id	EASA reply	Question	Answer
			Questions received from the functional mailbox
1	LDA	Could you please send me a list of participants to the workshop so that we can network with our peer group?	The list of participants is available upon request. Please send your requests to doa@easa.europa.eu
2	MGE	Does Part21 RMT also consider the removal of the obligation to have a specific ADOA in case ETSO certifications are performed?	This is currently not in the rulemaking programme.
3	CBO	Please confirm the Rule Making Task (RMT) numbers for both Instructions for Continued Airworthiness, and LOI. I believe there is a discrepancy in the initial Rulemaking activities presentation (where it stated ICA as RMT.0252), and the current LOI Presentation (where it states LOI as RMT.0252). Can you please clarify?	It has been corrected in the published presentation.
4	MGE	We are currently using the LOI approach in our STC application. Can we have the draft of the certification memo you are explaining at the moments?	The certification memo will be published for external consultation beginning of 2017.
5	LDA	Some early feedback from today's conference. I believe the facilities are a real backward step in the recent history of the workshop with the seating area being overly cramped, and the air con not being able to establish a reasonable temp (too warm). The lunch and coffee facilities are also significantly compromised when compared with Hyatt & Maritim hotels.	We noted your point. However, taking into consideration the number of participants, facilities where such events can take place are very limited in Cologne. Next year either a larger conference room will be booked or participation will be limited. We also plan to make presentations and the event available on line.

		I urge EASA to consider either limiting the number of attendees to make it a more pleasurable experience or find a better venue that can actually accommodate the number of attendees.	
6	CBO	Could you confirm that all presentation will be available on EASA website?	The presentation are already published
7	LDA	How is the contact point to obtain additional information relating to certification of aeronautical companies that are headquartered in Africa? Our client we support in training and consultancy next year will apply for DOA, but we need to discuss how they can apply (and if they can) without NAA/EASA Bilateral Agreement. Can I have name and email of specialist?	A list of FAQs related to the scope of approval for DOA has been published under this link. Additional information on your specific cases can be asked via the functional mailbox doa@easa.europa.eu.
8	CBO	Dear EASA, After the presentations of Mr. Dop on Stakeholders Feedback, I would like to request to send me the 2016 Questionnaire. I was notified by me predecessor as Head of Airworthiness Office within KLM DOA, Mr. Maurice Laarakker, that he received the Questionnaire. Therefore I would like to also advice EASA to check their mailing list for correctness.	Noted. It has been sent.

9	LDA	The workshop is good but should be recorded on video and presenter together with the presentations. The answers to questions raised after the presentations can be very important. However the best Would be to broadcast the workshop on the web. I.e. One attendee and one web login. Two attendees two web login	We will do your best to try to have such facilities for the next workshop. The questions and answers from the plenary sessions and the ones from the side meetings will be published.
10	FCA	As a member of a small DOA, I am concerned that LOI is going to present no advantages to smaller DOAs. The embodiment of LOI is going to emphasise the quantity of STCs that DOAs complete each year. The concern I have is that the agency are going to be more stringent on the quantity of STCs carried out by DOAs and therefore shall be quicker to identify and thus remove the STC privilege from the small DOAs ToA which partake in only 1-3 STCs a year, for example. Consequently, I feel that LOI is going to drive a bigger gap between large and small DOAs. Please can EASA comment on the above	It is easy to mix the LOI concept and the new privilege related to Equivalent Major Changes even if they are different. To achieve the new privilege could be more difficult for DOAs not doing so many STC/Major Changes per year when projects have big differences. However, to be a small DOA is not a limit in itself. Small DOAs are usually specialised in some specific domain applying for quite similar STCs but differentiated by their involvement on different aircrafts. For these cases, the application of new privileges could make sense. E.g. introducing similar cabin reconfiguration on different aircrafts, or installing same Wi-Fi antenna on different types, could have similar certification programme. The certification basis will need to be adjusted, but eventually, the definition of EASA involvement will be at level of the Compliance Demonstration Item (CDI). For each of these CDIs (evaluated at level of EASA area of expertise) EASA will define its involvement. Initially, the first project will imply certain involvement. It is a goal of the DOA to perform properly in order to achieve higher confidence from a certain panel in order to reach a lower LOI from EASA. Significant change to DOA is envisaged to comply with future amended Part 21. During this phase, the DOATL may involve different experts and/or PCMs to recognise previous experience.

			Sampling of the CDIs can be evaluated during DOA surveillance with the contribution of specific experts from the panel (area of expertise) to which a specific CDI is related. In a nutshell, 1. the Product Certification team will define for each project a certain LOI, based on the proposal made by the DOA; 2. the EASA DOA team, will define the Level of Oversight (LOO) during the surveillance period, based on DOA performance and the feedback coming from Product Certification; 3. the DOA organisation will have the goal to perform properly on Product Certification. Regarding the privilege for Equivalent Major Changes, similar STCs could follow under this privilege, however in cases where DOA does not have many different type of STC, the privilege limited to the type of project usually applied by the DOA itself could be achieved.
11	OTR/FSA	First of all I would like to congratulate all the EASA staff for the high level event we had these two days in Cologne. Unfortunately, we didn't have time during the event to raise all the questions we want, but this was already expected given the dimension of the event and, cleverly, you left this e-mail account as a last open channel to the participants. Taking advantage of this last chance, I would like to know the Agency position regarding the following two points:	The assessment of the applicant is done by the PCMs/Experts after each project. These assessments are then put together and analysed on a yearly basis (quarterly basis for applicants with high volume). The indicators are a mix of data-driven indicators and assessment from EASA staff. The examples you provide (number of changes incorporated in the design due to problems found during the EASA verification process or the number of findings) are part of the criteria already.

		1) From the DOA Dashboard presentation was not clear to me whether the DOA evaluations are made in yearly basis or in project basis. I believe the latter one would provide more reliable information. I also missed some data driven indicators in the dashboard, they seemed to be based only in subjective perception of EASA personnel. The number of changes incorporated in the design due to problems found during the EASA verification process or the number of repetitive findings during the EASA DOA Oversight, are some example of hard data that could be used to validate the EASA personnel perception and could be part of the dashboard. 2) From the DOA Terms of Approval presentation I would like to know if it would be possible for a DOA to overcome a given limitation of its DOA by subcontracting that expertise. For example, a DOA 1 has a flight-test limitation (it cannot design modifications that requires the execution for flight-test), however, for a given STC that is necessary to conduct flight-tests, then it decides to subcontract this expertise by signing a contract with another company, DOA 2, that doesn't have such limitation. Is this possible? In this scenario DOA 1 would have to apply for a significant change to its terms of approval?	

		I would be really grateful if you could comment this two points.	
		Questions and answers collected during the plenary meeting	
		Rulemaking Activities Affecting Part 21: Update (MGE)	
12	**LDA/MGE**	This question is related to RMT 252 and to Continuous Airworthiness. What happens if an STC holder goes bankrupt or out of business? Does the responsibility goes back to EASA?	This is not an issue originating from RMT.0225 but related to the approach towards "orphan aircraft /certificates". It is a challenge to ensure CAW of aircrafts in a situation where the TC or STC holder cannot execute anymore its responsibility. The Agency is currently working on this.
13	**LDA/MGE**	What does the term Single POA refer to?	In case organisations prefer to receive one single approval (where otherwise would have to apply for several approvals in different Member States), EASA is the competent authority (Art. 20 of the BR).
14	**LDA/MGE**	ASD has made a proposal some months ago to EASA to change some guidance material of Part 21 is this going to be addressed through the RMT.0031 and what is the current state?	RMT.0031 is the regular updating task for AMC/GM to Part-21. Currently, this specific RMT is used for including new CPR guidance and guidance for LFTE. The proposals from ASD are under discussion. We will inform them about the outcome on the proposals be included as candidates for discussion in future rulemaking programmes.
15	**LDA/MGE**	The Basic Regulation states what the remits of EASA are. Part 21 is pretty well described and developed but AMC and GM is far from been clear. What are the proposals that you have received to improve it? What we need to have is consistency across all the rules there is currently a lot of room for interpretation for example in areas of classifications which lead to different interpretations and opinions from the Agency (some DO get some commercial advantages or disadvantages because they get different views from EASA).	Since a couple is years, during Rulemaking tasks, we also access in a more structured manner the impact of our proposal and take safety issues to bring it into the Rule. In the future, we will also have ex post reviews for each of our rules. These reviews and timelines need to be discussed with CE and we are confident that they will address our concern.

16	LDA/JLA	Question regarding ETSO and FAA. FAA has recently announced that they will separate production and design for ETSO FAA will separate design from the production aspect. What will EASA put in place?	If FAA moves into EASA direction, it should not affect the reciprocal acceptance of TSOA/ETSOA. EASA will evaluate the future change within FAA before confirming that FAA procedures are acceptable for EASA.
	Level of Involvement (LOI) (MGE/ALE/DRO)		
17	LDA/MGE	This a question regarding slide 9 of the presentation, in case of High LOI, can we delete our CV (Compliance verification) signature from the documents you are verifying?	The applicant, here the DOA holder, is responsible to demonstrate compliance. The demonstration of compliance must be checked by the DOA CVE. It is only when the office of Airworthiness of the DOA has established compliance (has been properly demonstrated and checked) that the authorised person can sign the declaration of compliance and submit it to EASA. EASA (21B.100) will decide what verification (level of Involvement, depth of the investigation) should be done before the approval.
18	LDA/MGE/ALE/DRO	How the LOI does works in case EASA delegate the check to NAAs, what happens? Especially for the LOI?	We work with outsourced accredited resources (either NAAs or qualified entities). Consequently, these entities work under the EASA Certification system and apply EASA processes, including LOI (work is not simply been delegated).
19	LDA/DRO/MGE	This question addresses the term "verification "It is around the question to know whether the Agency is giving compliance verification. According the Part 21 it is up to the DOA to do the compliance verification and the Agency does the verification in the AD-DOA. There is a mix of terms between "verifying" and "validity" in our presentation and also among EASA colleagues.	Under, 21.B.100 Level of involvement (a) the Agency shall determine its level of involvement in compliance verification with CDI of the certification programme. The confusion comes from the terminology used in practice: the individuals of the DOA in charge of checking the demonstration of compliance are unfortunately called CVE Compliance Verification Engineer. This is where the confusion comes from.
20	LDA/MGE	Could you please explain the idea begin the CDI? with our TC we could have many	A CDI is a meaningful grouping of compliance demonstration activities. No further guidance have been provided so far. At this

		requirements in a checklist : please explain the complexity	stage the Agency offers a lot of flexibility to the applicant to define its own system.
21	**LDA/MGE**	When we look at the chart for the risk assessment it appears that EASA has already an idea of performance of DOAs, did you share this already because from our point of view this LOI is going reduce your work and perhaps increase ours.	The Agency is assessing the performance of DOAs and has recently developed what is called the "DOA dashboard". This dashboard is been made available gradually to all organisations.
22	**MGE/ALE/DRO**	This question is about the advance implementation phase which is running since three months now. We have two projects in process, we do not have any conclusion on the LOI, this is not sufficient for us and we have been waiting 6-8 weeks.	Thanks for highlighting this point. We will investigate and will solve the issue.
23	**LDA/MGE**	This is a question regarding a slide shown on the LOI matrix where there is a Level 3 involvement in the yellow box for a non-critical severity. Is this a mistake?	The two matrices are still under discussion and the consequences are to be accessed still. The advance application projects help us to predict what can be expected. This is an example of a novel and complex CDI performed by an organisation that has really low performance so we considered there is a high likelihood of non-compliance (even if it is not critical).
24	**MGE**	For us these matrices and the way of working are a big change and challenge for us but also for EASA. Could we belong the classical implementation discussion develop some workshop or to share some training in order to have the same level of understanding.	Agreed. We will consider how to best share experiences and organise add-doc training.
25	**MGE/ALE/DRO**	This a question regarding provision for end user of the STC (approving minor changes and minor repairs) to have an input into the performance of DOAs.	The applicant for a minor change and ETSO have no obligation to select CDIs and to make an LOI proposal

26	MGE/ALE/DRO	Suggestion: From our side we feel that just a few definition of the LOI is not enough, we need a more precise tool preferably more a quantitative approach. For instance something information stating that if you are at level 2 we will not review more that for example 5 % of the CDIs or better to give even a rage in order to motivate the DOAs to get to the next level.	We take your point. We are in a process of discussing possibilities to be more precise, without limiting too much and without creating a complexity which e.g. happened with Change product rule (CPR). During the next review of the Certification memo we will think about how to make it work in practice.
		Level of Involvement (LOI) (cont.) **DOA performance considerations for LOI determination (OTR)**	
27	LDA/OTR	When does the applicant get informed about the feedback from the PCM?	The quality of the applicant performance will be assessed at the end of the project and in accordance with our internal procedures and Certification handbook. In order to do so the following element are been taken into consideration: - Project planning and Communication; - Applicable requirements and means of compliance; - Compliance of Documents. This assessment is not systematically shared today with the applicant, but it is been considered.
28	LDA/OTR	When does the applicant get informed about scoring? , it would be appreciated to have the information just after project is finalised in order to have the possibility of discussion in case there is a disagreement nor 2 years later when everything is already settled.	We understand your preference for sharing the result at the end of the project, however, at the current stage, we do not have the appropriate tools. The dashboard cannot be updated each time a project arrives to an end. On yearly basis, an evaluation is done and is linked to our internal process. This feedback also supports the LOI process. In the near future, we will implement a way to give 'live feedback' (see SEPIAC). Finally, we are also currently considering the possibility for the applicant to express he/her opinion at the end of the project on the performance of the EASA team. This will enable both sides to

		define corrective actions to improve the process and the performance.	
29	LDA/OTR	The performance measurement with just three areas and three ratings is not sufficient. We have also seen at the level of NAAs it appears to be an overall rating not separated per discipline with rather stating personal opinions rather than objective opinions. Could you considering finding a way to better define this are you still planning to improve this matrix especially since the performance has an influence on the LOI afterwards?	The tool used by EASA and the NAAs are the same, initially we had aggregated result indicating the overall performance. We are still working on the indicators, which presently also reflect the information at the panel level. Regarding the number of criteria and level of detail, we consider the current state appropriate (Project planning and Communication, applicable requirements and means of compliance and Compliance Demonstration). Finally, with regards to the levels applied to rate the criteria we currently have 3 scales: high, medium and low. Last year a four level scale was envisaged to avoid the "average effect" in the middle. Its implementation is currently ongoing.
30	LDA/OTR	My question is related to the feedback for the ends users. I am not sure that we capture all information especially at a certain stage since the scoring is made at the end for the project. E.g. how you capture the potential error on STCs. For end users it is not only about safety it is also about quality of the STC.	The CAW is the missing bit in the dashboard. Presently, we do not have specific criteria of CAW, as it is difficult to transform the related information into an indicator. What we are currently scoring is the specific capability of applicant to achieve the project for a specific application. The aim is to ensure that airworthiness requirement are met and that the DOA of the applicant meets EASA requirements in terms of approval process. Any suggestion for a good metrics on CAW is welcome.
31	LDA/OTR	How is the notation computed? The rating should start not from 0 to 100 but rather from 100 to 0. This means that EASA starts with the assumption that if a DOA receives no comments then the rating is the maximum. It is a matter of confidence.	This is a question of standards and trainings. We need to improve the guidelines given to our PCMs/Experts in order to ensure a standardised application of the scoring. Today, an applicant receiving no comment is (or should be) scored 100 (High) indeed. It is important to keep in mind the current number of companies rated with a high score in our database, showing that the system works.

		Cybersecurity	
32	**LDA/CRO**	There is a need for experts and CVEs to have the appropriate level of knowledge about cyber security in order to perform their task under the DOA privileges. How can we achieve this goal?	The need to develop specific training is recognised and to give further details in the implementing rule (Part 21). However, it is pending on the revision of the Basic Regulation and the way to address cyber security.
		Operational Suitability Data (OSD) implementation (RBO, ABO)	
33	**LDA/RBO/ ABO**	In the presentation it is indicated that Minor changes can only affect MMEL (GM No 1 to 21.A.93(c)) can you please clarify?	In case when Type design Change classification is classified as minor, then it is not requirement to look at other OSD constituents. What will still needs to be considered is whether the MMEL is affected with this particular change. However, for cases where both changes (type design and OSD) are minor, it will still fall under DOA privileges, assuming OSD is in the scope.
34	**LDA/RBO/ ABO**	What are the obligations from a TC holder to provide OSD documentation? What is actually obligatory to provide the OSD references or to provide the actual content?	Under "21.A.62 Availability of operational suitability data" a TC holder has the obligation to make to the competent authority for conformity verification the OSD content available (and not just the reference). This includes also "any person required to comply with one or more elements of this set of operational suitability data."
35	**RBO/ ABO**	Remark: We do not want to give it to some STC applicants because we are not required because they are not the end user. The airline needs to provide it.	It is a matter of interpretation of point (c) 2 in 21.A.62. An STC holder or change holder may need to access the data to perform their work. In some cases, the STC holder may request the data to the operator they are working with.
36	**RBO/ ABO**	Our experience as a non EU DO- this is what is happening with Boeing, based on EASA regulation to provide the data to EU operators but not to the others. The outcome of our discussion was that in the operational regulation side we are not aligned yet. The operating requirement are mandating the OSD implementation.	Under "21.A.62 Availability of operational suitability data" a TC holder has an obligation to make the OSD content available, on request, to "any person required to comply with one or more elements of this set of operational suitability data." Based on a wide interpretation, if an Organisation needs the OSD to demonstrate compliance to EU requirements, they should have access.

37	(RBO, ABO)/ DRO	How can we be sure that we receive the right OSD data?	Either through an agreement with the TC holder or via the operator which, according to Part-21 provisions, will always have access to the latest revision.
38		Yesterday, in the side meeting it was mentioned that what is provided in the TC might not represent sufficient data to access the OSD TC.	The OSD is clearly identified through a reference in the TCDS, similarly to other documents/manuals approved under the TC. The referenced documents (OSD) and any document/content identified by reference in the OSD constitute the data and shall be made available under 21.A.62.
39	ABO	If we talk about money, form 128 application, how much is that for an application for an OSD? OSD is part is the TC process. There is a provision in the Regulation that foresees that the OSD may not be finish at the same time that the STC. Does this mean that if the STC is changed at a later stage to enter the OSD element in my STC a mayor change application will be required?	From the administrative perspective, there is no fixed charge for OSD, as it is dependent on the number of hours spent on the verification of compliance activities. The procedure approval of OSD after TC/STC approval is currently been verified. Also, for updating the TC/STC by removing the limitation and including reference to the OSD in the TCDS.
	International Cooperation: BASA negotiations Japan and China.(GLI)		
40	LDA/GLI	China: Once will have the signature of the agreement when will it enter into application?	The process is as follows: by the end of the negotiation, the Agreement (including its annexes) is initiated by the Head negotiating teams to freeze the final text. Then on the EU side, a Council Decision is required to allow its signature by the corresponding Authority of the EU MS. Once signed, it enters into force once the ratification process is completed from both sides (on the EU side, the ratification is done by the EU Parliament* not by EU national Parliaments, for this type of "aviation safety" Agreement). This step completed, the ratification will be formalised by exchange of diplomatic notes (done at EU side by the Council of the EU)

			*After Treaty of Lisbon consent of EU Parliament is required, not only its opinion.
41	LDA/GLI	What will happen with the privileges and STC once the UK leaves the EU? The outcome needs to be clarified since there are 72 companies in the UK.	EASA is willing and wanting to continue work for the UK and the UK NAAs has also expressed its willingness to continue working with us. At this point we cannot provide further information.
	Design Organisation Department Update (MGO, LDO)		
42	(MGO, LDO)	With regards to DOA extensions for ETSO do you foresee as well to revise the eligibility to the ETSO applicant to DOA in order to have a single procedure?	Indeed, this is the first stage e.g. when the company has already a DOA and is requested to hold an ADOA in addition for ETSOAs we plan to streamline and to require just one organisational approval (full DOA) covering both areas. This could in the future be further expanded • to allow voluntarily application for full DOA instead of an ADOA • to require a full DOA for instance for complex ETSO articles.
	Shared Electronic Platform for Initial Airworthiness Certification SEPIAC (OTR)		
43	LDA/OTR	Who will used this platform? It was understood the Certification staff will be the end users. How about DOA staff?	SEPIAC started as a platform for IAW certification. It is considered to extend it to DOA with different sites for each DOA holder. The suggestion is on the table and it is likely to be implemented within two years' time.
44	LDA/OTR	Did you also test SEPIAC with a validation application for non EU applicant?	We could not performed any tests with non-EU applicants since we did not have volunteers. AeroSpace and Defence Industries Association of Europe (ASD) is stakeholder and involved in SEPIAC testing. SEPIAC will be available to all applicants, regardless of their location, so any volunteer, including overseas, are welcome.
	DOA terms of approval- (FSA)		
45	LDA/FCA	a) How many pages the DOA Term of Approval tool will have? b) How many significant changes are you expecting? c) I do not recognise the disciplines and the	a) For most of the companies it would be a one page document, b) significant changes will be as needed, the new ToAs will be published after careful discussion with each DOAs including significant changes as necessary. c) The full subject of disciplines

		panels in your presentation as they not matching (example given during the presentation: for Cabin safety disciplines, rotorcraft ditching in included, why only rotorcraft and no other aircrafts?)	and panels of experts was recently consolidated in the EASA Certification Handbook; verification of consistency with the level of Involvement certification memo needs to be completed and may produce revision of the Memo itself.
46	LDA/FCA	Will this tool be available for free in the website? We will need to see the template at least.	The template is published as an official EASA record. The tool generating the ToA is indeed not published but will be shared individually by the relevant DOATL with each DOA
47	LDA/FCA	Will this matrix published together with the list of DOA from EASA? Are you thinking of limitations of types, double significant changes should be avoided.	At the moment, it has been envisaged to keep the published scope of work of DOAs at high level. The new ToAs will be published after discussion with each DOAs including significant changes as necessary.
48	LDA/FCA	Regarding the word "limitations" you are using in the presentation: Perhaps the wording used for the scope of work need to be reconsidered. Here we have a definition by exclusion. This could be dangerous because what is not forbidden is authorise. It would be more secure to define clearly what is authorised.	With the new ToA, the "limitation" wording will be standardised avoiding potential misunderstanding and misuse of the approval.
49	LDA/FCA	Where do you draw a line between significant change and change where the companies can approve itself in the future?	Significant changes are defined in part 21.a.247 EASA (DOA Department) has the obligation to comply with the rule.
Independent System Monitoring (ISM) from CPI			
50	LDA/CPI	a) Question regarding item 3.2: on the interpretation of the section, how to you do an audit of the monitoring. Sometimes they could miss some items, there is a view that you should get your independent system to be audited by an independent company. b) ISM are not fully competent to audit some deliverables	a) It is not required to have external auditors to verify ISM function compliance; the HDO has the ultimate responsibility for the proper function of the DAS including the ISM function b) Lead auditors may be supported by team members competent in the subject to be audited as long as a certain level of independence is maintained

51	LDA/CPI	This is a question related to quality, there is no link for the EN 9100 and Part 21	Yes this is the case for the moment. Sometimes we accept industry standards; so it is for the industry to propose.
52	CPI	Can you please improve the guidance material?	The material published can be considered best practice; there is for the moment no rulemaking tasks on this aspect.
		Certification Programme J. Neumann, D. Richard	
53	DRO	Can the CDI be more standardised?	is not nothing that we can standardise (see previous reply on the matter)
		Side Meeting of Group 1: Airlines Community	
54	THO	The Airlines Community is interested in a specific working group for Additive Manufacturing (3D Printing) on Cabin parts. Would the Agency consider organising such event?	As follow-up from the CERT/DOA Workshop 2016, it was identified that a separate meeting related to Additive Manufacturing / 3D Printing at EASA with the affected DO/Airlines could be useful. EASA is currently discussing when to have this meeting (possibly 1st Quarter 2017), who needs to be invited (this will have an impact on where to host the meeting), and what are the most urgent topics to be discussed. Proposals are welcome.
55	PTO/GSC	The Airlines Community requested a confirmation of the arguments leading to a classification of 0 PAX configuration changes as 'major'. Would the Agency agreed to the reclassification of such changes to 'minor'? Alternatively, is it acceptable to included in one single STC the change to several aircraft models of the same family (e.g. A319 and A320)?	The EASA Cabin Safety team considers the introduction of an operational limitation, specifically the restriction to the transport of passengers in the cabin, as the central aspect for classification as 'major'. This is an established position in the Agency, and the Cabin Safety team is committed to communicate it to all concerned industry, so as to ensure a fair playing field. The Cabin Safety team would not agree to a reclassification of such projects to 'minor'. Operators are entitled to develop and obtain the approval of one single STC for all aircraft in their fleet belonging to one aircraft family, and thereafter extend the effectivity of this STC via minor changes.
56	LDA/JLA	The Airlines Community understands that the preferred route to handle 0 PAX configurations is to obtain a Permit to Fly.	There is no plan for mutual acceptance of Permit to Fly as they are subject to acceptance by overflown States on a case by case basis.

		However, obtaining the Permit to Fly in certain states outside the European Union (e.g. the USA) can at times be a lengthy process and therefore an obstacle to the Airlines operational needs. Would the Agency consider including the mutual acceptance of Permits to Fly in the negotiations of existing and future Bilateral Agreements?	In the future, acceptance of flight conditions supporting the permit to fly may be considered.
57	JLA	The Airlines Community insists that the efforts from EASA International Cooperation need to be more industry oriented. The current main industry needs are: a)Acceptance of minor changes and minor repairs of states with bilateral agreements or authorities with working arrangement; b)Acceptance of all change and repair approvals for parts production by states with bilateral agreement or working arrangement without validation activities; c) Introduction by EASA of a PMA process similar to the current process which exists under the FAA (benchmark Hong Kong CAA (HKAR 21)).	a) Already in place for bilateral agreements, not possible in the frame of working arrangements (illegal) b) No validation activity means automatic acceptance which is limited to bilateral agreements for minor and major level 2 changes. All repairs should be automatically accepted soon. No acceptance allowed for working arrangements. c) No plan in the current Rulemaking Programme
General aviation Community: input from group 2 (industry speaker)		
58	RMA	New CS-23: How will TCDS record the standard used as MoC so the certification basis is known for future modifications	It is not done currently and it will not be done in the future.
59	LDA/RMA	CS-STAN: What is in the pipeline for future revisions of CS-STAN? How can industry make proposals?	The second NPA has been published explaining details about the procedure in place to submit proposals or comments. In addition, there will be a new functional mailbox where proposals will be collected.

		Input from Side Meeting of Group 6: DOA's Outside EU Community	
60	**LDA**	Can a DOA whose registered address is located in a country out of the territory of the EU Member States, apply to the Agency for the approval of STCs?	EASA published under this link a list of FAQs related to the scope of approval for DOA. Additional information on your specific case can be asked via the functional mailbox doa@easa.europa.eu.
61	**MGO**	Can a DOA whose registered address is located in a EU Member State, but being the design activities performed completely in a third country out of the territory of the EU Member States, apply to the Agency for the approval of STCs?	Yes, as this would still be covered under the EASA DOA who is ultimately responsible. This includes the activities performed by e.g. a sub-contractor located outside the EU.
62	**(LDA,XVE)**	How can a DOA located out of the territory of the EU Member States be involved in the rulemaking process?	Participation to Rulemaking Groups: Appropriate groups to assist the drafting of rules issued by EASA are established after consultation of the Rulemaking Advisory Group (RAG), the Thematic Advisory Group (TAG) and the Safety Standards Consultative Committee (SSCC). Advisory bodies nominate candidates for participation in the Rulemaking Group; design organisations located outside the EU can also propose candidates. EASA then select the most suitable candidates depending on their skills while limiting the size of the Group. Participation to provide comments towards the Notice of Proposed Amendments (NPAs) The consultation phase is open to all stakeholders and is a public process. Participation to review groups: The same principle as for rulemaking group nominations applies