



International Civil Aviation Organization

Air Navigation Bureau

REPORT ON THE ICAO EVALUATION OF REGIONAL SAFETY OVERSIGHT ORGANIZATIONS

November 2017

R. Lambo
Consultant
ANB/IMP

Table of Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.	METHODOLOGY.....	3
3.	EVALUATION CRITERIA	4
4.	CLASSIFICATION OF THE FUNCTIONS OF THE RSOO.....	5
5.	OVERVIEW OF RSOOS.....	6
6.	CHALLENGES FACING RSOOS	6
6.2	Legal Framework.....	6
6.3	Organizational structure	8
6.4	Funding mechanism.....	8
6.5	Management processes and systems.....	10
6.6	RSOO functions.....	10
6.7	Membership.....	12
6.8	General comments	12
7.	PROPOSED ACTIONS	13
8.	CONCLUSIONS	14
	APPENDIX 1 – Summary of the Responses of the RSOOs.....	15
	APPENDIX 2 - RSOO Evaluation Questionnaire.....	19

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 ICAO and the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) jointly held the Forum on Regional Safety Oversight Organizations (RSOOs) for Global Aviation Safety in Ezulwini, Swaziland, from 22 to 24 March 2017. The Forum agreed on a Global Strategy and Action Plan for the improvement of RSOOs and the establishment of a global system for the provision of safety oversight. The Global Strategy consisted of three objectives:

- a) The improvement and strengthening of the RSOO's capacity to carry out safety oversight functions and actively contribute to ICAO's programmes and activities;
- b) the implementation of a global aviation safety oversight system (GASOS); and
- c) the establishment of an RSOO cooperative platform.

1.2 The Forum called for an evaluation to be conducted for the purpose of updating information on the major challenges that RSOOs faced in relation to their improvement. The evaluation was conducted from mid-May to August 2017 and provides an overall picture of the current status of the RSOOs and the major challenges they face in the implementation of their respective mandates. The evaluation represents a first step towards a more in-depth gap analysis, which can be conducted for any of the RSOOs on their request.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 A questionnaire² was designed and sent to the RSOOs with the aim of collecting information on each RSOO's characteristics, challenges, lessons learned and best practices. The questionnaire contained fifty questions, arranged in the following eight sections:

- Section 1: Contact details
- Section 2: Legal framework
- Section 3: Organizational structure
- Section 4: Funding mechanism
- Section 5: RSOO management processes and systems
- Section 6: Tasks, functions and activities³
- Section 7: RSOO membership
- Section 8: General comments

2.2 The questionnaire was sent to the RSOOs in mid-May 2017 and by the end of July, all the RSOOs had responded.

¹ A copy of the Report on Forum on Regional Safety Oversight Organizations (RSOOs) for Global Aviation Safety can be found at <https://www.icao.int/ESAF/EASA-ICAO-RSOO-2017/Pages/RSOO-Report.aspx>

² A copy of the questionnaire is found at Appendix 2.

³ Although reference is made in the Forum's report and questionnaire to tasks and functions, for the sake of brevity, reference is only made to function in this document.

2.3 The evaluation used the generic definition in the ICAO Safety Oversight Manual, Part B: The Establishment and Management of a Regional Safety Oversight Organization (Doc 9734, Part B), whereby RSOO refers to a number of legal forms and institutional structures that range from highly formalized international governmental organizations . . . to less institutionalized projects established under the ICAO Cooperative Development of Operational Safety and Continuing Airworthiness Programme (COSCAP). Part B of the ICAO Document 9734 states that ICAO Assembly Resolutions essentially leave it up to each group of States to determine the legal form and institutional structure of their RSOO, in accordance to their needs and the characteristics of their region. The evaluation therefore covered a range of RSOOs, from fully institutionalized international organizations to the ICAO COSCAP programmes.

2.4 Apart from the questionnaire, the evaluation also used other documents and material that were either sent in by RSOOs along with their questionnaires or were already on file with ICAO. These included reports, working papers, studies, strategic plans, etc. Furthermore, use was made of the ICAO Integrated Safety Trend Analysis and Reporting System (iSTARS) data, particularly in relation to the Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme (USOAP) safety oversight levels of effective implementation (EI).

3. EVALUATION CRITERIA

3.1 The Forum agreed on the following five criteria for the purpose of carrying out the evaluation:

- a) **Efficiency:** This criterion measures the use of human and financial resource in comparison to an RSOO's outputs. It also addresses the degree of overlap and duplication of programmes and activities between the RSOO and its member States and between RSOOs within a specific Region.
- b) **Effectiveness:** Effectiveness measures the extent to which an RSOO can meet its stated goals and objectives. It also addresses the clarity of the RSOO's role, the level of empowerment granted by member States, the establishment of common standards and practices within a region, the level of political commitment of member States and the level of resources dedicated to the RSOO. A key measurement of effectiveness is the impact an RSOO has on raising the EI of its member States.
- c) **Sustainability:** The primary measure of the long-term viability of the RSOO is the stability and sustainability of its funding. Other factors that have an impact on the long-term survivability of an RSOO, are the availability of trained manpower within the region, the degree of legal authority granted to the RSOO and the extent to which management and planning practices cater for the organization's strategic development.
- d) **Relevance:** A primary measure of relevance is the ability of the RSOO to meet the expectations of its member States and other stakeholders. This assesses the RSOO's mission, goals, programmes and activities, and their alignment with those of its major stakeholders, to include its member States, ICAO and donor States and organizations.

- e) **Adaptability:** Adaptability assesses the ability of the RSOO to adapt to an evolving environment, brought about by a rapidly expanding aviation industry, changing technologies, scope and processes.

4. CLASSIFICATION OF THE FUNCTIONS OF THE RSOO

4.1 Increasing usage of the term RSOO in the ICAO Annexes now requires that greater clarity be given to the functions carried out by the different types of RSOO. The Forum therefore agreed that the level of complexity of the functions of an RSOO, as a safety oversight provider, should be classified as follows:

- a) **Level 1** – Advisory and coordinating functions
- b) **Level 2** – Operational assistance functions
- c) **Level 3** – Certifying agency functions

4.2 Under Level 1, an RSOO provides advisory assistance to a member State or a group of States. No formal agreement is established directly between the RSOO and the State, for the delegation of functions for regulating, certifying or supervising industry entities. An RSOO may coordinate the use or release of an inspector to carry out inspections and audits for a State's civil aviation authority (CAA). In this case, the inspector acts in his/her individual capacity and the member State grants all required authorizations. Level 1 functions also include training, the harmonization of the aviation safety regulations of member States and the development of guidance manuals and other documentation. Other activities carried out by a number of RSOOs under Level 1 include coordinating and managing the surveillance of foreign air operators and facilitating the acceptance of a member State's approved maintenance organizations (AMOs), approved training organizations (ATOs) and approved aeromedical centres, by other States within the RSOO's region.

4.3 Under Level 2, the RSOO, in addition to carrying out all Level 1 functions, also provides operational assistance to a State or group of States on the basis of a formal and binding agreement. The operational assistance includes the conduct of audits, inspections and other investigations on industry entities. The State issues certificates, licences and approvals on the basis of the operational assistance provided. The RSOO can also conduct surveillance over the respective document holders. Under Level 2, the RSOO is empowered or granted delegated authority to carry out inspectorate activities that support the certification and surveillance responsibilities of the State.

4.4 Under Level 3, the RSOO, in addition to carrying out both Level 1 and Level 2 functions, is formally delegated by a binding agreement with a State (or group of States), to issue certificates, licences and approvals on its (or their) behalf. The State retains responsibility under the Chicago Convention for safety oversight and for any certificates, licences and approvals issued by the RSOO. The State exercises this responsibility by monitoring the RSOO's capabilities. These certifying functions are carried out by RSOOs that are either empowered by a common legislative framework or are delegated authority through separate agreements with a State or group of States. The RSOO must at least be therefore empowered to accept legally binding delegations from its member States. To date, only two RSOOs (EASA and IAC) are empowered to carry out Level 3 functions.

5. OVERVIEW OF RSOOS

5.1 The table in Appendix 1 gives for each RSOO the year in which operations began, the type of founding document, their respective member States, funding sources, annual budget, functional areas, the membership's average EI and the level of its functions. To date, a total 143 ICAO member States are also members of fifteen RSOOs. Six of the RSOOs, with a total membership of 43 States, are found in the ICAO AFI Region. Four of the RSOOs in the AFI Region (ACSAC, ASSA-AC, BAGASOO and ISASO) have transitioned, or are transitioning, from a COSCAP to a fully institutionalized safety oversight body. The SRVSOP in South America also transitioned from a COSCAP (the COSCAP-LAM).

5.2 The SRVSOP has, along with the three Asian COSCAPs – COSCAP-NA, COSCAP-SA, COSCAP-SEA – remained under ICAO management. Their work programmes are however subject to the approval of their member States and, typically, they carry out Level 1 functions. COSCAPs have been instrumental in developing harmonized regulatory requirements, which are subsequently included in the national regulations of their member States, and guidance material and manuals. In addition, a number of the COSCAPs have coordinated inspectors within their respective regions to conduct safety oversight inspections and audits on behalf of member States.

5.3 All the other RSOOs have been established either as full international organizations in their own right, as is the case of PASO and BAGASOO, or as agencies or institutions integrated within the institutional framework of a regional economic integration organization (REIO). Examples of the latter are EAC-CASSOA, which is an institution of the East African Community (EAC) and EASA, which is an agency of the European Union (EU). Normally, an RSOO that has been established as an international organization or as institution or agency of an REIO can legally carry out Level 2 and Level 3 functions. Whether it actually does however will depend on its level of empowerment or the authority delegated by its member States.

5.4 RSOOs differ in accordance with the expectations of their member States and the characteristics of their regions. Whereas the COSCAPs in the AFI Region transitioned to fully institutionalized bodies, the COSCAP-NA fully meets its Member State's expectations by remaining a COSCAP. As mentioned above, whereas some RSOOs are international organizations in their right, other RSOOs are closely tied to their regional economic groups. These factors must therefore be taken into account when evaluating an RSOO.

6. CHALLENGES FACING RSOOS

6.1 Each of the five sections of the RSOO questionnaire relating to an RSOO's legal framework, organizational structure, funding mechanism, management processes and systems, tasks, functions and activities and membership are addressed in the following review of the challenges facing RSOOs in general. A short description of the general comments made by RSOO on the revision of Part B of the ICAO Document 9734 and the RSOO Cooperative Platform, is also included.

6.2 Legal Framework

6.2.1 The majority of RSOOs are governed by international agreements (see Appendix 1). The COSCAPs are governed by their respective ICAO Programme or Project Documents and SRVSOP is governed by both a Project Document and by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) established between ICAO and the Latin American Civil Aviation Commission (LACAC). EASA, as an EU

regulatory agency, was established on the basis of secondary legislation, in the form of a regulation of the European Parliament and the Council (otherwise referred to as the EASA Basic Regulation).

6.2.2 Chapter 3 of the ICAO Document 9734, Part B addresses the strengths and weaknesses of each type of governing document. An MOU or MOC is perfectly adequate for the provision of Level 1 advisory and coordinating functions. However, the preferred option for securing the commitment of States and ensuring long-term sustainability is to establish the RSOO on the basis of a more binding international agreement or treaty. For an RSOO to deliver Level 2 or Level 3 safety oversight services, it must be governed by a binding international agreement or treaty.

6.2.3 Analysis of the responses to the questionnaire highlighted the following issues:

- a) The founding documents of some RSOOs have failed to clearly state the objectives and functions of the RSOO in line with the expectations of its member States. Lack of clarity in the founding document on the objectives and functions of the organization can result in a lack of consensus between the RSOO and its member States on its role, effectiveness and relevance.
- b) A lack of clarity on the type of legal personality granted to an RSOO. Legal personality allows an organization to accept in its own name, delegation of functions that enables it to at least provide Level 2 operational assistance to States. In the case of an RSOO established on the basis of an international agreement or treaty, it can be reasonably inferred that it has international legal personality, even if this is not explicitly stated in the agreement. However, failure to make explicit the type of legal personality (i.e. whether it be international or domestic legal personality) can, in some cases, lead to disagreement on whether the RSOO has the authority to accept delegations of functions from member States and enter into contracts and agreements with third-party States and other organizations. This is important if the RSOO intends to also provide for its own funding through the collection of fees and charges and to negotiate with lending agencies.
- c) Cases where an RSOO's founding document fails to formally empower the organization to accept delegation of functions from States. Such formal delegations are necessary if the RSOO plans to carry out Level 2 functions on behalf of States. Although the RSOO's founding document provides for legal personality, it does not explicitly allow the organization to establish agreement with States for the delegation of functions. Such agreements usually also use terms, such as *coordinate*, *promote*, *assist* and *foster* for denoting the provision of only Level 1 advisory and coordinating functions. Such mandates usually result in the perceived ineffectiveness of the RSOO to provide operational assistance for resolving safety oversight deficiencies, if this is the expectation of States. Normally, this shortfall can only be corrected through subsequent amendments that are difficult and time-consuming to make. Currently, only ACSA, BAGASOO and IAC are authorized by their founding documents to accept the delegation of functions from member States.
- d) COSCAPs, which normally provide Level 1 services on the basis of ICAO Programme Documents, MOUs or Memoranda of Cooperation (MOCs), are not empowered to carry out Level 2 functions. In order to be suitably empowered, COSCAPs intending to carry out Level 2 functions must (as is already the case in the ICAO African-Indian Ocean (AFI) Region) institutionalize on the basis of a more formal and binding document. Providing Level 2 operational assistance on the basis of a mandate that only allows for Level 1 activities is not an option. A COSCAP can coordinate the use of its technical staff to provide Level 1 services to a State. However, if the expert in question provides Level 2 operational assistance under the

authority of the State, and is an ICAO staff member, the arrangement can create a conflict of interest for ICAO.

6.3 Organizational structure

6.3.1 Several RSOOs currently face challenges with manpower shortages, lack of training and inadequate (or lack of) guidance material for technical staff. Nine of the respondents to the questionnaire have faced chronic shortages in staffing, particularly with technical staff and experts. This includes those RSOOs, which, although not yet fully operational, earlier operated as a COSCAP.

6.3.2 The lack of qualified and experienced technical manpower has had a debilitating impact on the effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of affected RSOOs, particularly with regard to their ability to deliver Level 2 operational assistance to States. This can result in the loss of confidence in an RSOO's capability to resolve safety oversight deficiencies. Shortage of manpower is linked to a number of factors that include a lack of funding and competition with the national authorities of the member States for scarce resources. This is the case in the ICAO AFI Region, where there is a relatively high number of RSOOs. Uncertainty as to the RSOO's responsibilities and the absence of aligned planning between the RSOO and its member States are also contributory factors.

6.3.3 Seven RSOOs, including BAGASOO, EAC-CASSOA and PASO, have attempted to resolve their manpower shortages by pooling national inspectors within the region. However, these schemes have only been partially successful, since they depend on the availability of inspectors within the region and on the willingness of national authorities to release their inspectors for RSOO assignments. They also depend on the implementation of common or harmonized standards, harmonized inspector training and standardized inspector manuals. There are no easy solutions to these problems as long as the RSOOs concerned remain severely underfunded.

6.3.4 Two other factors that compound the inability of RSOOs to recruit qualified personnel include:

- a) RSOO mandates that are too broad. Some mandates cover a scope of activities that include aircraft operations, airworthiness, personnel licensing, aerodromes, air navigation services, accident investigation and even, aviation security. In some cases, RSOOs failed to consolidate resources on a reduced scope of activities, as prioritized by areas of greatest need.
- b) Resources that are spread thinly over too many RSOOs within any one region, with overlapping mandates and membership. Failure to rationalize the number of RSOOs with reference to available resources results in ineffectiveness and a lack of sustainability.

6.3.5 The other issues highlighted by responses to the questionnaire include the absence of a methodology for determining required numbers of technical staff and training policies and programmes. Only four RSOOs had developed a methodology for determining manpower needs, and although eight RSOOs reported having developed a training policy for their staff, only five RSOOs had actually implemented training programmes. In addition, only eight RSOOs had developed a policy and procedures handbook for their staff. The majority of RSOOs had, however, developed job descriptions of technical staff positions.

6.4 Funding mechanism



6.4.1 Thirteen RSOOs provided information on their budget in response to the questionnaire (see Appendix 1) and all of them gave information on funding sources. The majority of RSOOs stated that their allocated budgets were adequate for financing their activities. However, since they primarily depend on the contributions/annual subscriptions of their member States, the challenge is in getting the States to pay their contributions in full and/or pay on schedule. For the most part, member States' contributions are unreliable and unstable. In many cases, member States either do not pay their contributions in full or payments are delayed. In the case of two RSOOs, for example, only about 50% of the 2016 budget was actually paid up by the member States.

6.4.2 To a lesser degree, RSOOs also derive funding from other sources, to include user fees, voluntary contributions and grants and loans. EASA, which derives the bulk (i.e. over 60%) of its funding from user fees, and ACSA, which is funded through air navigation charges collected by its parent body, COCESNA⁴, are exceptions to the rule, in that both are established on comparably stable funding platforms.

6.4.3 There are a number of reasons why, in many cases, RSOO member States have so much difficulty in paying either their annual subscriptions or user fees for services rendered. They include:

- a) Low levels of commitment on the part of Member States to the RSOO;
- b) loss of confidence in the RSOO's ability to make a meaningful contribution towards resolving safety oversight deficiencies in the region;
- c) competing development priorities in the States where health, education, housing etc., pose a greater need than air transport; and in some cases,
- d) low levels of aviation activity in member States.

6.4.4 Any discussion on the funding of RSOOs has also to address the cost efficiency and effectiveness of these organizations. A review of the thirteen RSOO budgets in Appendix 1, excluding EASA's budget which is almost fifteen times higher than the budgets of all the other twelve RSOOs combined, shows that the average annual budget of eight of the fully institutionalized RSOOs, are more than three times the average budget of the four basic RSOOs (i.e. the COSCAPs and SRVSOP). CASSOS, which only carries out Level 1 functions, is the only institutionalized RSOO that has a comparable budget to the COSCAPs and SRVSOP. In general, therefore, institutionalization comes at a much higher cost.

6.4.5 Considering that, apart from AAMAC, the eight institutionalized RSOOs also only provide Level 1 safety oversight services, then the COSCAPs and SRVSOP must be considered as more cost effective. The SRVSOP has, in particular, provided its member States with good value and effective safety oversight by developing a programme at the level of the region that enables the acceptance of certificates and approvals of AMOs, ATOs and aeromedical centres on the basis of a number of multinational technical cooperation agreements. In addition, it coordinates at the regional level, the Safety Ramp Inspection Data Exchange Programme (IDISR) as a means of monitoring all aircraft operations, including foreign operators.

⁴ Central American Corporation for Air Navigation Services (COCESNA)

6.4.6 The cost effectiveness of an institutionalized RSOO is questionable if it only provides Level 1 services. This has specific implications for the sustainability of RSOOs in the AFI Region that, having transitioned from COSCAPs, still only have Level 1 capability.

6.4.7 The funding of an RSOO also needs to be both stable and sustainable in the long term. The search for a more stable and sustainable funding platform for an RSOO usually means moving away from member State contributions and towards funding mechanisms that are dependent on the use of either passenger safety fees and/or air navigation overflight charges and user fees. PASO is in the final stages of introducing a passenger safety fee in the Pacific Islands and as mentioned above, ACSA successfully uses funding derived from air navigation charges. Other RSOOs, such as BAGASOO and CASSOA, also mentioned plans to derive funds from the use of a passenger safety fee.

6.4.8 The introduction of a passenger fee is not however without its problems. RSOOs that are attempting to introduce such a system have faced difficulties with the inability of an RSOO's member States to reach agreement on the fee, different policies in the member States on fees and charges, low passenger and flight volumes in some States and opposition from unconvinced industry entities that the RSOO is not just going to establish another layer of costly bureaucracy. In addition, perceptions by States and industry that the RSOO is ineffective and irrelevant to their needs, unable to operate in an efficient and cost-effective manner or that the funds collected will be misused, hinder the introduction of a passenger levy as a major source of RSOO funding.

6.4.9 RSOOs that are not cost effective, inefficient and irrelevant to their stakeholders will not attract stable and sustainable funding. Efficiency, as measured by the adoption by an RSOO of management systems and processes for strategic planning, controlling costs, ensuring quality of service and measuring risks, is also important for instilling confidence in the RSOO's member States, industry and other stakeholders in the organization's capabilities.

6.5 Management processes and systems

6.5.1 Most RSOOs have established basic planning documents such as an annual budget and business and strategic plans. They also ensure that, at least at the level of their governing bodies, efforts are made to align the RSOO's mission, goals, objectives and activities with the planning documents developed by the States. However, although member States are expected to align their activities with those of the RSOOs and reflect this in their own planning documents, this is not necessarily always the case.

6.5.2 Chapter 6 of Part B of the ICAO Document 9734 contains guidance on performance-driven/results-based management strategies and processes and quality management systems (QMS), which States can use to develop systems that would strengthen the governance of the organization. However, the review of the responses to the questionnaire shows that the majority of RSOOs have yet to develop such systems. The same can be said for risk and change management frameworks or systems that, with the exception of some of the RSOOs, such as EASA and the SRVSOP, have yet to be applied for the purpose of managing or mitigating an RSOO's exposure to risk.

6.6 RSOO functions

6.6.1 The majority of RSOOs indicated that their scope of activities covered areas of safety oversight, such as aircraft operations, continuing airworthiness, personnel licensing, aerodromes, air navigation services and, in some cases (such as ACSA, CASSOS and IAC), accident investigation (see Appendix 1). Several RSOOs also work in the area of safety management systems (SMS). In addition, the scope of four



RSOOs – ACSA, CASSOS, EAS-CASSOA and IAC – includes aviation security. As earlier mentioned, a full scope of activities weighs heavily on limited manpower and financial resources. In several cases where work programmes for 2016 were not completed, the lack of manpower and funding were cited as the main reasons.

6.6.2 Only two RSOOs – EASA and IAC – currently have the capacity to carry out functions up to Level 3 (see Appendix 1). ACSA and AAMAC carry out activities up to Level 2, with the latter organization limiting its activities to surveillance over ASECNA⁵, i.e. the air navigation service provider. All the other RSOOs currently carry out advisory and coordinating functions at Level 1. This applies to those RSOOs whose mandates do not enable the delegation of functions from States and also RSOOs, such as BAGASOO, which in spite of having strong mandates, lack resources for carrying out Level 2 functions. Other RSOOs that provide Level 1 safety oversight services, such as the SRVSOP, CASSOA and the COSCAP-SA, are currently examining arrangements that will enable them to undertake Level 2 functions.

6.6.3 Level 1 activities, such as coordinating inspector resources within a region, providing advisory services to States, assisting States prepare for the ICAO Coordinated Validation Missions (ICVMs) and audits and strengthening safety oversight capabilities at regional level with the provision of training, Information Technology tools, etc., have been of great benefit to an RSOO's members States. This is particularly the case in regions where the ICAO USOAP-CMA average effective implementation (EI) rate is already relatively high. SRVSOP's membership has an average EI of 80% and, although one State has an EI below the world average, all the other States have EIs well above the average.

6.6.4 Where needed, however, RSOOs must be strengthened and empowered to deliver Level 2 operational assistance. The average ICAO USOAP EI score for the membership of each RSOO is included in Appendix 1. Given that the average EI for all the member States of ICAO is 65%, only six RSOOs (ACSA, COSCAP-NA, COSCAP-SA, EASA, IAC and the SRVSOP) have memberships with average EIs greater than the world average. The other nine RSOOs have memberships with average EIs ranging from 37% to 64%. Even in respect to those RSOO memberships with relatively high EIs, there are still individual member States with low EIs. For example, with respect to the world average, IAC has five States with EIs below average, EASA and the COSCAP-SA still each have two States with below average EIs and ACSA and, as mentioned above, the SRVSOP each have a State with EIs below average.

6.6.5 Amongst those RSOOs with average membership EIs below the world average, the range of individual State EIs can be quite wide. In the case of ACSAC, EIs range from 12% to 86% and although BAGASOO has a State with an EI of 79%, it has two States with EIs as low as 19%. The point of this analysis is therefore not to demonstrate which RSOOs have been effective and relevant. Safety oversight is the responsibility of the State, and a State solicits safety oversight assistance from not just its RSOO, but also from a variety of other sources. Conversely, there are States that, even with the best efforts of their RSOO, have failed to make use of it. The situation is complex and only the conduct of an in-depth gap analysis on an individual RSOO can determine the extent of its contribution towards raising the EI of its member States.

6.6.6 This analysis does however show that, although most of the RSOOs have been operational in one form or another for over ten years now, much more work needs to be done, and that much of that work requires at least Level 2 operational assistance capabilities. This is particularly the case in those regions,

⁵ Agence pour la sécurité de la navigation aérienne en Afrique et à Madagascar

such as the AFI Region and the Pacific Island States, where low EIs still prevail, and States expect their RSOOs to provide operational assistance.

6.6.7 The average EI for all ICAO States that are members of an RSOO and the average EI of all ICAO States that are not members of an RSOO are each around the world average, i.e. 65%. If North American and the EASA States are removed from the calculation, the figures are 60% versus 64%. Again, the point of the analysis is not to measure the effectiveness of individual RSOOs. However, the fact that there is little difference in the average EIs of the RSOO member States as compared to the non-member States, could call into question the fundamental premise of the RSOO, as being a cost-effective means for States to resolve their safety oversight deficiencies. This is particularly the case if, as mentioned above, the RSOO has not developed the capability of at least carrying out Level 2 functions.

6.6.8 The same reasoning applies in the case of an RSOO whose membership either includes or included States with significant safety concerns (SSCs), and where, because of the RSOO's lack of Level 2 capabilities, the SSC persists or has persisted for several years without being resolved.

6.7 Membership

6.7.1 The membership of each of the fifteen RSOOs varies from four to thirty two States (see Appendix 1). There is no optimum number when it comes to the size of an RSOO's membership. The only impact it has, is on the size of the RSOO's governing board, where ideally all the member States should be represented. Decision making processes may be detrimentally impacted in the case of very large governing boards. In such cases, the RSOO may consider establishing expert committees to assist the governing board and/or a smaller executive board. These would function in much the same way as the Air Navigation Commission, Council and the Assembly do in ICAO.

6.7.2 A matter of concern that has already been referred to in this report is the establishment of several RSOOs with overlapping mandates and memberships, in a region where resources are scarce. Such is the case in the AFI-Region, where such overlaps exist between AAMAC, ACSAC and ASSA-AC and in respect to AAMAC and ISASO, where Madagascar is a member of both RSOOs and between ISASO and EAC-CASSOA in respect to Tanzania's dual membership.

6.7.3 In the case of AAMAC, ACSAC and ASSA-AC, a partial solution has been found through the signing of a memorandum of understanding by all three parties limiting AAMAC's scope to air navigation services and the scope of the other two RSOOs to areas of flight safety other than ANS. However, since all the flight safety areas still remain enshrined in the AAMAC treaty, a more permanent solution would have entailed an amendment to the treaty itself. In addition, responses to the questionnaire did not indicate the actions being taken, if any, to resolve the overlaps between ISASO and both AAMAC and EAC-CASSOA, regarding the dual memberships of Madagascar and Tanzania.

6.8 General comments

6.8.1 Under General comments RSOOs were asked to provide their suggestions for amendments to Part B of the ICAO Document 9734, the RSOO cooperative platform and the provision of additional ICAO support. The questionnaire also invited the RSOOs to comment on the role they played, or planned to play, in strengthening the safety oversight capabilities of their States and regions. Several RSOOs gave extensive comments on these subjects. Although their comments were far too many to include in this report, they will be taken into account when establishing the RSOO cooperative platform and amending Part B of the ICAO Document 9734. In addition, comments on the support RSOOs expect from ICAO

have been brought to the attention of the responsible sections within ICAO. Other issues, such as the need for information, access to data and training will be raised and addressed at the first meeting of the RSOO Cooperative Platform, to be held in December 2017.

6.8.2 RSOOs expressed a lot of support for the establishment of the RSOO Cooperative Platform. The platform is seen as a means of facilitating inter-RSOO communication, exchanging information/best practices/data and for coordinating on common positions and actions so as to strengthen RSOOs globally. Other RSOOs see the platform as a means of interfacing with ICAO and for the provision of technical assistance and hope that it will lead to the sharing of work programmes between ICAO and the RSOOs.

7. PROPOSED ACTIONS

7.1 The primary purpose of this study was to evaluate RSOOs in general as a first step towards their strengthening and improvement. At the same time, the evaluation results are expected to support future individual RSOO evaluations/gap analyses, work on the GASOS, the establishment of an RSOO cooperative platform and the future amendment of Part B of the ICAO Document 9734.

7.2 It is therefore proposed that the results of this evaluation be:

- a) used by States that are already members of an RSOO or are in the process of establishing an RSOO, to ensure that their RSOO meets the criteria agreed by the Forum, with respect to effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, relevance and adaptability.
- b) used by ICAO for designing and implementing the gap analysis that will be conducted on individual RSOOs on their request;
- c) used by ICAO to support the work being conducted on the development of the GASOS, particularly in respect to the conduct of the GASOS feasibility study and the deliberations of the GASOS Study Group;
- d) taken into consideration by ICAO and the RSOOs in the development of the RSOO Cooperative Platform, particularly in respect to the Platform's contribution towards the strengthening and improvement of RSOOs; and
- e) used by ICAO for the purpose of amending the ICAO Document 9734, Part B on the establishment and management of an RSOO.

7.3 Furthermore, the results of this evaluation will support the implementation of the Ezulwini Ministerial Declaration on Regional Safety Oversight Organizations that was adopted by those African Ministers responsible for Civil Aviation, who met in Swaziland on the occasion of the Forum. The Ministers decided to accelerate the establishment and strengthening of RSOOs in the AFI Region and their relationship and empowerment within their member States. They also decided to ensure the utilization of RSOOs for the timely resolution of all SSCs and deficiencies identified through the ICAO USOAP-CMA and the progressive increase of EI rates of the African States. It is therefore proposed that the results of this evaluation:

- a) be used by ICAO, the AFI Plan, States in the AFI Region and other stakeholders to support the Ezulwini Ministerial Declaration on Regional Safety Oversight Organizations to accelerate the



establishment and strengthening of RSOOs in the AFI Region and to ensure their use in the timely resolution of all SSCs and deficiencies identified through the USOAP-CMA, and for progressively increasing the EI rates of African States.

8. CONCLUSIONS

8.1 RSOOs have been contributing towards the enhancement of levels of safety oversight for over ten years. They have contributed to the development of harmonized or common aviation requirements, inspector manuals and other guidance material and the training of inspectors. They have also participated in ICAO programmes, including the Regional Aviation Safety Groups (RASGs) and assisted their member States to prepare for the ICAO USOAP audits and other monitoring activities. This has equally been the case with an RSOO, such as the SRVSOP, which excels in the provision of Level 1 services, and a more institutionalized RSOO, such as EASA that issues certificates and approvals based on a transfer of competencies from member States to the European Union. Both organizations have met with the expectations of their member States.

8.2 The majority of RSOOs have, however, had to overcome major challenges related to insufficient manpower and financial resources and inadequate mandates that do not allow for the delegation of functions from States. For the most part, this has meant that the majority of RSOOs have yet to exploit their full potential as functionally and financially effective providers of safety oversight. Several institutionalized RSOOs that do otherwise have the mandate to carry out Level 2 or even Level 3 functions, are still only capable of providing Level 1 services. Some of these RSOOs operated as COSCAPs prior to becoming international organizations in their own right.

8.3 The evaluation has shown that there is a cost differential between the more basic RSOOs, such as the COSCAPs, and RSOOs that have institutionalized as international organizations, and that the extra costs cannot be justified if the institutionalized body is only capable of Level 1 functions. The inability of the majority of fully institutionalized RSOOs to provide at least Level 2 operational assistance in areas needed by their member States, results in a reduced commitment by the State and a loss of confidence by both the State and industry. Ineffective and inefficient RSOOs are not sustainable and risk becoming irrelevant to, and marginalized by, their member States who prefer to obtain assistance from more reliable sources.

8.4 It has therefore been proposed in this report that States, ICAO, the RSOOs and other stakeholders take several actions to support the strengthening and improvement of RSOOs, in order that these organizations can play a more effective role in enhancing the safety oversight capabilities of their member States. The evaluation makes it clear that most RSOOs will need considerable support for improvement in the coming years if they are to become the core components of the GASOS.

APPENDIX 1

Summary of the Responses of the Regional Safety Oversight Organizations (RSOOs) to the ICAO Evaluation Questionnaire

RSOO	Year of Operation	Agreement Document	Member States	Funding Sources	Annual Budget (U.S.\$)	Functional Areas	Functional Levels ⁶	Average Overall EI (%) in August 2017
Agencia Centroamericana para la Seguridad Aeronáutica (ACSA)	2006	International Agreement	Guatemala, El Salvador, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras	COCESNA Operational Income/ Member State contributions/other voluntary sources	2 million	OPS, AIR, PEL, AGA, ANS, SEC, AIG, SMS, safety data collection and any other function decided by Council	Levels 1 and 2	81
Agence Communautaire de Supervision de la Sécurité et de la Sureté de l'Aviation Civile (ACSAC) Presently still operating as COSCAP-UEMOA during the parallel transition to ACSAC	COSCAP-UEMOA– 2004 – Present Day ACSAC Founded in 2013; Not yet operational	ICAO Programme (COSCAP) Document International Agreement (ACSAC)	Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinee Bissau, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Togo	Member State contributions/user fees/Airport/air navigation/ passenger safety charge/possible contribution of financial partners Not yet operational	Not Available	OPS, AIR, PEL (under the COSCAP)	Level 1 (Under the COSCAP) ACSAC Not Operational	37

⁶ Levels refer to the functions that are currently being carried out by an RSOO as considered by ICAO, which is not necessarily the same as the level foreseen by the RSOO's founding document or the level reported by the RSOO in the questionnaire.

RSOO	Year of Operation	Agreement Document	Member States	Funding Sources	Annual Budget (U.S.\$)	Functional Areas	Functional Levels ⁶	Average Overall EI (%) in August 2017
Agence de Supervision de la Sécurité Aérienne en Afrique Centrale (ASSA-AC)	COSCAP-CEMAC – 2005 ASSA-AC – 2016	ICAO Programme (COSCAP) Document International Agreement (ASSA-AC)	Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Gabon, Equatorial Guinea, Chad	Member States contributions through CEMAC by the Community Import Tax	1.35 million	OPS, AIR, PEL, AGA, SMS	Level 1	64
Autorités Africaines et Malagauche de l'Aviation Civil/African and Malagasy Civil Aviation Authorities (AAMAC)	2015	International Agreement	Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Central African Republic, Comoros, Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Gabon, Guinee Bissau, Equatorial Guinea, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal	Member State contributions/user fees/foreign funding/voluntary contributions/financial assistance/Donation/and fees for publication, training or other services	1.25 million	OPS, AIR, AW, PEL, AGA, ANS, SMS and any other task decided by Council;	Level 1 (Level 2 with respect to certification and surveillance of ASECNA)	50
Banjul Accord Group Aviation Safety Oversight Organization (BAGASOO)	COSCAP-BAG – 2005 BAGASOO – 2010	International Agreement	Cabo Verde, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone	Member State contributions/user fees/foreign funding/voluntary contributions/financial assistance/revenue from software applications and training	1.3 million	OPS, AIR, PEL, AGA, ANS, SMS Confidential and Voluntary Incident Reporting System (CVIRS)	Level 1	48
Civil Aviation Safety and Security Oversight System (CASSOS)	RASOS – 2001 CASSOS – 2008	International Agreement	Barbados, Haiti, Guyana, Jamaica, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, The OECS: Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, St. Lucia, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Vincent and Grenadines	Member State contributions	400,000	OPS, AIR, PEL, AGA, ANS, AVSEC, AIG, SMS, ENV/CORSIA	Level 1	55
Cooperative Development of Operational safety and Continuing Airworthiness	2003	ICAO Project Document	China (to include SARs in 2017), Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Mongolia, Republic of Korea	Member State Contributions/foreign funding/voluntary contributions/financial assistance	430,000	OPS, AIR, PEL, AGA, ANS, AIG,	Level 1	88

RSOO	Year of Operation	Agreement Document	Member States	Funding Sources	Annual Budget (U.S.\$)	Functional Areas	Functional Levels ⁶	Average Overall EI (%) in August 2017
Programme – North Asia (COSCAP-NA)						SMS		
Cooperative Development of Operational safety and Continuing Airworthiness Programme – South Asia (COSCAP-SA)	1997	ICAO Programme Document	Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka	Member State contributions/foreign funding/voluntary contributions/ financial assistance through partners/donors	534,500	OPS, AIR, PEL, AGA, ANS, AIG, SMS	Level 1	71
Cooperative Development of Operational safety and Continuing Airworthiness Programme – South East Asia (COSCAP-SEA)	2001	ICAO Project Document	Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Timor Leste, Thailand, Viet Nam, Hong Kong (China), Macao (China) (SARs to transfer to COSCAP-NA in 2017)	Member State contributions/foreign funding/voluntary contributions/ financial assistance	400,000	OPS, AIR, PEL, AIG	Level 1	62
East African Community Civil Aviation Safety and Security Agency (EAC-CASSOA)	2007	International Agreement	Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, South Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda	Member State contributions foreign funding/voluntary contributions/financial assistance, other sources (not specified)	4 million	Areas of safety and security oversight	Level 1	50
European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA)	2003	Secondary Legislation (the Basic Regulation)	Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom	User Fees/member State contributions/foreign funding/ voluntary contributions/ financial assistance/contribution from EFTA countries (European Free Trade Association)	227 million	OPS, AIR, PEL, AGA, ANS, SMS	Levels 1, 2 and 3	82
Interstate Aviation Committee (IAC)	1991	International Agreement	Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Uzbekistan, Russian Federation (reported to withdraw in 2017), Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine	Member States contributions/ aircraft and aircraft equipment certification, certification of production facilities, training centres, aerodromes and aerodrome equipment is being carried out on the basis of	Not Available	OPS, AIR, IAW, AGA, ANS, SEC, AIG, SMS, training of specialists	Levels 1, 2 and 3	67

RSOO	Year of Operation	Agreement Document	Member States	Funding Sources	Annual Budget (U.S.\$)	Functional Areas	Functional Levels ⁶	Average Overall EI (%) in August 2017
				cost recovery				
Interim Southern African Development Community Aviation Safety Organization (iSASO)	COSCAP-SADC – 2008 - 2016 SASO – 2016 (as the interim SASO)	Project Document (COSCAP) International Agreement	Angola, Botswana, Congo, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania. Zambia, Zimbabwe	Member State contributions	1.9 million	Area of safety oversight	Level 1	49
Pacific Aviation Safety Office (PASO)	2007	International Agreement	Cook Islands, Kiribati, Nauru, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu	Member State contributions/user fees/foreign funding/ voluntary contributions/ financial assistance Other source: World Bank Reform Project	1.2 million	OPS, AIR, PEL, AGA, ANS, AVSEC	Level 1	47
Regional Safety Oversight Cooperation System (SRVSOP)	COSCAP-LAM – 2001 SRVSOP – 2003	Project Document and MOU	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela	Member State contributions/ industry contributions	650,000	OPS, AIR, PEL, AGA, ANS	Level 1	80

RSOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE¹

Section 1: Contact Details

1. RSOO name:
2. Address:
3. Name of Chief Executive Officer:
4. Telephone contact:
5. Email address:

Section 2: Legal Framework

6. Title of founding document: _____
7. Type of founding document (i.e. Memorandum of Understanding, intergovernmental treaty, etc.):

8. Has the RSOO been established within the framework of an existing regional organization or regional economic organization or commission? Yes/No. If Yes, please explain:

9. Please provide the names of the RSOO's Member States and the dates on which they signed and, if appropriate, ratified the RSOO's founding document (add more rows if required):

Member State	Founding Document Name	Date Signed	Date Ratified

10. Has the RSOO signed agreements with other non-Member States and/or organizations? Yes / No. If Yes, please provide details (type of agreement, name of State/organization, dates, etc.):

11. Date on which the RSOO became operational: _____
12. Does the RSOO founding document provide for the following?:

¹ The Forum on Regional Safety Oversight Organizations (RSOOs) for Global Aviation Safety (<http://www2010.icao.int/ESAF/EASA-ICAO-RSOO-2017/Pages/RSOO-Report.aspx>), held from 22 to 24 March 2017, agreed on a global strategy and action plan for the improvement of RSOOs and the establishment of global system for the provision of safety oversight. A major component of the strategy is the conduct of an evaluation of RSOOs in general, for the purpose of updating information on the challenges facing their improvement. This questionnaire has been designed for collecting the information required for conducting the evaluation.

- a) objectives, responsibilities and functions of the RSOO? Yes / No
- b) duties and functions of the Chief Executive Office? Yes / No
- c) duties and functions of the executive board? Yes / No
- d) delegation of tasks and functions to the RSOO by its Member States? Yes / No. If Yes, please describe: _____

13. Does the founding document provide the RSOO with legal personality? Yes/No. If Yes, please provide details: _____

14. If the RSOO carries out inspections and audits on industry entities on behalf of either an individual Member State or a group of its Member States, is formal delegation provided by the RSOO's founding document or individual agreements between the State(s) concerned and the RSOO? Yes /No. If Yes, please explain: _____

15. If the RSOO carries out inspections and audits on industry entities by formal delegation from an individual Member State or a group of its member, is provision made in the relevant agreement document(s) for proper authorization for inspectors to access facilities, aircraft and documentation when carrying out certification and surveillance activities in the Member State(s) concerned? Yes /No. If Yes, please explain:

(Note: Please attach a .pdf copy of the founding document.)

Section 3: Organizational Structure:

16. Please describe the organizational structure of your RSOO and the lines of authority:

(Note: Please attach a copy of an organizational chart if available.)

17. Does the RSOO have a sufficient number of technical staff and inspectors? Yes / No. If Yes, please provide a breakdown of the numbers of staff per technical area: _____

18. Does the RSOO use a methodology for determining the number of technical staff and inspectors required? Yes / No. If Yes, please explain: _____

19. Does your RSOO make use of an inspector sharing scheme? Yes/No. If Yes, please explain:

20. Has the RSOO developed a training policy? Yes /No. If Yes, please provide a copy of the policy.
21. Has the RSOO developed training programmes for its technical staff and inspectors, to cover initial, refresher and specialized training, if required? Yes /No. If yes, please describe:

22. Has the RSOO developed a *Policy and Procedures Manual* for use by its technical staff and inspectors? Yes /No. If Yes, please provide a copy of the table of contents.
23. Are the RSOO's technical staff and inspectors adequately provided with the technical manuals, handbooks and checklists that they require for carrying out of their duties? Yes /No. If Yes, please provide the titles of relevant documents: _____

24. Are the RSOO's technical staff and inspectors adequately provided with the facilities and equipment needed for carrying out their duties? Yes/No. If Yes, please state if the equipment and facilities consist of telephones, cellular phones, fax, printers, computers/laptops, photocopiers, and internet/intranet: _____

25. Has the RSOO developed qualification criteria and job descriptions for its technical staff and inspector positions? Yes/No. If Yes, please explain _____

-

Section 4: Funding Mechanism

26. Please indicate which of the following source(s) of funding are used by your RSOO:
- a) Member State contributions/government funds. Yes/No
 - b) user fees. Yes/No
 - c) foreign funding/voluntary contributions and/or financial assistance. Yes/No
 - d) airport/air navigation/passenger safety charge. Yes/No
 - e) debt financing. Yes/No
 - f) any other source. Yes/No. If Yes, please explain: _____

27. Please indicate the annual budget of the RSOO: _____
28. Is your annual budget adequate for supporting the RSOO's work programme, including the hiring of technical staff and inspectors and the provision of training? Yes/No. If No, please explain:

29. If your current financing is derived from sources other than the use of a passenger safety charge, do you have plans for introducing a passenger safety charge in the future for the purpose of financing the RSOO? Yes/No. If Yes, please explain: _____

Section 5: RSOO Management Processes and Systems

30. Please indicate if the RSOO prepares any of the following planning and management documents:

- a) annual budget. Yes/No
- b) annual work programme. Yes/No
- c) business plan Yes/No
- d) strategic plan. Yes/No
- e) other. Yes/No. If Yes, please explain: _____

31. Are the RSOO's mission, goals, programmes and activities clearly stated in its planning and management documents? Yes/No. If Yes, please explain: _____

32. Are the RSOO's planning documents (e.g. work programme and strategic plan) aligned with the planning documents of its Member States? Yes/No. If Yes, please explain: _____

33. Does the RSOO implement performance-driven/results-based management and planning processes and systems? Yes/ No. If Yes, please describe the processes and systems used: _____

34. Does the RSOO implement risk and change management and planning processes and systems? Yes/No. If Yes, please describe the processes and systems used: _____

35. Does the RSOO implement a quality management system (QMS)? Yes/o. If Yes, please describe the RSOO's QMS: _____

36. If the RSOO implements a QMS, is the QMS implemented in accordance with ISO 9000 or any other international quality management standard? Yes/No. If Yes, please explain: _____

(Note: Please attach electronic copies of planning and management documents, if available). Include documents that describe the performance-drive/results-based management and planning process and systems implemented by the RSOO).

Section 6: Tasks, functions and activities

Please read the following background information before answering the following questions related to this section.

Background Information

In future, the tasks and functions carried out by an RSOO will be classified in accordance with the level of delegation granted by their Member States. The following three levels of delegation/empowerment will be defined based on the complexity of tasks and functions performed:

- a) Level 1 – Advisory and coordinating tasks and functions.
- b) Level 2 – Operational Assistance tasks and functions.
- c) Level 3 – Certifying Agency tasks and functions

An RSOO may be delegated common tasks and functions by all of its members or it may be delegated by an individual Member State to carry out tasks and functions specific to that State. An RSOO may carry out Levels 1, 2 and 3 tasks and functions in parallel. In respect to Level 1, a safety oversight provider may provide advisory assistance to a State or a group of States. No agreement is established directly between the provider and the State or a group of States, for the delegation of tasks and functions for certifying or supervising industry entities. Inspectors employed by a provider (or working under a coordinated inspector sharing scheme) can carry out inspections or audits for a State’s CAA in their own individual capacity. The State grants all required authorizations; the provider only coordinates the use of the inspector.

In relation to Level 2, the safety oversight provider can carry out all Level 1 activities. The provider can also provide operational assistance to a State or a group of States on the basis of a formal and binding delegation agreement. The operational assistance may include audits, inspections and other investigations on industry entities. The State issues certificates, licences and approvals on the basis of the operational assistance provided. These services can also include surveillance over the respective document holders.

Under Level 3, both the conduct of the technical services and the issuance of certificates, licences and approvals are formally delegated to the provider in a legally binding manner. The State retains responsibility under the Chicago Convention for safety oversight and for any certificates, licences and approvals issued on its behalf. The State exercises this responsibility by monitoring provider’s capabilities. A certifying agency must be empowered to take legally binding decisions and accept legally binding delegations from States or a group of States.

37. Please indicate in which of the following areas of activity, the RSOO has been delegated tasks and functions:

- a) aircraft operations (OPS). Yes/No
- b) continuing aircraft airworthiness (AIR). Yes/No
- c) design certification and production. Yes/No
- d) Personnel licensing (PEL). Yes/No
- e) aerodromes (AGA). Yes/No
- f) air navigation services (ANS). Yes/No
- g) aviation security. Yes/No
- h) accident investigation (AIG)
- i) safety management systems (SMS). Yes/No
- j) other. Yes/No. If Yes, please explain: _____

38. Please list in the table below the tasks and functions that the RSOO currently carries out on behalf of its Member States. Indicate in the case of each task and function whether it is *Common*, i.e. it has been delegated in common by all the Member States or a group of Member States, or *Specific*, if it has been delegated to the RSOO by a specific Member State. Using the background information above, also indicate whether you determine each listed task or function to be at Level 1, 2 or 3. Add more rows to the table as required.

Task/Function	Common	Specific	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3

39. Is the RSOO planning to expand its role beyond the existing areas of activities or tasks and functions currently being carried out? Yes/No. If Yes, please explain: _____

40. Did the RSOO complete its work programme for 2016? Yes/No. If No, please state the percentage of the work programme not completed and provide the reasons why this was the case:

41. Did the RSOO complete its training programme for 2016? Yes/No. If No, please state the percentage of the training programme not completed and provide the reasons why this was the case:

Section 7: RSOO Membership

42. Please list the States that are currently members of the RSOO and indicate their level of membership (i.e. if they are full members, observer States, etc.): _____

43. Are any of the Member States of the RSOO currently members of another RSOO (including COSCAPs)? Yes/No. If Yes, please explain: _____

44. Are all the RSOO’s Member States represented on your executive board (or governing Council, governing board, etc. as appropriate)? Yes/No. If No, please explain: _____

45. Have any organizations been invited to participate in the executive board meetings of the RSOO? Yes/No. If Yes, please explain the capacity in which they participate (e.g. as observers without voting rights, etc.): _____

Section 8: General comments

46. One of the objectives of the RSOO evaluation questionnaire is to also collect information that will assist ICAO in amending and updating its current Safety Oversight Manual, Part B, *The Establishment and Management of a Regional Safety Oversight Organization* (Doc. 9734, Part B.

Please therefore provide any suggestions you may have for the amendment of Doc. 9734, Part B:

47. Integral to the strategy for strengthening and improving RSOOs is the establishment of an RSOO Cooperative Platform. The platform will interface with ICAO and provide RSOOs with technical assistance and support. Please therefore provide any suggestions you may have for the establishment and implementation of the RSOO Cooperative Platform:

48. Please provide below any additional general comments on your RSOO and the role that it currently plays, or could play in the future within the region and in respect to strengthening the safety (and, if appropriate, security) oversight capabilities of its Member States and the region as a whole:

49. Please provide any suggestions you may have for the provision of additional ICAO support to your RSOO in particular and to RSOOs in general: _____

50. Please provide the name and contact details for the focal point for any follow-up clarification or additional questions. _____