

A count of the categories of differences against the total of 10,696 ICAO standards and recommended practices notified by Serbia, Vanuatu and Australia as at 13 January 2014 is shown in the table below.

State	More exacting or exceeds	Different in character or other means of compliance	Less protective or partially implemented or not implemented	Not applicable
Serbia	84	58	41	1514
Vanuatu	2	71	9	3914
Australia	91	597	2078	1258

A difference should not be solely considered as a deficiency – States will also notify a difference where they exceed the ICAO standard and recommended practices or where they achieve the ICAO standard using a different method.

Some examples of differences, for each country, according to the categories of differences are:

More exacting or exceeds ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices:

- An example from Serbia is the ICAO standard specifying the procedures by which aeronautical telecommunication services should communicate with pilots before closing down. Serbia has notified ICAO that it requires all of its aeronautical telecommunication services to operate 24 hours per day.
- An example from Vanuatu is in relation to the ICAO standards specifying the minimum ages of pilots and other specialist aircraft maintenance crew – Vanuatu’s minimum age thresholds are higher than the ICAO standards.
- Australia exceeds the ICAO standard specifying which types of flights are required to carry contingency fuel reserves because Australia requires that contingency fuel is carried on all flights.

Difference in character or other means of compliance:

- An example from Serbia is the ICAO standard describing the visibility thresholds for flights using Visual Flight Rules. Serbian rules use the same minimum ground distance to describe cloud ceiling but also requires an 8km distance from clouds (horizontally) as compared with the ICAO minimum of 5km.
- In Vanuatu there is a different definition used to define the roles of the specialists in an aircraft, including different definitions for flight crew, cabin crew and regular crew.
- Australia has notified ICAO that in relation to the ICAO standard for a checklist to be used to search an aircraft following suspicion or detection of a hazard or a dangerous substance, Australian legislation requires that every aeroplane must be searched before the flight. This achieves the same outcome as a search conducted only after a potential hazard has been identified.

Less protective or partially implemented or not implemented:

- An example from Serbia is the standard regarding the certification of aeroplanes in relation to the least-risk bomb location. The ICAO standard requires that after 12 March 2000

aircraft able to seat more than 60 people be assessed during certification in relation to the least-risk location on the aircraft where a bomb may be placed so as to minimise the effects of detonation. Serbia has notified ICAO that it has not implemented this requirement.

- Vanuatu has notified ICAO that it has not yet implemented proof of compliance standards in regards to airworthiness testing.
- Australia has notified ICAO that it does not have legislation to define remotely piloted aircraft, but is currently developing legislation to comply with the ICAO standards.

Not applicable:

The majority of differences notified by most countries are those where the ICAO standard and recommended practice is not applicable. An example for both Australia and Vanuatu would be those standards relating to snow-clearing activities at airports. An example for Serbia is in relation to flight paths from an International Airport that project out into the sea – as a land-locked country, these standards are not applicable to Serbia.

There is no ability to compromise or negotiate notified differences from ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices. The process of notification of differences provides a structured way for each State to communicate its aviation rules by measuring itself against the neutral framework of the ICAO standards.

Commercial or private pilots preparing to enter into the airspace controlled by that State are required to familiarise themselves with the aviation rules of the State – and by using the ICAO standards and recommended practices and the notified differences, the information required is streamlined into a framework that is understood by all aviators.

Regards

Gilon Smith

Director (a/g), Air Services Negotiations
Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development
gilon.smith@infrastructure.gov.au Ph: 02 6274 6634