolution of the reserve fund. The ISPG also sought advice on how to establish the reserve fund, based on the financial regulations of the Organization, and was advised that its establishment should be undertaken by the Finance Branch upon approval by Council. The ISPG noted the price benchmarking results and welcomed the indications that the pricing of ICAO training products and services are generally lower than those from comparable training providers. However, the Secretariat was urged to carry out this activity on a regular basis while enhancing the scope of training organizations benchmarked. Lastly, the revised version of the Pricing Policy incorporated the views expressed by the ISPG, which recommended that Council approve the revised ICAO Pricing Policy for GAT activities.

72. Expressing his thanks to the ISPG for the report, the Representative of Mexico stated that it was important to recall that, at the outset, ICAO's role in training was to help developing and least developed countries to create capacity and resolve certain deficiencies. While there had been a reference to price discrimination for States as opposed to the private sector in the Oral Report, the policy did not reflect this. He also proposed modifying a phrase in paragraph 1 of the proposed policy that would read, "the Secretary General in accordance with this policy" and he suggested removing the phrase in paragraph 3.1. that read "as well as support the Organization's priorities and strategic objectives". He also suggested that using the expression "reduced rate" in paragraph 3.1 could be misleading and suggested instead referring to "cost-recovery basis". Commenting on the fund, he agreed with the opinion expressed by the ISPG that the fund should be restricted to surpluses generated by courses given to the private sector. With regard to paragraph 5.1 d), he suggested deleting the phrase "contribution to support organizational priorities" as this did not align with the objective of providing training to States. With regard to programme support costs (paragraph 4.1 b)), he enquired whether the Secretariat would also consider these costs for training of staff under the Regular Programme or in a TCB programme.

73. The Representative of Germany asked for examples of "comparable training providers" referred to by the ISPG in its Oral Report and requested clarifications on the relationship between GAT training and private entities and whether GAT was in competition with private entities for the same customers.

74. In response to the preceding interventions, Manager, GAT (M/GAT) cited IATA, ACI, ENAC and the Singapore Aviation Academy as examples of comparable training providers. With regard to the question raised on the programme support costs, he clarified that for services rendered to and received from the Regular Programme and the Secretariat, an arrangement existed to report the costs of the services across all bureaus. On the creation of a reserve fund for surpluses generated, he observed that the policy did not distinguish between surpluses generated from the private sector and from developing countries. Since this aspect had not been considered during the preparation of the policy, he suggested it be referred back to the ISPG.

75. Thanking the ISPG for its report and expressing his support for the intervention by the Representative of Mexico, the Representative of the United Republic of Tanzania referred to the issue of the reserve fund and enquired why, if the purpose of the fund was to assist States with EI rates below 60 per cent had this point had been omitted from paragraphs 1.1 and 1.3.

76. In also thanking the ISPG for the report, the Representative of Spain expressed his appreciation for the flexibility shown by the ISPG in introducing most of the suggestions made by Representatives at their recent meeting. He noted that the procedure for TRAINAIR PLUS, as outlined in the Oral Report appeared to be different from the procedures for other activities undertaken by the Organization in that any surpluses generated by the TRAINAIR programme would remain and be used solely for TRAINAIR activities. If, as suggested by the Representative of Mexico, services provided to countries would be on cost-recovery basis, then any surplus generated would have to come from other activities. In the circumstances, the Representative suggested that a policy might need to be developed to define how these surpluses could be used. For example, surpluses generated from other activities could fund related activities under the various strategic objectives. He observed that there would be a need for such scenarios to be reflected in the text of the policy on training. The Representative also expressed his agreement with the Chairperson of the ISPG who had observed that the policy was more of a policy for price structure rather than a pricing policy wherein the prices would be determined by the Secretary General but only on the understanding that these would be reported to the Council.

77. M/GAT recalled that the changes with regard to the States with an EI rate below 60 per cent occurred during the discussions of the ISPG. He also highlighted that the Pricing Policy was aligned with the *ICAO Training Policy*, which clearly indicated that there were two sources of revenue; the TPP activities which were ring-fenced since the revenues were generated through membership fees, and the other through training activities outside of TPP. He informed the Council that GAT also conducted courses that were not per se part of the TRAINAIR PLUS Programme and that the fee structure included revenue to cover the resources of the GAT office. This would be an example cited in the previous ICAO training policy that specified that any surplus generated from such activities would be used to support organizational activities as opposed to the TPP membership fees that were ring-fenced. This was the main distinction.

78. To provide further clarification on the operating reserve for GAT, the Secretary General recalled that the purpose of the operating reserve was to cover contingencies and to ensure the continuity of the GAT operations. According to Financial Regulation 7.3 d) governing the ARGF fund, 25 per cent of GAT annual revenue was reserved for other ARGF activities. Should Council so decide, this percentage could be increased or decreased. TPP revenues were ring-fenced not only for the membership fees but for all other training activities contributing to the ARGF. In this way the surplus contributed to the Regular Programme budget activities and had been included in the Regular Budget of the current triennium. Furthermore, Council had approved and the Assembly endorsed using the 26 per cent increase in the ARGF fund for the Regular Budget. This amount included the contribution from training activities. The contribution of training activities to the ARGF fund assisted in meeting the targets of the ARGF contribution to the Regular Programme Activities.

79. Providing supplementary information as to why the reference to States with an EI rate below 60 per cent had been removed, the Chairperson, ISPG recalled that this was the sole criterion for ability to access the scholarship arrangement. During the group's discussions, it was highlighted that States, even those at the 60 per

cent level, would benefit from ICAO assistance and it was also observed that the input of the Regional Offices would be required in this regard. Since the mechanism for setting up the scholarship fund would be outlined in Administrative Instructions to be issued by the Secretariat, the ISPG judged that it would be better to have more flexibility. In short, the reason to remove the EI rate of less than 60 per cent was to ensure greater flexibility and increase access for the States.

80. The Representative of Singapore thanked the Chairperson of the ISPG for the work that had been carried out on the policy. However, he maintained that it was essential to remember the reasons behind the policy. First among these was the necessity to provide training packages for developing countries at the lowest possible cost. Although it might be difficult to reflect this in the policy, the underlying purpose of the policy dictated some pragmatic measures. For instance, cost-reduction could be achieved by limiting the number of persons sent on mission to carry out the training and reducing travel costs as much as possible. Likewise, streamlining overhead costs could also include eliminating the charges related to the incremental costs of training packages that already existed and were given by TPP members, instead of charging the overhead of all the contributors involved. Bulk pricing could also be implemented and, once all the costs had been recovered, discounts could be offered.

81. The Secretary General expressed her thanks to the Representative of Singapore for his suggestions aimed at reducing costs and she assured him that continuous efforts were being made in this direction. In 2016, the overhead costs had been reduced and, reducing the costs of courses to States was being envisaged, based on cost-recovery. She confirmed that additional information would be provided with regard to the financial regulations that governed the reserve fund. However, she also underscored that the revenue generated by training activities formed part of the overall revenue targets established for the ARGF Fund and that this revenue contributed to support regular programme activities and was included in the current budget. She also confirmed that the Administrative Instructions would be developed by the Secretariat as soon as practicable and posted on the website.

82. The Representative of Spain enquired whether there would be a policy proposed to Council regarding the fund or whether the policy attached to the Oral Report would serve to establish the fund. He also thanked the Secretary General for confirming that the pricing structure for the GAT activities that were to be set by the Secretary General in accordance with the relative administrative procedures would be reported to Council. With regard to the pricing policy itself, the Representative reiterated that it was important for any surpluses generated to be used to advance the strategic objectives, scholarships, promotions as well as capacity-building activities for developing countries.

83. Expressing appreciation to the Chairperson of the ISPG for the Report, the Representative of Malaysia stressed that the pricing policy would undoubtedly impact the scope of the TRAINAIR PLUS activities for ICAO. He also supported the changes proposed by the Representative of Mexico that he had indicated in his earlier intervention and recalled that in a previous Council session, the subject of cost-recovery had been thoroughly discussed. Referring to the scope in the Pricing Policy, he enquired whether there were other training activities in ICAO that were not part of GAT. Specifically, he referred to GAsEP, GANP and even the implementation of CORSIA for which some States would require training in for capacity-building.

84. In response, M/GAT confirmed that the scope, as outlined in the pricing policy, was an exact copy of the text in the *ICAO Civil Aviation Training Policy*. This had been done intentionally so as to avoid introducing new concepts that would not be aligned with the *ICAO Civil Aviation Training Policy*. However, the scope of the pricing policy did not mean that there was no coverage of air navigation issues. There was always room for expansion in the coverage of the policy to take in other training areas such as aviation law, environment and facilitation, based on the support received.

85. Supplementing the comments made by M/GAT, the Secretary General confirmed that Financial Regulation paragraph 7.3 d) stipulated that the ARGF reserve fund included training activities, hence the suggestion for adding the footnote in the policy to indicate this. Since the reserve fund was already governed by a Financial Regulation, it would be reported to Council in the financial statements according to existing procedures. This would be reflected in the Administrative Instructions to be developed by the Secretariat and circulated to the Council.

86. After clarifying the wording changes to the policy that he had proposed in previous interventions, the Representative of Mexico emphasized that the ARGF activities should not be funded by training surpluses generated from States but rather, should be restricted to surpluses generated by the private sector and that a mechanism should exist to differentiate between the two. Otherwise, the references to supporting priorities and strategic objectives included in paragraphs 3.1 and 5.1 d) of the policy, should be deleted.

87. The Representative of Malaysia reiterated his concern that all training being offered by ICAO, and not necessarily only the TRAINAIR PLUS component, was now going to be offered on a cost-based basis since this would have implications for the States.

88. M/GAT confirmed that all GAT training activities were certainly on a cost-recover basis but that this was not inconsistent with the GAT mission to assist States in capacity-building especially with regard to human resource development. With this in mind, GAT was also intending to broaden the scope of courses being offered to States.

89. In approving the Pricing Policy as it had been revised and presented by the ISPG and appended to the oral report, the Council further agreed to the following additional amendments:

- a) paragraph 1.1 of the Policy would now read: “The Pricing Policy for the Global Aviation Training (GAT) activities complies with the ICAO Civil Aviation Training Policy and includes the pricing rationale, assumptions and fee structure. It also establishes a reserve fund and scholarship for trainees from States which in the context of capacity-building efforts within the *No Country Left Behind* initiative are endeavouring to either meet or maintain their Effective Implementation (EI) rates. Pricing for GAT activities is set by the Secretary General in accordance with this policy as well as relevant administrative procedures and is included in reporting to the Council”;
- b) paragraph 3.1 of the Policy would now read: “Based on its non-profit principle and the pricing mechanisms contained in the ICAO Civil Aviation Training Policy, pricing of training services and products are set to recover GAT staff costs, product development, and delivery costs.” with the originally proposed subsequent wording: “...as well as support the organization’s priorities and Strategic Objectives” to be deleted;
- c) paragraph 3.2 of the Policy would now read: “Pricing of ICAO training products and services for trainees and training organizations from civil aviation regulatory bodies will be cost-based.” with the originally proposed subsequent wording: “...and offered at a reduced rate compared to those from the private sector” to be deleted;
- d) paragraph 3.3 of the Policy in relation to the reserve fund, would now contain a footnote to indicate that: “The reserve fund is established in line with the relevant provisions set forth in paragraph 7.3 d) of *The ICAO Financial Regulations*” and in this regard, it was also understood that the Administrative Instructions that were currently being developed by the Secretariat in relation to the fund would contain additional information on how the fund

would operate and that this information would be made available to Council Representatives via the Council website; and

- e) paragraph 5.1 d) of the Policy would now read: “fees for the delivery of courses, conducted by ICAO or TRAINNAIR PLUS Members, are intended to cover the costs of course development and delivery, and any shortfall from TPP annual membership fees and contribution to the GAT reserve fund” with the originally proposed wording: “...to support organizational priorities” to be deleted.

Subject: 14.3.8 Aviation Training

Customer Satisfaction Survey on the Global Aviation Training (GAT) Activities

90. The Council considered this item on the basis of C-WP/14630, which presented the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the provision of customer satisfaction surveys on GAT activities. An oral report thereon from the Implementation, Strategy and Planning Group (ISPG), was also presented for consideration.

91. It was recalled that during its 209th Session, the Council had considered C-WP/14511 *Report on the Implementation of the ICAO Civil Aviation Training Policy and Global Training Activities for 2017-2018-2019*. In doing so, the Council had requested (C-DEC 209/4 refers) that an independent survey be conducted on Global Aviation Training (GAT) activities as a whole to determine the level of State satisfaction.

92. The Chairperson of the ISPG (Representative of Australia) presented the Oral Report and recalled that the Council had requested an independent survey on GAT activities aimed at TRAINAIR PLUS participants and Members States and that the working paper outlined the terms of reference for the conduct of the survey. The ISPG had suggested an amendment to paragraph 5.4 of the terms of reference that would give respondents the option of identifying themselves or remaining anonymous, thus allowing respondents to provide an objective assessment of GAT activities. The ISPG had sought confirmation from the Secretariat that the role of the GAT office would be limited to ensuring the survey report would conform with the terms of reference of the survey and that the format of the report to be made to the Council would be in line with existing ICAO guidelines. The ISPG had also welcomed the confirmation that the statistical results would be provided to Council.

93. With regard to the cost of the survey, the ISPG had noted the budgeted amount of USD 70,000 to be rather high but received assurances from GAT that this amount represented a maximum amount and that necessary measures would be taken to select the most cost-effective service provider during the tendering process. The ISPG recommended that GAT draw upon the experience of the Technical Cooperation Bureau (TCB) which had conducted a similar survey recently. Subject to these observations, the ISPG had endorsed the terms of reference of the proposed survey.

94. Referring to the concerns expressed by the ISPG in the Oral Report, the Representative of Mexico underscored the importance of GAT consulting TCB before undertaking the survey given that the latter had already conducted a similar survey recently and in this context it would be helpful to establish a common practice.

95. Supporting this suggestion, the First Vice-President highlighted the importance of a consultation process being undertaken between GAT and TCB before embarking on the survey.

96. The Representative of Singapore questioned whether it would be possible to instead have the Secretariat conduct the survey. He believed that the resources were available in-house, that he trusted the Secretariat to be objective and professional about the results and that this would result in savings of USD 70,000 that could instead be used to assist States in other areas. He also suggested that this be considered as a standard

solution for the long term. For the case under consideration, he wondered whether there would not be an economy of scale if both GAT and the TCB were to work with the same survey provider.

97. Echoing the views expressed by the Representative of Singapore, the First Vice-President observed that it was the Terms of Reference for the Customer Service Survey on GAT activities that were being considered and not the pricing. However, it would be worthwhile to consider in future a joint TCB-GAT survey, since the surveys were essentially the same and this would greatly reduce the costs of conducting these surveys.

98. The Representative of the Russian Federation agreed with the proposals of the Representative of Singapore and the First Vice-President on undertaking such survey as a joint effort between different parts of the Secretariat.

99. Recalling that the customer satisfaction survey had been recommended by Council and that GAT was seeking to implement that decision, Manager, GAT (M/GAT) explained that GAT in fact already had three different levels of survey that it carried out: on the instructors, on the trainees and on the course material. The feedback on the products offered was already being used to effect improvements and to make sure the products were well received by the trainees themselves.

100. Noting the concern raised by the ISPG in relation to the proposed Terms of Reference with regard to the identity of the respondents, the Representative of the United Republic of Tanzania enquired whether the ISPG had made any proposals or taken any decisions on this question of guaranteeing the anonymity of respondents.

101. The First Vice-President confirmed that this issue had been discussed at the meeting of the ISPG and that the terms of reference would be changed to indicate that respondents had the option to remain anonymous unless they chose to do otherwise.

102. Confirming that this had indeed been their intention, the Chairperson of the ISPG explained that the terms of reference would be amended to indicate that respondents would remain anonymous and given the opportunity to identify themselves only if they had issues to further discuss. Since the Council was not being asked to approve the TORs but simply to take note at this stage and since GAT had been tasked with conducting the survey, the ISPG had decided to make its recommendations for the amendments instead of redrafting the document on this point.

103. In responding to the First Vice-President's specific question related to pricing and contract negotiations, M/GAT noted that the tender for the TCB survey had already been awarded and the terms of reference already conveyed to the survey entity. Therefore, changing those terms of reference in order to now reflect the requirements of the subsequent GAT survey might result in another round of negotiations with new delivery times. He suggested that at this point in time it would be more efficient to allow the GAT survey to proceed de-coupled from the previous TCB exercise while perhaps considering a joint survey in the future.

104. In concluding its consideration of this item, the Council noted that the ISPG had recommended that in order to objectively analyze customer feedback on training provided by the GAT Office, an amendment to paragraph 5.4 of the proposed terms of reference be made to ensure that respondents remain anonymous with the option of identifying themselves, should they choose to do so. The Council endorsed this recommendation.

105. In addition, it was noted that GAT has used as a reference the TCB customer satisfaction survey terms of reference. In relation to the concern expressed by the Council at the ceiling price of the survey, it was understood that GAT will negotiate the most competitive price with the prospective survey entity and in the future,

both GAT and TCB would seek to jointly negotiate one contract with an external survey entity in order to optimise cost efficiencies for the Organization.

106. Subject to the amendments indicated in the preceding paragraphs, the Council endorsed the terms of reference of the Customer Satisfaction Survey on the Global Aviation Training (GAT) activities as reflected in C-WP/14630.

107. The meeting adjourned at 1730 hours.

COUNCIL — 211TH SESSION**SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING****(THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, WEDNESDAY, 7 JUNE 2017, AT 1000 HOURS)****OPEN MEETING**

President of the Council: Dr. Olumuyiwa Benard Aliu

Secretary: Dr. Fang Liu, Secretary General

PRESENT:

Algeria	— Mr. A.D. Mesroua	Kenya	— Ms. M.B. Awori
Argentina	— Mr. G.E. Ainchil	Malaysia	— Mr. Y.-H. Lim
Australia	— Mr. S. Lucas	Mexico	— Mr. D. Méndez Mayora
Brazil	— Mrs. M.G. Valente da Costa	Nigeria	— Mr. M.S. Nuhu
Cabo Verde	— Mr. C. Monteiro	Panama	— Mr. G.S. Oller
Canada	— Mr. M. Pagé	Republic of Korea	— Mr. J. Hur
China	— Mr. Shengjun Yang	Russian Federation	— Mr. A.A. Novgorodov
Colombia	— Mr. A. Muñoz Gómez	Saudi Arabia	— Mr. S.A.R. Hashem
Congo	— Mr. R.M. Ondzotto	Singapore	— Mr. T.C. Ng
Cuba	— Mrs. M. Crespo Frasquiere	South Africa	— Mr. M.D.T. Peege
Ecuador	— Mr. I. Arellano	Spain	— Mr. V.M. Aguado
Egypt	— Mr. A. Khedr	Sweden	— Mr. S. Vuokila (Alt.)
France	— Mr. M. Millefert (Alt.)	Turkey	— Mr. A.R. Çolak
Germany	— Mr. U. Schwierczinski	United Arab Emirates	— Miss A. Alhameli
India	— Mr. A. Shekhar	United Kingdom	— Mr. M. Rodmell
Ireland	— Mrs. A. Smith Floch	United Republic of Tanzania	— Mr. R.W. Bokango
Italy	— Mr. M.R. Rusconi	United States	— Mr. S. Kotis (Alt.)
Japan	— Mr. S. Matsui	Uruguay	— Mr. M. Vidal

ALSO PRESENT:

Dr. N. Luongo (Alt.)	— Argentina
Mrs. M.F. Loguzzo (Alt.)	— Argentina
Mr. N. Castro da Silva (Alt.)	— Brazil
Mr. P. Langlais (Alt.)	— Canada
Mr. Chunyu Ding (Alt.)	— China
Mr. N. Naoumi (Alt.)	— Germany
Mr. M. Usami (Alt.)	— Japan
Mr. K.A. Ismail (Alt.)	— Malaysia
Mrs. D. Valle Álvarez (Alt.)	— Mexico
Mr. S. Kim (Alt.)	— Republic of Korea
Mr. K. Lee (Alt.)	— Republic of Korea
Mr. D. Subbotin (Alt.)	— Russian Federation
Mr. M.S. Habib (Alt.)	— Saudi Arabia
Mr. Ö. Doğrukol (Alt.)	— Turkey
Mrs. K.L. Rienzeema (Alt.)	— United Kingdom
Mr. J. Méndez (Alt.)	— Uruguay

SECRETARIAT:

Mrs. J. Yan	— C/OSG
*Mr. I. Galán	— D/TCB
*Mr. B. Djibo	— D/ATB
*Mr. V. Smith	— D/ADB
*Mr. R. Bhalla	— C/FIN
*Ms. H. Jackson	— A/C/EAO
*Mr. H. Gourdji	— DD/MO
*Mr. R. Macfarlane	— DD/AN
*Mr. A. Detchou	— DD/LP
*Mr. M. Fox	— C/PRC
*Mrs. L. Comeau-Stuart	— C/POD
*Ms. K. Balram	— C/SEA
*Miss L. Lim	— C/FSV
*Ms. S. Brand	— C/RPM
*Mr. S. Jossai	— C/RCP
*Mr. T. Shatani	— SEA/SAU
*Mr. M. Leitgab	— ADADB
*Mrs. P. Romano	— Head, ASV/ARU
Miss S. Black	— Précis-writer

Mr. C. Mancinelli, External Auditor, Corte dei Conti
 Mr. S. Penati, External Auditor, Corte dei Conti
 Mr. E. Granelli, External Auditor, Corte dei Conti

*Part-time