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*<red text is guidance, and should be removed from the document before completion>*

# AGREEMENT ON DOCUMENT CONTENT

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ORGANISATION A** | |
| Responsible person (name and function) | *<the organisation itself determines who is the responsible person>* |
| Date |  |
| Signature |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ORGANISATION B** | |
| Responsible person (name and function) |  |
| Date |  |
| Signature |  |

*<add further tables for further affected organisations C, D,...>*

# PURPOSE

This document summarises the coordination performed for a multi-actor change, i.e., the change to the functional system of a Service Provider that affects one or more other Service Providers and/or Aviation Undertakings.

It includes an overview of the dependencies, aligned assumptions and aligned risk mitigations. For relevant changes, it also includes an Overarching Safety Argument, assuring that the complete change is safe.

The document is supported by the safety arguments of individual organisations involved.

This template was developed to support the instructions and guidance from FABEC’s Coordination Agreement for Multi-Actor Changes (CAMAC) Manual. Its use is optional.

# ORGANISATIONS AND CONTACT DATA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Organisation A** | |
| Organisation |  |
| Address |  |
| Services provided |  |
| Safety Manager |  |
| Phone |  |
| E-mail |  |
| Point of Contact for the change |  |
| Function |  |
| Phone |  |
| E-mail |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Organisation B** | |
| Organisation |  |
| Address |  |
| Services provided |  |
| Safety Manager |  |
| Phone |  |
| E-mail |  |
| Point of Contact for the change |  |
| Function |  |
| Phone |  |
| E-mail |  |

*<add further tables for further affected organisations>*

# SUMMARY OF CHANGE DATA

This section provides a change for each affected organisation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ORGANISATION A** | |
| Change to functional system?  (yes or  no + explanation) | *<YES /NO>*  *If yes: fill out rows below*  *If no: describe in short how the change affects the organisation, and explain why no change to the functional system is involved. No need to fill out further rows.* |
| Change description |  |
| Reason for the change |  |
| Planned implementation date for change |  |
| Services impacted by the change |  |
| Reference to safety (support) case |  |
| Reference of notification of change to competent authority |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ORGANISATION B** | |
| Change to functional system?  (yes or  no + explanation) | *<YES /NO>*  *If yes: fill out rows below*  *If no: describe in short how the change affects the organisation, and explain why no change to the functional system is involved. No need to fill out further rows.* |
| Change description |  |
| Reason for the change |  |
| Planned implementation date for change |  |
| Services impacted by the change |  |
| Reference to safety (support) case |  |
| Reference of notification of change to competent authority |  |

*<add further tables for further affected organisations>*

# COORDINATION APPROACH

*<describe in short how the coordination was conducted. Also make reference to e.g., safety assessment activities conducted jointly, safety assessment results exchanged, and/ or other validation activities jointly conducted or exchanges>.*

# DEPENDENCIES, ALIGNED ASSUMPTIONS AND RISK MITIGATIONS

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Dependencies between organisations** | **Organisations involved** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Aligned assumptions** | **Organisations involved** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Aligned risk mitigations** | **Organisations involved** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# OVERARCHING SAFETY ARGUMENT

*<‘not applicable’ in case of not any of the involved organisation makes a safety case for the change (e.g., only safety support cases and/ or organisations whose functional system is not affected). In that case, delete the below text. Instead, describe in short why the overarching safety argument is not applicable.>*

The multi-actor change consisting of the changes described in Section 4 is safe, because:

* The involved organsations coordinated about the change as described in Section 5;
* The coordination of the organisation resulted into agreed dependencies, aligned assumptions and risk mitigations as described in Section 6;
* Each individual organisation that makes a change to its functional system developed their safety assurance arguments as listed in Section 4; and
* Each individual organisation that makes a change to its functional system used the agreed dependencies, aligned assumptions and risk mitigations of Section 6 in their individual safety assurance arguments as listed in Section 4.