

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Roll No. 4207

1. The interests of civil aviation growth and its security are often seen as being at cross purposes. This has led to a lot of conflicts between stakeholders, i.e., airports, airlines, ground handling agents, cargo transporters, etc. on the one hand and the security agencies, i.e., the security regulator, access control forces, intelligence agencies, etc. on the other, with the Ministries of Civil Aviation and Home Affairs trying to play an uneasy referee. It has created a vicious cycle of the stake holders trying to get away with cutting corners, the security agencies devoting more time to policing and hardening their stance than to constructive security and the stake holders trying for regulatory capture and so on.
2. This study describes the current aviation security architecture in the country and the areas of conflict between the two sides to explore a way out of the *vicious* cycle and convert it into a *virtuous* one in which both the sides come together to enhance the cause of both civil aviation growth and civil aviation as well as national security.
3. A new National Civil Aviation Policy, 2016 has been announced recently. This study examines the various provisions of the same and has noted that, overall, the new policy has diluted civil aviation security while the global trend is to make the civil aviation security more robust. The study recommends revisiting some provisions, adding riders to some and enhancing certain good initiatives.
4. The dissertation has examined the long – standing question of raising a dedicated Aviation Security Force (ASF) and has concluded that ASF should be carved out of CISF and made into a separate force under Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA). The regulation and execution should be kept separate so that there is good check and balance. The study

also finds merit in the argument that the security regulator, Bureau of Civil Aviation Security (BCAS) should come under the oversight of MHA instead of Ministry of Civil Aviation (MCA) as at present.

5. It is noted that, at present, there is no scientific basis for ascertaining the efficacy of the regulations/ technology/ processes/ equipment against any predefined regulatory safety and security goal. This study evolves a scientific mechanism for making the cost benefit analysis for choosing amongst alternatives and provides a formula for sharing the costs between the stake holder/s and the government after a particular regulation or proposed adoption of technology/ process/ equipment passes securitisation criteria.