**ORGANISATION RISK PROFILE (ORP) ASSESSMENT**

**CAA OF LATVIA**

**AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS DIVISION**

**Organisation Name: Assessed by / Date:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk level/profile** | | |
| **No** | **Organisation risk parameter** | **Level 3 (least desirable)** | **Level 2 (average)** | **Level 1 (most desirable)** | **Result (Level #)** |
| 1 | Accountable manager —  ownership of safety/quality  functions | Safety/quality functions non-existent in Accountable manager’s TORs. | Accountable manager’s TORs have negligible or indistinct mention of safety/quality functions. | Final accountability for safety and quality matters clearly addressed in the Accountable manager’s TORs. |  |
| 2 | Experience and qualifications of  the accountable manager | Has less than 3 years of aviation  experience and no technical  qualification | Has more than 3 years of aviation experience or technical qualifications. | Has more than 3 years of aviation experience and aviation technical qualifications. |  |
| 3 | Experience and qualifications of  the quality manager (QM) | QM has less than 5 years of civil aviation QC/QA experience or no civil aviation technical qualifications. | QM has more than 5 years of civil aviation QC/QA experience and civil aviation technical qualifications. | QM has more than 15 years of civil aviation QC/QA experience and civil aviation technical qualifications. |  |
| 4 | Experience and qualification of the safety manager (SM) | SM has less than 5 years of civil aviation safety/quality experience or no aviation technical qualifications. | SM has more than 5 years of civil aviation safety/quality experience and aviation technical qualifications. | SM has more than 15 years of civil aviation safety/quality experience and aviation technical qualifications. |  |
| 5 | Financial state of the organisation | One bad debtor record in last 12 months. | One bad debtor record in last 24 months. | No bad debtor records in last 24 months. |  |
| 6 | Average age of fleet | More than 12 years | 8 to less than 12 years | Less than 8 years |  |
| 7 | Multiplicity of aircraft types | More than 4 aircraft types | 3 to 4 aircraft types | Less than 3 aircraft types |  |
| 8 | Fleet size | The smallest number of any one aircraft type operated is 1 to 2. | The smallest number of any one aircraft type operated is 3 to 9. | The smallest number of any one aircraft type operated is 10 or more. |  |
| 9 | Change in company organisation, scope or size | Any aircraft have been owned for less than 12 months. | All aircraft have been owned for 12 months to 24 months. | All aircraft have been owned for at least 24 months. |  |
| 10 | Company experience (years of  operation) | Less than 5 years | 5 to 10 years | More than 10 years |  |
| 11 | Level of activity | Total operating hours for Large Aeroplanes > 3000 hours per annum, or total operating hours for all other aircraft > 500. | Total operating hours for Large Aeroplanes > 5000 hours per annum, or total operating hours for all other aircraft > 1000. | Total operating hours for Large Aeroplanes > 8000 hours per annum, or total operating hours for all other aircraft > 2000. |  |
| 12 | Mixed fleet flying (MFF)  (percentage of pilots involved in  MFF — higher percentage is less  desirable) | 50% or more of pilots involved in MFF | Less than 50% of pilots involved in MFF | Pilots not involved in MFF |  |
| 13 | Average fleet MEL application rate (per 1 000 FH) | More than 30 MEL applications per  1 000 FH | 10 to 30 MEL applications per  1 000 FH | Less than 10 MEL applications per 1 000 FH |  |
| 14 | Staff turnover especially Chief Pilots/supervising staff | More than half the senior persons have held their positions < 12 months | All senior persons have held positions for > 12 months | All senior persons have held positions for > 24 months |  |
| 15 | Combined turnover of the  accountable manager, the safety  manager and the quality manager  over the last 36 months | 3 or more | 2 | 1 or nil |  |
| 16 | Part time nominated (senior) persons | Most senior persons work for this organisation on a part time basis, or two or more senior persons also work for other organisations. | Most senior persons are full time employees of this organisation, and no more than 1 is employed elsewhere. | All senior persons are full time employees of this organisation only. |  |
| 17 | Safety, risk and quality management systems | A basic Management System is in place and it may contain a QA system. There are aspects/facets of the operations that have not been considered. Process and problem ownership is defined but some deficiency noted. A proactive planning system is in place. Some deficiencies in the planning or management system noted. Risks are evaluated but not always dealt with in a systemic formal manner. A general awareness of risk management is evident through informal processes. Lines of communication are defined. | A well-designed Management System is in place within the organisation. It may contain a documented and comprehensive QA system. No significant deficiencies in the Management, Planning, or QA systems were noted. Process and problem ownership is well defined. SMS in place. Risks are evaluated and routinely dealt with, although not always proactively. Training in risk management is provided to some, but not all affected staff. Clear, well-defined lines of communication exist. | A comprehensive documented Quality Management system is in place. The Management has clear visibility of issues confronting them. No deficiencies in the QMS were observed during the most recent CAA evaluation. Best practice SMS is evident. Risks are effectively evaluated and mitigated or eliminated.  Training in risk management is provided to all relevant staff.  Free communications exist between all levels and units. |  |
| 18 | Hazard reporting system | None in place | Voluntary hazard reporting system in place | Voluntary hazard reporting system is in place. Also procedure for identification of hazards in conjunction with incident investigation process is in place. |  |
| 19 | Incident reporting, investigation  and remedial action procedures | No documented incident reporting,  investigation or remedial action procedures | Documented incident reporting,  investigation and remedial action procedures | Documented incident reporting,  investigation and remedial action procedures integrated in approved SMS. |  |
| 20 | Organisation's attitude to the regulator | Senior persons not available. Attempts to postpone audits for no practical reason. Information is provided only when specifically requested. Reluctant to "open up" and only co-operates if it suits. | Accepts regulatory access without question. Organisation is open, transparent, and cooperative. | Organisation encourages regulatory participation in projects and access at any time. Organisation is cooperative and helpful accepting of comments and recommendations. |  |
| 21 | Roster control (reports on increase of an FDP that exceeds 1 hour during the month) | Interrupts of schedules are tolerated but are not well managed and pressure is put on safety services to minimise them (more than 3 reports). | The need to interrupt schedules for safety reasons is understood and generally accepted (up to 3 reports). | Roster management system has facilities for identifying and tackling crew problems due to revised schedules, delays, cancellations or other operating problems. |  |
| 22 | Fatigue and alertness management (Day and night crew rosters) | No formal fatigue management system established, but there is no evidence of fatigue. Rosters focus on maximising service availability without reference to fatigue management systems. Staffing is below minimum levels, leading to leave accrual. No fatigue management training is provided. | Fatigue management system in place but feedback indicators are not always acted upon. Rosters have minimum hand over or briefing time built in. Staffing is at minimum levels to enable adequate leave, although leave accrual could be evident. A general awareness of fatigue management is evident through informal processes. | A fatigue monitoring system is in place and feedback indicators are routinely acted upon. Rosters are well designed in accordance with fatigue management principle. Staffing is adequate to allow leave to be taken at reasonable intervals. Training in fatigue management is provided to all relevant staff. |  |
| 23 | Ratio of internal safety plus quality control staff to all operational staff | 1: more than 20 | 1:15 to 20 | 1: less than 15 |  |
| 24 | Multiple portfolio safety/quality  management staff (QM/SM) | SM or QM holds other simultaneous executive positions within or outside of the organisation | SM or QM TOR include other non-direct safety/quality functions, e.g. IT, administration, training | SM or QM does not hold any other simultaneous executive positions within or outside of the organisation and their TOR do not include other non-direct quality/safety functions |  |
| 25 | Safety accountability structure | Safety management function/  office/manager is accountable or  subservient to some operational  functions | Safety management function/  office/manager is accountable to  senior management and is  independent of all operational  functions | Safety management function/  office/manager has direct  accountability and reporting to the Accountable manager |  |
| 26 | Quality accountability structure | Quality management function/office/manager is accountable or subservient to non-quality/safety-related functions | Quality management function/office/manager is accountable to senior  management and is independent of all operational functions | Quality management function/office/  manager has direct accountability and reporting to the Accountable manager |  |
| 27 | Audit/inspection findings (Levels 1 and 2) during the last 24 months | Any Level 1 finding or more than  10 Level 2 findings | 10 or less Level 2 findings | No findings |  |
| 28 | Safety trends | Occurrence rate remained static in last year | One of occurrence rate decreased in last year | Occurrence rate decreased in last year (>10% decrease) |  |
| 29 | SAFA/SACA inspections findings (Category 3, 2, 1) rate for the last 12 months | Any Category 3 finding rate remained static in last year | A decrease of Category 3 and Category 2 findings rate in last year | More than 10% decrease of any Category finding rate |  |
| 30 | Training programme | The organisation is able to show that most of its training is effective. Where training is ineffective it is usually recognised as such and managed. | The organisation is able to show that ineffective training is the exception. Where training is ineffective it is recognised as such and managed. | The organisation can show that all the training is effective. |  |
| 31 | Industrial relations | Employee and company representatives usually meet to discuss issues, but rarely solve them without some industrial action or other. | Employee and company representatives have a good professional relationship. Industrial problems are solved by negotiation when they occur. | Superb industrial relations characterised by complete trust of company by employee representatives and vice-versa. Industrial problems are prevented before they occur. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Subtotal** |
| Level 3 |  |
| Level 2 |  |
| Level 1 |  |
| N/A |  |
| Total number of questions |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessment result** | |
| Total points | ORP category |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ORP categorization** | |
| Total score | ORP category |
| 30-41 | A (most desirable) |
| 42-53 | B |
| 54-66 | C |
| 67-79 | D |
| 80-90 | E (least desirable) |
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