UK Civil Aviation Authority

Unmanned Aircraft System Operations in UK Airspace – SAIL Mark Policy Concept

CAP 722K

First Edition

Published by the Civil Aviation Authority, 2025

Civil Aviation Authority
Aviation House
Beehive Ring Road
Crawley
West Sussex
RH6 0YR

First edition of CAP 722K – March 2025

The latest version of this document is available in electronic format at on the CAA website.

Contents

Revision History

First Edition March 2025

This is the first edition of this document following public consultation.

Abbreviations and Glossary of Terms

AMC	Acceptable Means of Compliance
ARC	Air Risk Class
BVLOS	Beyond Visual Line of Sight
CAA	UK Civil Aviation Authority
COR	Containment Requirements
COT	Containment Requirements (Tether)
Crit.	Criterion
GRC	Ground Risk Class
OA	Operational Authorisation
OAT	Outside Air Temperature
OSO	Operational Safety Objective
RAE(F)	Recognised Assessment Entity for Flightworthiness
RPAS	Remotely Piloted Aircraft System
SAIL	Specific Assurance and Integrity Level
SORA	Specific Operations Risk Assessment
SRG	Safety Regulation Group
TMPR	Tactical Mitigation Performance Requirements
TPM	Technical Procedures Manual
UAS	Unmanned Aircraft System
UK	United Kingdom

Compliance basis	List of all UK SORA requirements which the OA Applicant must comply with to obtain an OA for their intended operation. The list includes requirements that are already complied with through a SAIL Mark certificate, and identifies such requirements as already complied with. The compliance basis takes the form of a spreadsheet called the ‘compliance matrix’, where each requirement is identified in a single row.
Compliance approach	A high level description of how the OA Applicant intends to comply with the UK SORA requirements. It is an extension of the

	compliance matrix (see definition for compliance basis) with added columns, where the OA Applicant provides against each requirement a brief statement of the compliance method (one sentence suffices) and the expected evidence documents (generic document titles suffice). The actual compliance data and documents are not required at this stage. Where a requirement is satisfied through a SAIL Mark certificate, the OA Applicant writes a simple statement such as “compliance demonstrated by the SAIL Mark certificate”.
Compliance evidence	Compliance evidence is the term used to describe a piece of evidence used to demonstrate compliance with a regulation, requirement or standard. Compliance evidence can take several forms such as: i) Flight logs. ii) Technical data sheet. iii) Flight tests. iv) Design information.
Designer	The person or design and production organisation responsible for the development and manufacture of a UAS.
Flightworthiness	The process for technical assurance of a UAS in the Specific Category of Operation, such that it is in a condition for safe operation.
OA Applicant	The person who applies to the CAA for an operational authorisation within the specific category.
Person	Where this Policy Concept refers to a ‘person’, it means a natural person or a legal person. A natural person is an individual – a human being as opposed to a corporate entity. This may be someone operating as a sole trader, whether or not they employ or contract with others to do specific tasks. A legal person in this context is a person other than a natural person, for example a limited liability company or other type of organisation, that has legal rights and is subject to legal obligations.
Staff	Where this Policy Concept refers to the “staff” of an entity, it means the entity’s employees and individuals with whom the entity has a contract for services (i.e. sub-contracted workers).

UK SORA	The UK version of SORA adopted as AMC to Article 11 of the UK Reg (EU) 2019/947; it is adapted from the version of SORA developed with the Joint Authorities for Rulemaking on Unmanned Systems (JARUS).

The definitive list of abbreviations and terms/definitions that are relevant to UAS operations within the UK and for the whole CAP 722 ‘series’ of documents are centralised within CAP 722D UAS Definitions and Glossary

Foreword

Aim

This SAIL Mark Policy Concept intended for use by the Designer of an Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) and a Recognised Assessment Entity for Flightworthiness (RAE(F)) to understand the requirements, administrative processes and guidance to enable the delivery of a Specific Assurance and Integrity Level (SAIL) Mark certificate for a UAS to be operated within the Specific Category in the United Kingdom.

This document is being published as a Policy Concept. The contents of this Policy Concept are available for immediate use, however some of the content or requirements may change in due course. As this process is new to both the CAA, and industry, we expect to work closely with industry throughout its deployment to understand how it is used, and areas where more, or different, guidance may be required.

How to use this document

The SAIL Mark Policy Concept is an acceptable means of compliance with Article 11(2)(d) of Assimilated Regulation (EU) 2019/947. An Operational Authorisation (OA) Applicant may choose to describe the technical features of a UAS for the purposes of that Article by relying on a UAS configuration that has been granted a SAIL Mark certificate in accordance with the SAIL Mark Policy Concept.

The SAIL Mark Policy Concept identifies Requirements sections and Guidance Material sections.

In this SAIL Mark Policy Concept:

> ‘**Requirements’** highlighted in dark green are conditions that must be satisfied by either (a) the Designer, to be approved for a SAIL Mark; or (b) an RAE(F), to maintain their RAE(F) approval. Any individual requirement may comprise several parts (indicated by paragraphs (a, b, c, etc.) and sub-paragraphs (i, ii, iii, etc.)). Every part of a requirement must be fulfilled to comply with the requirement as a whole.
>
> ‘**Guidance’** highlighted in light green is guidance material that is intended to help the Designer or RAE(F) understand how to comply with the associated requirements.

The purpose of this format is to make it clear what information is required from the Designer or RAE(F) and what is guidance.

This document also applies the following editorial practices:

'Must' indicates a condition that either (a) the Designer is required to comply with to obtain and maintain a SAIL Mark certificate or (b) the RAE(F) is required to comply with to maintain approval as an RAE(F).

'Should' indicates a strong recommendation: while the Designer or RAE(F) is not required to comply with the recommendation, the CAA would expect it to have regard to the recommendation and provide clear and rational justification for not following it.

'May' indicates discretion.

'Must not' indicates prohibition.

Where any reference in this policy concept is made to a document or a piece of legislation, it should always be assumed that the amended version is being referred to, unless stated otherwise. It is a Designer's or RAE(F)'s responsibility to ensure that it is using the latest version currently in force.

Policy and scope

This SAIL Mark Policy Concept sets out:

- the process by which a Designer for a specific UAS configuration may apply for a SAIL Mark for that UAS configuration;
- how that application will be assessed;
- the minimum criteria a Designer and their product must meet to be eligible for a SAIL Mark certificate;
- the effect of a SAIL Mark certificate for the purposes of an OA Application;
- conditions a Designer and their product must comply with to maintain the SAIL Mark certificate;
- conditions an RAE(F) must comply with relating to its roles and responsibilities in the technical assessment of a UAS configuration for the purposes of a SAIL Mark certificate;
- the roles and responsibilities of the CAA in granting a SAIL Mark certificate.

This SAIL Mark Policy Concept supplements and must be read alongside the RAE(F) Policy Concept (CAP 722J) as regards the roles and responsibilities of an RAE(F). It must also be read alongside the UK Specific Operations Risk Assessment (UK SORA) adopted as Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC) to Article 11 of UK Reg (EU) 2019/947.

The CAA has the function of authorising operations in the 'Specific' category under Article 12 UK Reg (EU) 2019/947. To carry out this function, the CAA must evaluate the risk assessment, and the robustness of the mitigating measures proposed by an OA Applicant to keep the UAS operation safe in all phases of flight (Article 12(1)). This includes

mitigation measures relating to the technical features of the UAS: the CAA must establish whether these mitigation measures are sufficiently robust to keep the operation safe in view of the identified ground and air risks (Article 12(2)(b)).

The CAA may take into account advice from entities in accordance with this SAIL Mark Policy Concept to facilitate our assessment of whether such mitigation measures are sufficiently robust for an operation at a given Specific Assurance and Integrity Level (SAIL). The CAA may grant a SAIL Mark certificate where we are satisfied of that robustness.

Article 11 of UK Reg (EU) 2019/947 sets out the rules for conducting a risk assessment, one of which is that it must describe the characteristics of the UAS operation. Article 11(2)(d) makes clear that this includes a description of the technical features of the UAS, including its performance in view of the conditions of the planned operation.

This SAIL Mark Policy Concept enables an OA Applicant to comply with that provision by relying on a UAS that has been assessed and granted a SAIL Mark in accordance with this SAIL Mark Policy Concept.

Context

The CAA has contributed to, and further adapted, the methodology developed by the Joint Authorities for Rulemaking on Unmanned Systems (JARUS) to establish criteria for assessing mitigation measures relating to the technical features of a UAS. These are listed in the UK Specific Operations Risk Assessment (UK SORA) methodology.

UK SORA identifies a range of technical issues that could, if not adequately addressed, endanger a UAS operation. It also identifies criteria that can be used to determine whether a given technical issue can be deemed to be mitigated to a low, medium or high level of robustness. We refer to these criteria as “UK SORA requirements”.

UK SORA also sets out a clear methodology by which a UAS operator can assess ground and air risks for the planned operation and arrive at final ground and air risk scores. These consolidated scores are combined to generate a Specific Assurance and Integrity Level (SAIL), with SAIL 1 reflecting the lowest ground and air risk and SAIL 6 the highest. The SAIL level determines which requirements must be met, and at which level of robustness.

The UK SORA requirements are therefore mapped against each SAIL to identify the level of robustness necessary for us to conclude that mitigation measures relating to the relevant technical issues are appropriate to the level of ground and air risk in question.

SAIL Marking at the UAS design stage

The CAA has proposed two pathways for assessing a UAS against the UK SORA requirements, described in CAP 722J. This SAIL Mark Policy Concept relates to the first of these pathways assessment at the design stage.

Some UK SORA requirements can only be satisfied through the design features and fabrication methods of a UAS. An OA Applicant with a commercial off-the-shelf UAS is unlikely to possess the supporting technical evidence needed to demonstrate compliance with these requirements.

The SAIL Mark Policy Concept allows such evidence to be provided directly by the Designer while the UAS is being developed, and its methodology enables a Designer to develop their UAS by reference to UK SORA requirements.

Where a detailed technical assessment has been done at the design stage and the CAA is satisfied that a UAS in a given configuration complies with UK SORA requirements associated with one or more given SAILs, the CAA may grant a SAIL Mark certificate for that UAS configuration. UAS produced in that configuration may then be described as “SAIL Marked”. The SAIL Mark certificate will indicate the highest SAIL for which the UAS configuration meets the UK SORA requirements to the appropriate level of robustness.

Where the CAA evaluates an OA Applicant’s risk assessment that includes a SAIL Marked UAS, it may be deemed (in the absence of evidence to the contrary) that the UAS has the minimum technical features considered necessary to reduce risk to an acceptable level in the class of operations to which the SAIL Mark relates.

In practical terms, the SAIL Mark will reflect the highest SAIL at which the CAA deems the UAS to be safe to operate.

Role of an RAE(F)

An entity approved as an RAE(F) may carry out the detailed assessment of a UAS against UK SORA requirements at the design stage in accordance with this SAIL Mark Policy Concept.

The RAE(F) will then advise the CAA as to whether the UAS complies with the relevant UK SORA requirements.

The CAA will take the advice of the RAE(F) into account when deciding whether the conditions for issuing a SAIL Mark certificate have been met (as set out in the SAIL Mark Policy Concept).

Availability

The AMC and GM to UK Regulation (EU) 2019/947 and the latest versions of the CAP 722 series documents are available on the CAA website Publications section.

The CAA has a system for publishing further information and guidance, which can be found on the CAA website under the Skywise section, which can be filtered for information and subject matter relevant to UAS.

Point of contact

Unless otherwise stated, all enquiries relating to this CAP should be made to:

FS&I D&C Policy Team
Civil Aviation Authority
Safety and Airspace Regulation Group
Aviation House
Beehive Ringroad
West Sussex
RH6 0YR

E-mail: uavenquiries@caa.co.uk

Chapter 1
SAIL Mark Policy Concept

1.1 Privileges to the Designer

The SAIL Mark scheme is optional. There is no obligation for the Designer of a UAS to SAIL Mark their UAS in the UK.

Where a SAIL Mark is granted in relation to a UAS, it means that the UAS will be deemed to comply with the UK SORA requirements identified on the SAIL Mark Certificate. The UK SORA requirements identified on the SAIL Mark Certificate do not require further compliance evidence from the OA Applicant during the OA process.

Requirements

(a) In order to describe and sell any UAS as a 'SAIL Marked UAS', a Designer must:

i. Have the design of their UAS assessed by an RAE(F) in accordance with this Policy Concept;

ii. Satisfy the CAA on an initial and continuing basis that they comply with all the requirements of this Policy Concept; and

iii. Ensure that any UAS placed on the market as a 'SAIL Marked UAS' is produced in accordance with and complies with any conditions of a valid SAIL Mark certificate.

1.2 Validity of the SAIL Mark certificate

A valid SAIL Mark certificate means that in the context of an OA application, and for the purposes of evaluating a risk assessment carried out using the UK SORA methodology, the UAS will be deemed compliant with the UK SORA requirements identified on the SAIL Mark certificate. The period of validity of the SAIL Mark certificate will extend for the in-service life of the UAS unless the OA Applicant has carried out a major modification to the SAIL Marked UAS as defined in CAP 722L.

The SAIL Mark certificate is only valid for the UAS configuration specified on the certificate.

Requirements

(a) A Designer must not apply a SAIL Mark to a UAS configuration if the SAIL Mark certificate has been suspended or revoked.

(b) A Designer must only apply a SAIL mark to the UAS configuration described on the SAIL Mark Certificate.

Guidance

The CAA may suspend or revoke a SAIL Mark certificate at any time, including in but not limited to the following instances:

i. The Designer fails to demonstrate compliance with the requirements identified in this SAIL Mark Policy Concept (as amended from time to time) or with any applicable legislation.

ii. The Designer prevents the CAA from carrying out any oversight, or the RAE(F) from carrying out any assessment activity, relating to the SAIL Mark certificate.

iii. The Designer surrenders their SAIL Mark certificate to the CAA.

The revocation of a SAIL Mark certificate will set out the scope of revocation, for example it may include every UAS produced under that SAIL Mark certificate (e.g. following deployment of a software update) , or only the application of that SAIL Mark to future UAS.

The Designer should consider the inclusion of any payload in the UAS configuration to be assessed by the RAE(F).

A SAIL Mark certificate can only be suspended or revoked by the CAA; it cannot be suspended or revoked by an RAE(F).

1.3 Transferability of SAIL Mark certificate

Requirements

(a) A Designer (the original Designer) may transfer ownership of a valid SAIL Mark certificate to another natural or legal person (the new Designer) able to maintain compliance with 1.1(a)(ii) and (iii), and 1.2, if the original and new Designers comply with the following conditions:

i. As part of the transfer of ownership of a SAIL Mark certificate, the original Designer must provide to the new Designer all the data used in the demonstration of compliance with the requirements in this SAIL Mark Policy Concept.

ii. The original Designer must notify the CAA of the transfer of ownership as soon as reasonably practicable after the transfer takes place.

iii. From the date on which ownership of a SAIL Mark certificate is transferred to a new Designer, the new Designer must comply with all ongoing requirements of this Policy Concept.

Guidance

The CAA will re-issue the SAIL Mark certificate to the new Designer.

1.4 UAS modification process

Requirements

(a) Where a Designer identifies a potential modification or change to an existing SAIL Marked UAS, they must determine whether the change is a modification per the definition in CAP 722L, and if so, whether it is classified as a major or minor UAS modification.

(b) Where the change is a UAS modification and is classified as major, the Designer must apply for a new SAIL Mark certificate.

(c) Where the change is a UAS modification and is classified as minor, or where the change is not a UAS modification, the Designer may continue to rely on the original SAIL Mark certificate and should notify the CAA of the minor change.

(d) Where the Designer makes any modification to the UAS manufacturing process, they must apply for a new SAIL Mark certificate (SAIL Mark 3, 4, 5 and 6 only).

Guidance

The Designer may re-use or update previous evidence data where possible to re-establish compliance with the requirements.

Guidance for an OA Applicant who wishes to make a modification to a SAIL Marked UAS as part of a UK SORA OA application can be found in CAP 722J section 6.2.

1.5 Changes to the Designer’s organisation

Requirements

A change to the Designer’s organisation does not affect the validity of the SAIL Mark certificate if the organisation is able to maintain such validity per 1.2.

Guidance

Such changes may include organisational changes, which may be out of scope of this SAIL Mark Policy Concept and CAA oversight. Providing the Designer is able to maintain compliance with the requirements set out in this SAIL Mark Policy Concept, then the SAIL Mark Certificate remains valid.

1.6 Eligibility of the Designer

Requirements

Any natural or legal person is eligible to apply as a Designer for a SAIL Mark certificate under the requirements of this SAIL Mark Policy Concept.

Guidance

This includes a Designer whose primary place of business is outside the UK.

Chapter 2

RAE(F) Assessment

2.1 Process

Requirements

(a) The Designer must select an RAE(F) and apply to them for a SAIL Mark Certificate assessment.

(b) The RAE(F) must confirm the provision of their services for the SAIL Mark process and communicate it to both the Designer and the CAA.

(c) Using UK SORA, the Designer must determine the highest risk class and containment robustness level that they wish the UAS to comply with:

i. GRC for the footprint and any M2 Criteria 1 and 2 Mitigations used.

ii. ARC for the operational volume.

iii. Containment robustness level.

(d) From (c), the Designer must determine the maximum SAIL that they wish to comply with:

i. SAIL 1.

ii. SAIL 2.

iii. SAIL 3.

iv. SAIL 4.

v. SAIL 5.

vi. SAIL 6.

(e) From (c), (d) and 2.2 (and 3.2, if M1 mitigations used), the Designer must determine the compliance basis and develop their compliance approach.

(f) The RAE(F) must review and agree the compliance basis and compliance approach with the Designer.

(g) The Designer must develop and submit evidence data to the RAE(F) that demonstrates compliance with the UK SORA requirements identified and set out in the agreed compliance basis and compliance approach.

(h) The RAE(F) must verify the Designer’s compliance with the UK SORA requirements identified and set out in the agreed compliance basis and compliance approach.

(i) Where an RAE(F) concludes as a result of its assessment that the Designer complies with the applicable UK SORA requirements for the intended SAIL, it must advise the CAA via a flightworthiness report (as per section 5.6 of CAP 722J) and must at the same time send a copy of that report to the Designer.

(j) Where an RAE(F) concludes as a result of its assessment that the Designer does not comply with the applicable UK SORA requirements for the intended SAIL, it must advise the CAA detailing the reasons for its conclusions and must at the same time send a copy of its advice to the Designer.

(k) The Designer must provide to the CAA the serial number of each newly produced UAS of the same configuration.

Guidance

(a) The GRC and ARC at this stage are not considered to be the 'Final GRC' and 'Residual ARC' but are used nonetheless by the Designer to determine the SAIL and UK SORA requirements. Later on, during the OA process, the OA Applicant may wish to apply further ground risk reduction (e.g. M1 mitigation) or further air risk reduction (e.g. air risk strategic mitigation) in order to obtain a Final GRC or Residual ARC lower than what the UAS is designed for.

If the Designer chooses to comply with the optional M2 mitigation requirements in section 3, it is up to the Designer to include the resultant reduction in ground risk in the GRC.

GRC, ARC and containment robustness level are recorded on the SAIL Mark certificate to allow the future Operator to confirm that the UAS is suited for their intended operation.

(b) The compliance basis is the list of all UK SORA requirements to be complied with to obtain the SAIL Mark certificate. It includes mandatory requirements (e.g. Tactical mitigations, Containment requirements, Operational Safety Objectives (OSOs)) and optional requirements (e.g. M2 ground risk mitigation).

The compliance approach is a high-level description of how the Designer intends to comply with the UK SORA requirements. It should take the form of a compliance matrix in which the Designer provides a brief statement of the compliance method against each requirement (one or two sentences typically suffice) and the expected evidence documents (generic document titles suffice). The actual compliance evidence data and documents are not required at this stage. The Designer should follow the guidance provided in UK SORA Annex A for developing compliance basis and approach.

(c) The Designer should follow the guidance provided in UK SORA Annex A for developing compliance evidence data.

(d) For SAIL 1 and 2, the RAE(F) will systematically verify the Designer's compliance with Tactical Mitigation Performance Requirements (TMPRs), OSO 8, 5 and 13 as applicable. The compliance data to other UK SORA requirements will be uploaded by the Designer per 2.3 (a), but it will not be systematically verified by the RAE(F). The RAE(F) reserves themselves the right to verify the Designer's compliance with any

other UK SORA requirement.

(e) The CAA will maintain a database that will be able to verify whether the serial number of a particular UAS is covered by a SAIL Mark certificate. Individual SAIL Mark Certificates will not routinely be issued to each individual UAS. Instead, the overall SAIL Mark Certificate should be read in conjunction with the database of serial numbers, to confirm that a specific UAS holds a SAIL Mark Certificate.

2.2 Requirements to be complied with

This section identifies the parts of UK SORA to be complied with, and within them the requirements which are not relevant to a SAIL Mark application. The Designer uses this section to determine their compliance basis in 2.1 (e).

A number of UK SORA requirements depend on the intended operation, which will not be known to the Designer at this stage. The Designer should therefore develop their own set of assumptions such as the class of airspace or the environmental conditions in which their UAS may be operated and use these assumptions to develop their compliance evidence.

Requirements

(a) The Designer must comply with the following UK SORA requirements at the level of robustness determined in 2.1 (f):

UK SORA Annex B:

i. M1A Criterion 2 (if applicable).

UK SORA Annex D:

ii. Tactical mitigations:

- D3 i) TM1 (if applicable)

UK SORA Annex E:

iii. OSO 2.

iv. OSO 4.

v. OSO 5 all requirements except:

- OSO5.L.A (b)

vi. OSO 16 Criterion 3 all requirements (if applicable) except:

- OSO16C3.M.A (c).

vii. OSO 18.

viii. OSO 19.

ix. OSO 20 all requirements except:

- OSO20.L.A (c).
- OSO20.M.A (d).

x. OSO 24 all requirements except:

- OSO24.M.A (c).

xi. COR – Containment requirements:

- Criterion 1 all requirements except CORC1.L.A (c).
- Criterion 2 all requirements except CORC2.L.A (b), CORC2.M.A (c).
- Criterion 3 all requirements except CORC3.L.A (c).
- Criterion 4 all requirements except CORC4.M.A (c).

xii. COT – Containment requirements (Tether) (if applicable):

- Criterion 1 all requirements except COTC1.L.A (d).
- Criterion 2 all requirements except COTC2.L.A (c), COTC2.H.A (b).

(b) The Designer must comply with the following requirements in Appendix A of this SAIL Mark Policy Concept at the level of robustness determined in 2.1 (f):

SAIL Mark Policy Concept Appendix A:

i. SOSO 3.

ii. SOSO 6.

iii. SOSO 7.

iv. SOSO 16.

v. SOSO 24.

vi. SCOR – Containment requirements.

vii. SCOT – Containment requirements (tether) (if applicable).

Guidance

(a) TMPRs are only applicable if the Designer chooses to comply with the requirements for Beyond Visual Line of Sight (BVLOS) operation in ARC-b and above.

The meteorological conditions considered in the definition of the ground risk buffer for compliance with Containment requirements Criterion 3 should match those considered in the compliance with OSO 24.

(b) Appendix A contains a number of requirements for the Designer to comply with which are specific to the SAIL Mark Policy Concept. These requirements are not intended to be additional requirements over and above those in UK SORA to meet the target level of safety; they are the mechanism to provide technical data to the future OA Applicant that will enable a successful OA, which would otherwise not be available to the OA Applicant.

The requirements in Appendix A are labelled with the letter “S” (e.g. SOSO3.L.I), standing for ‘SAIL Mark’, in order to differentiate them from the requirements in UK SORA.

2.3 Data handling and retention

Requirements

(a) The Designer must submit the entirety of their compliance evidence data to the RAE(F).

(b) The Designer must keep records of their compliance evidence data for as long as the UAS remains in service.

(c) The RAE(F) must provide secure storage for the Designer’s data and for their own data to ensure that no damage to, or tampering of, records can occur.

(d) The RAE(F) must not disclose the Designer’s data or other information acquired in the course of carrying out their duties under the RAE(F) Policy Concept (including as it relates to the SAIL Mark Policy Concept), except to its staff, to the CAA, where required to do so by law or where required to do so by the CAA or the Designer, and in relation to personal data, it must comply with the UK General Data Protection (GDPR) and the Data Protection Act 2018. The RAE(F) must ensure that its staff comply with the obligations above.

(e) The RAE(F) must keep any of the Designer’s data that they have on record in their database for 3 months after the CAA has decided to grant or refuse a SAIL Mark certificate, or until a Regulation 6 process has been completed, whichever is the later and must then delete all records of the Designer’s data from their database.

(f) The RAE(F) must delete any of the Designer’s data that they have on record in their database no later than 3 months after the date on which the Designer terminates their SAIL Mark application.

(g) The RAE(F) must submit to the CAA a draft SAIL Mark certificate per Appendix B.

(h) The RAE(F) must keep a record of their assessment data in accordance with Section 2.3 (e) and ensure the CAA has received all relevant data, which includes:

i. Assessment report of ground risk mitigation means.

ii. Assessment report of air risk mitigation means.
iii. Assessment report of compliance with Operational Safety Objectives (OSO).
iv. Assessment report of compliance with containment requirements.
v. Test witnessing reports.
vi. Corrective actions by the Designer to achieve compliance with UK SORA requirements.

(i) Data records listed in (h) must include details of any standards used by the RAE(F) to conduct the assessments.

(j) The RAE(F) must provide access to, or copies of, any data specified in this section to the CAA upon request, within the notified timescale.

(k) An RAE(F) whose approval is surrendered or revoked must provide to the CAA as soon as reasonably practicable the data specified in (h) in relation to every SAIL Mark assessment performed by the RAE(F) up to the date of the surrender or revocation of its RAE(F) approval.

Guidance

(c) The OA Applicant will need to exchange data with the RAE-F for assessment purposes. This data must be held securely and deleted as per the requirements section above. Privilege-based access ensures that intellectual property data is only accessed on a need-to-know basis and controlled, and duties of confidence are imposed to provide further protection of an OA Applicant's data.

If there is a requirement to host this data on CAA IT systems, such that the OA Applicant and RAE-F can both access this securely without it being held directly on the RAE-F IT system, this should be discussed with the RAE-F and CAA.

(d) The Designer may instruct the RAE(F) to liaise with a third party contracted by the Designer for the assessment of certain documents. The Designer and the RAE(F) are expected to comply with any requests from the Air Accident Investigation Branch (AAIB).

(e) If the CAA refuses to grant a SAIL Mark certificate, the Designer may have that decision reviewed. Additionally, if the CAA proposes to suspend or revoke a SAIL Mark certificate, the Designer may have that proposal reviewed. Appeal a decision the CAA has made affecting your organisation.

2.4 Interfaces between parties

Requirements

(a) The Designer and the RAE(F) must communicate with each other as and when necessary.

Guidance

(a) The Designer should not normally need to communicate with the CAA.

The RAE(F) should not normally need to communicate with the CAA, except for the purposes of section 2.1 (i) and (j) and (k).

2.5 Recurrent manufacturing auditing for SAIL 5 and 6

Requirements

Where a high level of assurance is required for OSO 2, the RAE(F) must inform the CAA that this is the case, so that a recurring audit plan with the Designer can be established, to verify that the manufacturing procedures satisfy the UK SORA requirements and to verify that the UAS confirms to its design and specifications on an ongoing basis.

Chapter 3

M2 Mitigation (optional)

3.1 Process

Requirements

The process described in 2.1 must be followed, if the Designer wishes to use M2 criterion 1 or 2 mitigations.

Section 3.2 below sets out specific requirements for M2 mitigations.

3.2 M2 Requirements to be complied with

Requirements

(a) The Designer must comply with the following UK SORA requirements at the robustness level determined in 3.1 (a):

UK SORA Annex B:

i. M2 Criterion 1 all requirements.

ii. M2 Criterion 2 all requirements except:

- M2C2.M.I.
- M2C2.M.A (c).
- M2C2.H.A (b).

(b) The Designer must comply with the following requirements in Appendix A of this SAIL Mark Policy Concept at the level of robustness determined in 3.1 (a):

SAIL Mark Policy Concept Appendix A:

i. SM2 mitigation.

Guidance

This section identifies the parts of UK SORA to be complied with, in relation to Annex B. The Designer uses this section to determine their compliance basis in section 3.1 (c).

(b) Appendix A contains a number of requirements for the Designer to comply with which are specific to the SAIL Mark Policy Concept. These requirements are not intended to be additional requirements over and above those in UK SORA to meet the target level of safety; they are the mechanism by which to provide technical data to the future OA

Applicant that will enable a successful OA, which would otherwise not be available to the OA Applicant.

The requirements in Appendix A are labelled with the letter “S” (e.g. SOSO3.L.I), standing for ‘SAIL Mark’, in order to differentiate them from the requirements in UK SORA.

APPENDIX A

Requirements to support the UAS Operator

This appendix sets out requirements to be complied with, as described in part (b) of section 2.2. These requirements should be read in conjunction with the UK SORA requirements, described in part (a) of section 2.2.

A.1 SOSO 3 – UAS maintained by competent entity

SOSO 3 – UAS maintained by competent and/or proven entity

LEVEL of INTEGRITY

	Low (SAIL 1, 2)	Medium (SAIL 3, 4)	High (SAIL 5, 6)
Criterion	SOSO3.L.I	SOSO3.L.I SOSO3.M.I	SOSO3.L.I SOSO3.M.I

LEVEL of ASSURANCE

	Low (SAIL 1, 2)	Medium (SAIL 3, 4)	High (SAIL 5, 6)
Criterion 1 (Procedure)	SOSO3C1.L.A	SOSO3C1.L.A	SOSO3C1.L.A

A.1.1 Low level of robustness (SAIL 1 and 2)

SOSO3.L.I

The Designer must provide maintenance instructions and requirements to be recorded on the SAIL Mark certificate.

SOSO3C1.L.A

Criterion 1 – Procedures

The Designer must provide evidence of compliance with the Integrity requirements.

GM.SOSO3.L.I

The maintenance requirements are the needs for maintenance on the UAS, e.g. inspection after hard landing, regular check of lighting system. The Designer ensures that these requirements are covered in the maintenance instructions.

The maintenance instructions are the information establishing how to carry out the needed maintenance or repairs. These instructions are followed by the maintenance staff while performing maintenance.

A.1.2 Medium level of robustness (SAIL 3 and 4)

Lower robustness level requirements to be complied with:

- **SOSO3.L.I**
- **SOSO3C1.L.A**

Additional requirements to be compiled with:

SOSO3.M.I

The Designer must provide scheduled maintenance instructions to be recorded on the SAIL Mark certificate.

SOSO3C1.M.A

Criterion 1 – Procedures

No additional requirement.

A.1.3 High level of robustness (SAIL 5 and 6)

Lower robustness level requirements to be complied with:

- **SOSO3.L.I**
- **SOSO3C1.L.A**
- **SOSO3.M.I**

Additional requirements to be compiled with:

OSO3.H.I

No additional requirement.

SOSO3C1.H.A

Criterion 1 – Procedures

No additional requirement.

A.2 SOSO 6 – C3 link characteristics

SOSO 6 – C3 link characteristics (e.g. performance, spectrum use) are appropriate for the operation

	LEVEL of INTEGRITY		
	Low (SAIL 2, 3)	**Medium (SAIL 4)**	**High (SAIL 5, 6)**
Criterion	SOSO6.L.I	SOSO6.L.I	SOSO6.L.I
	LEVEL of ASSURANCE		
	Low (SAIL 2, 3)	**Medium (SAIL 4)**	**High (SAIL 5, 6)**
Criterion	SOSO6.L.A	SOSO6.L.A	SOSO6.L.A

A.2.1 Low level of robustness (SAIL 2 and 3)

SOSO6.L.I

(a) The Designer must provide the following data to be recorded on the SAIL Mark Certificate:

i. C3 link performance specification.

ii. C3 link RF spectrum.

iii. Environmental conditions which the C3 link are designed to.

(b) The Designer must ensure that the UAS provides means for the remote pilot to continuously monitor the C3 link performance and to ensure the performance continues to meet the operational requirements.

SOSO6.L.A

The Designer must provide evidence of compliance with the Integrity requirements.

AMC.SOSO6.L.I

(b) The requirement may be complied with by monitoring the C2 link signal strength and receiving an alert from the UAS HMI if the signal becomes too low (SAIL 2 and 3 only).

GM.SOSO6.L.I

(b) The remote pilot should have continuous and timely access to the relevant C3 information that could affect the safety of flight.

A.2.2 Medium level of robustness (SAIL 4)

Lower robustness level requirements to be complied with:

- **SOSO6.L.I**
- **SOSO6.L.A**

Additional requirements to be compiled with:

SOSO6.M.I

No additional requirement.

SOSO6.M.A

No additional requirement.

A.2.3 High level of robustness (SAIL 5 and 6)

Lower robustness level requirements to be complied with:

- **SOSO6.L.I**
- **SOSO6.L.A**

Additional requirements to be compiled with:

OSO6.H.I

No additional requirement.

SOSO6.H.A

No additional requirement.

A.3 SOSO 7 – Conformity check of the UAS configuration

SOSO 7 – Conformity check of the UAS configuration

LEVEL of INTEGRITY

	Low (SAIL 1, 2)	Medium (SAIL 3, 4)	High (SAIL 5, 6)
Criterion	SOSO7.L.I	SOSO7.L.I	SOSO7.L.I

LEVEL of ASSURANCE

	Low (SAIL 1, 2)	Medium (SAIL 3, 4)	High (SAIL 5, 6)
Criterion 1 (Procedure)	SOSO7C1.L.A	SOSO7C1.L.A	SOSO7C1.L.A

A.3.1 Low level of robustness (SAIL 1 and 2)

SOSO7C1.L.I

The Designer must provide recommendations for the development of UAS conformity checks by the Operator to be recorded on the SAIL Mark certificate.

SOSO7C1.L.A

Criterion 1 – Procedures

The Designer must provide evidence of compliance with the Integrity requirements.

A.3.2 Medium level of robustness (SAIL 3 and 4)

Lower robustness level requirements to be complied with:

- **SOSO7.L.I**
- **SOSO7.L.A**

Additional requirements to be compiled with:

SOSO7.M.I

No additional requirement.

SOSO7C1.M.A

Criterion 1 – Procedures

No additional requirement.

A.2.3 High level of robustness (SAIL 5 and 6)

Lower robustness level requirements to be complied with:

- **SOSO7.L.I**
- **SOSO7.L.A**

Additional requirements to be compiled with:

OSO7.H.I

No additional requirement.

SOSO7.H.A

Criterion 1 – Procedures

No additional requirement.

A.4 SOSO 16 – Multi crew coordination

SOSO 16 – Multi crew coordination

LEVEL of INTEGRITY

	Low (SAIL 1, 2)	Medium (SAIL 3, 4)	High (SAIL 5, 6)
Criterion 3 (Communication devices)	N/A	SOSO16C3.M.I	SOSO16C3.M.I

LEVEL of ASSURANCE

	Low (SAIL 1, 2)	Medium (SAIL 3, 4)	High (SAIL 5, 6)
Criterion 3 (Communication devices)	N/A	SOSO16C3.M.A	SOSO16C3.M.A

A.4.1 Low level of robustness (SAIL 1 and 2)

Not applicable.

A.4.2 Medium level of robustness (SAIL 3 and 4)

SOSO16C3.M.I

Criterion 3 – Communication devices

The Designer must provide the performance specifications and limitations for the communication devices to be recorded on the SAIL Mar certificate.

SOSO16C3.M.A

Criterion 3 – Communication devices

The Designer must provide evidence of compliance with the Integrity requirements.

A.4.3 High level of robustness (SAIL 5 and 6)

Lower robustness level requirements to be complied with:

- **SOSO16C3.M.I**
- **SOSO16C3.M.A**

Additional requirements to be compiled with:

SOSO16C3.H.I

Criterion 3 – Communication devices

No additional requirement.

SOSO16C3.H.A

Criterion 3 – Communication devices

No additional requirement.

A.5 SOSO 24 – UAS designed and qualified for adverse conditions

SOSO 24 – UAS designed and qualified for adverse conditions

LEVEL of INTEGRITY

	N/A	Medium (SAIL 3)	High (SAIL 4, 5, 6)
Criterion	N/A	SOSO24.M.I	SOSO24.M.I

LEVEL of ASSURANCE

	N/A	Medium (SAIL 3)	High (SAIL 4, 5, 6)
Criterion	N/A	SOSO24.M.A	SOSO24.M.A

A.5.1 Medium level of robustness (SAIL 3)

SOSO24.M.I

The Designer must provide the environmental conditions which the UAS is designed to, to be recorded on the SAIL Mark certificate.

SOSO24.M.A

The Designer must provide evidence of compliance with Integrity requirements.

A.5.2 High level of robustness (SAIL 4, 5 and 6)

Lower robustness level requirements to be complied with:

- **SOSO24.M.I**
- **SOSO24.M.A**

Additional requirements to be compiled with:

SOSO24.H.I

No additional requirement.

SOSO24.H.A

No additional requirement.

A.6 SCOR – Containment requirements

LEVEL of INTEGRITY

	Low	Medium	High
Criterion 1 (Operational volume containment)	SCOR.C1.L.1	SCOR.C1.L.1	SCOR.C1.L.1
Criterion 2 (End of flight upon exit of the operational volume)	SCOR.C2.L.1	SCOR.C2.L.1	SCOR.C2.L.1
Criterion 3 (Definition of the final ground risk buffer)	SCOR.C3.L.1	SCOR.C3.L.1	SCOR.C3.L.1
Criterion 4 (Ground risk buffer containment)	N/A	N/A	N/A

LEVEL of ASSURANCE

	Low	Medium	High
Criterion 1 (Operational volume containment)	SCOR.C1.L.A	SCOR.C1.L.A	SCOR.C1.L.A
Criterion 2 (End of flight upon exit of the operational volume)	SCOR.C2.L.A	SCOR.C2.L.A	SCOR.C2.L.A
Criterion 3 (Definition of the final ground risk buffer)	SCOR.C3.L.A	SCOR.C3.L.A	SCOR.C3.L.A
Criterion 4 (Ground risk buffer containment)	N/A	N/A	N/A

A.6.1 Low level of robustness

SCOR.C1.L.I

Criterion 1 – Operational volume containment

The Designer must provide the following aspects considered in their compliance evidence to be recorded in the SAIL Mark certificate:

i. External systems.

ii. Operational volume.

iii. Particular risks.

SCOR.C2.L.I

Criterion 2 – End of flight upon exit of the operational volume

The Designer must provide the procedures which initiate the immediate end of flight available to be recorded on the SAIL Mark certificate.

SCOR.C3.L.I

Criterion 3 – Definition of the final ground risk buffer

The Designer must provide the ground risk buffer definition to be recorded in the SAIL Mark certificate.

SCOR.C1.L.A

Criterion 1 – Operational volume containment

The Designer must provide evidence of compliance with the Integrity requirements.

SCOR.C2.L.A

Criterion 2 – End of flight upon exit of the operational volume

The Designer must provide evidence of compliance with the Integrity requirements.

SCOR.C3.L.A

Criterion 3 – Definition of the final ground risk buffer

The Designer must provide evidence of compliance with the Integrity requirements.

A.6.2 Medium level of robustness

Lower robustness level requirements to be complied with:

- **SCOR.C1.L.I**
- **SCOR.C1.L.A**

- **SCOR.C2.L.I**
- **SCOR.C2.L.A**
- **SCOR.C3.L.I**
- **SCOR.C3.L.A**

Additional requirements to be compiled with:

SCOR.C1.M.I

Criterion 1 – Operational volume containment

No additional requirements.

SCOR.C2.M.I

Criterion 2 – End of flight upon exit of the operational volume

No additional requirements.

SCOR.C3.M.I

Criterion 3 – Definition of the final ground risk buffer

No additional requirements.

SCOR.C1.M.A

Criterion 1 – Operational volume containment

No additional requirements.

SCOR.C2.M.A

Criterion 2 – End of flight upon exit of the operational volume

No additional requirements.

SCOR.C3.M.A

Criterion 3 – Definition of the final ground risk buffer

No additional requirements.

A.6.3 High level of robustness

Lower robustness level requirements to be complied with:

- **SCOR.C1.L.I**
- **SCOR.C1.L.A**

- **SCOR.C2.L.I**
- **SCOR.C2.L.A**
- **SCOR.C3.L.I**
- **SCOR.C3.L.A**

Additional requirements to be compiled with:

SCOR.C1.M.I

Criterion 1 – Operational volume containment

No additional requirements.

SCOR.C2.M.I

Criterion 2 – End of flight upon exit of the operational volume

No additional requirements.

SCOR.C3.M.I

Criterion 3 – Definition of the final ground risk buffer

No additional requirements.

SCOR.C1.M.A

Criterion 1 – Operational volume containment

The Designer must provide evidence of compliance with the Integrity requirements.

SCOR.C2.M.A

Criterion 2 – End of flight upon exit of the operational volume

The Designer must provide evidence of compliance with the Integrity requirements.

SCOR.C3.M.A

Criterion 3 – Definition of the final ground risk buffer

The Designer must provide evidence of compliance with the Integrity requirements.

A.7 SCOR – Containment requirements (tether)

LEVEL of INTEGRITY

	Low	Medium	High
Criterion 1 (Technical design)	SCOT.C1.L.1	SCOT.C1.L.1	SCOT.C1.L.1
Criterion 2 (Procedures)	SCOT.C2.L.1	SCOT.C2.L.1	SCOT.C2.L.1

LEVEL of ASSURANCE

	Low	Medium	High
Criterion 1 (Technical design)	SCOT.C1.L.A	SCOT.C1.L.A	SCOT.C1.L.A
Criterion 2 (Procedures)	SCOT.C2.L.A	SCOT.C2.L.A	SCOT.C2.L.A SCOT.C2.H.A

A.7.1 Low level of robustness

SCOT.C1.L.I

Criterion 1 – Technical design

(a) The Designer must provide the length of the tether to be recorded in the SAIL Mark certificate.

(b) The Designer must provide the ultimate loads to be recorded in the SAIL Mark certificate.

SCOT.C2.L.I

Criterion 2 – Procedures

The Designer must provide the procedures to install and periodically inspect the condition of the tether to be recorded in the SAIL Mark certificate

SCOT.C1.L.I

Criterion 1 – Technical design

The Designer must provide evidence of compliance with Integrity requirements.

SCOT.C2.L.I

Criterion 2 – Procedures

The Designer must provide evidence of compliance with Integrity requirements.

A.7.2 Medium level of robustness

Lower robustness level requirements to be complied with:

- **SCOT.C1.L.I**
- **SCOT.C1.L.A**
- **SCOT.C2.L.I**
- **SCOT.C2.L.A**

Additional requirements to be compiled with:

SCOT.C1.M.I

Criterion 1 – Technical design

No additional requirements.

SCOT.C2.M.I

Criterion 2 – Procedures

No additional requirements.

SCOT.C1.M.A

Criterion 1 – Technical design

No additional requirements.

SCOT.C2.M.A

Criterion 2 – Procedures

No additional requirements.

A.7.3 High level of robustness

Lower robustness level requirements to be complied with:

- **SCOT.C1.L.I**
- **SCOT.C1.L.A**
- **SCOT.C2.L.I**
- **SCOT.C2.L.A**

Additional requirements to be compiled with:

SCOT.C1.H.I

Criterion 1 – Technical design

No additional requirements.

SCOT.C2.H.I

Criterion 2 – Procedures

No additional requirements.

SCOT.C1.H.A

Criterion 1 – Technical design

No additional requirements.

SCOT.C2.H.A

Criterion 2 – Procedures

The Designer must provide the flight envelope to be recorded in the SAIL Mark certificate.

A.8 SM2 mitigation (optional)

SM2 – effects of UA impact dynamics are reduced

LEVEL of INTEGRITY

	Low	Medium	High
Criterion 2 (Procedures)	N/A	SM2.C2.M.I	SM2.C2.M.I

LEVEL of ASSURANCE

	Low	Medium	High
Criterion 2 (Procedures)	N/A	SM2.C2.M.I	SM2.C2.M.A

A.8.2 Medium level of robustness

SM2.C2.M.I

Criterion 2 – Procedures

(a) The Designer must provide installation instructions for the equipment used to reduce the effect of the UA impact dynamics to be recorded in the SAIL Mark certificate.

(b) The Designer must provide maintenance instructions for the equipment used to reduce the effect of the UA impact dynamics.

SM2.C2.M.A

Criterion 2 – Procedures

The Designer must provide evidence of compliance with the Integrity requirements.

A.8.3 High level of

Lower robustness level requirements to be complied with:

- **SM2.C2.M.I**
- **SM2.C2.M.A**

Additional requirements to be compiled with:

SM2.C2.H.I

Criterion 2 – Procedures

No additional requirement.

SM2.C2.H.A

Criterion 2 – Procedures

No additional requirement.

APPENDIX B

SAIL Mark Certificate template

This section describes the contents of the future SAIL Mark Certificate. The SAIL Mark Certificate format is in development at the time of publication, information in Appendix B is subject to change. The SAIL Mark Certificate template will be made available to the RAE(F).

1. Certificate unique ID and revision no.
2. UAS Designer name.
3. RAE(F) name.
4. UAS configuration description:
    - 4.1. Model.
    - 4.2. Part Number (P/N).
    - 4.3. Serial Number (S/N) (where applicable).[1]
    - 4.4. Maximum UA characteristic dimension
    - 4.5. Weight
    - 4.6. Maximum speed
    - 4.7. Modification state of UAS and equipment, equipment model.
5. SAIL number (highest achieved).
6. Operational volume:
    - 6.1. GRC (highest achieved).
    - 6.2. ARC (highest achieved).
7. Containment robustness level (highest achieved)
8. M2 mitigation:
    - 8.1. Level of robustness achieved.
    - 8.2. Instructions for installation and maintenance.
9. OSO 3:

[1] It is likely that no S/N will be displayed on the SAIL Mark certificate, as the certificate will pertain to many individual UAS with unique S/Ns. Instead, a list of S/Ns to which this certificate applies, will be held by the CAA. This schedule of S/N should be read in conjunction with the SAIL Mark certificate to confirm whether an individual UAS holds a SAIL Mark Certificate.

9.1. Maintenance instructions and requirements (low robustness).

9.2. Scheduled maintenance instructions (medium robustness).

10. OSO 5:

10.1. External systems (low robustness). Note: this is provided through Containment criterion 1.

11. OSO 6

11.1. C3 link performance specification (low robustness).

11.2. RF spectrum (low robustness).

11.3. Environmental conditions (low robustness).

12. OSO 7:

12.1. Recommendations for UAS conformity checks.

13. OSO 16:

13.1. Communication devices performance specification and limitations.

14. OSO 24:

14.1. Environmental conditions.

15. COR - Containment criterion 1:

15.1. External systems (low robustness).

15.2. Operational volume (low robustness).

15.3. Particular risks (low robustness).

16. COR - Containment criterion 2:

16.1. Procedures for immediate end of flight (low robustness).

17. COR - Containment criterion 3:

17.1. Ground risk buffer definition (low robustness).

18. COT – Containment tether criterion 1:

18.1. Length of tether (low robustness).

18.2. Ultimate loads (low robustness).

19. COT - Containment tether criterion 2:

19.1. procedures to install/inspect the tether (low robustness).

20. COT - Containment tether criterion 2:

20.1. flight envelope (high robustness).

21. Statement confirmed as read and agreed by the Designer:

3.1 A major modification to the UAS configuration will revoke the SAIL Mark

certificate.

22. M2 mitigation requirements which have been complied with (optional):

M2 mitigation requirements	
Medium	**High**
M2.C1.M.I(a)	M2.C1.M.I(a)
M2.C1.M.I(b)	M2.C1.M.I(b)
M2.C1.M.I(c)	M2.C1.M.I(c)
	M2.C1.H.I(a)
	M2.C1.H.I(b)
M2.C1.M.A(a)	
M2.C1.M.A(b)	
	M2.C1.H.A
M2.C2.M.A(a)	M2.C2.M.A(a)
M2.C2.M.A(b)	M2.C2.M.A(b)
M2.C2.M.A(d)	M2.C2.M.A(d)
	M2.C2.H.A(a)
SM2.C2.M.I(a)	SM2.C2.M.I(a)
SM2.C2.M.I(b)	SM2.C2.M.I(b)
SM2.C2.M.A	SM2.C2.M.A

23. OSO requirements which have been complied with:

OSO requirements					
SAIL 1	**SAIL 2**	**SAIL 3**	**SAIL 4**	**SAIL 5**	**SAIL6**
		OSO2.L.I(a)	OSO2.L.I(a)	OSO2.L.I(a)	OSO2.L.I(a)
		OSO2.L.I(b)	OSO2.L.I(b)	OSO2.L.I(b)	OSO2.L.I(b)
		OSO2.L.I(c)	OSO2.L.I(c)	OSO2.L.I(c)	OSO2.L.I(c)
			OSO2.M.I(a)	OSO2.M.I(a)	OSO2.M.I(a)
			OSO2.M.I(b)	OSO2.M.I(b)	OSO2.M.I(b)
			OSO2.M.I(c)	OSO2.M.I(c)	OSO2.M.I(c)
			OSO2.M.I(d)	OSO2.M.I(d)	OSO2.M.I(d)

			OSO2.M.I(e)	OSO2.M.I(e)	OSO2.M.I(e)
			OSO2.M.I(f)	OSO2.M.I(f)	OSO2.M.I(f)
				OSO2.H.I(a)	OSO2.H.I(a)
				OSO2.H.I(b)	OSO2.H.I(b)
		OSO2.L.A(a)	OSO2.L.A(a)	OSO2.L.A(a)	OSO2.L.A(a)
		OSO2.L.A(b)	OSO2.L.A(b)	OSO2.L.A(b)	OSO2.L.A(b)
			OSO2.M.A	OSO2.M.A	OSO2.M.A
				OSO2.H.A	OSO2.H.A
SOSO3.L.I	SOSO3.L.I	SOSO3.L.I	SOSO3.L.I	SOSO3.L.I	SOSO3.L.I
		SOSO3.M.I	SOSO3.M.I	SOSO3.M.I	SOSO3.M.I
SOSO3C1.L.A	SOSO3C1.L.A	SOSO3C1.L.A	SOSO3C1.L.A	SOSO3C1.L.A	SOSO3C1.L.A
			OSO4.L.I		
				OSO4.M.I	
					OSO4.H.I
			OSO4.L.A(a)	OSO4.L.A(a)	OSO4.L.A(a)
			OSO4.L.A(b)	OSO4.L.A(b)	OSO4.L.A(b)
			OSO4FT.L.I		
			OSO4FT.L.A(a)		
			OSO4FT.L.A(b)		
		OSO5.L.I	OSO5.L.I		
			OSO5.M.I		
				OSO5.H.I(a)	OSO5.H.I(a)
				OSO5.H.I(b)	OSO5.H.I(b)
				OSO5.H.I(c)	OSO5.H.I(c)
				OSO5.H.I(d)	OSO5.H.I(d)
				OSO5.H.I(e)	OSO5.H.I(e)
		OSO5.L.A(a)	OSO5.L.A(a)	OSO5.L.A(a)	OSO5.L.A(a)
			OSO5.M.A(a)	OSO5.M.A(a)	OSO5.M.A(a)
			OSO5.M.A(b)	OSO5.M.A(b)	OSO5.M.A(b)
	SOSO6.L.I(a)	SOSO6.L.I(a)	SOSO6.L.I(a)	SOSO6.L.I(a)	SOSO6.L.I(a)
	SOSO6.L.I(b)	SOSO6.L.I(b)	SOSO6.L.I(b)	SOSO6.L.I(b)	SOSO6.L.I(b)
	SOSO6.L.A	SOSO6.L.A	SOSO6.L.A	SOSO6.L.A	SOSO6.L.A
SOSO7.L.I	SOSO7.L.I	SOSO7.L.I	SOSO7.L.I	SOSO7.L.I	SOSO7.L.I
SOSO7C1.L.A	SOSO7C1.L.A	SOSO7C1.L.A	SOSO7C1.L.A	SOSO7C1.L.A	SOSO7C1.L.A

	OSO16C3.M.I(a)	OSO16C3.M.I(a)	OSO16C3.M.I(a)	OSO16C3.M.I(a)
	OSO16C3.M.I(b)	OSO16C3.M.I(b)	OSO16C3.M.I(b)	OSO16C3.M.I(b)
			OSO16C3.H.I(a)	16C3.H.I(a)
			OSO16C3.H.I(b)	16C3.H.I(b)
	OSO16C3.M.A(a)	OSO16C3.M.A(a)	OSO16C3.M.A(a)	16C3.M.A(a)
	OSO16C3.M.A(b)	OSO16C3.M.A(b)	OSO16C3.M.A(b)	16C3.M.A(b)
	SOSO16C3.M.I	SOSO16C3.M.I	SOSO16C3.M.I	S16C3.M.I
	SOSO16C3.M.A	SOSO16C3.M.A	SOSO16C3.M.A	S16C3.M.A
	OSO18.L.I(a)			
	OSO18.L.I(b)			
		OSO18.M.I(a)	OSO18.M.I(a)	OSO18.M.I(a)
		OSO18.M.I(b)	OSO18.M.I(b)	OSO18.M.I(b)
	OSO18.L.A	OSO18.L.A	OSO18.L.A	OSO18.L.A
		OSO18.M.A	OSO18.M.A	OSO18.M.A
	OSO19.L.I			
		OSO19.M.I	OSO19.M.I	OSO19.M.I
	OSO19.L.A(a)	OSO19.L.A(a)	OSO19.L.A(a)	OSO19.L.A(a)
	OSO19.L.A(b)	OSO19.L.A(b)	OSO19.L.A(b)	OSO19.L.A(b)
OSO20.L.I(a)	OSO20.L.I(a)	OSO20.L.I(a)	OSO20.L.I(a)	OSO20.L.I(a)
OSO20.L.I(b)	OSO20.L.I(b)	OSO20.L.I(b)	OSO20.L.I(b)	OSO20.L.I(b)
				OSO20.H.I(a)
				OSO20.H.I(b)
				OSO20.H.I(c)
OSO20.L.A(a)	OSO20.L.A(a)			
OSO20.L.A(b)	OSO20.L.A(b)			
OSO20.L.A(d)	OSO20.L.A(d)			
		OSO20.M.A(a)	OSO20.M.A(a)	OSO20.M.A(a)
		OSO20.M.A(b)	OSO20.M.A(b)	OSO20.M.A(b)
		OSO20.M.A(c)	OSO20.M.A(c)	OSO20.M.A(c)
		OSO20.M.A(e)	OSO20.M.A(e)	OSO20.M.A(e)
OSO20FT.L.A(a)	OSO20FT.L.A(a)	OSO20FT.L.A(a)		
OSO20FT.L.A(b)	OSO20FT.L.A(b)	OSO20FT.L.A(b)		
	OSO24.M.I	OSO24.M.I	OSO24.M.I	OSO24.M.I
		OSO24.H.I	OSO24.H.I	OSO24.H.I

	OSO24.M.A(a)	OSO24.M.A(a)	OSO24.M.A(a)	OSO24.M.A(a)
	OSO24.M.A(b)	OSO24.M.A(b)	OSO24.M.A(b)	OSO24.M.A(b)
	OSO24FT.M.A(a)	OSO24FT.M.A(a)		
	OSO24FT.M.A(b)	OSO24FT.M.A(b)		
	SOSO24.M.I	OSOS24.M.I	SOSO24.M.I	SOSO24.M.I
	SOSO24.M.A	OSOS24.M.A	SOSO24.M.A	SOSO24.M.A

24. Containment requirements which have been complied with:

Containment requirements		
Low	**Medium**	**High**
COR.C1.L.I	COR.C1.L.I	
		COR.C1.H.I
COR.C2.L.I	COR.C2.L.I	COR.C2.L.I
COR.C3.L.I	COR.C3.M.I(a)	COR.C3.M.I(a)
	COR.C3.M.I(b)	COR.C3.M.I(b)
	COR.C3.M.I(c)	COR.C3.M.I(c)
	COR.C3.M.I(d)	COR.C3.M.I(d)
	COR.C4.M.I(a)	COR.C4.M.I(a)
	COR.C4.M.I(b)	COR.C4.M.I(b)
COR.C1.L.A(a)	COR.C1.L.A(a)	COR.C1.L.A(a)
COR.C1.L.A(b)	COR.C1.L.A(b)	COR.C1.L.A(b)
COR.C1.L.A(d)	COR.C1.L.A(d)	COR.C1.L.A(d)
COR.C2.L.A(a)		
COR.C2.L.A(c)		
COR.C2.L.A(d)		
	COR.C2.M.A(a)	COR.C2.M.A(a)
	COR.C2.M.A(b)	COR.C2.M.A(b)
COR.C3.L.A(a)	COR.C3.L.A(a)	COR.C3.L.A(a)

COR.C3.L.A(b)	COR.C3.L.A(b)	COR.C3.L.A(b)
	COR.C4.M.A(a)	COR.C4.M.A(a)
	COR.C4.M.A(b)	COR.C4.M.A(b)
SCOR.C1.L.I	SCOR.C1.L.I	SCOR.C1.L.I
SCOR.C2.L.I	SCOR.C2.L.I	SCOR.C2.L.I
SCOR.C3.L.I	SCOR.C3.L.I	SCOR.C3.L.I
SCOR.C1.L.A	SCOR.C1.L.A	SCOR.C1.L.A
SCOR.C2.L.A	SCOR.C2.L.A	SCOR.C2.L.A
SCOR.C3.L.A	SCOR.C3.L.A	SCOR.C3.L.A

25. Containment (tether) requirements which have been complied with:

Containment (tether) requirements		
Low	**Medium**	**High**
COT.C1.L.I(a)	COT.C1.L.I(a)	COT.C1.L.I(a)
COT.C1.L.I(b)	COT.C1.L.I(b)	COT.C1.L.I(b)
COT.C1.L.I(c)	COT.C1.L.I(c)	COT.C1.L.I(c)
COT.C1.L.I(d)	COT.C1.L.I(d)	COT.C1.L.I(d)
COT.C2.L.I	COT.C2.L.I	COT.C2.L.I
COT.C1.L.A(a)	COT.C1.L.A(a)	COT.C1.L.A(a)
COT.C1.L.A(b)	COT.C1.L.A(b)	COT.C1.L.A(b)
COT.C1.L.A(c)	COT.C1.L.A(c)	COT.C1.L.A(c)
COT.C2.L.A(a)	COT.C2.L.A(a)	COT.C2.L.A(a)
COT.C2.L.A(b)	COT.C2.L.A(b)	COT.C2.L.A(b)
	COT.C2.M.A(a)	COT.C2.M.A(a)
	COT.C2.M.A(b)	COT.C2.M.A(b)
		COT.C2.H.A(a)
SCOT.C1.L.I(a)	SCOT.C1.L.I(a)	SCOT.C1.L.I(a)

SCOT.C1.L.I(b)	SCOT.C1.L.I(b)	SCOT.C1.L.I(b)
SCOT.C2.L.I	SCOT.C2.L.I	SCOT.C2.L.I
SCOT.C1.L.A	SCOT.C1.L.A	SCOT.C1.L.A
SCOT.C2.L.A	SCOT.C2.L.A	SCOT.C2.L.A
		SCOT.C2.H.A