International Civil Aviation Organization

FOURTH MEETING OF THE COMMON REGIONAL VIRTUAL PRIVATE NETWORK TASK FORCE (VPN) OF APANPIRG (CRV TF/4)

Bangkok, Thailand, 18 – 19 May 2015

Agenda Item 2:   Review tasks progress and issues

f) DOA

**TWO POSSIBLE ORGANIZATIONAL SCENARIOS
FOR THE OVERSIGHT OF THE COMMON REGIONAL VPN
PERFORMANCE AND SELECTED SERVICE PROVIDER**

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY

This paper assesses the PROs and CONs of two organizational scenarios for the management and oversight of the Common Regional VPN performance and selected service provider: the Operations Oversight is established, run and terminated as 1-an independent programme, or 2- an APANPIRG body.

1.   Introduction

1.1   In order to facilitate States' collective efforts for cost-effective implementation, APANPIRG adopted a number of recommendations for developing, establishing, maintaining facilities and common services between concerned States. These recommendations are reflected in Regional Air Navigation Plan (Doc 9673), Volume I Basic ANP, GEN II-5 and in FASID Document Volume II of the Regional Air Navigation Plan (ICAO Doc 9673), pages II-2 to II-8.

1.2   The WP/03 discussed at CRV TF/1[1] meeting presented these guidelines. The meeting opined that CRV services should be considered as a multinational service.

1.3   The cost-effectiveness of such a multinational service was successfully demonstrated by the second iteration of the Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) for CRV.

1.4   The CRV Task Force also discussed that the CRV Operations would need an Oversight Group (Operations Oversight Group, OOG) to conduct the following tasks in line with the APANPIRG strategy:

- Oversight of the performance of the Service Provider (based on contractual KPI);

---

[1] available here http://www.icao.int/APAC/Meetings/2013%20CRVTF1/WP03_ICAO%20AI.%203%20-%20Guidelines%20for%20establishing%20a%20Multinational%20air%20navigation%20facility-service.pdf

- Oversight of the performance of the Common Regional VPN (based on contractual metrics);

- Promotion of CRV and migration of aeronautical communications onto CRV;

- Management of the safety and security issues;

- Administration of the Document of Agreement and cost sharing scheme (if any); and

- Maintenance of the Technical Specifications and necessary plans (IP address etc.)

1.5   While it is understood that OOG activity is more or less recurrent in nature, it can also be planned and executed as an annual programme with detailed objectives.

1.6   The objectives and operational concept of OOG have been well progressed by the CRV Task Force, but the work done since the CRV TF/1 leads to consider two scenarios with regard to the organizational arrangements:

- Scenario 1: OOG oversight is established, run and terminated as an independent programme; and

- Scenario 2: OOG is established, run and terminated as a project executed by an APANPIRG task force

1.7   After having reviewed what is done in different ICAO regions, this paper compares the two scenarios and proposes a decision.

2.   Discussion

2.1   Benchmarking

2.1.1   In CAR, EUR/NAT and SAM ICAO regions, similar aeronautical networks were developed.

CAR Region

In the case of the CAR Region, a regional Network named MEVA has been deployed. The service of the MEVA Network is supplied by a private service Provider whose performance is continuously evaluated by the Technical Management Group denoted TMG, which is formed by all the States/International Organization that are users of the MEVA Network and by ICAO as the MEVA Network coordinator. The MEVA Network was agreed by all MEVA Members through a DOA and its performance is based on a Service Level Agreement (SLA) between the MEVA Members and the Network Service Provider, which establishes the minimum times and conditions for the services and the penalties that apply.

The MEVA TMG is chaired by a Coordinator and reports to the CAR Directors and informs to other regional groups and is independent of GREPECAS. The purpose of the MEVA TMG is to:

- monitor the performance delivered by the MEVA Network Service Provider, including timely and Quality Maintenance;

- manage the MEVA Network technical specification and future services coordinating MEVA Network changes, including the Network interconnection with the REDDIG and E/CAR AFS Network; and

- coordinate the Service Level Agreement compliance and other common network management matters for MEVA Members.

The MEVA Terms of reference are attached (**Attachment A**).

Europe
In the case of Europe, and according to the PENS governance, a PENS Steering Group (PSSG) consisting of States representatives and a Chairman was established. Under the guidance of PSSG, a PENS Management Unit, run by Eurocontrol, carries out the day-to-day management of PENS, including planning, monitoring the service and liaising with the NSP and the PENS Users

The purpose of the PENS Management Unit service is to:

- manage the PENS Contract on behalf of the PENS Users (ANSPs) and manage all changes related to the PENS Service and the PENS Contract;

- monitor the performance delivered by the PENS Network Service Provider;

- manage the charging of the PENS Service to PENS Users.

MID Region
MID Region has recently started a project to implement a MID IP Network.

SAM region
In the case of SAM region, the network is named the REDDIG Network. The REDDIG is managed as an ICAO TCB Project, with ICAO performing as the Network management and operating Center. The REDDIG is independent of GREPECAS. The governance for oversight of performance of the network is done by the REDDIG Group, formed by the SAM States and ICAO.

The purpose of the REDDIG Group is to:

- manage the REDDIG network bandwidth on behalf of the REDDIG Users and manage all changes related to the REDDIG Service;

- monitor the performance delivered by the REDDIG Network;

- manage all charges and technical matters related to the REDDIG Network, including the maintenance and provision of training to REDDIG Users.

APAC Region
In APAC Region, bodies were created to execute multiannual programmes such as COSCAP and APAC FPP in the ICAO TCB framework.

The multinational agreement consists in those cases in a Management Service Agreement and a programme document.
COSCAPs and APAC FPP constitute regional programmes administered by TCB, supervised by the APAC ICAO Regional Director, and managed by a Steering committee.

2.1.2   The benchmarking shows that:

- a central body was established and tasked to monitor the performance delivered by the common service provider and execute administrative and technical tasks;

- membership: this body is independent in CAR, SAM, and EUR and consists of users (States/International Organizations) and ICAO;

- when a cost sharing scheme is needed, it is dealt with by this body;

- APAC region has considerable experience with managing multiannual programmes.

2.2   Two possible applicable frameworks

Two possible applicable frameworks are studied here: the Operations Oversight is established, run and terminated as 1-an independent programme, or 2- an APANPIRG body

2.2.1   In the scenario 1 (independent programme), the applicable framework would be as follows:

Scenario 1: OOG as an independent programme	
Multinational Agreement	UN financial regulations
OOG Terms of reference annexed to the DOA	TCB project stage 2
Individual service contracts signed by Parties based on the framework agreement	

2.2.2   In the scenario 2 (APANPIRG body), the applicable framework would be as follows:

Scenario 2: OOG as an APANPIRG body
APANPIRG procedural handbook
OOG Terms of reference adopted through an APANPIRG conclusion
Individual service contracts signed by Parties based on the framework agreement

2.2.3   So far the drafting of DOA and OOG TOR have been progressed with reference to the scenario 1. However the CRV TF seeks now confirmation from CNS SG and APANPIRG to ascertain this direction in 2015, so that no misunderstanding or late change would compromise the signing of the agreement.

2.3   Comparison of the two scenarios

	Scenario 1: OOG as an independent programme	Scenario 2: OOG as an APANPIRG project
Objective of the agreement	Same in both scenarios: Oversight of the performance of the Service Provider; Monitoring of the performance of the Common Regional VPN; Promotion of CRV and transition of aeronautical communications over CRV; Management of the safety and security issues; Administration of the Document of Agreement and cost sharing scheme (if any); Maintenance of the Technical Specifications; Not discriminatory	
Membership	Initial membership through signing of multinational agreement Changes through OOG chairman adoption	Initial membership through an APANPIRG conclusion Changes for new APAC States through revisions
	Other Users such as States (MID region), Airport operators or military organizations may want to join and can be accommodated	Joining of other Users such as States outside APAC (ICAO MID States, Airport operators or military organizations would be difficult
Definition and Description of the facility/service	Same in both scenarios: service of oversight is delivered through a Multiannual programme/project Not discriminatory	
Obligations of parties to the agreement	Stipulated by multinational agreement Not discriminatory	
Establishment of the facility/service	Establishment done through the multinational agreement. It may take time for some States and even not be possible if multinational agreement clauses are not in line with national laws/regulations. A mitigation is that States were requested to nominate representatives of their legal department.	Establishment straight-forward through an APANPIRG conclusion
Operation of the facility/service	Operations ruled by multinational agreement, OOG TOR and Terms and conditions of the individual service contracts signed by States/Organizations and the Common Service Provider Not discriminatory	
Legal responsibility	All parties are legally bound by the multinational agreement	Legal responsibility is not addressed by APANPIRG proc. Handbook
Liability aspects	Unless otherwise stated in this Agreement or its Annexes, no Party shall be liable for acts or omissions of any other Party which is done or to be done in the course of, or as a result of, executing this Agreement	Liability is not addressed by APANPIRG proc. Handbook
Managerial aspects:		

	Scenario 1: OOG as an independent programme	Scenario 2: OOG as an APANPIRG project
– Governing bodies and decision making arrangements	Through a steering committee	Handled through consensus, no vote possible (APANPIRG proc. Handbook)
- Administration	By ICAO TCB through a TCB project CRV stage 2 (similar to stage 1) Supervised by the APAC ICAO Regional Director Managed by a Steering committee	In line with APANPIRG proc. Handbook principles
– Organization	Multinational agreement Mechanism of quorum and vote proposed (steering committee)	TOR adopted by APANPIRG or sub-group
– Staffing	Managed through multinational agreement Chairperson is elected Manager/staff: Need to recruit and pay a manager and assistant May involve some cost travels that could be covered	Composed of experts nominated by States. Chairperson is elected Chairperson may authorize co-opting of experts as advisors to provide technical inputs (APANPIRG proc. Handbook)
- Reporting	To concerned APANPIRG, copy concerned Regional Directors Reporting about progress of aeronautical applications over CRV, CRV performance and performance of the Common Service provider to APANPIRG	To APANPIRG Reporting about progress of aeronautical applications over CRV, CRV performance and performance of the Common Service provider to APANPIRG
Financial aspects		
– Cost determination	Based on the outcome of the sealed tender and individual service contracts Not discriminatory	
– Cost sharing.	Cost of services: User-pay principle for costs involved by the service contracts If required, cost sharing scheme handled through an annex of the multinational agreement Cost of Operation & Management of OOG Administration: see "Staffing" Not discriminatory	
– Budgeting	Budget can be handled through a TCB project CRV stage 2 (similar to stage 1), under the UN regulations framework. Experience is gained with stage 1.	No budget can be handled by an APANPIRG body
– Authority to approve the budget	Budget can be approved through a TCB project CRV stage 2, under the UN regulations framework	
– Financial auditing	Budget of OOG administration, will be operated in complete independence of ICAO's regular	

	Scenario 1: OOG as an independent programme	Scenario 2: OOG as an APANPIRG project
	budget, through a TCB project CRV stage 2 (similar to stage 1), enabling financial auditing	
• **Taxation and other government levies**	Managed under sealed tender and individual service contracts No cash flow between OOG and Comm. Service provider Not discriminatory	
• **Procedures for settlement of disputes**	internal mechanisms between the disputing Parties and possibly dispute resolution clause providing for arbitration in Montreal, Canada, in accordance with UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules	Handled through consensus, no vote possible
Accessions, withdrawals, amendments to and termination of agreement	Managed through the multinational agreement	Ruled by APANPIRG proc. Handbook (Creation and dissolution of contributory bodies) and revisions of conclusions on membership
	Not discriminatory	

2.3.1   From the comparison, some criteria are discriminatory. The following criteria favour the scenario 1(independent body):

- Budgeting: if a budget is needed for staffing OOG, then it will be done through a TCB project for CRV stage 2 (similar to stage 1), enabling financial auditing under the UN regulations framework. Here, experience is gained with stage 1. There may be a need also to assist some States with the migration of their aeronautical communications;

- Managerial aspects: multinational agreement and OOG TOR would allow a more efficient decision making process through a steering committee with quorum and vote principles. The staffing of OOG, in the case of an independent body, could also be done using the appointment of experts paid through OOG budget. This is a mechanism already in place for programs such as APAC Flight procedure program. However at the start of OOG simple arrangements should be sought;

- Membership management: the case of users such as States (MID region), Airport operators or military organizations is difficult to manage with an APANPIRG body while it could be dealt with in the scenario 1. The management is more efficient in the case of an independent body as there is no need to wait for APANPIRG meetings;
- Legal responsibility: all parties are legally bound by the multinational agreement in the case of an independent programme, whereas the APANPIRG procedural handbook does not address legal responsibility;

- Liability aspects: liability is addressed by the multinational agreement in the case of an independent body (it is not transferable) whereas the APANPIRG procedural handbook does not address this aspect;

- Settlement of disputes: no effective mechanism exists within the APANPIRG framework to settle disputes. Considering the experience of the CRV MSA, the mechanism of settlement of disputes should be carefully addressed; and

- Accessions, withdrawals, amendments to and termination of agreement: it would be easily addressed by the multinational agreement in the scenario 1 while in the scenario 2 by APANPIRG proc. Handbook (Creation and dissolution of contributory bodies) and revisions of conclusions on membership.

2.3.2   The following criteria favour the scenario 2 (APANPIRG body):

- Establishment of the facility/service: it may take time for some States and even not be possible in the event that clauses in the multinational agreement are not in line with national laws/regulations. The mitigation action taken was that States were requested to nominate representatives of their legal department to draft the multinational agreement and facilitate the internal coordination within States and signing.

2.3.3   From the comparison, some other criteria are not discriminatory:
- Objective of the agreement
- Obligations of parties to the agreement
- Definition and description of the facility/service
- Operation of the facility/service
- Cost determination
- Cost sharing
- Taxation and other government levies
- Reporting

2.4   Proposed way forward

2.4.1   In light of the above, the scenario 1 establishing OOG as an independent programme appears more robust and adapted to manage the oversight of performance and service provision over a 10 years cycle.

2.4.2   Multinational agreement

2.4.2.1   The CRV Task Force has started the drafting of a Document of Agreement. However the DOA does not rely on typical clauses of UN and ICAO which would prevent OOG to use UN mechanisms for staffing and budget management. For OOG to benefit from the ICAO TCB mechanisms under UN regulations, the most efficient way forward is to use the framework of the MSA (management service agreement) for stage 2 also, and establish an annex 2 and programme document to run the OOG programme. In this case relevant provisions from the draft DOA and OOG TOR could be taken over to the MSA and its annexes, which would become the multinational agreement.

2.4.2.2   With the agreement of pioneer parties, funds remaining from stage 1 could be used for stage 2 to initiate the staffing of OOG. Necessary supplementary funds would then be called.

2.4.2.3   Draft guidelines of the programme document were developed and are provided in **Attachment B**, based on APAC and AFI FPP programmes. This could be versed into a new annex 2 of the MSA already in place.

2.4.2.4   Pioneer parties would need to sign annex 2 before they sign an individual service contract with the selected communication service provider.

2.4.2.5   States/users opting in in stage 2 would need to sign MSA and annex 2 before they sign an individual service contract with the selected communication service provider.

2.4.2.6   However it is recognized that in two cases legal issues delayed and even prevented the signing of the MSA and annex 1 in stage 1.

2.4.2.7   It is therefore recommended to strengthen the involvement of States legal departments and ICAO Legal Bureau to be able to finalize the annex 2 for stage 2 and solve any issue raised by pioneer parties.

2.4.2.8   Concerning the settlement of disputes, it is recommended that a first mechanism of settlement be enabled with ICAO as a moderator. Therefore a clause in the annex 2 should make sure that individual service contracts signed by States/ANSPs with the common service provider and their subsequent variations are sent to ICAO regional office.

2.4.2.9   If a cost allocation scheme is found necessary considering the prices of CRV services, then the formula for such an allocation should be managed and correct application monitored by OOG.

2.4.2.10   Technical assistance and training in the field of aeronautical communications and CRV may need to be delivered by OOG or under OOG's supervision.

2.4.2.11   To guide the action of CRV Task Force, the following draft decision is proposed for adoption:

> ***Draft Decision X/X -   Organizational framework for the oversight of the Common Regional VPN performance and of the selected communications service provider***
>
> *That,*
>
> *Considering the experience gained by some other ICAO regions in the management and oversight of a common aeronautical network, and the benefits to expect from an independent body as to its management (budget planning and execution, staffing, legal responsibility, liability, membership, settlement of disputes, and cost management),*
>
> *The provisions concerning the management of Operations Oversight of CRV be further developed by the CRV Task Force with the view that the Operations Oversight programme will be established and ruled by a multinational agreement based on a new annex to the ICAO TCB management service agreement (MSA) already in place for CRV, reporting to APANPIRG, in accordance with the recommendations in FASID Document Volume II of the Regional Air Navigation Plan (ICAO Doc 9673).*

3.   Action by the Meeting

3.1   The meeting is invited to:

a) note the information contained in this paper; and

b) discuss the draft decision developed in paragraph 2.4.2.11 and any other relevant matters as appropriate.

APPENDIX
MEVA III TMG TERMS OF REFERENCE

1.   Background

The MEVA Technical Management Group (TMG) originated from the MEVA Informal Working Group (1998), as a standing group to address issues concerning the MEVA Network. The MEVA TMG was formally established in accordance to Conclusion 7/17 of the Seventh Meeting of the MEVA Network (MEVA/7) (Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands 15-17 May 2000).

2.   Terms of Reference

In order to address the MEVA Network issues, the following activities are to be developed by the TMG:

a)   Review the current status of the Network (maintenance and reporting procedures, technical personnel involved, spare parts, tools for monitoring the Network status, identify common network points of failure, etc.) and submit recommendations;

b)   Assist the MEVA Members in the coordination and technical solutions of the problems presented in the operation and implementation of the AFS Services and the optimum frequency usage of the MEVA network. Likewise, to study and recommend measures to improve the operation and implementation fulfillment;

c)   Study and propose to the MEVA Members intra and inter-regional coordination for the MEVA Network connectivity with other regional and domestic digital communications networks of the CAR,NAM and SAM Regions;

d)   Study and assist the MEVA Members in measures of a technical character, in order to facilitate the operational benefits foreseen in the ICAO Aviation System Block upgrades (ASBU), transition of the MEVA Network towards the ATN infrastructure and its air-ground and ground-ground subnetworks of the air navigation services, implementation requirements from GREPECAS Conclusions and Recommendations, Implementation items from the NAM/CAR Implementation Groups, ICAO SARPs and technical guidance and the MEVA Members expectations; and

e)   Inform and advise the MEVA Network Coordination, ICAO, if a major failure or network concern that affects the entire network occurs or may occur or an event that doesn´t allow achieving the Network Service level agreement, recommending solutions for its recovery and actions by the MEVA Network Service Provider.

3. **Work Programme**

Attached

4. **Working Methods**

a) TMG work programme should present their activities in terms of objectives, responsible and deliverables. Further details can be provided in the form of Work Breakdown Schedule (WBS);

b) TMG will avoid duplication of work and maintain close coordination among the existing entities (like the Air Navigation Implementation Technical Group-ANI/WG), to optimize the use of available resources and experience;

c) TMG may designate, as necessary, ad-hoc groups or task forces to work on specific topics and activities; all tasks and activities should be clearly defined by time and deliverables;

d) TMG should coordinate and advance its works as follows to maximize efficiency and reduce costs:
   - conduct work via electronic written correspondence :
   - conduct work via phone and teleconference calls; and
   - hold meetings when necessary and based on the work programme activities;

e) TMG will report the progress of assigned tasks to the Meetings of Directors of Civil Aviation (DCA) of the Central Caribbean and other DCAs as required.

5. **Membership**

MEVA Members: Aruba, Bahamas (Nassau and Freeport), Cayman Islands, Cuba, Curacao, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Haiti, Mexico, Panama, Sint Maarten, United States (Atlanta, Miami, Puerto Rico) and COCESNA.

The REDDIG Administration representing Colombia and Venezuela are participants / users of the MEVA Network.

ICAO will act as the MEVA Network Coordinator and as technical adviser to the TMG.

3. **Rapporteur**

Mrs. Dulce M. Roses (United States).

MEVA TMG Work Programme
Revised: MEVA TMG/29 11 December 2014

No.	Activities	Objectives	responsible	deliverables
1	To assist the MEVA Members in coordination for the solutions to problems presented in this operation, and in the implementation of services and frequency management matters.	Keep MEVA SLA levels	TMG	MEVA assistance
2	To study and implement technical/operational measures that may be agreed upon to improve the operation and implementation of MEVA Network services, and that do not impact significant cost, investments and objectives of the Network.	Satisfactory operation and service levels	TMG	Network improvements implementation
3	Keep MEVA Members aware of the status of the MEVA Network performance and conditions of operation.	MEVA Network awareness	TMG	• Reliable MEVA Network website • Network Performance revision
4	Maintain valid and up-to-date MEVA Network Contingency Procedures, taking into consideration the contingency plans of each MEVA Member and of the Service Provider and in keeping with the CAR Region General Contingency Plan.	Readiness for contingencies	TMG	MEVA Contingency Procedures
5	To assist the MEVA Members, in finishing the data and voice circuits implementation, according to the requirements shown in the ANP CAR/SAM, GREPECAS and ANIWG/NACC/WG.	Fulfill Air Navigation requirements	Taskforces- Adhoc Groups	Data and voice circuit implementation

No.	Activities	Objectives	responsible	deliverables
6	To study and propose solutions for AFS connectivity of the MEVA Network with other regional and domestic NAM/CAR/SAM networks.	Fulfill Air Navigation requirements	Taskforces- Adhoc Groups	Data and voice circuit implementation
7	To review the RFP and the terms of the Services Agreement, based on the new ICAO requirements for the transitioning towards the ATN, as well as on the experience achieved, with the purpose of using them in a new Services Agreement for the MEVA Network.	Network improvements	Taskforces	Effective and efficient MEVA III Transition Process
8	Keep and validate with the MEVA Network Service Provider a procedural handbook on management, operation and maintenance of the MEVA Network telecommunication circuits.	Ensure proper MEVA Network maintenance and operation	TMG	Maintenance Procedural Handbook/Manual

Outlines of the PROGRAMME DOCUMENT

(annex to the MSA for stage 2)

1. Background

2. OOG concept of operations

3. APANPIRG implementation strategy

4. Expected outcome

5. Framework

    a. Parties

    b. Observers

    c. Host Organisation (if any)

    d. Steering Committee

        i. Members of the Steering Committee

The members of the Steering Committee consist of:
- One representative from each party;
- One representative from ICAO; and
- One representative from the Host Organisation.

        ii. First meeting

Upon signature of the Programme Document by the Host Organisation and at least XXX Parties, a Steering Committee meeting may be convened at the request of the Parties.

        iii. Roles and responsibilities

The roles and responsibilities of the Steering Committee include:
- Review and approve the Annual Work Programme of the OOG programme;
- Review and approve the Annual Budget;
- Review and approve annual financial contribution level for Active Participating States, including considering request for waiver of financial contribution in lieu of in-kind contribution;
- Review of the performance of the Programme and review the Programme document as necessary.
- Review and approve fee schedule for services and trainings in consultation with ICAO Policy.

        iv. Conduct of Steering Committee meetings

Frequency
The Steering Committee meeting will be conducted at least once a year to accomplish the role and the responsibility of the Steering Committee as listed in XXX;

Quorum and composition
A Steering Committee meeting will consist of at least XXX

Steering Committee meeting attendance includes the Members of the Steering Committee and can be extended, upon agreement by the Steering Committee, to the Common Service Provider.
The Steering Committee through the Chairperson may invite guests to attend the Steering Committee meeting to assist the Steering Committee in achieving the objectives of the Programme;

XXX is the Secretary of the Steering Committee and shall perform duties according to the job description in the Appendix XXX.

Role of ICAO
ICAO will facilitate the assistance detailed in this Programme Document by providing overall programme oversight, the inputs set out in XXX, financial account management and budgetary control of the programme, financial reports in accordance with its rules and procedures, and implementation monitoring of the programme in cooperation with the Programme Manager.
It will provide technical support to its experts in the performance of their duties and undertake monitoring missions.

6. Programme review, monitoring and reporting

Implementing APANPIRG strategy, OOG will report to APANPIRG on a XXX basis, concerning:
- Oversight of the performance of the Service Provider (based on contractual KPI);
- Oversight of the performance of the Common Regional VPN (based on contractual metrics);
- Promotion of CRV and migration of aeronautical communications onto CRV;
- Management of the safety and security issues;
- Administration of the Document of Agreement and cost sharing scheme (if any);
- Maintenance of the Technical Specifications and necessary plans (IP address etc);
- Any other concern as needed

The programme itself will be monitored as follows:

- Quarterly reports on the implementation of the Programme itself to ICAO Regional Office, the members of the Steering Committee, Air Navigation Bureau and Technical Cooperation Bureau.
- Annual Report to the Steering Committee.
- End of mission Report to the ICAO Regional Director.

7. Annual objectives of the OOG programme (2016-2026)

8. Inputs

    a. Parties
    b. Host organisation
    c. ICAO
    d. Other

9. Risks, mitigation measures and pre-requisites

10. Programme work plan

11. Programme budget