SELEZIONE PUBBLICA, PER TITOLI ED ESAME, PER L'ASSUNZIONE A TEMPO DETERMINATO DEL RESPONSABILE DI IMPRESA – ACCOUNTABLE MANAGER DEL NUCLEO ELICOTTERI DELLA PROVINCIA AUTONOMA DI TRENTO.

ELENCO DEI QUESITI PER L'ACCERTAMENTO DELLA LINGUA INGLESE DELLA PROVA ORALE DI DATA 03 GIUGNO 2025.

Lingua inglese.

1. **un colloquio in lingua inglese** finalizzato alla verifica della conoscenza di tale lingua pari ad almeno il livello B2 della scala europea.

   Il colloquio non sarà limitato solamente all'uso della terminologia specialistica, ma esteso anche alla capacità di comprendere ed esprimersi su argomenti di uso comune e concreto, seppure correlati al ruolo da rivestire.

Quesito n. 1 – Vedasi documentazione di riferimento allegata
Quesito n. 2 - Vedasi documentazione di riferimento allegata – ESTRATTA
Quesito n. 3 - Vedasi documentazione di riferimento allegata
Quesito n. 4 - Vedasi documentazione di riferimento allegata

ELENCO DEFINITIVO DOMANDE DELLA PROVA ORALE DI DATA 03 GIUGNO 2025.

GRUPPO A : **Normativa aeronautica.**

- Principi generali relativi alla normativa aeronautica, con particolare riferimento al regolamento EU 965/2012 e successivi aggiornamenti per le operazioni di volo, regolamento EU 1321/2014 e successivi aggiornamenti per la gestione della navigabilità continua e della manutenzione in campo aeronautico;

A-1	**Il candidato esponga le principali normative EASA applicabili a un operatore aereo come il Nucleo Elicotteri della Provincia Autonoma di Trento, indicando per ciascuna il contenuto generale, l'ambito di applicazione e la sua rilevanza per l'organizzazione. Cosa sono le AMC e le GM? -** **ESTRATTA**

A- 2	Nel contesto di una organizzazione che svolge operazioni di volo, l'Accountable Manager deve nominare responsabili per alcune "funzioni chiavi". Il candidato esponga quali sono queste funzioni ed in che modo l'AM ne supervisiona l'attivita' pur mantenendo la delega operativa. Quali sono in linea generale i requisiti d'accesso richiesti per le funzioni chiavi.
A- 3	L'Accountable Manager è responsabile, in ultima istanza, del rispetto delle normative aeronautiche. Quali sono queste normative? Il candidato esponga in quali circostanze può essere chiamato direttamente in causa sotto il profilo amministrativo o penale. Quali strumenti ha a disposizione per tutelarsi e garantire la conformità?
A- 4	Dopo una spiegazione di cosa è il Safety Management System di una Organizzazone Aeronauitca, Il candidato spieghi il ruolo specifico dell'Accountable Manager nel Safety Management System previsto dal Regolamento EU 965/2012. In che modo l'AM interagisce con il Safety Manager?

GRUPPO B : **Normativa provinciale.**

- cenni sull'ordinamento della Provincia Autonoma di Trento e del Nucleo elicotteri provinciale;

B-1	**II candidato esponga qual è la collocazione organizzativa formale del "nucleo elicotteri" all'interno della struttura della Provincia autonoma di Trento. - ESTRATTA**
B-2	Il candidato esponga qual è il principio cardine su cui si fonda il sistema organizzativo della Provincia per quanto riguarda la distribuzione dei poteri e delle responsabilità.
B-3	Il candidato esponga quali sono le principali funzioni che il Corpo permanente dei vigili del fuoco è chiamato a svolgere ed in che modo queste funzioni possono specificatamente beneficiare o avvalersi delle capacità operative del "nucleo elicotteri".
B-4	Il candidato esponga le Funzioni Operative e il Coordinamento Provinciale del "Nucleo Elicotteri" tenuto conto anche dell'ampia gamma di funzioni che svolge il "Corpo permanente dei vigili del fuoco".

GRUPPO C: O**rganizzazione e gestione risorse umane.**

- elementi di organizzazione e gestione delle risorse umane;
- saranno inoltre valutate ai fini dell'accertamento dell'attitudine personale del candidato a rivestire il ruolo in parola, le competenze manageriali con particolare riferimento alle attitudini di leadership e management, all'orientamento al risultato, alle abilità finalizzate a coordinare

organizzazioni complesse alla capacità di promozione delle risorse umane e di motivazione dei collaboratori.

C-1	**Risoluzione di un problema di performance. Supponga che uno dei Suoi diretti collaboratori abbia una performance inferiore alle aspettative, rischiando di compromettere il risultato complessivo del team. Come affronterebbe la situazione? Come motiverebbe questa persona a migliorare e come assumerebbe la responsabilità di garantire che il team raggiunga gli obiettivi? Quali strategie di organizzazione e leadership utilizzerebbe? - ESTRATTA**
C-2	**Riorganizzazione di un team in vista di nuovi obiettivi**. Supponga di dover riorganizzare tutto il team con l'inserimento di nove unità per raggiungere obiettivi più ambiziosi in un breve periodo. Come valuterebbe le competenze dei Suoi collaboratori? Quali strategie adotterebbe per motivarli e coinvolgerli nel nuovo progetto? Come pianificherebbe le attività e assegnerebbe i compiti per garantire il massimo risultato?
C-3	**Gestione dell'errore umano e della responsibilità**. Durante una fase critica di un'operazione, un collaboratore ha commesso un errore che avrebbe potuto compromettere la sicurezza e l'esito del lavoro. L'errore è stato scoperto all'ultimo momento e corretto in tempo, ma il manager responsabile lo attribuisce a una mancanza di competenza del collaboratore e Le chiede di intervenire per punire o richiamare severamente il dipendente in modo da mantenere l'ordine. Quali elementi terrebbe in considerazione nell'analisi dello scenario e come gestirebbe la situazione? Come eserciterebbe la Sua leadership nei confronti del manager e del collaboratore?
C-4	**Implementazione di una cambiamento organizzativo**. Deve introdurre un nuovo processo o tecnologia che ne richiede l'adozione da parte del team che lei coordina direttamente. Come comunicherebbe questa novità? Come motiverebbe i Suoi collaboratori ad accettare e adottare il cambiamento? Come organizzerebbe le attività di formazione e monitoraggio per garantire che tutti siano allineati e responsabili del successo dell'implementazione?

QUESITO N. 1

1.2 A HUMAN-CENTRED DESIGN PROCESS

People design, build, maintain, and operate all aspects of the global aviation system. Its performance, including safety, depends on Human Performance (HP). Since humans are central, a human-centred approach is essential for designing and developing system components.

Human-centered design (HCD)—also called user-centred design—ensures that products like systems, equipment, procedures, or regulations are both useful and usable, supporting skilled workplace performance and enabling operational benefits. HCD-based designs incorporate HP principles (see Section 1.4), enhancing both system effectiveness and human well-being.

HCD is important for regulators when evaluating personnel, processes, systems, and equipment, and when developing or adapting regulations. It also supports planning and managing the introduction of new technologies and operational changes.

According to the **International Organization for Standardization (ISO)**, an HCD approach includes these key elements (adapted for this manual):

a) the design is based upon an explicit understanding of users, tasks and work environments (i.e., how the HP principles presented in Section 1.4 below are manifested in the operational environment);

b) users are involved throughout design and development;

c) the design is driven and refined by user-centred evaluation and the use of operational data;

d) an iterative process is used which builds on lessons learned through multiple tests;

e) the process ensures that the whole user experience is addressed under varying conditions of use; and

f) the design team has multidisciplinary skills and perspectives, including individuals with relevant HP expertise.

Using an HCD approach means deeply understanding users' context and needs. Involving users often shortens implementation and increases acceptance. Continuous improvement through testing reduces the risk of unexpected outcomes. Ultimately, HCD enhances safety—a key regulatory goal—and can lower life-cycle costs.

A complete process that uses a human-centred approach encompasses design, development, production, implementation and monitoring. It typically involves the following steps:

1) *A concept of use (or operation) is identified.* This is the developer's general vision of how the user will interact with the product to be developed. It is based on: a) baseline assumptions about what the users need to know and are able to do; b) how they will do it; and c) a description of the operational context (including assumptions about the environment in which the design will operate and to what other systems it connects). For example, in developing a new technology, it is at this early stage that decisions are made about what functions the

technology will perform and what will be the role of the humans interacting with it.

2) *Design requirements are identified.* Design requirements specify what the product being developed must be able to accomplish as well as properties that it must have to "build in safety", recognizing the range of possible responses humans may make when interacting with the product. The design requirements will lead to design features and functions that are needed to support human performance. For example, in developing new airport markings, clear visibility in all lighting and weather conditions would be identified as a design requirement.

3) *Prototype designs are developed.* Prototype design concepts (also known as candidate designs) are developed based on the design requirements and user needs, not to create the perfect design solution, but to make sure the design solution is on target. For example, in developing a new display, several different layouts are drafted and different symbologies may be proposed. A prototype design can be anything from an informal drawing (low fidelity prototype), to a fully functional simulation (high fidelity prototype).

4) *Prototype designs are tested and evaluated.*

A test and evaluation programme allows prototype concepts to be trialed and improved through user feedback. Testing ensures the product functions as intended, is user-friendly under varying conditions, and meets human and operational requirements. While demonstrations offer value, they can't replace tests that collect objective and subjective data.

An HCD approach enhances safety by applying HP principles, involving users in design, prototyping, and testing to ensure expected performance.

Early and frequent testing is essential. Each iteration informs the next, improving design and reducing late-stage changes or "work-arounds." For example, new airport approach procedures can be refined through repeated simulator tests with different aircraft and environmental conditions.

An HCD approach builds in safety by considering HP principles and how people will interact with the product being designed, and by engaging end-users in the design, prototyping and testing before implementation to make sure that what is being developed performs as expected.

5) *The design is selected.* Finally, from the results of the evaluation of candidate designs and from lessons learned through user testing, the optimal design is selected for development. Once the selected design is fully developed into a product, formal testing, verification and validation rounds are completed with the participation of end-users, prior to implementation.

6) *Implementation guidance is developed.* Guidance needs to be developed to describe how the selected design is intended to be used in the operational context. Implementation guidance should not only explain how to use the design but also identify any changes in user responsibilities and include what, if any, training is needed to use the design. Again, engaging end-users in the development of guidance material can prove highly effective in achieving a smooth implementation. For example, in approving a fatigue risk management system (FRMS), a regulator should expect, as part of its approval process, that an operator presents an implementation plan that identifies to which part of its operations the FRMS applies, the various responsibilities of those involved, and the training they will undertake, as well as how the intended FRMS processes will be used. Similarly, in developing supporting regulatory material for a new regulation, details describing how the change can be implemented and acceptable means of compliance should be included.

Lessons learned using an HCD approach help to build robust implementation guidance to support ICAO SARPs and national regulations.

7) *Performance is monitored after implementation.* Using the implementation guidance, the selected design can be integrated as part of normal operations. Lessons learned through use should result in continuous improvement to evolve the capabilities of existing tools, technologies, processes or procedures, or drive the development of new design concepts. For example, following the adoption of a new departure procedure from an airport, indicators are identified and tracked to measure and monitor traffic counts, ground delays and potential losses of separation. In addition, reports from air traffic controllers and pilots are solicited to document any concerns and unintended consequences. This data and information are then used to determine if any further adjustments are needed to the procedure, or to any other part of the system, including supporting regulations.

QUESITO N. 2

Annex 13 — Aircraft Accident and Incident Investigation
Chapter 6: Final Report

6.1 Recommendation.

The format of the Final Report in Appendix 1 should be used. However, it may be adapted to the circumstances of the accident or incident.

RESPONSIBILITY OF ANY STATE

Release of information — Consent

6.2 States shall not circulate, publish or give access to a draft report or any part thereof, or any documents obtained during an investigation of an accident or incident, without the express consent of the State which conducted the investigation, unless such reports or documents have already been published or released by that latter State.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE STATE CONDUCTING THE INVESTIGATION

Consultation

6.3 The State conducting the investigation shall send a copy of the draft Final Report to the following States inviting their significant and substantiated comments on the report as soon as possible:

a) the State that instituted the investigation;

b) the State of Registry;

c) the State of the Operator;

d) the State of Design;

e) the State of Manufacture; and

f) any State that participated in the investigation as per Chapter 5.

If the State conducting the investigation receives comments within sixty days of the date of the transmittal letter, it shall either amend the draft Final Report to include the substance of the comments received or, if desired by the State that provided comments, append the comments to the Final Report.

If the State conducting the investigation receives no comments within sixty days of the date of the first transmittal letter, it shall issue the Final Report in accordance with 6.4, unless an extension of that period has been agreed by the States concerned.

Note 1 — Nothing in this Standard is intended to preclude the State conducting the investigation from consulting other States, such as those States which provided relevant information, significant facilities, or experts who participated in the investigation under 5.27.

Note 2 — Comments to be appended to the Final Report are restricted to non-editorial-specific technical aspects of the Final Report upon which no agreement could be reached.

6.3.1 Recommendation.

The State conducting the investigation should send, through the State of the Operator, a copy of the draft Final Report to the operator to enable the operator to submit comments on the draft Final Report.

6.3.2 Recommendation.

The State conducting the investigation should send, through the State of Design and the State of Manufacture, a copy of the draft Final Report to the organizations responsible for the type design and the final assembly of the aircraft to enable them to submit comments on the draft Final Report.

Recipient States

6.4 The Final Report of the investigation of an accident shall be sent with a minimum of delay by the State conducting the investigation to:

a) the State that instituted the investigation;

b) the State of Registry;

c) the State of the Operator;

d) the State of Design;

e) the State of Manufacture;

f) any State that participated in the investigation;

g) any State having suffered fatalities or serious injuries to its citizens; and

h) any State that provided relevant information, significant facilities or experts.

Release of the Final Report

6.5 In the interest of accident prevention, the State conducting the investigation of an accident or incident shall make the Final Report publicly available as soon as possible and, if possible, within twelve months.

Note — Making a Final Report publicly available can be achieved by posting the Final Report on the Internet, and does not necessarily require a hard-copy publication of the Final Report.

6.6 If the report cannot be made publicly available within twelve months, the State conducting the investigation shall make an interim statement publicly available on each anniversary of the occurrence, detailing the progress of the investigation and any safety issues raised.

6.7 When the State that has conducted an investigation into an accident or an incident involving an aircraft of a maximum mass of over 5 700 kg has released a Final Report, that State shall send to the International Civil Aviation Organization a copy of the Final Report.

Note — Whenever practicable, the Final Report sent to ICAO is to be prepared in one of the working languages of the Organization and in the form shown in Appendix 1.

Safety recommendations

6.8 At any stage of the investigation of an accident or incident, the accident investigation authority of the State conducting the investigation shall recommend in a dated transmittal correspondence to the appropriate authorities, including those in other States, any preventive action that it considers necessary to be taken promptly to enhance aviation safety.

Note — Precedence for the issuance of safety recommendations from an accident or incident investigation should be given to the State conducting the investigation; however, in the interest of safety, other States participating in the investigation may issue safety recommendations after coordinating with the State conducting the investigation.

6.9 A State conducting investigations of accidents or incidents shall address, when appropriate, any safety recommendations arising out of its investigations in a dated transmittal correspondence to the accident investigation authorities of other State(s) concerned and, when ICAO documents are involved, to ICAO.

Note — When Final Reports contain safety recommendations addressed to ICAO, because ICAO documents are involved, these reports must be accompanied by a letter outlining the specific action proposed.

RESPONSIBILITY OF A STATE RECEIVING OR ISSUING SAFETY RECOMMENDATIONS

Action on safety recommendations

6.10 A State that receives safety recommendations shall inform the proposing State, within ninety days of the date of the transmittal correspondence, of the preventive action taken or under consideration, or the reasons why no action will be taken.

Note — Nothing in this Standard is intended to preclude the State conducting the investigation from making proposals for preventive action other than safety recommendations.

6.11 A State conducting the investigation or any other State issuing a safety recommendation shall implement procedures to record the responses received under 6.10 to the safety recommendation issued.

6.12 A State that receives a safety recommendation shall implement procedures to monitor the progress of the action taken in response to that safety recommendation.

Note — Guidance on the identification, drafting and follow-up of safety recommendations is contained in the Manual of Aircraft Accident and Incident Investigation (Doc 9756), Part IV — Reporting.

QUESITO N. 3

A Day in the Life of an Accountable Manager:

Responsibilities, Decisions, and Regulatory Demands in an EASA-Compliant Helicopter Unit

The figure of the Accountable Manager (AM) holds a central and strategic role in aviation organizations, particularly within helicopter units operating under the stringent regulatory framework established by the European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA). Far from being a mere administrative functionary, the AM embodies the organization's commitment to operational excellence, legal compliance, and above all, safety. Legally and morally responsible for ensuring conformity with applicable aviation laws and internal procedures, the AM orchestrates a complex matrix of functions, teams, and systems—each of which plays a vital role in sustaining safe, efficient, and reliable operations.

This essay explores a typical working day in the life of an Accountable Manager, highlighting the multitude of decisions, regulatory obligations, and managerial tensions that arise. Through a chronological lens, we gain insight into the full scope of this demanding position and its critical contribution to aviation safety and organizational governance.

Early Morning: Strategic Awareness and Situational Control

The day typically begins around 07:30, well before the first aircraft takes off. At this early hour, the AM participates in a morning briefing with the key personnel: the Head of Flight Operations, the Continuing Airworthiness Manager, the Safety Manager, and the Chief of Maintenance. This is not a routine task—it is the heartbeat of operational awareness. The focus of the briefing is to assess mission readiness, review aircraft availability, and identify any safety concerns or anomalies that may compromise operations.

This session also serves to ensure compliance with ORO.GEN.210(b), which mandates that operations be conducted in accordance with applicable regulations and internal standards. It exemplifies the AM's need for strategic awareness: a dynamic balancing act between current operational demands and the ongoing requirements of regulatory alignment. Should an urgent technical issue arise—such as a Category B MEL (Minimum Equipment List) item becoming critical—the AM must not only authorize or delay a flight, but also consider the broader implications on mission continuity and compliance posture.

Equally important in this phase is the AM's ability to integrate feedback from the Safety Management System (SMS), translating safety reports and performance indicators into actionable insights. The AM acts as a pivotal link between tactical reality and strategic oversight.

Mid-Morning: Compliance Monitoring and Corrective Action

From approximately 08:30 to 10:30, the focus shifts to the Compliance Monitoring System (CMS), a fundamental component in ensuring the continuous conformity of operations and maintenance with both internal and external requirements. Here, the AM carefully reviews internal audit reports, checks for any expired licenses or certifications, and verifies the timely closure of corrective actions arising from non-conformities. This process is essential in maintaining compliance with Part-ORO and, when applicable, Part-CAMO for Continuing Airworthiness Management.

During this phase, the AM may issue internal directives or convene brief ad hoc meetings with the Training Manager or Quality Manager to address outstanding deficiencies. The AM is expected to guide without micromanaging, using systems and processes as instruments of leadership. This is where the paradox of the AM role becomes most evident: although the AM holds ultimate accountability, much of the work is carried out through delegated functions and specialized managers. Therefore, the ability to lead through trust, structure, and verification—rather than through direct control—is indispensable.

Midday: Safety Governance and Resource Allocation

By late morning, from around 11:00 to 13:00, attention turns to safety governance. Often, the AM chairs or contributes to a scheduled safety committee meeting, where reported occurrences, trend analyses, and Safety Performance Indicators (SPIs) are examined in detail. This forum is central to the implementation of ORO.GEN.200, which emphasizes the AM's overall responsibility for the effectiveness of the Safety Management System.

Key decisions are made in these meetings, ranging from the prioritization of internal investigations to the allocation of resources for corrective actions. The AM must often weigh competing priorities: should the organization invest in a new terrain awareness system, or direct funds toward updating its crew training syllabus? The constraints of public contracts or the urgency of mission-critical services—such as Helicopter Emergency Medical Services (HEMS) or Search and Rescue (SAR)—often require the AM to make nuanced decisions under pressure.

Balancing fiscal responsibility with the unwavering imperative of safety is one of the defining tensions of the role. Regulatory compliance, after all, is not a static checklist but an evolving commitment, requiring proactive leadership and resource flexibility.

Afternoon: Interface with Authorities and External Contractors

The afternoon, typically between 14:00 and 16:30, is often dedicated to external interfaces—especially with the National Aviation Authority (NAA). Whether it's responding to a finding from a previous oversight audit, submitting a change notification for managerial restructuring, or preparing for a ramp inspection, the AM is the principal liaison between the organization and the regulator.

At the same time, the AM reviews and manages contracts and service-level agreements with third-party providers such as Approved Training Organizations (ATOs), Maintenance Organizations (Part-145), or specialized safety consultants. These interactions are not merely contractual—they are strategic. Although services may be outsourced, accountability remains squarely with the AM. This legal reality underscores the importance of defining clear Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and maintaining regular audits of subcontractors.

This part of the day often highlights a structural vulnerability in aviation management: the potential misalignment between responsibility and control. The AM must ensure that all outsourced activities meet the same standards as in-house operations, reinforcing the principle that delegation does not equate to abdication.

End of Day: Strategic Reflection and Forward Planning

As the day winds down—usually between 17:00 and 18:30—the AM turns attention to strategic review and long-term planning. This is the time for evaluating the effectiveness of risk mitigations, reviewing the status of the risk register, and analyzing longitudinal trends in safety performance and operational efficiency.

This closing phase is essential to aligning organizational actions with EASA's model of continuous improvement. By integrating operational data, human performance considerations, and external feedback, the AM ensures that the organization evolves in tandem with regulatory changes and emerging risks. Whether planning for the integration of new aircraft types, revising the Emergency Response Plan (ERP), or preparing the organization for an upcoming IOSA or IS-BAO audit, the AM's forward-looking activities define the culture and direction of the enterprise.

QUESITO N. 4

The Role, Functions, and Challenges of the Accountable Manager in a Helicopter Unit

In the context of modern aviation, the Accountable Manager (AM) plays a pivotal role in ensuring the operational, legal, and strategic coherence of a helicopter unit. Particularly in organizations operating under the European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) regulations—or national equivalents —the AM is entrusted with the ultimate responsibility for ensuring that all aviation activities are conducted in full compliance with applicable safety and regulatory frameworks. However, this role extends far beyond mere compliance: it encompasses leadership, strategic planning, cultural transformation, and risk governance.

This essay examines the primary responsibilities, essential functions, and the main challenges faced by the Accountable Manager, highlighting the multifaceted nature of the position and its significance in sustaining aviation safety and organizational performance.

Core Functions and Objectives

1. Regulatory Compliance

At the heart of the Accountable Manager's role lies regulatory compliance. The AM must guarantee that every operational and maintenance activity is conducted in accordance with aviation legislation, particularly those laid out in EASA Parts ORO (Organization Requirements for Air Operations), CAMO (Continuing Airworthiness Management Organization), and 145 (Maintenance Organizations). This includes the maintenance of required approvals and certificates, such as Air Operator Certificates (AOC), along with ensuring that all personnel licenses, aircraft documentation, and training records are accurate and up to date.

Moreover, the AM must have systems in place to detect and rectify non-conformities before they escalate.

2. Safety Management Oversight

Another fundamental responsibility is the oversight of the Safety Management System (SMS). The AM must champion a proactive and evidence-based safety culture. This includes overseeing the timely reporting of safety occurrences, supporting internal investigations, monitoring risk assessments, and reviewing safety performance indicators (SPIs). In organizations operating high-risk missions such as Emergency Medical Services (EMS) or Search and Rescue (SAR), this responsibility becomes even more critical.

The AM ensures that the safety policies are not only documented but understood and actively implemented across all departments.

3. Resource Allocation and Organizational Planning

For safe operations to be sustained, the helicopter unit must have adequate human, technical, and financial resources. The AM is responsible for ensuring that qualified personnel are in place, training programs are implemented, and facilities and equipment meet regulatory standards.

This includes strategic planning, where the AM balances budgetary constraints with safety and operational needs.

4. Leadership and Accountability

The AM is not only a regulatory reference but also a leadership figure who influences the tone, culture, and ethical behavior of the entire organization. This includes appointing and supervising nominated post-holders, such as the Head of Flight Operations, the Safety Manager, and the Continuing Airworthiness Manager.

While the AM may delegate operational functions, they retain ultimate accountability for outcomes. Ensuring that key personnel collaborate effectively and work toward shared objectives is a constant managerial priority.

5. Liaison with Authorities

The AM serves as the primary interface with the National Aviation Authority (NAA) and other external oversight bodies. This includes facilitating audits, inspections, and investigations, as well as communicating significant changes to the organization's scope of work, management structure, or operational profile, in accordance with Part-ORO.GEN.130.

Maintaining a constructive and transparent relationship with authorities is essential to safeguarding the organization’s reputation and regulatory standing. The AM must be able to clearly articulate the organization's policies, defend decisions, and demonstrate continuous improvement efforts.

6. Continuous Improvement

A modern aviation organization must continuously adapt. The AM is responsible for promoting continuous improvement through the implementation of feedback mechanisms, internal audits, management reviews, and performance monitoring systems. Key performance trends are analyzed, and corrective actions are tracked to closure.

Continuous improvement also involves staying current with regulatory updates, integrating technological innovations, and proactively addressing new operational risks—such as those related to climate events, cybersecurity, or evolving airspace structures.

Critical Issues and Challenges

Despite the central authority conferred upon the Accountable Manager, the role is not without challenges. These often stem from operational realities, organizational dynamics, and external pressures.

• Balancing Safety and Operational Pressure

Helicopter units, particularly those involved in time-sensitive missions such as medical evacuations or disaster response, often face the challenge of balancing regulatory compliance with mission urgency. The AM must resist pressures to "bend the rules" and ensure that operational effectiveness never compromises safety.

This requires the AM to be a firm but pragmatic leader—able to explain decisions to both operational staff and clients while maintaining legal and ethical integrity.

• Limited Resource Availability

Especially in publicly funded or mixed-use helicopter services, available resources may be constrained. Ensuring safety and compliance in these conditions requires innovative thinking, careful prioritization, and sometimes difficult trade-offs. For example, limited funding might delay investments in advanced training tools or software systems, pushing the AM to seek alternative solutions or phased implementations.

• Cultural Resistance to Change

Fostering a safety culture often involves changing long-standing habits or attitudes. Staff or flight crews who have operated under different norms may show resistance to new procedures, digital tools, or reporting obligations. The AM must therefore be a change manager, investing in communication, engagement, and gradual adaptation strategies.

Establishing psychological safety—where personnel feel free to report errors without fear—is one of the hardest but most rewarding aspects of this cultural work.

• Accountability Without Control

A recurring issue is the legal responsibility the AM holds for outsourced or subcontracted activities. Even if line maintenance or training delivery is assigned to third parties, the AM remains fully accountable for the outcomes. This necessitates strict oversight mechanisms, performance-based contracts, and regular audits of third-party providers.

Inadequate monitoring in this area can result in regulatory violations, reputational damage, or even safety occurrences, making this an area of heightened vigilance.

• Adapting to Regulatory Evolution

The regulatory landscape is constantly evolving. New developments related to Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS), sustainability, fatigue risk management, or digital recordkeeping require the AM to be continuously informed and responsive. This means attending workshops, following regulatory bulletins, and adapting internal procedures to remain compliant and forward-looking.

Conclusion

The Accountable Managers are far more than a figurehead fulfilling regulatory paperwork. They are the cornerstone of strategic integrity, legal responsibility, and safety assurance within a helicopter unit. Their ability to integrate regulatory requirements into operational practice, lead cross-functional teams, allocate resources wisely, and build a culture of safety has a direct impact on the unit's efficiency, resilience, and public trust.

To succeed in this demanding role, the AM must combine technical and regulatory expertise with leadership, communication skills, and adaptability. Navigating the intersection of law, operations, culture, and ethics, the Accountable Manager ultimately defines the standard to which the entire organization is held—both on paper and in the
skies.