

Regulations

Aircrew

Operational Suitability Data (OSD) for flight crew (FC)

What is the content and purpose of the EASA type rating and licence endorsement lists?

Answer

Two separate EASA type rating and licence endorsement lists - flight crew are published by EASA (one for helicopters and one for all other aircraft): [Type Ratings and Licence endorsement lists](#).

These lists constitute the class and type of aircraft categorisations in accordance with definitions of category of aircraft, class of aeroplane, and type of aircraft and paragraph FCL.700 and GM1 FCL.700 of Annex I (Part-FCL) to Commission Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011.

The lists also indicates if operational suitability data (OSD) for flight crew are available. EASA type certificate data sheets (TCDSs) and the list of EASA supplemental type certificates contain further references to OSD. Complete current OSD information is held by the relevant type certificate (TC) or supplemental type certificate (STC) holder.

Furthermore, the lists provide aircraft-specific references relevant to flight crew qualifications and air operations, including references to (non-OSD) documents, such as (J)OEB reports or Operational Evaluation Guidance Material (OE GM).

Explanatory notes for these lists are found at the same website location.

Last updated:

06/02/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45113>

Why do the EASA type rating and licence endorsement lists not contain references to the latest applicable version of an OSD FC document?

Answer

The EASA type rating and licence endorsement lists indicate whether an OSD FC document for a relevant aircraft exists. OSD FC documents are certification documents which are held and maintained by TC/STC Holder and are subject to Annex I to Commission Regulation No 748/2012 (Part-21) provisions. Consequently, changes to OSD are handled in accordance with Part-21 procedures in the same way that e.g. changes to aeroplane flight manual (AFM's) are dealt with. This includes the principle of delegation of privileges to DOAs based on which minor changes to OSD FC are approved under DOA privileges.

The responsibility of tracking the OSD FC document version resides therefore with the TC/STC holder and referencing that in the TR and licence endorsement list could potentially generate inconsistencies.

Users should consider establishing a process to ensure the regular receipt of OSD FC updates, similarly to what might exist for holding current AFM and quick reference handbook (QRH) documents.

Last updated:

06/02/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45114>

Are ODR tables available as part of the operational suitability data (OSD) for flight crew (FC) document?**Answer**

ODR tables which have been established as part of an OSD FC operational evaluation, are part of the OSD FC data, approved under the type certificate (TC)/ supplemental type certificate (STC) and owned by the TC/STC holder. These ODR tables are original equipment manufacturer OEM generic and must be customized for use by operators to their specific aircraft configurations.

Such ODR tables should therefore be requested directly from the TC/STC holder which has an obligation according to Part-21 to make OSD FC documents available to users.

Last updated:

06/02/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45115>**When should changes to OSD FC provisions be implemented by users to take into account any revised mandatory elements included in a revision?****Answer**

Article 9a of Commission Regulation No 1178/2011 (amended by Commission Regulation No 70/2014) contains a 2 year transition period for the implementation after initial publication of OSD FC report. This allows training providers, such as ATOs and operators time to adapt their training programmes and provide additional training if needed.

Pilot training courses which were approved before the approval of the OSD FC data should contain the mandatory elements not later than 18 December 2017 or within 2 years after the OSD FC was approved, whichever is later.

Implementation of changes to the OSD FC into existing approved training courses should be implemented within a reasonable timeframe following the OSD change. This timeframe is not clearly defined within the aircrew regulation, however a timeframe of 3 months (or 90 days as under the air ops requirements for an MEL) is considered reasonable.

Last updated:

06/02/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45116>**What is the status of non-mandatory items in the OSD FC? How should users proceed if deviating from non-mandatory items in the OSD FC?****Answer**

The data contained in OSD FC documents are identified as either 'mandatory' or 'non-mandatory' elements. While mandatory elements have the status of a rule, non-mandatory elements have the status of Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC).

In order to provide some flexibility to users, non-mandatory elements typically address such items as training devices, training duration, previous experience, or currency. In line with the general principles for AMCs, these elements are non-binding provisions established as a means of compliance with the Aircrew Requirements.

Users may choose Alternative Means of Compliance (AltMoC) to use alternatives to the OSD-FC non-mandatory parts by following the dedicated process for AltMoCs described in the implementing rules for aircrew licensing and air operations. Further details on the AltMoC process can be found on [EASA's website](#).

Last updated:

06/02/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45117>

What aspects should be considered when substituting a training level or device described in the OSD FC by another training level or device?

Answer

The data approved in the OSD FC are linked to the minimum training syllabus for a pilot type rating. An evaluation of differences (e.g. for aircraft modifications or between variants) identifies minimum training levels and associated training devices, if required.

With regard to the acquisition of knowledge through theoretical training, some elements may be validated as Level A and can be adequately addressed through self-instruction, whereas other elements may require aided instruction and are identified as Level B. Training organisations may find it more practical to combine Level A and Level B elements into one module of the higher level (such as computer-based training or instructor-led sessions).

With regard to the acquisition of skills through practical training, the OSD FC minimum syllabus identifies elements requiring Level C, D or E practical training and these elements are usually associated in the OSD FC document with specified training devices.

In principle, the devices described in the OSD FC document and the devices used in pilot training should be of the same training level. The use of a more complex device requires additional considerations, regarding the capabilities and characteristics of the device and the impact this may have on the training objective(s).

As an example, the OSD FC may refer to an FMS desktop trainer for Level C training. FMS training in an FTD, an FFS (without motion or vision) or in the aircraft (static, on power) may provide the same training objectives. However, the more complex training environment introduces elements which may affect the focus of the training, the time required, or other factors and these should be taken into consideration.

The same principles apply for the substitution of an FTD. To replicate the characteristics of an FTD Level I with an FTD Level II, to replicate an FTD Level I with an FFS (without motion or vision), or to replicate an FTD Level II with an FFS (without motion or vision) require different considerations to preserve achievement of the training objective.

Last updated:

06/02/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45118>

How can I get access to OSD FC documents?

Answer

Contrary to Operational Evaluation Board (OEB) reports which were owned and published by EASA, OSD documents are certification documents which are held by the TC/STC Holder within the framework of Annex I to Commission Regulation No 748/2012 (Part-21).

Paragraph 21.A.62 of Part-21 establishes requirements for the owner of the data (type certificate (TC)/supplemental type certificate (STC) holder) on making these OSD data available. It reads as follows:

21.A.62 Availability of operational suitability data

The holder of the type-certificate or restricted type-certificate shall make available:

- (a) at least one set of complete operational suitability data prepared in accordance with the applicable operational suitability certification basis, to all known EU operators of the aircraft, before the operational suitability data must be used by a training organisation or an EU operator; and*
- (b) any change to the operational suitability data to all known EU operators of the aircraft; and*
- (c) on request, the relevant data referred to in points (a) and (b) above, to:*

1. the competent authority responsible for verifying conformity with one or more elements of this set of operational suitability data; and
2. any person required to comply with one or more elements of this set of operational suitability data.

Consequently, users should request OSD data from the relevant owner, when required.

To assist users in contacting the relevant owner of the document, EASA provides some information on its [website for OSD](#), in particular an [OSD contact list](#) based on feedback from manufacturers.

Last updated:

06/02/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45112>

Licensing

What is the difference between the terms FCL (Flight Crew Licensing) and Aircrew?

Answer

Aircrew is the common term for "Flight Crew" and "Cabin Crew". [Commission Regulation \(EU\) No 1178/2011](#) laying down technical requirements and administrative procedures related to civil aviation aircrew ("the Aircrew Regulation") covers both flight crew and cabin crew.

Annex I (Part-FCL) to the Aircrew Regulation contains Implementing Rules for Flight Crew.

Annex V (Part-CC) to the Aircrew Regulation contains Implementing Rules for Cabin Crew.

Last updated:

23/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19182>

Following the introduction of a new variant to an existing type rating, how do pilots attain the privileges to operate the new variant?

Answer

1. Licensing following the introduction of a new variant to an existing type rating.

Pilots must receive differences training or familiarisation as appropriate in accordance with point FCL.710 of Part-FCL in order to extend their privileges to another variant of aircraft within one class or type rating.

A class or type rating and license endorsement should comply with the class and type ratings that are listed in one of the following EASA publications, as applicable: (1) 'List of Aeroplanes — Class and [Type Ratings and Endorsement List](#)'; and (2) 'List of Helicopters — Type Ratings List'.

Unless otherwise required in the EASA Type Rating & License Endorsement List Flight Crew' published on the Agency's web page, aircraft models/names of variants which are separated by a horizontal line in the tables require differences training, whereas those aircraft which are contained in the same cell require familiarisation when transitioning from one aircraft to another.

2. Qualification of pilots, instructors and examiners for the new variant:

1. Instructors holding instructor privileges as a TRI or SFI on the existing type intending to use their instructor privileges also on the new variant should complete differences training or familiarization on that new type (as applicable) and qualify in accordance with the last subparagraph of point FCL.910.TRI(b) / point FCL.910.SFI or, alternatively and solely for the initial phase of new aircraft introduction, may obtain a special certificate in accordance with point FCL.900(b) (special conditions for the introduction of a new type).

2. Examiners holding examiner privileges as a TRE or SFE on the existing type intending to use their examiner privileges also on the new variant should qualify in accordance with either FCL.1000(b) (special conditions for the introduction of a new type) or with (1) and (2) above (differences training on the new variant and instructor privileges).
3. Pilots, instructors and examiners without existing type privileges shall complete the full type rating course and follow the requirements of Part-FCL for instructor and examiner privileges on any variant in the type.

Last updated:

22/03/2023

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19200>

How should the new class and type rating list for aeroplanes which is published on the Agency's website be understood?

Answer

For guidance on how to read and understand the EASA List of Class or Type Ratings, please refer to the [related Explanatory Notes](#).

Last updated:

22/03/2023

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19179>

How can a third country (non-EU) licence be converted into a Part-FCL licence?

Answer

For conversion of third country licences, the provisions of the [Commission Delegated Regulation \(EU\) 2020/723 of 4 March 2020](#) are applicable. That Regulation sets out possible credits and experience requirements, when seeking a Part-FCL licence on the basis of a third-country licence.

National Competent authorities of the EASA Member States are responsible for the conversion of third country licences. Therefore, the national aviation authority of the Member State where an applicant resides or wishes to work should be contacted for further information concerning the applicable acceptance requirements.

To find a list of the national competent authorities (NAAs), please visit the [EASA member states](#) page.

To access the different national competent authorities, you should:

1. select the tab "EASA Member State";
2. select the MS to be contacted;
3. select the hyperlink to the authority website under the 'Related Content' tab.

Last updated:

22/03/2023

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19185>

To whom can an appeal against the examination/test/check results be sent?

Answer

If an applicant does not agree with the result of his/her assessment, he/she can only resolve this problem at the national level.

An applicant cannot apply to the EASA management regarding a decision taken by his/her national aviation authority. Appeals to

the Agency can only be made against decisions of the Agency.

Therefore the applicant should resolve this problem on the national level by sending his/her complaints to the national body dealing with complaints against state authorities.

Last updated:

29/02/2012

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19189>

Could the European Central Question Bank be published?

Answer

The Agency is the administrator of the European Central Question Bank (ECQB).

Taking into account that:

1. Ownership of the copyright of the ECQB database is vested to the European Aviation Safety Agency; and
2. Ownership of the contents of the database remains vested to its respective owners; and
3. The possession, management and administration of the contents of the database have been fully vested in the hands of the Agency; and
4. The contents of the database are confidential and have been treated as such without interruption.

The Agency, acting in the capacity of copyright owner and administrator of the database, enjoys the exclusive right among others, to prevent temporary or permanent reproduction by any means and in any form, as well as to prevent any form of distribution to the public of the database or of copies thereof.

It is the opinion of the Agency that such reproduction and distribution would endanger the functionality and integrity of the applicable examination system and would invalidate the associated substantial investment in both intellectual and monetary terms.

Last updated:

09/04/2013

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19190>

How can a military licence be converted to a civilian one?

Answer

The EU rules for recognising military licences can be found in [Commission Regulation \(EU\) No 1178/2011](#) on Aircrew. Article 10 states that the knowledge, experience and skill gained in military service shall be credited towards the relevant requirements of Part-FCL in accordance with the principles of a credit report established by the competent authority of the Member State where a pilot served, in consultation with the Agency.

Therefore, the competent authority of the Member State where the pilot served should be contacted and asked for the provisions applicable for such credits.

Last updated:

09/04/2013

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19191>

Which licence do I have to hold to become a TRI on a multi pilot aeroplane (MPA)?

Answer

The prerequisites to obtain and hold any TRI rating are regulated in FCL.915.TRI. There it is stated in a) that an applicant for a TRI rating shall hold a CPL, MPL or ATPL pilot licence on the applicable aircraft category.

Last updated:

22/02/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22050>

Can a co-pilot apply for a TRI rating on a multi pilot aeroplane (MPA)?**Answer**

Yes, but the rating has to be restricted to simulator training only. The reason is that FCL.915 b) (3) stipulates that all instructors providing flight training in an aircraft have to be able to act as PIC during the training flight which would not be allowed to a co-pilot.

Last updated:

22/02/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22051>

Upset Prevention and Recovery Training**Which pilots need to undergo what kind of UPRT?****Answer**

The different 'levels' of UPRT (please refer to the FAQ 'What is UPRT?') will be integrated into pilot training as follows:

- **basic UPRT**
 - all modular and integrated CPL and ATP training courses for aeroplanes as well as the integrated MPL training course
- **'advanced UPRT course'**
 - **Part of**
 - integrated ATP course
 - integrated MPL course
 - **Pre-requisite to**
 - training courses for single-pilot class or type ratings operated in multi-pilot operations
 - training courses for single-pilot high performance complex aeroplanes
 - training courses for multi-pilot aeroplanes
- **class-or type-related UPRT**
 - training courses for single-pilot high performance complex aeroplanes
 - training courses for multi-pilot aeroplanes
 - bridge course for extending privileges on a single-pilot aeroplane to multi-pilot operations

Last updated:

22/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/44871>

To which extent flight simulation training devices (FSTDs) can be used for upset prevention and recovery training

(UPRT)?**Answer**

Training of UPRT exercises within the validated training envelope of the particular FSTD will be possible. In this context, it needs to be highlighted that the revised Part-FCL requirements mandate the conduct of 'approach-to-stall' exercises only, with no obligation to conduct 'post-stall' exercises. For the conduct of stall or post-stall UPRT exercises, FSTDs need to be qualified in accordance with special evaluation criteria (see Section A, point 18 of Appendix 9 to Part-FCL).

Last updated:

06/09/2023

Link:
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/44873>
Is UPRT also be mandatory for the LAPL and the PPL?**Answer**

UPRT, as introduced into Part-FCL with amending Regulation (EU) 2018/1974, is not applicable to LAPL or PPL training. However, to address the fact that loss of control in-flight is still a major issue in general aviation, the requirements and associated AMC applicable to training flights for revalidation of SEP and TMG class ratings/privileges are planned to be revised to outline the necessity for these training flights to cover emergency procedures (such as different stall scenarios).

Last updated:

22/03/2023

Link:
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/44874>
What is UPRT?**Answer**

UPRT stands for aeroplane 'upset prevention and recovery training' and constitutes:

- aeroplane upset prevention training: a combination of theoretical knowledge and flying training with the aim of providing flight crew with the required competencies to prevent aeroplane upsets; and
- aeroplane upset recovery training: a combination of theoretical knowledge and flying training with the aim of providing flight crew with the required competencies to recover from aeroplane upsets.

In order to expose pilots to different 'levels' of UPRT at various stages of their professional pilot's career, Annex I (Part-FCL) to Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 contains the following "levels" of UPRT:

- **Basic UPRT** exercises as part of all CPL and ATP integrated training courses as well as the MPL training course (phase 1 to 3).
- An '**advanced UPRT course**' including at least 5 hours of theoretical instruction as well as at least 3 hours of dual flight instruction in an aeroplane, with the aim to enhance the student's resilience to the psychological and physiological aspects associated with upset conditions.
- **Class- or type-related UPRT** during class or type rating training to address the specificities of the relevant class or type of aeroplane.

Last updated:

22/03/2023

Link:
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/44870>

Performance-based Navigation applicability

How does my national authority endorse the PBN privileges to my IR?

Answer

Please refer to the answers provided by the Member States in the table: [Link](#)

Last updated:

25/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47756>

Cabin Crew

Definition of 'cabin crew'

What is the definition of 'cabin crew member'?

Answer

Reference: [Commission Regulation \(EU\) No 1178/2011 Aircrew](#), Article 2 'Definitions'.

Article 2 'Definitions' defines 'cabin crew member' as follows:

Reference: Commission Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 Aircrew, Article 2 'Definitions'.

Article 2 'Definitions' defines 'cabin crew member' as follows:

(11) "Cabin crew member" means an appropriately qualified crew member, other than a flight crew or technical crew member, who is assigned by an operator to perform duties related to the safety of passengers and flight during operations;

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19130>

Does the definition of 'aircrew' include cabin crew members?

Answer

Reference: [Commission Regulation \(EU\) No 1178/2011 Aircrew](#), Article 2 'Definitions'.

Yes, the definition of 'aircrew' includes a cabin crew member as well.

Article 2 'Definitions' defines 'aircrew' as follows:

(12) "Aircrew" means flight crew and cabin crew;

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/124099>

Medical fitness

Is Cabin Crew Member required to carry his/her medical certificate when on duty?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 Aircrew, Annex IV Part-MED and ED Decision 2011/015/R are available on EASA website.

EU legislation does not contain any provisions on the carriage of a medical report when on duty. MED.C.030(a)(2) requires cabin crew members to provide the related information of their medical report or the copy of their medical report to the operator(s) employing their services. MED.C.030(b) requires the cabin crew medical report to indicate the date of the aero-medical assessment, whether the cabin crew member has been assessed fit or unfit, the date of the next aero-medical assessment and, if applicable, any limitation(s). Any other elements shall be subject to medical confidentiality in accordance with MED.A.015.

Cabin crew members are encouraged to carry their medical report or a copy while on duty to attest their medical fitness and limitation(s). The operator may also have procedures in place through which a cabin crew member's medical report can be readily available upon request by a competent authority.

Last updated:

20/03/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45822>

Decrease of medical fitness and an 'unfit' medical report.**Answer**

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 Aircrew, Annex IV Part-MED and ED Decision 2011/015/R are available on EASA website.

In case of a decrease in cabin crew member's medical fitness, the cabin crew member shall, without undue delay, seek the advice of an aero-medical examiner or aero-medical centre or, where allowed by the Member State, an occupational health medical practitioner who will assess the medical fitness of the individual and decide if the cabin crew member is fit to resume his/her duties.

In case a cabin crew member has been assessed as 'unfit', the cabin crew member has the right of a secondary review. The cabin crew member shall not perform duties on an aircraft and shall not exercise the privileges of their cabin crew attestation until assessed as 'fit' again.

Last updated:

20/03/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45823>

Where can I find the EU medical requirements for Cabin Crew?**Answer***References:*

Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 Aircrew, Annex IV Part-MED.

ED Decision 2011/015/R containing AMC and GM.

All the referenced regulations are available on EASA website.

NOTE: This FAQ only provides an overview of the area-content covered by the individual Subparts A, C and D of the Reg. 1178/2011. The medical requirements for cabin crew are extensive in text, therefore to find the exact aspect you are looking for, you need to look through the respective Subpart of the Reg. 1178/2011, Annex IV Part-MED and the related AMC and GM (ED Decision 2011/015/R).

Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 - Annex IV - Part-MED: <https://www.easa.europa.eu/document-library/regulations/commission-regulation-eu-no-11782011>

- Subpart A, Section 1: scope, definitions, decrease in medical fitness, obligations of doctors who conduct aero-medical assessments of cabin crew, etc.
- Subpart C (all): requirements for medical fitness of cabin crew
- Subpart D, Section 1: aero-medical examiners (AEM)
- Subpart D, Section 3: occupational health medical practitioners (OHMP); requirements for doctors who conduct aero-medical assessments of cabin crew

ED Decision 2011/015/R contains acceptable means of compliance (AMC) and guidance material (GM) which complement the rules. The AMC and GM specify the detailed medical conditions and the related medical examinations or investigations:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/document-library/agency-decisions/ed-decision-2011015r>

Last updated:

21/01/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45821>

Practical 'raft' training

Why does Initial training under Part-CC require practical 'raft' training even if the operator's aircraft is not equipped with slide rafts or life rafts?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 Aircrew as amended by Regulation (EU) No 290/2012 Part-CC available on EASA website.

Under EU-OPS, practical training on the use of rafts was required during Initial training. EU-OPS was a regulation directed, and applicable, to operators, therefore, an operator could provide raft training only when a cabin crew member was to actually operate on the operator's aeroplane fitted with rafts or similar equipment. The training was conducted with that operator's specific equipment/rafts.

The Initial training under Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011, Part CC is no longer 'operator-related', it is generic, therefore, the practical training on rafts or similar equipment and an actual practice in water are not specific to an operator's equipment.

CCA holders, when recruited by an operator, are expected to have the ability to perform all types of cabin crew duties, including ditching related duties in water. Part-CC Cabin Crew Attestation (CCA) is issued for a life time and is recognised across all EU. Unlike the EU OPS Attestation, the CCA is subject to validity to attest the competence of the individual cabin crew member. This is foreseen in the Basic Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2018/1139) taking into account the increasing mobility of personnel in the aviation industry and the need to harmonise cabin crew qualifications.

An operator may be granted an approval to provide Part-CC Initial training and to issue the CCA (entitled to a mutual recognition as described above). That operator no longer acts as an operator training only its own cabin crew for its specific operations. That operator acts as a training organisation training future cabin crew who, in their life time, may also operate with other operators and in other Member States.

Last updated:

21/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45820>

Instructor and Examiner being the same person – conflict of interest

Instructor who provided any topic of the Initial training should not act as Examiner to avoid conflict of interest. What about small operators / cabin crew training organisations employing only one ground Instructor, for example to cover dangerous goods or aero-medical aspects and first aid?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 Aircrew and ED Decision 2012/006/R are available on EASA website.

ED Decision 2012/006/R, AMC1 ARA.CC.200(b)(2) clarifies that in such cases, the operator/training organisation establishes procedures to avoid situations that could lead to a conflict of interest, e.g. where an Instructor has to check/evaluate the proficiency of the trainee he/she has trained.

The qualifications of Instructors/Trainers, as well as of Examiners, are not defined at EU level, and remain to be defined by each Member State. Therefore, only the Competent Authorities may assess, when approving the training and checking programmes of the operator/training organisation, if the procedures can ensure that the objective of the rule is met.

AMC1 ARA.CC.200(b)(2) Approval of organisations to provide cabin crew training or to issue cabin crew attestations

PERSONNEL CONDUCTING EXAMINATIONS

For any element being examined for the issue of a cabin crew attestation as required in Part CC, the person who delivered the associated training or instruction should not also conduct the examination. However, if the organisation has appropriate procedures in place to avoid conflict of interest regarding the conduct of the examination and/or the results, this restriction need not apply.

Last updated:

20/03/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45828>

Cabin Crew Attestation

My Cabin Crew Attestation was issued in EU Member State A. I would like to join an operator in EU Member State B. Is my Cabin Crew Attestation recognised in EU Member State B?

Answer

References:

Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 New Basic Regulation.

Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 Aircrew.

Regulation (EU) No 290/2012 amended by Regulation (EU) No 2015/445 and Regulation (EU) No 245/2014.

All the referenced regulations are available on EASA website.

EU cabin crew member must hold a Cabin Crew Attestation compliant with the rules established by the Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011, as amended by Regulation (EU) No 290/2012, Regulation (EU) No 2015/445 and Regulation (EU) No 245/2014:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/document-library/regulations/commission-regulation-eu-no-11782011>

Cabin Crew Attestation issued in one EU Member State, or in EASA Member State, is valid and recognised in all EU Member States without further requirements or evaluation. Each cabin crew member can benefit from a free working movement amongst the EU operators/Member States.

The mutual recognition is established by Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 New Basic Regulation, in Article 67 and Article 3, paragraph (12) and (9).

Last updated:

21/01/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/69990>

My cabin crew qualification document was issued in a country that is not a member of the European Union and is not an EASA Member State either. Is my cabin crew qualification document recognised in the European Union?

Answer*References:*

Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 New Basic Regulation.

Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 Aircrew.

Regulation (EU) No 290/2012 amended by Regulation (EU) No 2015/445 and Regulation (EU) No 245/2014.

All the referenced regulations are available on EASA website.

No, the document is not recognised in the European Union. EU cabin crew member must hold a Cabin Crew Attestation compliant with the rules established by the Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011, as amended by Regulation (EU) No 290/2012, Regulation (EU) No 2015/445 and Regulation (EU) No 245/2014:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/document-library/regulations/commission-regulation-eu-no-11782011>

Last updated:

24/04/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/69991>

Fire and smoke training

What are the requirements for cabin crew fire/smoke training?

Answer

References: (all are available on EASA website)

Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 Aircrew as amended by Regulation (EU) No 290/2012.

Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 Air Operations.

ED Decision 2014/017/R containing AMC and GM to the rules.

NOTE: The requirements on fire and smoke training are extensive in text, therefore to have a better view and understanding, this FAQ should be read together with the rule text. The relevant rule reference is included in each line (type of training) below.

1. Initial training:

- CC.TRA.220 Initial training course and examination
- Appendix 1 to Part-CC Initial training course and examination / Training programme;
Point 8 on Fire and Smoke training
Reference: Regulation (EU) No 290/2012, Annex V Part-CC.

2. Aircraft type training:

- ORO.CC.125 Aircraft type specific and operator conversion training
Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012
- AMC1 ORO.CC.125(c) and AMC1 ORO.CC.125(d) containing a training programme for aircraft type specific training and operator conversion training respectively
Reference: ED Decision 2014/017/R

3. Recurrent training:

- ORO.CC.140 Recurrent training
Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012
- AMC1 ORO.CC.140 Recurrent training
Reference: ED Decision 2014/017/R

4. Refresher training:

- ORO.CC.145 Refresher training
Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012

Last updated:

06/07/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45824>

What is the content of fire and smoke training during the Initial training ?

Answer

Reference: [Regulation \(EU\) No 1178/2011](#) Aircrew as amended by Regulation (EU) No 290/2012, see Annex V 'Part-CC' and Appendix I to Part-CC.

Each applicant for a Cabin Crew Attestation shall undergo the Initial training and examination specified in the above referenced regulation. Please, refer to the point 8. Fire and smoke training, which shall cover the following elements:

- 8.1. emphasis on the responsibility of cabin crew to deal promptly with emergencies involving fire and smoke and, in particular, emphasis on the importance of identifying the actual source of the fire;
- 8.2. the importance of informing the flight crew immediately, as well as the specific actions necessary for coordination and assistance, when fire or smoke is discovered;
- 8.3. the necessity for frequent checking of potential fire-risk areas including toilets, and the associated smoke detectors;
- 8.4. the classification of fires and the appropriate type of extinguishing agents and procedures for particular fire situations;
- 8.5. the techniques of application of extinguishing agents, the consequences of misapplication, and of use in a confined space including practical training in fire-fighting and in the donning and use of smoke protection equipment used in aviation; and
- 8.6. the general procedures of ground-based emergency services at aerodromes.

Last updated:

06/07/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/123561>

Language proficiency

Is there any requirement on cabin crew member(s) communication with passengers in a certain language?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 Air Operations, Annex III (Part-ORO) and Annex IV (Part-CAT) is available on EASA website.

There is no EU (or ICAO requirement) that cabin crew members must speak English. It is a general practice that cabin crew members do speak English to facilitate the communication in the aviation industry. The operator defines what languages its cabin crew members must be able to speak and at what level.

Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 specifies the following two requirements:

- The operator shall ensure that all personnel are able to understand the language in which those parts of the Operations Manual, which pertain to their duties and responsibilities, are written (ORO.MLR.100(k)), and
- The operator shall ensure that all crew members can communicate with each other in a common language (CAT.GEN.MPA.120).

There is no EU (or ICAO) requirement for a specific language regarding cabin crew communication with passengers. It must be noted that it is difficult, if not impossible, to mandate the 'required' languages to be used on board with regard to

communication with passengers, as this differs on daily basis from a flight to flight. For example, a German airline has a flight departing from Frankfurt to Madrid and it is assumed that the cabin crew members speak German since they work for a German operator. In addition, they may speak English if the operator selected this language as a criterion. The passenger profile may, however, be such that these languages are not 'desired' on this flight as passengers do not necessarily speak or understand any of the two languages (passengers may be e.g. Russian, Chinese, Iranian, Indian, Pakistani, Polish, Finnish, Croatian, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Czech, Slovak, etc., or there is a large group of e.g. Japanese tourists).

Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 mandates the operator to ensure that briefings and demonstrations related to safety are provided to passengers in a form that facilitates the application of the procedures applicable in case of an emergency and that passengers are provided with a safety briefing card on which picture type-instructions indicate the operation of emergency equipment and exits likely to be used by passengers. It is therefore the operator's responsibility to choose the languages to be used on its flights, which may vary depending on the destination or a known passenger profile. It is also a practice of some operators to employ 'language speakers', i.e. cabin crew members speaking certain languages, who mainly operate their language-desired route(s).

Last updated:

20/03/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45819>

Do cabin crew members have to be able to speak English to obtain their Cabin Crew Attestation?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 Air Operations, Annex III (Part-ORO) and Annex IV (Part-CAT) is available on EASA website.

There is no EU (or ICAO requirement) that cabin crew members must speak English. It is a general practice that cabin crew members do speak English to facilitate the communication in the aviation industry. The operator defines what languages its cabin crew members must be able to speak and at what level.

Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 specifies the following two requirements:

- The operator shall ensure that all personnel are able to understand the language in which those parts of the Operations Manual, which pertain to their duties and responsibilities, are written (ORO.MLR.100(k)), and
- The operator shall ensure that all crew members can communicate with each other in a common language (CAT.GEN.MPA.120).

There is no EU (or ICAO) requirement for a specific language regarding cabin crew communication with passengers. It must be noted that it is difficult, if not impossible, to mandate the 'required' languages to be used on board with regard to communication with passengers, as this differs on daily basis from a flight to flight. For example, a German airline has a flight departing from Frankfurt to Madrid and it is assumed that the cabin crew members speak German since they work for a German operator. In addition, they may speak English if the operator selected this language as a criterion. The passenger profile may, however, be such that these languages are not 'desired' on this flight as passengers do not necessarily speak or understand any of the two languages (passengers may be e.g. Russian, Chinese, Iranian, Indian, Pakistani, Polish, Finnish, Croatian, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Czech, Slovak, etc., or there is a large group of e.g. Japanese tourists).

Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 mandates the operator to ensure that briefings and demonstrations related to safety are provided to passengers in a form that facilitates the application of the procedures applicable in case of an emergency and that passengers are provided with a safety briefing card on which picture type-instructions indicate the operation of emergency equipment and exits likely to be used by passengers. It is therefore the operator's responsibility to choose the languages to be used on its flights, which may vary depending on the destination or a known passenger profile. It is also a practice of some operators to employ 'language speakers', i.e. cabin crew members speaking certain languages, who mainly operate their language-desired route(s).

Last updated:

20/03/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45818>**Aircraft type training**

Do I have to undergo Aircraft type specific training and operator conversion training with every new operator I join if I am already qualified on that aircraft type?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 Air Operations, Annex III (Part ORO) is available on EASA website.

Aircraft type specific training and operator conversion training is not transferable from one operator to another as each operator may have its own customised aircraft cabin configurations incl. differences in safety and emergency equipment and standard operating and emergency procedures. Therefore, as required by ORO.CC.125, cabin crew members must complete Aircraft type specific training and operator conversion training before being assigned to operate on the operator's aircraft.

Last updated:

20/03/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45826>

Can a cabin crew training organisation (CCTO) provide Aircraft type specific training and operator conversion training?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 Air Operations, Annex III (Part ORO) is available on EASA website.

Aircraft type specific training and operator conversion training is a requirement directed to operators as specified in ORO.GEN.005, therefore the operator is responsible for this training. However, an operator may contract out some activities (e.g. training) as specified in ORO.GEN.205 complemented by AMC1 ORO.GEN.205 and GM1 ORO.GEN.205 and GM2 ORO.GEN.205. Therefore, CCTO can only provide Aircraft type specific training and operator conversion training if contracted by an operator to do so. The operator remains responsible for this training and for the competence of its cabin crew.

Last updated:

20/03/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45825>**Reduction of cabin crew during ground operations**

Do the evacuation procedures with a reduced number of required cabin crew during ground operations or in unforeseen circumstances require prior endorsement?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 Air Operations and the associated ED Decisions are available on EASA website.

The minimum number of cabin crew for an aircraft type, as determined by certification and approved by EASA, is stated on the Type Certification Data Sheet. The minimum number of cabin crew and the evacuation procedures form part of the Operations Manual. Reducing the minimum cabin crew is a deviation from the required minimum number and requires close monitoring. Changes to evacuation procedures with a reduced number of cabin crew are required to be acceptable to the Competent

Authority.

The minimum number of cabin crew required in the passenger compartment may be reduced under conditions stated in ORO.CC.205 incl. AMC1 ORO.CC.205 (c)(1). Procedures must be established in the operations manual; it has to be ensured that an equivalent level of safety is achieved with the reduced number of cabin crew, in particular for evacuation of passengers.

Last updated:

20/03/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45827>

Minimum required cabin crew

Determination of the minimum required number of cabin crew on an aircraft

Answer

NOTE: The purpose of this FAQ is to explain how the operator and the Competent Authority (National Aviation Authority) conclude the minimum number of cabin crew required on the operator's aircraft. This FAQ does not provide specific numbers for aircraft types or individual aircraft. The minimum number of cabin crew may vary on each aircraft, depending on the certification history of that aircraft. To learn the minimum number of cabin crew on your aircraft, please, consult your Competent Authority. To have a better view and understanding of the explanation below, this FAQ should be read together with the rule ORO.CC.100 ([Regulation \(EU\) No 965/2012 on air operations](#)).

Minimum number of cabin crew is established during the certification process of the aircraft and this number must be clearly written in the certification documentation (reference: EASA Certification Memorandum [CM-CS-008](#), issued on 03 July 2017). The 'certification documentation' is the Type Certificate Data Sheet (TCDS) or the Supplemental Type Certificate (STC).

Therefore, in order to establish the minimum number of cabin crew on the operator's aircraft, as specified in ORO.CC.100(b)(1) of [Regulation \(EU\) No 965/2012](#), the operator/National Aviation Authority must check the aircraft certification documentation and apply the number written in the certification documentation.

However, historically, not all aircraft had the number of minimum cabin crew written in the certification documentation, or even established during the certification process. In this case, the operator may use the calculation method specified in ORO.CC.100(b)(2) of [Regulation \(EU\) No 965/2012](#).

In summary:

Certification documentation of the operator's aircraft issued:

1. **Before 3rd July 2017:** if the certification documentation does not include the number of minimum cabin crew or the number has not been established for the aircraft, you may apply the calculation method specified in ORO.CC.100(b)(2)).
2. **After 3rd July 2017:** you must apply the number of minimum cabin crew specified in the certification documentation in accordance with the rule ORO.CC.100(b)(1).

Background information:

The development stage of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 ('AIR OPS') initially did not include the paragraph (b)(2) in ORO.CC.100, i.e. the '1 per 50' calculation. This inclusion was done last minute and it resulted in the overall lack of clarity of ORO.CC.100(b). To help with the implementation, EASA published Safety Information Bulletin ([SIB](#)) 2014-29, which provided detailed information on how to comply with ORO.CC.100. The SIB was supported by the EU Members States, however resulted in a strong opposition by EU operators. As a result, discussions were held in 2015 between EASA and IATA/IACA on the application of ORO.CC.100(b), i.e. how to establish the minimum required number of cabin crew. As an outcome of these discussions, on 7th December 2015 EASA communicated to the stakeholders the 'EASA conclusions following the consultation on the proposed Certification Memo and Safety Information Bulletin on minimum cabin crew for twin-aisle aeroplanes'.

On 3rd July 2017, EASA published the above-mentioned Certification Memorandum EASA-CM-CS-008. This document clarifies to aircraft manufacturers and design organisations that the number of cabin crew assumed in their evacuation certification activity

must be clearly stated in their documentation. Following the publication of this Certification Memorandum, the TCDSs have been amended to include the minimum number of cabin crew. Some aircraft manufacturers have amended their TCDSs even before the publication of this Certification Memorandum.

There may be cases where the minimum number of cabin crew for the operator's aircraft will be different (e.g. lower) than the number written in the TCDS. Such a change must be approved by EASA and such an aircraft will hold a Supplemental Type Certificate. STC means that it was demonstrated that the aircraft cabin configuration used by the operator is compliant with the applicable certification specifications with a lower number of cabin crew members than the number specified in the TCDS. If the operator's aircraft holds a STC, the number of minimum cabin crew written in the STC will be applicable to that aircraft.

Last updated:

14/01/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45829>

Working for multiple operators

I work for Operator A and have short/long-term contract(s) with Operator B. What training do I require when I return back to Operator A after the completion of my short/long-term contract with Operator B?

Answer

Ref.: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 Air Operations, Annex III (Part-ORO) is available on EASA website.

When joining Operator B, the cabin crew member undergoes the Aircraft type specific and operator conversion training & Familiarisation.

When returning to Operator A (after completing the short/long-term contract with Operator B) the options are:

- No training is required, provided the cabin crew member's recency is within the validity of the Recurrent training and the cabin crew member has operated on Operator A aircraft type during the last 6 months.
- Recurrent training if the validity is about to expire.
- Refresher training, provided the cabin crew member has not operated on Operator A aircraft type for more than 6 months.
- Refresher training, if Operator A considers this training to be necessary due to complex equipment or procedures for the cabin crew member who has been absent from flying duties for less than 6 months.
- Aircraft type specific and operator conversion training & Familiarisation if the validity of the Recurrent training has expired.

Last updated:

23/05/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/46795>

What credit can I get as regards Subject 090 Communications for my IR, CPL or ATPL(H)/VFR?

Answer

Regulation (EU) 2018/1974 extended the scope of the training & examination on communications for the CPL(A) and CPL(H) (and the ATPL(H)/VFR) from only VFR to both VFR and IFR. Likewise, it extended the scope of communications for the instrument rating from just IFR to both VFR and IFR. Applicants applying for a CPL or ATPL who already hold an IR can be credited towards Subject 090 Communications, if they sat that specific exam. Such credit can also be given to the IR holder who completed ECQB-based exams for Subjects "VFR Communications" and "IFR Communications". If the applicant only completed "IFR Communications" then no credit for the exam is available. A similar case applies to applicants holding a CPL or ATPL(H)/VFR applying for an IR: credit towards Subject 090 is available, except for where the applicant only holds a pass in "VFR Communications".

Last updated:

22/03/2023

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/137736>**I have successfully passed the CB-IR theoretical knowledge examinations – what instrument rating can I use this for?****Answer**

According to point FCL.035 to Aircrew Regulation, someone who has successfully passed the IR(A) theoretical knowledge examination (including via the CB-IR(A) route) can use this towards their IR(A), or also for credit towards the Basic IR. If the candidate is seeking to obtain an IR in another aircraft category, additional training at an ATO must be completed.

Last updated:

22/03/2023

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/137737>**On which learning objectives will my theoretical knowledge training and exam for the ATPL, CPL or instrument rating be based?****Answer**

As of 01 February 2022, the theoretical knowledge training and exam is based on learning objectives that include Subject 090 Communications. The learning objectives are published as appendices to AMC1 FCL.310; FCL.515(b); FCL.615(b); FCL.835(d). Further information is available on the [ECQB page](#).

Last updated:

22/03/2023

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/137738>

Medical

Where can the aero-medical requirements for ATCOs be found?**Answer**

The requirements for Air Traffic Controllers' aero-medical certification can be found in Annex IV –PART ATCO.MED – of the Regulation (EU) 2015/340.

Please follow this link: <https://www.easa.europa.eu/regulations#regulations-atco---air-traffic-controllers>

Last updated:

20/01/2019

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/44548>**Who can perform the Class 1 aero-medical examination?****Answer**

Initial Class 1 aero-medical examination can be performed only at an Aero-medical centre (AeMC) certified to perform class 1 aero-medical examinations. The aero-medical examination for the renewal or revalidation of the medical certificate can be performed by either an AeMC or an authorized aero-medical examiner (AME) with the privileges to revalidate and renew Class 1 medical certificate. For more details, please refer to the website of the competent authority of a Member State where you are planning to apply. Usually competent authorities publish a list of the authorised AeMCs and AMEs on their website. The list of Member States and the websites of their competent authorities can be found on our website under '[EASA by Country](#)'.

Last updated:

21/01/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/44549>

Who can perform the Class 3 aero-medical examination?

Answer

Initial Class 3 aero-medical examination can be performed only at an Aero-Medical Centre (AeMC) certified to perform class 3 aero-medical examinations. The recurrent aero-medical examination can be performed by either an AeMC or an authorized aero-medical examiner (AME) with the privileges to revalidate and renew Class 3 medical certificate. For more details, please refer to the website of the competent authority of a Member State where you are planning to apply. Usually competent authorities publish a list of the authorised AeMCs and AMEs on their website. The list of Member States and the web sites of their competent authorities can be found on our website under '[EASA by Country](#)'.

Last updated:

21/01/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/44550>

Who can perform the Class 2 and LAPL aero-medical examination?

Answer

All Class 2 and LAPL aero-medical examination can be performed by any AeMC or AME authorized to perform aero-medical examinations for aircrew. In addition to that, subject to national provisions, LAPL aero-medical examinations may be performed by General Medical Practitioners (GMPs). For more details, please refer to the website of the competent authority of a Member State where you are planning to apply. Usually competent authorities publish a list of the authorised AeMCs and AMEs including information whether GMPs are allowed to perform aero-medical examinations for LAPL applicants. The list of Member States and the websites of their competent authorities can be found on our website under '[EASA by Country](#)'.

Last updated:

21/01/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/44551>

Who can perform the Cabin crew aero-medical assessment?

Answer

Cabin Crew aero-medical assessment can be performed by any AeMC or AME authorized to perform aero-medical examinations in accordance with Regulation (EU) 1178/2011. In addition to that, subject to national provisions, aero-medical examinations and assessments may be performed by Occupational Health Medical Practitioners (OHMPs). For more details, please refer to the website of the competent authority of a Member State where you are planning to apply. The list of Member States and the websites of their competent authorities can be found on our website under '[EASA by Country](#)'.

Last updated:

21/01/2019

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/44552>**Do you have a list of certified AeMCs and AMEs in Europe?****Answer**

No, EASA does not have any list of available AeMCs and AMEs. Nevertheless you should be able to find the list of AeMCs and AME on Competent Authorities' web-sites for each Member State. The list of Member States and links to the competent authorities websites can be found on our website under '[EASA by Country](#)'.

Last updated:

21/01/2019

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/44553>**Is there any AeMC available outside Europe?****Answer**

YES. The list of the third-country AeMCs can be found at the following [link](#) or under the 'Downloads' section of the following [webpage](#).

Last updated:

18/09/2023

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/44554>**Where can the aero-medical requirements for Pilots and Cabin Crew be found?****Answer**

The requirements for Aircrew aero-medical certification can be found in Annex IV – Part-MED – of the Regulation (EU) 1178/2011.

Please follow this link: <https://www.easa.europa.eu/regulations#regulations-aircrew>

Last updated:

21/01/2019

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/44547>**May I exercise the privileges of my PPL licence if I have a Class 1 medical certificate?****Answer**

Yes, the Class 1 medical certificate includes Class 2 and LAPL privileges.

Last updated:

14/12/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/44555>

May I exercise the privileges of my PPL licence if I have a Class 3 medical certificate?

Answer

No, the Class 3 medical certificate does not include Class 2 privileges. In order to exercise the privileges of or undertake solo flights for a PPL licence you need to hold a valid Class 2 or Class 1 medical certificate.

Last updated:

14/12/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/44556>

If I undertake my aero-medical examination in another Member State than the state that issued my licence do I need to validate resulting medical certificate with my licensing authority?

Answer

No, if you hold a valid medical certificate issued by an AME authorized by an EASA State then no validation is needed, the medical certificate shall be recognized by all Member States without additional proceedings.

Last updated:

14/12/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/44557>

Flight Simulation Training Devices (FSTDs)

CS- FSTD(A) Issue 2 - UPRT Compliance of current qualified FSTD

Answer

In order to satisfy the FCL requirements, of Opinion 6, CS-FSTD(A) Issue 2 is applicable. For updated devices this can be done either through a special evaluation or at the recurrent evaluation (requires application for the Issue 2 elements to be evaluated and credited).

Please refer to CS-FSTD(A) Issue 2 AMC11 FSTD(A).300 Guidance on high angle of attack/stall model evaluation, and approach to stall for previously qualified FSTDs.

When considering the additional requirements under Issue 2 as well for the UPRT requirements please refer to the Explanatory Note to Decision 2018/006/R (reference section 2.5. What are the benefits and drawbacks "Safety improvement by further mitigating/preventing loss of control in-flight (LOC-I). Safety would improve due to the objective testing provisions which would validate not only the cruising configuration, but also the approach and landing configurations. Current FSTDs would be qualified to accurately reproduce the approach to stall in certain conditions and the behaviour of the aeroplane when affected by ice."

AMC11 applies to previously qualified devices and in some cases where the aeroplane being represented may not have the required validation data – this AMC allows an acceptable means of providing such test data by using a footprint method (when no validation data is available).

If any of the elements of Issue 2 are missing, then this will be shown in the Qualification Certificate as "Restrictions or limitations" to show the users the capabilities of the FSTD.

In conclusion, current qualified FSTD will not need to be fully compliant with CS-FSTD(A) issue 2 but only with the elements related to UPRT and icing. The qualification certificate of the FSTD will therefore show references to two PRDs (Primary

Reference Document):

- The PRD used during the initial evaluation of the FSTD;
- CS-FSTD(A) issue 2 for UPRT and icing.

Last updated:

12/11/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47253>

Where can I find more information about Flight Simulation Training Devices (FSTDs)?

Answer

The application form for FSTDs is available [here](#).

A dedicated FAQ section on FSTD-related questions is available [here](#).

Last updated:

22/05/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21966>

General

Where can I find guidance on the use of ‘shall’, ‘must’, ‘should’ and ‘may’ in the Agency’s rulemaking publications and generally in EU legislation?

Answer

This question relates to the English writing standards used in Community legislation. Points 10.23 to 10.32 of the [English Style Guide](#), prepared by the European Commission’s Directorate-General for Translation, provide guidance concerning the use of modal verbs in legislation, contracts and the like, as well as an explanation of the distinction between modal verbs used in enacting and non-enacting terms.

Further, points 2.3, 10 and 12 of the [Joint Practical Guide of the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission for persons involved in the drafting of European Union legislation](#) also provide guidelines on the principles of drafting Community legislation.

Last updated:

23/05/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/18999>

What is the difference between European Community (EC) and European Union (EU) in the regulation reference?

Answer

The Lisbon Treaty, the latest primary treaty at EU level, was signed on 13 December 2007 and entered into force on 1 December 2009.

The European Union has been given a single legal personality under this Treaty.

Previously, the European Community and the European Union had different statutes and did not operate the same decision-making rules. The Lisbon Treaty ended this dual system.

On practical terms, all EU legislation has the reference to the EU since 1 December 2009. Up till then, the reference was made to the European Community (EC) as only this body had legal personality.

Last updated:

19/05/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19000>

Why has the numbering of the EU regulations changed as of 2015?

Answer

Starting with 2015, the European Union adopts a new numbering system for its legal acts. (see [Harmonising the numbering of EU Legal Acts](#))

Last updated:

25/02/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19064>

What is the definition of an IR, AMC and CS and GM and what differences can be proposed?

Answer

Implementing Rules (IR) are binding in their entirety and used to specify a high and uniform level of safety and uniform conformity and compliance. The IRs are adopted by the European Commission in the form of Regulations.

Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC) are non-binding. The AMC serves as a means by which the requirements contained in the Basic Regulation, and the IR, can be met. However, applicants may decide to show compliance with the requirements using other means. Both NAAs and organisations may propose alternative means of compliance. 'Alternative Means of Compliance' are those that propose an alternative to an existing AMC. Those Alternative Means of Compliance proposals must be accompanied by evidence of their ability to meet the intent of the IR. Use of an existing AMC gives the user the benefit of compliance with the IR.

Certification Specifications (CS) are non-binding technical standards adopted by the EASA to meet the essential requirements of the Basic Regulation. CSs are used to establish the certification basis (CB) as described below. Should an aerodrome operator not meet the recommendation of the CS, they may propose an Equivalent Level of Safety (ELOS) that demonstrates how they meet the intent of the CS. As part of an agreed CB, the CS become binding on an individual basis to the applicant.

Special Conditions (SC) are non-binding special detailed technical specifications determined by the NAA for an aerodrome if the certification specifications established by the EASA are not adequate or are inappropriate to ensure conformity of the aerodrome with the essential requirements of Annex Va to the Basic Regulation. Such inadequacy or inappropriateness may be due to:

- the design features of the aerodrome; or
- where experience in the operation of that or other aerodromes, having similar design features, has shown that safety may be compromised.

SCs, like CSs, become binding on an individual basis to the applicant as part of an agreed CB.

Guidance Material (GM) is non-binding explanatory and interpretation material on how to achieve the requirements contained in the Basic Regulation, the IRs, the AMCs and the CSs. It contains information, including examples, to assist the user in the interpretation and application of the Basic Regulation, its IRs, AMCs and the CSs.

Last updated:

12/04/2013

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19026>

Implementing Rules are available in all of the national languages of the EASA Member States. How is the quality of these translations assured? Who is responsible for the translations?

Answer

EASA is committed to facilitating the production of good quality translations. To ensure this and, where necessary, to improve, EASA has set up a Translation Working Group in 2008. This Working Group is made up of members of the National Aviation Authorities (NAAs), the Translation Centre of the EU Bodies (CdT), as well as EASA staff members. Also, EASA in cooperation with NAAs and CdT, is developing glossaries in the different aviation domains, such as Air Operations or Air Traffic Management, to enhance the quality of translations. The Member States also contribute to this project in order to capitalise on existing material and experience.

The final responsibility for translations lies with the EU Commission. The correction of translation mistakes of the Implementing Rules follows the same formal procedure as for their adoption: 1. preparation of the proposal, 2. interservice consultation, 3. committee, 4. scrutiny of European Parliament and of European Council, and 5. adoption. For minor mistakes, the procedure may be shorter. In any case, the linguistic changes will have to be agreed by the Commission's translation services. These linguistic services will check that no substantial change is introduced, that the term used is acceptable according to an internal translation code or that the same change is included in all linguistic versions.

Last updated:

12/04/2013

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19001>

What is the progress of a regulation towards publication?

Answer

The Agency drafts regulatory material as Implementing Rules, Acceptable Means of Compliance, Guidance Material and Certification Specifications. These are available for consultation (as Terms of Reference, Notices of Proposed Amendment and Comment Response Documents). After consultation, the Implementing Rules are sent to the European Commission as Opinions.

Following publication of the Opinions, responsibility for completing the decision-making process prior to the Regulation's publication in the [Official Journal of the European Union](#) passes onto the European Commission. The Opinions' progress can be followed via the European Commission's [comitology website](#). It is advisable to search by year and for the committee dealing with these Opinions: Committee for the application of common safety rules in the field of civil aviation. As several Opinions may be negotiated in one such committee meeting, it is difficult to search by rule or title.

Once the committee has adopted the draft regulation, it is passed on to the European Parliament and Council for scrutiny. Further information and links to the documents under scrutiny can be found via the [European Parliament's Register of Documents](#).

The Agency is responsible for finalising the associated Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC), Guidance Material (GM) and Certification Specifications. As these need to take into account any changes made to the Cover Regulation and Implementing Rules by the EASA Committee, European Parliament and Council, the Decisions are published on the Agency website shortly after the date when their corresponding regulation has been published in the Official Journal.

The Agency also publishes a rulemaking programme, listing the tasks that are ongoing and advance planning. It is available [here](#).

Last updated:

10/06/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/18995>

What is the legal status of documents published during the EASA Rulemaking process such as Notice

of Proposed Amendment (NPA), Comment Response Document (CRD) or an Opinion? Can they be used if there is no EU rule available?

Answer

The proposed draft rules published during the EASA Rulemaking process are not binding documents as they are still subject to change. This may occur either during the EASA rulemaking process or through the Commission's comitology process. Consequently, NPAs, CRDs and Opinions cannot be used in place of an EU rule.

NPAs and CRDs are part of the Agency's rulemaking process, at different stages. They inform and consult stakeholders on possible rule changes or new rules. The NPAs include an explanatory note, the proposed draft rules, a regulatory impact assessment (RIA) — if applicable, and proposed actions to support implementation. They are published on the Agency's website to allow any person or organisation with an interest in or being affected by the draft proposed rule to submit their comments.

The CRD to a particular NPA is published after the comments have been reviewed and contains a summary of the comments received, along with all the comments submitted by stakeholders on that particular NPA and EASA's responses to those comments.

Most of the times, the EASA rulemaking process also leads to the issuance of Opinions, which contain proposals of implementing and delegated acts. They are submitted to the European Commission, as a proposal to change existing regulations or create new ones.

More information on [EASA rulemaking](#).

Last updated:

02/09/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19121>

What is the comitology procedure?

Answer

Please refer to the information provided by the European Commission at:

https://ec.europa.eu/info/implementing-and-delegated-acts/comitology_en

Last updated:

26/08/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/18997>

What does 'Cover' Regulation mean?

Answer

Implementing rules are Commission regulations. A regulation is usually composed of a short introductory regulation, colloquially known as 'cover regulation', and Annexes thereto, containing the technical requirements for implementation. In the EASA system, these Annexes are usually called Parts (e.g. Part-21 is an annex to Regulation 1702/2003; Part-ORO is an annex to Regulation (EU) No 965/2012).

The 'cover' regulation is usually short (a few pages) and it includes:

- The preamble made up of:
 - Citations (the paragraphs introduced by 'Having regard to...'); and
 - Recitals (clauses introduced by 'whereas'), explaining the reasons for the contents of the enacting terms (i.e. the articles) of an act, the background principles and considerations that lead the legislator to adopt the regulation;

- The articles of the regulation, which contain:
 - A description of the objective and scope of the regulation;
 - Definitions that are used throughout the regulation and its annexes;
 - The establishment of the applicability of its annex(es);
 - Conversion and transition measures.

Last updated:

02/09/2019

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/18998>**Can the information provided in EASA's FAQ be considered legally binding?****Answer**

No, the information included in the Agency's FAQs cannot be considered in any way to be legally binding. EASA is not the competent authority to interpret EU Law. Such responsibility rests with the judicial system, and ultimately with the Court of Justice of the European Union. Therefore any information included in these FAQs shall only be considered as EASA's technical understanding on a specific matter.

Last updated:

02/09/2019

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19115>**Continuing Airworthiness****COVID-19 - Continuing Airworthiness**

What is the flexibility allowed to the person or organisation responsible for the aircraft continuing airworthiness when it comes to the planning of Aircraft Maintenance Programme (AMP) scheduled maintenance tasks with intervals expressed in calendar time?

Answer**1. Purpose of the document**

The Agency was requested by the industry for additional guidance on the application of the airworthiness rules in respect to certain specific issues particularly affected by the current COVID-19 crisis. One of those topics concerns the obligations of the person or organisation responsible for continuing airworthiness of aircraft when it comes to the accomplishment of Aircraft Maintenance Programme tasks with intervals expressed in calendar times. Accordingly, the Agency prepared this additional, temporary, guidance, which complements the existing AMC/GM to Commission Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014.

The guidance provided in this document is primarily intended for 'Part-M' aircraft, but can be used also as regards 'Part-ML' aircraft, except that in case of 'Part-ML' aircraft, the competent authority does not need to be involved if an AMP task is to be postponed, as this is done under the responsibility of the aircraft owner or the organisation responsible for the aircraft continuing airworthiness. This person or organisation may also decide, if necessary to revise the AMP, which will not involve the competent authority.

2. Description of the issue

During the COVID-19 crisis, a large number of aircraft is being parked / stored at different and partially remote locations. This guidance document was prepared based on an assumption that these aircraft have been subject to parking/storage procedures defined by the Type Certificate (TC) Holder (those parking and storage procedures are usually contained in a chapter of the Aircraft Maintenance Manual (AMM e.g. Chapter 10). If the existing AMM does not contain parking/storage procedures, the TC

Holder should be contacted.

Note: It is not necessary to revise the AMP to include the parking/storage tasks to be followed.

During the COVID-19 crisis, the parked/stored aircraft are not operated and consequently the AMP scheduled maintenance tasks based on 'Flight hours' and 'Flight cycles' are not impacted. On the other hand the AMP scheduled maintenance tasks based on intervals (and threshold, if applicable) expressed in calendar times need to be considered. Indeed, some of the calendar time based scheduled maintenance tasks will become due during parking/storage period.

In the normal practice, following the principles of AMC M.A.301(c) and point 4 of Appendix I to AMC M.A.302 and AMC M.B.301(b), if a scheduled maintenance task cannot be performed within the interval approved in the AMP, its postponement may be allowed in accordance with pre-defined 'permitted variation' agreed with the CA in the AMP.

3. Considerations in the frame of COVID-19 crisis

3.1 Postponement until the end of parking/storage period

In the current situation, it may not be always feasible, to perform the calendar scheduled maintenance tasks of the AMP in due time, or within the permitted variation specified in the AMP.

In such cases, it is acceptable for EASA to plan the accomplishment of these tasks (even if they have become due multiple times during the parking/storage period) at the next suitable opportunity (e.g. next weekly check of storage/parking procedure), or at the end of the storage/parking period, but in any case before the next flight, as part of the work package necessary for the de-preserving/de-storage of the aircraft.

Note: Certain AMP scheduled maintenance tasks may be assessed as unnecessary because they are covered by equivalent tasks in the parking/storage procedures put in place.

3.2 Postponement beyond return to service

If exceptionally, a calendar task needs to be postponed until after the return to service and beyond the AMP permitted variation, the aircraft owner or CAMO/CAO should receive advice from the TCH or the Design Approval holder (DAH) on such postponement and on the subsequent due date after the accomplishment.

The applicant should then submit such postponement, together with the proposed technical justification, including if appropriate, a risk assessment, for approval by the CA.

The CA should consider the following conditions, mitigating actions or any other elements which the CA deems necessary, when allowing a postponement of a due calendar task after return to service:

- An approved maintenance organisation has applied the appropriate parking/storage procedures during the full period.
- The owner/CAMO/CAO has monitored what AMP tasks are due (M.A.708(b)(4), CAMO.A.315(b)(5) and CAO.A.075(b)(7)).
- This does not apply to mandatory continuing airworthiness instructions (MCAI) such as AD or ALS tasks.
- The environmental conditions where the aircraft was parked/stored have been taken into consideration. Certain calendar tasks may be more relevant to a particular storage environment, e.g. wet, salty conditions propagate corrosion.

In addition, the importance of the AMP task (e.g. based on MRB task type/source/category, reliability-alert task), the performance of the CAMO/CAO quality system, and if applicable the review of the risk assessment performed by the applicant, should also be considered.

Based on the above elements, it may be possible to allow an exceptional (one-off) postponement, not exceeding the following:

- (i) AMP task interval of 1 year or less: up to 3 months
- (ii) AMP task interval of more than 1 year, but not exceeding 2 years: up to 4 months
- (iii) AMP task interval of more than 2 year, but not exceeding 3 years: up to 5 months
- (iv) AMP task interval of more than 3 years: up to 6 months.

Such postponement should be calculated from the original AMP task due date, unless otherwise agreed with the competent authority.

The subsequent due date should also be part of the CA approval.

The Aircraft continuing airworthiness record system, and if applicable, the aircraft technical log system should properly record such agreement and the effective accomplishment date.

Depending on the length of the COVID-19 crisis and the future annual utilisation of the aircraft, the CA may also require to the

owner/CAMO/CAO an ad-hoc review of the AMP pursuant to M.A.302(h).

Last updated:

01/07/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116314>

Under the present rules, is the person responsible for the continuing airworthiness of an aircraft (owner, CAO or CAMO) allowed to split the customised maintenance checks?

Answer

1. Purpose of the document

The Agency was requested by the industry for additional guidance on the application of the airworthiness rules in respect to certain specific issues particularly affected by the current COVID-19 crisis. One of those topics concerns the possibility for a person responsible for continuing airworthiness of aircraft to split the customised maintenance tasks. Accordingly, the Agency prepared this additional, temporary, guidance document, which complements the existing GM/AMC to Commission Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014.

2. Description of the issue

Considering the large number of aircraft grounded at the same time during the COVID-19 crisis, the movement restrictions of persons, the temporary lack of access to certain facilities and/or services, the competent authorities may need to facilitate a more practical scheduling process of the Aircraft Maintenance Programme (AMP) tasks and a simpler process of approving changes to the responsible organisation's procedures, in order to ensure as much as possible the continuation of organisation activities during this period, in compliance with the applicable requirements.

For aircraft managed under Annex I (Part-M) to Commission Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014, in accordance with M.A.301(c), the owner, CAO or CAMO, as applicable, should have a system to ensure that all aircraft maintenance tasks are performed within the limits prescribed by the approved Aircraft Maintenance Programme (AMP) and that, whenever a maintenance task cannot be performed within the required time limit, its postponement is allowed in accordance with a procedure agreed by the competent authority (CA).

If an owner, CAO or CAMO, as applicable, has developed the AMP through grouping of individual maintenance tasks into packages based on usage parameter(s) (e.g.: annual inspection, 1,000 FH inspection) or letter-checks (e.g.: A-check, C1-check), as per points M.A.302(a)&(f) any split of such a package back to individual maintenance tasks requires an amendment to the AMP and is subject to direct approval by the CA as per point M.A.302(b), unless this is already covered by the indirect approval of the AMP as per point M.A.302(c).

Under the COVID-19 circumstances, splitting the maintenance packages may give to the aircraft owner, CAO or CAMO, as applicable, the possibility to tailor and schedule the individual maintenance tasks as they are strictly needed, fitting the aircraft operational needs and activities, as well as the availability of the required facilities and/or services. It must be ensured that the AMP task intervals are respected.

For aircraft managed under Annex Vb (Part-ML) to Commission Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014, the aircraft owner, CAO or CAMO, as applicable, may simply declare/approve an amendment to the AMP in accordance with ML.A.302(b). When doing so, the same principles as the ones mentioned above for aircraft managed under Part M may be implemented, within the limits of the applicable rules.

EASA welcomes the efforts of the owners, CAOs and CAMOs, as applicable, for amending the AMPs and the CAs for having the amendments approved as quickly as possible, based on the principles mentioned above, within the limits of the applicable rules.

EASA is available to provide more technical support on this process on a case by case basis, upon the CAs' request.

Last updated:

01/07/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116316>

Under the present rules, how can a maintenance organisation extend the use of the privileges specified in 145.A.75(c) of line maintenance performed away from an approved location?

Answer**1. Purpose of the document**

Considering the impact of the COVID-19 crisis on the aviation sector – a large number of aircraft grounded at airports/ locations where there is no maintenance organisation which can perform the required maintenance/ preservation tasks, to name but a few – the Agency was requested to provide to competent authorities (CAs) with additional guidance material to facilitate a simpler process of approving changes to the applicable organisation's procedures. This document is therefore intended to guide CAs in keeping continuing compliance with the applicable requirements and ensure, as much as possible, the continuation of maintenance organisation activities.

The guidance provided in this document is primarily intended for Part-145 organisations, but can be used also in case of Part-M, Subpart F and Part-CAO organisations, if needed.

2. Description of the issue

In accordance with 145.B.35 and 145.B.40 of Regulation (EU) 1321/2014, the CA may consider to approve a concession to allow deviating from the Maintenance Organisation Exposition (MOE) procedures for maintenance performed away from an approved location, as per 145.A.75(c) and permit the performance of line maintenance in a non-approved location for a period up to 3 months (90 days).

The maintenance organisation may be allowed to perform line maintenance at such a location without having the obligation to get the approval of a line station in accordance with 145.A.85 i.e. without the need to declare the location in the MOE as required by 145.A.75(d).

The concession will be controlled by the maintenance organisation in accordance with MOE Ch. 3.10.

3. Considerations for the competent authority (CA)

When deciding on approving such a concession (requested by the maintenance organisation), the CA should take into consideration its duration period and the conditions for applying the respective change of procedure, based on at least the following aspects:

- previous performance of the organisation; and
- confidence of the competent authority in the ability of the internal quality system of the organisation to ensure safe operations.

After the initial period of the approved concession, the competent authority may reassess, following the same process as described above, the situation and may approve an additional extension of the initial period with another maximum 3 months (90 days) together with specifying the related conditions, as necessary.

Last updated:

01/07/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116317>

Under the present rules, how can a production or maintenance organisation continue to use tools or equipment even if their calibration/periodical check cannot be carried out before the due date?

Answer**1. Purpose of the document**

Considering the restrictions of movement of people or the temporary lack of access to certain facilities and/or services due to the COVID-19 crisis, which may have as a result that production and maintenance organisations are not able to get

calibration/periodical checks of their tools and equipment carried out before the due date, the Agency was requested to provide additional guidance to the competent authorities to facilitate a simpler process of approving changes to the applicable organisation's procedures, and to ensure as much as possible the continuation of production and maintenance organisation activities during this period, in compliance with the applicable requirements.

2. Description of the issue

In accordance with:

- For Part 21, Subpart F: points 21.A.125A and 21.A.126(a)(3)/GM No 2 to 21.A.126(a)(3);
- For Part 21, Subpart G: points 21.A.139(b)1.(vii), 21.A.143(a)(11) and 21.A.145(a)/GM 21.A.145(a); and
- For Part-M, Subpart F; Part-CAO and Part-145: as applicable, points M.A.604(a)7, M.A.608(b), CAO.A.050(b), CAO.A.025(a)(10), 145.A.40(b), 145.A.70(a)12., M.A.402(d) and ML.402(b)(4),

the production or maintenance organisation shall ensure, by complying with adequate procedures included in its exposition or manual, that all tools and equipment, as appropriate, are controlled and calibrated/periodically checked according to an officially recognised standard at a frequency to ensure serviceability and accuracy.

When such a procedure includes a recurrent calibration/periodical check of tools or equipment, it is possible that, due to the COVID-19 crisis, the procedure cannot be complied with because a recurring calibration/periodical check cannot be carried out before the specified due date. In such a case, a temporary change (direct or indirect approved or concessions) to the procedure may be acceptable in order to allow continuation of the activities in compliance with the rules.

In accordance with:

- For Part 21, Subpart F: points 21.A.125A and 21.B.140;
- For Part 21, Subpart G: points 21.A.143, 21.A.147 and 21.B.240;
- For Part-M, Subpart F: points M.A.604, M.A.617 and M.B.606;
- For Part-CAO: points CAO.A.025, CAO.A.105 and CAO.B.065; and
- For Part-145: points 145.A70, 145.A.85 and 145.B.35,

the competent authority may approve a temporary change to the applicable organisation's procedure to allow an extension of the period at the end of which the calibration/periodical check of the tool or equipment is due.

3. Considerations for the competent authority (CA) and the organisations

The decision of the competent authority on the approval of such a temporary change should be taken based on a risk analysis performed by the organisation. The risk analysis shall consider the previous performance and reliability of the tool or equipment, previous calibration and periodical checks results and possible additional mitigating measures (like using tools from other organisations for critical applications).

Few considerations for the risk analysis may be, but are not limited to the following:

- when the normal calibration/check period is ≤ 12 months the extension of the calibration and/or periodical check can be up to a maximum of 10 % of the normal calibration/check;
- when the calibration/check period is > 12 months the extension of the calibration can be 10 % of the normal calibration/check period up to a maximum of 3 months;
- the risk associated to the use of the tool or equipment for the specific task in relation to ensuring conformity with the approved data or continuing airworthiness of the aircraft or components is not determined critical;
- the tool or equipment is inspected before use and no damage or corrosion is identified;
- the tool or equipment was recently used (e.g. within the 3 months preceding the calibration or periodical check due date);
- no deficiency with the use of this tool or equipment has been reported since the last calibration or periodical check;
- the last two calibration results or last periodical checks are not showing any possible issues (e.g.: drift in the value, value very close to the acceptable limit, etc.) that can endanger the result of the activity performed.

If the risk associated to the use of the tool or equipment for the specific task is identified as critical, the organisation shall receive the tool or equipment manufacturer extension acceptance, and shall take additional measures to verify and ensure the correct production / maintenance results, such as:

verification of the tool or equipment serviceability by comparison with another tool/equipment duly calibrated/periodically checked, and/or

verification of the measurement/test/job-result by other acceptable means.

The tools or equipment with extended calibration or maintenance interval, should be recorded in a dedicated form, allowing tracking the tasks performed. If the tool / equipment fails during next regular calibration / inspection, the completed tasks may require to be verified / performed again.

Last updated:

01/07/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116318>

Under the present rules, can a maintenance organisation continue to keep a supplier on the approved list even if full compliance with its evaluation of suppliers' procedure cannot be ensured?

Answer

1. Purpose of the document

Considering the impact of the COVID-19 crisis on the aviation sector - the reduced personnel in the maintenance organisations, or late feedback/reply from their suppliers which may affect compliance with their suppliers' evaluation procedures - the Agency was requested to provide to competent authorities (CA's) with additional guidance material to facilitate a simpler process of approving changes to the applicable organisation's procedures, in order to ensure as much as possible the continuation of maintenance organisation activities in compliance with the applicable requirements.

This document is therefore intended to guide CA's in keeping continuing compliance with the applicable requirements and ensure, as much as possible, the continuation of maintenance organisation activities.

2. Description of the issue

In accordance with 145.A.70(a)(12), 145.A.42(b)(i), M.A.604(a)(7), CAO.A.025(a)(10), M.A.501(b) and ML.A.501(a)(i) of Regulation (EU) 1321/2014, as applicable, the approved organisation carrying out maintenance on products or components have to ensure, by complying with adequate procedures included in the exposition or manual (MOE chapter 2.1, MOM chapter 2.8 or CAE chapter C.3), that the necessary components, standard parts and/or material are supplied in satisfactory conditions. When such a procedure includes a recurrent evaluation of a supplier's quality system based on a questionnaire which is periodically sent by the maintenance organisation to the supplier, it is possible that, due to the COVID-19 crisis, the procedure cannot be complied with. In such a case, a temporary change to the procedure (including concessions), in accordance with 145.A.70(b), M.A.604(b) and CAO.A.105(a) 5, as applicable, may be acceptable in order to allow continuation of the activities in compliance with the rules.

3. Considerations for the competent authority (CA)

In accordance with 145.B.35, 145.B.40, M.B.606(c) or CAO.B.065 of said Regulation, the competent authority may approve (direct or indirect) a temporary change to the applicable organisation's procedure to allow an extension of the period for evaluation of the suppliers' performance (when based on a questionnaire sent to supplier) up to 3 months in order to maintain the respective suppliers on the approved list of suppliers, based on a risk assessment which considers at least the following elements:

- confidence in the quality system / organisational review of the maintenance organisation; and
- analysis performed by the maintenance organisation to support the extension, taking into account the criticality of the supplied articles, the results of the previous evaluation of the respective supplier and the supplier's performance.

After the agreed extension period the situation may be reassessed and an additional extension of the initial period up to a maximum of 3 additional months may be envisaged by the CA, following the same process as the one described above (change of the organisation's applicable procedure).

Last updated:

01/07/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116319>

Is there any possibility to temporary extend the validity of NDT personnel certification due to coronavirus (COVID-19) crisis?

Answer

According to the industry standard EN4179, recognised by the EASA via AMC 145.A.30(f) and AMC M.A.606(f) to be used for qualification of NDT personnel, the NDT personnel Level 1, 2 and 3 shall be recertified every 5 years. No flexibility is given by EN4179 to deviate from the specific requirements of EN4179, Chapter 8 related to the recertification of NDT personnel process.

Due to the extraordinary worldwide coronavirus crisis, the recertification requirements might not be fulfilled (examinations). Other impacted processes can be "annual maintenance" and "vision examination" which invalidate the certification if not performed on time.

In these circumstances, the Agency recommends the organisation to agree with the Competent Authority a deviation from the organisation's procedure (e.g. in case of Part-145 to use the normal concession process - deviation from an approved exposition (MOE) for a limited period of time) in case of a need to temporary extend (without fulfilling the normal requirements) the validity of NDT personnel certification, annual maintenance and/or vision examination. The organisation should contact their Competent Authority surveyor and agree on mitigating measures depending on the extent of the concession needed (e.g. EN4179 para. 8.3.2, second and fourth bullet points could offer grounds for mitigation measures).

For standardisation reasons, it is recommended that each National Aerospace NDT Board (NANDTB) together with the corresponding Competent Authority establishes the general scenario to be followed by the organisations (e.g. by an information notice on the NANDTB website or by e-mail etc.). This will be further adapted to the specific case (e.g. in the case of a Part-145 organisation with D1 rating additional mitigation measure could be taken for the NDT personnel who is also certifying staff).

Same principles can be applied by Part-21 Subpart G and F organisations having the NDT personnel qualified/certified i.a.w. EN 4179 when applying the GM 21.A.145(a) or GM No 2 to 21.A.126(a)(3).

Last updated:

16/04/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/112804>

Interpretation and policy papers

What is the EASA policy on Certificates of Release to Service for aircraft maintenance? With respect to such maintenance, what are the responsibilities of maintenance organisations and CAMOs?

Answer

EASA issued on December 17, 2015 a paper to answer these questions; please see the link here: ["EASA policy on Certificates of Release to Service for aircraft maintenance and associated responsibilities of maintenance organisations and CAMOs"](#).

Since that time, several regulations, including the ones below were adopted, amending Commission Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014.:

1. Regulation (EU) 2018/1142, introducing certain categories of aircraft maintenance licences;
2. Regulation (EU) 2019/1383, introducing new Annexes to Commission Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014:
 - Part-CAMO;
 - Part-CAO for non-complex aircraft
 - Part-ML for light aircraft defined in Article 3(2).

The intent of that paper is still valid in describing the principles of EASA's position on the following questions:

- Continuing airworthiness responsibilities, including maintenance (chapter 1)
- How many CRS can or should be issued (chapter 3)
- What does it mean that "there are no non-compliances which are known to endanger flight safety" (chapter 4)

However, questions on roles and responsibilities of certifying staff and support staff (chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8) are now addressed in an updated paper dated March 2023 that is available in [FAQ n° 137750](#).

Last updated:

23/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/46216>

What practice is accepted by EASA to release maintenance on aircraft not covered by the Basic Regulation?

Answer

EASA issued on 20 March 2013 a paper to answer this question (please see link here):

[‘Rulemaking interpretation on “Maintenance release of aircraft not covered by the Basic Regulation”’](#).

Since that time:

- the [Basic Regulation \(Regulation \(EU\) 2018/1139\)](#) was issued, repealing the previous Basic Regulation (Regulation (EC) No 216/2008); and
- [Commission Regulation \(EU\) No 1321/2014](#) was issued, repealing Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003.

However, the intent of that paper is still valid in describing the various practices and EASA’s position on the release of maintenance on aircraft that are aircraft excluded from complying with the airworthiness requirements contained in the Basic Regulation, and in its delegated and implementing acts.

Last updated:

31/10/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/46215>

What is the view of EASA on the transition of existing continuing airworthiness organisations to the new Part-CAO and Part-CAMO organisations?

Answer

Regulation (EU) 2019/1383 amending Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 introduces new types of organisations (Part-CAO and Part-CAMO) in the Continuing Airworthiness domain, as of 24 March 2020.

[This guide](#) offers the view of EASA on the transition of existing continuing airworthiness organisations to the new Part-CAO and Part-CAMO organisations, based on Article 4 of Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 as amended. This is not binding material.

Last updated:

03/11/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/108380>

Regulation (EU) 2021/1963 introduces SMS requirements to Part-145. What is the view of EASA on the transition of these maintenance organisation to the new requirements?

Answer

Regulation (EU) 2021/1963 amends Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 and introduces new requirements for Part-145 approved maintenance organisations, which apply from 02 December 2022.

[This guide](#) offers the view of EASA on the transition of a Part-145 approved maintenance organisation to the new requirements, including SMS, based on Article 4(7) of Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014, as amended by Regulation (EU) 2021/1963.

This is not binding material.

Last updated:

04/07/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136745>

What are the roles and responsibilities of personnel involved in aircraft line and base maintenance?

Answer

EASA issued on March 2023 a paper to answer this question: "[EASA Policy on the roles and responsibilities of personnel involved in aircraft line and base maintenance](#)".

This paper supersedes the chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the paper issued December 2015 that can be found in [FAQ No. 46216](#).

Please refer also to the [Roles and responsibilities of Maintenance personnel webinar](#) that was organised to explain the content of this paper

Last updated:

23/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/137750>

What is the view of EASA on 'paperless maintenance' and on the use of electronic documents, records, and signatures?

Answer

Both European industry and EU Member State competent authorities have requested EASA to prepare guidelines to cover the topic of 'paperless maintenance', aiming to establish some basic standards upon which stakeholders can create their systems under the assumption that these will be recognised as adequate and regulatory-compliant by the competent authorities, at least those participating in the EU-aviation system.

[This guide](#) offers the view of EASA on the use of electronic documents, records, and signatures. This is not binding material.

Last updated:

05/05/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/137907>

Continuing airworthiness - General

Concerning the approval of the continuing airworthiness organisations, what is the sharing of responsibilities between EASA and the national competent authorities of the EASA Member States? How to get the lists of the approved continuing airworthiness organisations?

Answer

In accordance with point 2(b) in Article 77 of the Basic Regulation (i.e. [Regulation \(EU\) 2018/1139 on common rules in the field of civil aviation and establishing a European Union Aviation Safety Agency](#)), EASA is responsible for the organisations whose principal place of business is outside the territories for which the EASA Member States are responsible under the Chicago Convention.

For more information, see the website [Continuing-airworthiness-organisations](#), where the lists of organisations managed by the Agency are available.

This webpage also includes the lists of the Part-145 maintenance organisations managed on the basis of the Bilateral Aviation Safety Agreements (BASAs) with Brazil, Canada and USA.

In all other cases, and in the absence of the implementation of Articles 64 or 65 of the Basic Regulation, the organisation is managed by the national competent authority of the EASA Member State in whose territory the principal place of business of the organisation is located.

Therefore, information request (including on the application process) about those organisations should be directed to the EASA Member State national competent authorities.

You may contact them using information available on <https://www.easa.europa.eu/the-agency/member-states>, or consult their public websites, when they accepted, on a voluntary basis, to publish the lists of the organisations they manage.

The continuing airworthiness organisations concerned are the following:

- Part-145 (Annex II) maintenance organisations
- Part-147 (Annex IV) maintenance training organisations
- Continuing airworthiness management organisations: Part-M Subpart G until **24 September 2021** and Part-CAMO (Annex Vc) from **24 March 2020**
- Part-M Subpart F maintenance organisations until **24 September 2021**
- **From 24 March 2020**, Part-CAO (Annex Vd) combined airworthiness organisations.

Last updated:

31/10/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19067>

Where can I find the continuing airworthiness requirements for third-country registered aircraft used by EU operator/owner?

Answer

The European Implementing Rules for continuing airworthiness (EU) 1321/2014 **do apply** to third-country registered aircraft if:

- The regulatory safety oversight of such aircraft has been delegated to one of the Member States (*), in which case Part-M (Annex I) or Part-ML (Annex Vb) applies [see Article 3(1) of Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014] or
- The aircraft is dry leased-in by an EU licenced air carrier, in which case Part-T (Annex Va) is applicable [see Article 3(6) of Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014].

When third-country registered aircraft are not captured by above-mentioned cases, it is advised to go back to the foundation of the EASA system, namely the Basic Regulation (BR), i.e. [Regulation \(EU\) 2018/1139](#).

Reference should be made to Annex V (**Essential requirements for air operations**) in accordance with Article 29 for the aircraft described in Article 2(1)(b)(ii) (aircraft registered in a third country and operated by an aircraft operator established, residing or with a principal place of business in the territory to which the Treaties apply). **Point 6 in Annex V** of the BR describes air operations requirements related to continuing airworthiness, such as the requirement for release to service, pre-flight inspection, maintenance programme, records, ... Being part of an Annex relevant to air operations, these requirements have to be overseen by the competent authority of the state of the operator.

Furthermore, as required by point 8 of Annex V of the BR, **for commercial air transport and other operations subject to a certification or declaration requirement performed with aeroplanes, helicopters or tilt rotor aircraft**, the continuing airworthiness management and maintenance tasks shall be controlled by an organisation, whose obligations (such as establishment of a management system) are referred to in points 8.8 and 8.9 of Annex V.

(*) – *The transfer of a state's oversight responsibility is addressed in Article 83bis bis of Chicago Convention.*

Last updated:

02/02/2021

Link:

How to use information and communication technologies for performing remote audits on to DOA, LoA/POA, AMO, CAMO, CAO and AMTO holders*?

Answer

Objective of this document:

This document provides technical guidance on the use of remote information and communication technology (ICT) to support:

- the competent authorities when performing the oversight of regulated organisations and
- the industry when conducting internal audits / monitoring compliance of the organisation with the relevant requirement and when performing evaluation of suppliers and subcontractors.

It is the responsibility of the competent authority to assess whether the use of remote ICT constitutes a suitable alternative to the physical presence of the auditor on-site in accordance with the applicable requirements.

In the context of this document, “remote audit” is understood as an audit performed with the use of any real-time video and audio communication tools in replacement of the physical presence of the auditor on-site. Specificities of each type of approval / letter of agreement need to be considered in addition to the below general overview when applying the “remote audit” concept.

1. Conduct of remote audit by a Competent Authority

Competent authorities who decide to use remote audit should describe the remote audit process in their documented procedures and should consider at least the following elements:

- Methodology for the use of ICT is sufficiently flexible and non-prescriptive in nature to optimise the conventional audit process.
- Adequate controls are defined and in place to avoid abuses that could compromise the integrity of the audit process.
- Measures to ensure that security and confidentiality are maintained throughout the audit activities (data protection and intellectual property of the organisations also need to be safeguarded).

Examples of use of ICT during audits may include but are not limited to:

- meetings, by means of teleconference facilities, including audio, video and data sharing;
- assessment of documents and records by means of remote access, in real-time;
- recording, in real-time during the process, of evidence to document the results of the audit (non-/conformities) by means of exchange of emails or documents, instant pictures, video or/and audio recordings;
- visual (livestream video) and audio access to facilities, stores, equipment, tools, processes, operations, etc.

An agreement between the competent authority and the organisation should be established when planning a remote audit which should include:

- determining the platform for hosting the audit (e.g. Go-To-Meeting, WebEx, Microsoft Lync, Microsoft TEAMS, etc.);
- granting security and/or profile access to the auditor;
- testing platform compatibility between the competent authority and organisation prior to the audit;
- considering the use of web-cams, cameras, drones, etc. when physical evaluation of an event (product, part, process, etc.) is desired or necessary;
- establishing an audit plan which will identify how ICT will be used and the extent of its use for the audit purposes to optimise its effectiveness and efficiency while maintaining the integrity of the audit process;
- if necessary, time zone acknowledgement and management to coordinate reasonable and mutually agreeable convening times;
- a written statement of the organisation that they ensure full cooperation and provision of the actual and valid data as requested, including ensuring any supplier or subcontractor cooperation, if needed; and
- data protection aspects.

The following elements of the equipment and setup should be considered:

- the suitability of video resolution, fidelity, and field of view for the verification being conducted;
- the need for multiple cameras, imaging systems, or microphones and whether the person performing the verification can switch between them, or direct them to be switched and has the possibility to stop the process, ask a question, move equipment, etc.;
- the controllability of viewing direction, zoom, and lighting;
- the appropriateness of audio fidelity for the evaluation being conducted; and

- real-time and uninterrupted communication between the person(s) participating to the remote audit from both locations.

When using ICT, the competent authority and other involved persons (e.g. drone pilots, technical experts) should have the competency and ability to understand and utilize the ICT tools employed to achieve the desired results of audit(s)/assessment(s). The competent authority should also be aware of the risks and opportunities of the ICT used and the impacts that they may have on the validity and objectivity of the information gathered.

Audit reports and related records should indicate the extent to which ICT has been used in carrying out remote audit and the effectiveness of ICT in achieving the audit objectives, including any item that was not able to be completely reviewed.

2. Internal Audits performed by approved organisation and evaluation of its suppliers and subcontractors

The considerations described in paragraph 1 may also be applied by approved organisations when conducting internal audits / monitoring compliance of the organisation with the relevant requirements and when performing evaluation of suppliers and subcontractors. The application of “remote audit” concept should be described in a documented procedure accepted / approved by the Competent Authority.

* DOA: Design Organisation Approval; LoA/POA: Letters of Approval/Production Organisation Approval; AMO: Maintenance Organisation Approval; CAMO: Continuing Airworthiness Management Organisations Approval; CAO: Combined Airworthiness Organisation Approval; and AMTO: Maintenance Training Organisation Approval

Last updated:

19/07/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116561>

Can a Pilot-Owner or Flight Crew accomplish an inspection required by an AD?

Answer

The provisions for a Pilot-Owner or Flight Crew to accomplish AD actions are to be found in [Commission Regulation \(EU\) No 1321/2014](#) on the continuing airworthiness of aircraft and aeronautical products, parts and appliances, and on the approval of organisations and personnel involved in these tasks, Annex I (Part-M), Annex II (Part-145), Annex Vb (Part-ML) & Annex Vd (Part-CAO).

For AD tasks carried out by Flight Crew:

- IF INDICATED IN THE AD (*- see Note), THE FOLLOWING APPLIES:

145.A.30(j)3 or M.A.606(h)1 Personnel requirements, or CAO.A.040(c)(1) Certifying staff.

For a repetitive pre-flight task, where the AD specifically states that the flight crew may carry out such task, the organisation (Part-145, Part-M Subpart F or Part-CAO maintenance organisation) may issue a limited certifying staff authorisation to the pilot-in command/aircraft commander on the basis of the flight crew licence held, provided that the organisation ensures that sufficient practical training has been carried out to ensure that such person can accomplish the AD task to the required standard. A repetitive pre-flight task in an AD does not mean that the task needs to be certified prior to each flight. At AD issuance EASA will determine that the task is simple enough and does not require complex tools nor complex instructions, which allows the Maintenance Organisation to authorise the person.

- IF NOT INDICATED IN THE AD, THE FOLLOWING APPLIES:

145.A.30(j)4 or M.A.606(h)2 Personnel requirements, or CAO.A.040(c)(2) Certifying staff.

In the case of aircraft operating away from a supported location the organisation may issue a limited certification authorisation to the pilot-in command/aircraft commander on the basis of the flight crew licence held, provided that the organisation ensures that sufficient practical training has been carried out to ensure that such person can accomplish the specified AD task to the required standard. The organisation's manual shall include specific procedures for such authorisations, and in addition the task must be simple maintenance.

For AD actions performed by Pilot-Owner for aircraft subject to Part-M:

M.A.803 Pilot-owner authorisation

- This is only applicable for other than complex motor-powered aircraft of 2 730 kg MTOM and below, which are not used commercially;
- The accomplishment of an AD task by the Pilot-Owner is permitted only in the case where it is specifically allowed in the AD (* - see Note); and
- Furthermore, it is only permitted to the Pilot-Owner under the conditions of M.A.803 (a) and (b) (limited Pilot-owner maintenance (Appendix VIII to Part-M)).

For AD actions performed by Pilot-Owner for aircraft subject to Part-ML:

ML.A.803 Pilot-owner authorisation

- This is only applicable to aircraft not operated commercially, to balloons not operated under Subpart-ADD of Regulation (EU) 2018/395 or to sailplanes not operated under Subpart DEC of Regulation (EU) 2018/1976;
- The accomplishment of an AD task by the Pilot-Owner is permitted only in the case where it is specifically allowed in the AD (* - see Note); and
- Furthermore, it is only permitted to the Pilot-Owner under the conditions of ML.A.803 (a) and (b) (limited Pilot-owner maintenance (Appendix II to Part-ML)).

* Note: For ADs issued by EASA, when the flight crew / pilot-owner is entitled to carry out the AD task(s) subject to the applicable requirements, the AD will contain a text similar to the following:

The action(s) required by paragraph (x) of this AD may be accomplished, as appropriate: either by suitably authorised flight crew under the provisions of [Commission Regulation \(EU\) No 1321/2014](#) 145.A.30(j)3, M.A.606(h)1, or CAO.A.040(c)(1), as applicable; or by the pilot-owner under the provisions of M.A.803 or ML.A.803, as applicable, of the same regulation.

In respect of aircraft not subject to (EU) No 1321/2014, the State of Registry should consider if the national regulations allow the action(s) to be accomplished by the flight crew or pilot owner.

Last updated:

09/07/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19491>

Bilateral Agreement (BASA) - related to Continuing Airworthiness

When do I need a dual release on FAA Form 8130-3 under EU/US bilateral agreement?

Answer

Under the terms of the EU/US bilateral agreement (BASA) (see [here](#)), a DUAL release is required for acceptance of USED engine/components from an US based repair station.

NOTE: a single EASA release on Form 8130-3 with only "Other regulation specified in block 12" ticked in block 14a is also acceptable for USED engine/components. This is to cover the case where component maintenance includes the installation of a used (sub)component released on an EASA Form 1 with 'single release' only, and therefore where the assembly is not eligible for US-registered aircraft.

CAUTION: DUAL release is not acceptable for 'rebuilt' engine/components because EASA recognises the term 'rebuilt' only as a manufacturing/production release (not a maintenance release) and only for engine.

Last updated:

30/10/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/43770>

Can I import a rebuilt engine and associated components from US?

Answer

Under the terms of the EU/US bilateral agreement (BASA) (see [here](#)), you can import an engine with a 'rebuilt' status in block 11, only when it has been released by the original engine manufacturer on a Form 8130-3 using the blocks 13a. to 13e. (left side).

Please note that Form 8130-3 with 'rebuilt' status are not acceptable for components other than engine (regardless whether it has been released on left or right side) therefore the components accompanying the rebuilt engine should either be released REPAIRED/OVERHAULED... (right side) or NEW (left side).

Last updated:

30/10/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/43771>

What does it mean 'a release document issued by an organisation under the terms of a bilateral agreement signed by the European Union' referred in AMC1 M.A.501(a)(1)/AMC1 145.A.42(a)(i)/AMC1 ML.A.501(a)(ii)?

Answer

AMC1 M.A.501(a)(1)/AMC1 145.A.42(a)(i)/AMC1 ML.A.501(a)(ii) refers to a release document issued by an organisation under the terms of any existing bilateral agreement signed by the European Union. Currently such agreements are signed with:

- [USA](#)
- [Canada](#)
- [Brazil](#)
- [Japan \(limited to design and production\)](#)
- [China \(limited to design and production\)](#)
- [United Kingdom \(limited to design and production\)](#)

Note:

For organisations approved under Part-CAO and Part-M Subpart F the situation is different. Credit can be taken for their technical capabilities and their competent authority oversight (FAA and TCCA). This situation is explained in AMC1 CAO.A.070(a) paragraph 2.8 and AMC M.A.613(a) paragraph 2.8.

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19057>

What kind of release document is considered equivalent to an EASA Form 1 under the terms of the US-EU Bilateral safety agreement? (AMC1 M.A.501(a)(1)/AMC1 145.A.42(a)(i)/AMC1 ML.A.501(a)(ii)/AMC1 CAO.A.070(a))

Answer

Under the terms of an EU/US bilateral agreement (BASA) (see [here](#)):

Acceptance of NEW engine/components (and rebuilt engines) is governed by the Technical Implementation Procedure (TIP). The general principle is to accept such engine/components when released new on FAA Form 8130-3 using the blocks 13a to 13e (left side). Please refer to Section VII (from para 7.7 on) of the TIP for the detailed conditions under which this is acceptable.

Acceptance of USED engine/components from an US based repair station is governed by the Maintenance Annex Guidance (MAG). The general principle is to accept such engine/components when subject to 'dual release' on FAA Form 8130-3 (except where the component is not eligible for U.S.-registered aircraft), using the blocks 14a to 14e (right side).

- Block 11 should provide the status of the component (e.g. 'overhauled')
- Block 12 should include (or refer to) detailed information on the work performed, the associated approved data (e.g. 'Overhauled in accordance with CMM 111, Section X, Rev 2, S/B 23 and FAA AD xyz complied with') as well as the EASA

Part-145 statement and approval number.

- Block 14 should at least show "Other regulation specified in block 12" ticked

Please refer to Appendix 1 of section B, paragraph 10 (Release and acceptance of components) of the MAG for the detailed conditions under which this is acceptable.

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19058>

What are the component release documents acceptable for installing a component (on aircraft or on a higher assembly) and releasing associated maintenance under EASA Part-145 regulation?

Answer

The [linked reference table](#) provides a table summarising the component release documents (FAA Form 8130-3, TCCA Form One, ANAC Form F-100-01...) acceptable to an EASA Part-145 organisation, depending on where such organisation is located and from which regulatory system the component is coming.

Last updated:

10/09/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/66700>

Part-M

Part-M: General

Continuing airworthiness management for each type of operator/ aircraft

Answer

		CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT
Commercial operations	Licensed air carriers ^[1]	Continuing airworthiness shall be performed by a CAMO. Operator shall be CAMO approved (CAMO linked to the AOC).
	Commercial specialised operations or CAT operations other than licensed air carriers or commercial ATOs	Continuing airworthiness shall be performed by a CAMO. Operator shall obtain CAMO approval, or operator shall contract a CAMO
Other than commercial operations	Complex motor-powered aircraft ^[2]	Continuing airworthiness shall be performed by a CAMO. Owner shall contract a CAMO
	Other than complex motor-powered aircraft (CMPA) and limited operations ^[3]	Continuing airworthiness management may be performed by the owner. CAMO is not required.

[1] Licensed air carriers are EU air carriers holding an operating licence in accordance with Regulation (EC) 1008/2008

[2] Twin turboprop aeroplanes of 5 700 kg MTOM and below can be exempted by the Member State from complying with any requirements applicable to CMPA and shall instead comply with the requirements applicable to other than CMPA.

[3] Limited operations are defined in Regulation (EU) 1312/2014 Article 2(p).

Last updated:

07/10/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19038>

Can an independent certifying staff maintain non-complex motor-powered aircraft used by commercial ATO or commercial DTO?

Answer

No, non-complex motor-powered aircraft used by commercial ATO or commercial DTO cannot be maintained by independent certifying staff because in accordance with M.A.201(h) or ML.A.201(e)(2), these aircraft require maintenance release by an approved maintenance organisation (Part-CAO with maintenance privilege, Part-M Subpart F or Part-145).

Note: 'GM1 ML.A.201(e)' provides examples of aircraft not considered to be operated by a commercial ATO or a commercial DTO.

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19041>

Which are the correct statements to be written in block 11 of EASA Form 1 after maintenance?

Answer

Appendix II to Part-M describes the following 4 permissible entries in block 11 of EASA Form 1:

- Overhauled,
- Repaired
- Inspected/tested
- Modified

The meaning of "Inspected/Tested" status is inspected and/or, if applicable, tested as it described in provisions of Part-M/Part-145. Besides that, block 12 in the EASA Form 1 should contain the detailed information on the status/work described in block 11.

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19044>

Can a licenced pilot without a valid medical certificate perform pilot-owner maintenance?

Answer

This question arises because of the different understandings of license validity in Commission Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011

This question arises because of the different understandings of license validity in Commission Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 (Aircrew) and No 1321/2014 (Continuing Airworthiness).

In Reg. (EU) 1321/2014, the pilot-owner authorisation described in M.A.803 or ML.A.803 assumes that a pilot has sufficient technical knowledge to perform certain maintenance tasks. While exercising such pilot-owner authorisation, the pilot-owner even further develops his/her competency in maintenance. Hence, in the case where the medical examination has not been conducted or not been passed and the licence has therefore lost its validity, it is the intent of the rule to allow the pilot-owner to continue using this authorisation as long as he/she still considers himself/herself physically fit (including good visual acuity) and competent to carry out such maintenance (ref. point (a)(2) of Appendix VIII to Part-M or Appendix II of Part-ML).

This is the reason why a new point (5) was introduced in AMC M.A.803 in 2016 (ED Decision 2016/011/R) stating: "not holding a valid medical examination does not invalidate the pilot licence (or equivalent) required for the purpose of the pilot-owner authorisation". For Part-ML the same information can be found in AMC1 ML.A.803 (ED Decision 2020/002/R).

Last updated:

02/02/2021

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47722>**What are the responsibilities relevant to pre-flight inspection?****Answer**

The pre-flight inspection forms part of the essential requirements for air operation, as required in Annex V (point 6.2) of the 'Basic Regulation' (Regulation (EU) 2018/1139). Being relevant to the aircraft's fitness for the intended flight, this essential requirement is implemented by the Commission Regulation (EU) 1321/2014 for continuing airworthiness in the following way:

Reference	Obligation	Who	Remark
M.A.201(d) ML.A.201(d)	Carry out pre-flight inspection satisfactorily	Part-M: Pilot-in-command or, in case of Licensed Air Carrier, a qualified staff under the responsibility of the operator (e.g. maintenance staff - see note) Part-ML: Pilot-in-command or a qualified person under the responsibility of the pilot-in-command	
M.A.301(a)/ ML.A.301(a)	Ensure pre-flight inspection is carried out	Owner or CA(M)O (according to M.A.201/ML.A.201)	
M.A.301(a)/ ML.A.301(a)	Ensure pre-flight inspection includes the actions necessary to ensure that the aircraft is fit to carry out the intended flight	Owner or CA(M)O (according to M.A.201/ML.A.201)	AMC M.A.301(a) points (1) and (2) elaborates those actions
M.A.301(a)/ ML.A.301(a)	If a/c managed by CA(M)O: Provide training to ensure that pre-flight inspection is carried out adequately [AMC M.A.301(a) point (3)]	CA(M)O	Pre-flight inspection training described in the CAME part 1.11 or CAE part D.6
Additional information:			
M.A.712(b)/ CAMO.A.200(a) (3)/ CAO.A.100(b)	If a/c managed by CA(M)O: Ensure pre-flight inspection is subject to the quality system/compliance monitoring [AMC M.A.301(a) point (3)]	CA(M)O	This is important because the pre-flight inspection contributes in feeding the process of aircraft continuing airworthiness

Note:

As per the definition of 'maintenance' in article 2 (h) of Commission Regulation (EU) 1321/2014, 'pre-flight inspection' (as defined in article 2(j)) is not considered maintenance. Therefore, it does not require a certificate of release to service [M.A.201(d)/ML.A.201(d)].

Last updated:

02/02/2021

Link:

Do declared training organisations (DTO) need a CAMO/CAO and approved maintenance organisations?**Answer**

Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 was amended in July 2018 to introduce Part-DTO as regards to declared training organisations (ref. Reg. (EU) 2018/1119). Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 was therefore amended and aligned the Continuing Airworthiness obligations of ATO with those of DTO.

This means:

		Complex motor-powered aircraft	Other than complex motor-powered aircraft
Applicable requirement		M.A.201(f) is applicable	M.A.201(h) or, for aircraft specified in Article 3(2), ML.A.201(e) are applicable
Commercial DTO	Continuing airworthiness management	CAMO is required	CAO (with continuing airworthiness management privilege) or CAMO is required
	Maintenance	Part-145 organisation is required	CAO (with maintenance privilege) or Part-145 or Part-M Subpart F organisation is required
	Applicable requirement	M.A.201(g) is applicable	M.A.201(i) or, for aircraft specified in Article 3(2), ML.A.201(f) are applicable
Non-Commercial DTO	Continuing airworthiness management	CAMO is required	CAMO is not required CAO (with continuing airworthiness management privilege) is not required
			With the exception of complex maintenance tasks under Part-M:
	Maintenance	Part-145 organisation is required	CAO (with maintenance privilege) is not required Part-145 organisation not required Part-M Subpart F organisation is not required

Please also refer to GM1 ML.A.201(e) which provides examples of aircraft not considered to be operated by a commercial ATO or a commercial DTO.

Last updated:

02/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/65445>

Airworthiness review

Can an airworthiness review certificate (ARC)/recommendation be issued after an airworthiness review with open findings?

Answer

Neither an ARC nor a recommendation can be issued with open findings. Each finding requires a corrective action before the issue of the ARC or recommendation. The corrective action should be adequate to the open finding and it should be carried out and verified by the airworthiness review staff (ARS) before the issue of the ARC/ recommendation.

Last updated:

15/12/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19048>

Can the extension of an ARC be anticipated more than 30 days?

Answer

Assuming the aircraft satisfies the conditions for extension established in M.A.901 or ML.A.901, 30 days is the maximum allowed period for which the ARC extension can be anticipated without losing the continuity of the airworthiness review pattern. This means that the new expiry date is established as one year after the previous expiry date (AMC M.A.901(c)2, (e)2 and (f), ML.A.901(d)).

If the extension is anticipated by more than 30 days, the new expiry date will be established as one year after the date of extension.

Last updated:

06/09/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19050>

Can airworthiness review staff (ARS) qualified under point CAMO.A.310 perform an airworthiness review of an aircraft on which they have previously released maintenance as certifying staff?

Answer

Point CAMO.A.310(a)(4) of Annex Vc (Part-CAMO) to [Commission Regulation \(EU\) No 1321/2014](#) establishes that airworthiness review staff (ARS) in a Part-CAMO organisation must have a position within the approved organisation with appropriate responsibilities.

According to point (e) of AMC1 CAMO.A.310(a), an acceptable means to show compliance in respect of such position is to demonstrate independence from the airworthiness management process of the affected aircraft (this is to avoid possible conflict of interest). In the case where ARS qualified in accordance with point CAMO.A.310 is employed by an organisation holding both CAMO and maintenance organisation (Part-145 or Part-CAO) approvals, the second bullet point under point (e) of AMC1 CAMO.A.310(a) further specifies that this person should not have been involved in the release of the maintenance for the aircraft intended to undergo the airworthiness review, except in one of the following cases:

1. such maintenance has been released as required during the airworthiness review's physical survey of the aircraft (e.g. release necessary after visual inspections requiring panel opening); or
2. such maintenance has been released as a result of findings discovered during the physical survey of the aircraft (defect rectification).

In other cases where the CAMO ARS happens to be employed as certifying staff (CS) at another maintenance organisation, or happens to work as independent CS, the European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) recommends the CAMO ARS to ensure absence of conflict of interest before allowing them to conduct the airworthiness review on aircraft on which they have previously released maintenance.

Remark

Point M.A.901(l) or point ML.A.903(b) of Annex I (Part-M) to Commission Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014: When the ARS is not qualified as CS, they must be assisted by CS in case maintenance needs to be released during the physical survey of the aircraft.

Last updated:

11/09/2025

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19049>

Can the airworthiness review certificate (ARC) of the Part-M aircraft be extended during the extensive maintenance/long term storage?

Answer

An ARC extension could be performed as long as:

1. the conditions established for controlled environment (M.A.901 (b)) are met. This means:
 - a. continuously managed during the previous 12 months by a unique CAMO or CAO, and
 - b. maintained for the previous 12 months by Part-145, Part-M Subpart F or Part-CAO organisations.

AND

2. there is no evidence or reason to believe that the aircraft is not airworthy, as stated in M.A.901(j).

Thus, the procedure for the extension established in the CAMO or CAO has to address verification of the compliance with 3 above mentioned conditions. An aircraft going through the lengthy maintenance/modification or long-term storage is not considered to meet the condition number 2.

Last updated:

29/01/2021

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19062>

Is an aircraft considered to be in controlled environment at the end of the ARC validity when that aircraft was received by the CA(M)O during the 90/30 days anticipation of the ARC issue/extension performed by the preceding CA(M)O?

Answer

CA(M)O 1 uses the anticipation when performing the airworthiness review or extension for 90 or 30 days correspondingly. After the issue or extension of the ARC, the aircraft is transferred during the anticipation period from CA(M)O 1 to CA(M)O 2. As the consequence CA(M)O 2 has solely continuously managed the aircraft for more than 12 months due to the term of the validity of the ARC accordingly being more than 12 months. Are the requirements of the M.A.901(b) point 1 satisfied?

The intent of the point M.A.901(b) point 1 is to define the 'controlled environment' (see also ML.A.901(c)(1)) by indicating that the aircraft must be managed during last 12 months by unique CA(M)O, which indirectly refers to a standard term of validity of the ARC. Therefore, if the aircraft has been managed by more than one CA(M)O since the date of issue of the last ARC or the date of issue of the ARC extension, it actually indicates that controlled environment was discontinued.

In addition, in accordance with M.A.901(n) or ML.A.903(d) the 90 days anticipation for the ARC issue shall be used to allow the physical review to be performed during a maintenance check. Hence the intention of the rule is not to address the transfer of the aircraft within those 90 days with the purpose of avoiding the forthcoming airworthiness review.

Concerning the ARC extension and its 30 days anticipation, point M.A.901(f) [AMC M.A.901(c)2, (e)2 and (f)] or ML.A.901(d) are intended for 2 consecutive extensions by the same CA(M)O managing the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft from the date of issue of the ARC. Therefore, an ARC extended for the first time by an organisation cannot be extended a 2nd time by another organisation, because this constitutes a 'breach' in controlled environment.

Last updated:

29/01/2021

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19063>

Are EASA Forms 1 required during the import in the EU of an aircraft subject to Part-M?**Answer**

For the import of an aircraft in the EU under Part-M regime, the provisions of M.A.904 require the accomplishment of an airworthiness review in accordance with point M.A.901.

Note: AMC M.A.904(a)(2) defines specific elements to be considered for imported aircraft.

However, when performing the airworthiness review of an imported aircraft in accordance with point M.A.901 and its AMC, it may happen that 'AMC M.A.901(k)' is not fully satisfied in which certain components subject to the review may not hold an EASA Form 1 (or equivalent under a bilateral agreement). In such a case, other component releases to service or serviceable tags may be acceptable for the competent authority of the importing Member State.

Nevertheless, it is important to ensure that the information required by M.A.305(c) and (d) related to the status of ADs, life accumulated by life-limited parts and time-controlled components, modifications and repairs is available.

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19060>

Technical records**Is there any European requirement to maintain the back-to-birth traceability for any component fitted to an European aircraft?****Answer**

The term "back to birth" is not used in European regulations. The requirements that apply to a life-limited part or a service life-limited component (see definition in ML.A.503(a)) are basically stated in M.A.305 (d)&(e) or ML.A.305(e). All detailed maintenance records of a maintenance action (e.g. a restoration) must be kept until another maintenance action equivalent in scope (another restoration) is done, but never less than 36 months. Keep in mind that:

- a life-limited part or service life-limited component log card must be kept with all the relevant information, so the action should be recorded there, and
- the records showing compliance with other requirements stated in M.A.305 or ML.A.305, e.g. an airworthiness directive, or any other information that could be affecting the configuration of the aircraft, must be retained too.

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19043>

What does the term "detailed maintenance records" mean?**Answer**

There has been a certain confusion about the understanding of "detailed maintenance records", because this term is used in a different context for continuing airworthiness management and approved maintenance organisation (AMO).

"Detailed maintenance records" as defined in M.A.614, 145.A.55(c) or CAO.A.90(a) are required to be kept by an AMO (respectively Part-M/F organisation, Part-145 organisation or CAO with maintenance privileges). Maintenance organisations are required to retain all detailed records in order to be able to demonstrate that they maintained aircraft and components in compliance with applicable requirements (see also remark).

"Detailed maintenance records" as defined in M.A.305(e)(2) or ML.A.305(h)(1) are those records, coming from the AMO1 having


performed maintenance, required to be kept by the owner/operator (or the CAMO or CAO with Continuing airworthiness management privileges when required by M.A.201 or ML.A.201) allowing to determine the aircraft configuration, the airworthiness status of the aircraft and all components installed, as well as to plan future maintenance as required by the AMP, based on the last accomplishment.

Consequently, the AMO should transmit to the owner/operator/CA(M)O a certain subset of the AMO maintenance records, including the certificates of release to service and repair/modification data related to the performed maintenance, so that the owner/operator/CA(M)O can demonstrate compliance with M.A.305 or ML.A.305.

Not all AMO maintenance records need to be transferred from the AMO to the owner/operator unless they specifically contain information relevant to aircraft configuration/status and future maintenance. Thus, incoming certificates of conformity, batch number references and individual task card sign-offs verified by and/or generated by the maintenance organisation are not required to be transferred to the owner/operator/CA(M)O. However, dimensional information contained in the task card sign-offs or work packages may need to be transferred and kept by the owner/ operator.

It is to be noted that the record-retention period requirements are slightly different for the AMO and the CAMO and CAO with Continuing airworthiness management privileges. The AMO shall retain the records for 3 years, whereas the CAMO and CAO with Continuing airworthiness management privileges has to retain their records until they are superseded by new information (equivalent in scope and detail), but not less than 3 years. The starting point in both cases is when the aircraft or component maintenance has been released.

Remark: It is considered a best practice as part of the AMO record-keeping system, (and it is also required by certain competent authorities) to record information (e.g. batch number or other tracking reference) relevant to the identification of all standard parts and material used during any maintenance. This practice may limit safety and industrial risks in the case where a batch is recalled by the manufacturer. Such record does not need to be transmitted to the owner/operator/CAMO/CAO with Continuing airworthiness management privileges.



*: Transmitted records is a subset of AMO maintenance records provided to the CA(M)O. Certain transmitted records do not need to be kept as a record by the CA(M)O such as EASA Form 1 for a component with no scheduled maintenance task selected and not subject to AD or modification/repair.

** : by new information equivalent in scope and detail

¹Or pilot-owner [M.A.803 or ML.A.803], or independent certifying staff [M.A.801(b)point 1 or ML.A.801(b)(2)]

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19042>

Is there an obligation to keep the EASA Form 1 for on-condition components?

Answer

There is no specific requirement to retain the EASA Form 1 of such components unless needed to comply with the requirements set forth in M.A.305(e) or ML.A.305(h) for determining the continuing airworthiness and configuration of the aircraft.

Last updated:

02/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19103>

AMP (Aircraft Maintenance Programme)

What are the main principles governing the development of the AMP under Part-ML?

Answer

For aircraft complying with Part-ML (refer to Article 3(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014, the AMP should be based either on the applicable ICA or on the Minimum Inspection Programme (MIP) defined in ML.A.302(d).

The owner, when she/he has not contracted the continuing airworthiness management to a CAMO or CAO [see ML.A.201(f)], should 'declare' the AMP assuming responsibility for its content. Such declared AMP does not need to be sent to the competent authority. Except for the mandatory requirements (see also remark below) the owner may decide, under his/her full responsibility, to deviate from the applicable scheduled maintenance recommendations (including ICA if the AMP is not based on the MIP) without the need to justify such deviation(s) (**see GM1 ML.A.302**).

If the aircraft is managed by a CAMO or CAO, such organisation should 'approve' the AMP. Deviations from the applicable scheduled maintenance recommendations (including ICA if the AMP is not based on the MIP) should be justified and properly recorded.

In both scenarios though (AMP declared by owner or approved by CAMO/CAO), when the AMP is not based on the MIP, the deviations to the applicable ICA **shall not result in a less restrictive** task than the corresponding MIP task. A clear overview of the different options for the development (including the source of information and potential customisation) and approval of such an AMP is provided by 'GM1 ML.A.201', 'GM2 ML.A.302'.

In addition, the AMP shall be reviewed annually. For declared AMP, this review should be done by the person who performs the airworthiness review during its accomplishment (see AMC1 ML.A.302(c)(9)). For approved AMP, the review can be done either by the Airworthiness Review Staff (ARS) during the airworthiness review or by the CAMO itself.

If during the airworthiness review it is observed that there are discrepancies on the aircraft linked to deficiencies in the content of the aircraft maintenance programme, the AMP must be amended. The competent authority shall be informed in the case where the ARS does not agree with the measures taken to amend the AMP.

Remarks:

In accordance with ML.A.302 and in particular ML.A.302(c)(4), the AMP, declared or approved, shall in all cases include all the mandatory maintenance/continuing airworthiness requirements, such as repetitive Airworthiness Directives or the Airworthiness Limitation Section (ALS).

References:

Please refer also to 'AMC2 ML.A.302' (EASA Form AMP), 'GM1 ML.A.302' and 'AMC1 ML.A.302(d)' (content of MIP).

Last updated:

21/06/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/43423>

When does the calendar interval for the next aircraft or component maintenance task start?**Answer**

In a normal scenario :

- The date of signing the certificate of release to service (CRS) should be considered to be the date of the accomplishment.
- The next due date should be calculated using this date.

However, there may be different considerations that render the normal scenario no longer applicable. For example:

Case 1: The interval of the maintenance task has been previously subject to a one-time extension using an approved procedure included in the aircraft maintenance programme (refer to Appendix I to AMC M.A.302 point 4) normally called 'permitted variation' or 'tolerance'. In this case the next due date should be calculated using the previous due date (as opposed to accomplishment date) or as agreed by the competent authority.

For aircraft regulated by Part-ML the situation is different when applying the tolerance of 1 month foreseen in ML.A.302(d), the next interval shall be calculated from the accomplishment date (refer to ML.A.302(d)(1) and AMC1 ML.A.302(d)).

Case 2: The maintenance task refers to a component maintenance task, for example the landing gear overhaul. In this case the start of the interval would be the date of the release to service after the overhaul of the landing gear or in some particular cases when specified in the maintenance data the interval may start from the date of installation on aircraft.

Case 3: The task is released as part of a maintenance check/visit, where the duration of the check/visit is significant compared to the interval of the task. In this case, there may be significant difference between date of accomplishment and date of release. For example, a check/visit that lasts for 2 months and an inspection that has an interval of 3 months. In this case, either the task is carried out on the last days of the maintenance check/visit and the next due date is calculated from the CRS, or the task is carried out at the beginning of the visit and the next due date should be calculated from the date of accomplishment.

There may be other examples, but the key principle is to use sound engineering judgment and the guidance provided in the Instructions for Continuing Airworthiness to calculate the next due date.

Last updated:

02/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19102>

When should I revise my Aircraft Maintenance Programme (AMP)?**Answer****Part-M:**

In accordance with M.A.302(h), the Aircraft Maintenance Programme (AMP) shall be subject to 'periodic reviews' and amended accordingly when necessary.

This means that the owner/operator/CA(M)O should review at a regular interval:

- new/modified maintenance instructions by the TC holder,
- modifications and repairs embodied in the particular a/c, which may require compliance to additional maintenance instructions (by Design Approval Holder),
- in-service experience collected for the particular a/c or for the fleet and
- changes in the type and specificity of operations.

Such a review allows to determine if an AMP revision is necessary to still comply with the obligations of M.A.302(h), and ensure that the AMP continues to be valid in light of the operating experience. As a minimum, point (3) of AMC M.A.302 states it should be at least annually.

However, this should not prevent amending the AMP outside of this formal periodic review, when a specific need arises. This may depend for example on in-service experience (e.g. adverse trend), nature of instruction revisions (e.g. significant reduction of TBO (time between overhaul)), the extent of instruction revisions (amount of affected tasks) as well as source of instruction

revisions (e.g. MRBR, ALS, etc.)

When a revision of the ALS (Airworthiness Limitation Section) introduces a new or more restrictive task, EASA has the policy to issue an AD (Airworthiness Directive). Such an AD would typically mandate on one side the revised task accomplishment and on the other side the revision of the AMP itself, together with a compliance time for these two actions.

However, in accordance with point (3) of AMC M.A.302, EASA recommends to review the AMP as soon as possible in this case to avoid a disconnection between accomplished maintenance task(s) and maintenance task(s) listed in the AMP.

If the aircraft's continuing airworthiness is being managed by a CA(M)O, the CA(M)E (Continuing Airworthiness Management Exposition/Combined Airworthiness Exposition) should describe the AMP revision policy (including 'periodic review') under point 1.2 [Appendix V to AMC M.A.704], point 1.2 [AMC1 CAMO.A.300] or point D.3 [AMC1 CAO.A.025].

Remark: In the case where the source documents are amended without having an effect on the AMP content, it is acceptable to use an indirect approval procedure (if granted by the competent authority in accordance with M.A.302(c)) to amend the relevant source document references in the AMP.

Part-ML:

ML.A.302(c)(9) requires an annual review of the AMP.

For aircraft regulated by Part-ML the review of the AMP may be carried out with the airworthiness review (AR) of the aircraft by the person who performs such AR.

Such a review allows to determine if an AMP revision is necessary to still comply with the obligations of ML.A.302(c) or ML.A.302(d) and ensure that the AMP or MIP continues to be valid in light of the operating experience. As a minimum, ML.A.302(c)(9) states it should be at least annually.

However, this should not prevent amending the AMP outside of this formal periodic review, when a specific need arises. This may depend for example on in-service experience (e.g. adverse trend), nature of instruction revisions (e.g. significant reduction of TBO (time between overhaul)), the extent of instruction revisions (amount of affected tasks) as well as source of instruction revisions (e.g. MRBR, ALS, etc.)

However, in accordance with ML.A.302(c)(9), EASA recommends to review the AMP as soon as possible in this case to avoid a disconnection between accomplished maintenance task(s) and maintenance task(s) listed in the AMP.

If the aircraft's continuing airworthiness is being managed by a CA(M)O, the CA(M)E (Continuing Airworthiness Management Exposition/Combined Airworthiness Exposition) should describe the AMP revision policy (including 'periodic review') under point 1.2 [Appendix V to AMC M.A.704], point 1.2 [AMC1 CAMO.A.300] or point D.3 [AMC1 CAO.A.025].

Remark:

AMP regulated by Part-ML are declared by the owner or approved by the CAMO or CAO (ML.A.302(b)).

Last updated:

02/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47406>

Can a competent authority require the owner/CAMO/CAO to include national requirements in the Aircraft Maintenance Programme (AMP), based on M.A.302(d)(1)?

Answer

Although the Member State's competent authorities are responsible for approving the AMP, the intention of the rule is that they should not impose aeronautical instructions (such as national requirements) in addition to the instructions for continuing airworthiness (ICA) issued by the design approval holder during the certification process with the Agency. The Agency is, on behalf of the Member States, the competent authority for initial airworthiness as per Article 77(1) of [Regulation \(EU\) 2018/1139](#) (the EASA 'Basic Regulation'). Following M.A.302(d)(2), those ICA shall be the basis to develop an AMP.

Nevertheless, competent authorities may issue alternate instructions to ICA when such instructions aim to offer flexibility to the operator [AMC M.A.302(d) point (2)].

Additionally, the mentioned AMC facilitates the rare case, where there has been no ICA issued by the design approval holder for a particular aircraft, modification, repair or STC (Supplemental Type Certificate): competent authorities may issue relevant instructions for the AMP in this case.

Remarks:

- The airworthiness (initial and continuing) of the aircraft for which the Basic Regulation is not applicable, has to comply solely with the national rules of the state of registry; and
- There is no equivalent of US CFR Title 14 Part-43 Appendix E/Part-91 (§91.411) or Part-43 Appendix F/Part-91 (§91.413) in the EU system.

Last updated:

02/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47696>

How is it possible to escalate AMP task intervals?

Answer

Part-M

General:

Some general expectations for escalation initiatives are described in the following paragraph:

- a) It should be ensured that the AMP continues to be valid in light of the operating experience [M.A.302(h) – see FAQ n.47406].
- b) It should form part of the analysis of the effectiveness of the AMP (if required by M.A.301(e)),
- c) The AMP should include a procedure to manage the escalation of established intervals [AMC M.A.302 point (4) and point (2) of AMC M.B.301(c)].

Supported by a formal reliability programme if required by M.A.302(g) or voluntarily implemented [AMC M.A.302(d) point (6)] or collection and analysis of in-service experience.

'Appendix I to AMC M.A.302 and AMC M.B.301(b)' provides detailed guidelines for the integration of this information into the AMP.

- d) If there is a CA(M)O involved, those points also have to be emphasised within the CA(M)E, as specified in Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704, AMC1 CAMO.A.300 or AMC1 CAO.A.025.

Two different cases:

The escalation of AMP task intervals falls into the alternative instructions proposed by the owner/CA(M)O [M.A.302(e)] and distinguishes in the following cases:

Case 1:

Escalation of safety-related task intervals, which consist of all mandatory tasks (Airworthiness Limitation Section) as well as certain non-mandatory tasks issued by the DAH (Design Approval Holder) such as various MRBR (Maintenance Review Board Report) tasks [see note below], tasks related to emergency equipment, critical components...

Case 2:

Escalation of non-safety-related task (e.g. non-safety related MRBR task or a task recommended by a Service Letter) intervals

Note:

In cases, where the aircraft type has been subjected to the MRB process, the following MRBR tasks should be considered safety-related:

- Failure Effect Category (FEC) '5' (evident safety) and '8' (hidden safety) tasks (systems and powerplant)
- SSI (Structural Significant Item) tasks

- L/HIRF (Lightning / High Intensity Radiated Field) tasks (as applicable)
- Stand-alone EWIS tasks (EZAP procedure)

Escalation approval:

The approval of a task escalations is addressed separately for each case:

Regarding case 1:

1.1 Escalation of mandatory tasks represents a change of the initial type design and therefore must be discussed and agreed between the DAH and the Agency*.

1.2 The AMP revision proposal and the information used to substantiate the escalation of non-mandatory tasks [AMC M.B.301(b) (6)] have to be evaluated by the competent authority [AMC M.B.301(b) point (2)]. Following a positive evaluation, a direct approval of the AMP revision will be issued by the competent authority, as stated in M.A.302(e).

Regarding case 2:

An **indirect approval** of the AMP through a CA(M)O is possible and described in more detail in [FAQ n.19061](#).

* *Exception may exist under certain condition for Two Star CMR (Certification Maintenance Requirement) (see AMC 25-19).*

Remarks:

- In all cases, task de-escalation may need to be considered based on the supporting data [AMC M.A.302(g) point (4)].
- Escalation should not be confused with 'permitted variations' to AMP intervals, which applies to a unique aircraft for a unique occasion [Appendix I to AMC M.A.302 point (4)].

Part-ML

General:

Some general expectations for escalation initiatives are described in the following paragraph:

- It should be ensured that the AMP continues to be valid in light of the operating experience [[ML.A.302(c)(9) – see FAQ n.47406].
- The effectiveness of the AMP should be assessed at least by an annual review [ML.A.302(c)(9)].
- The AMP may include additional maintenance actions [ML.A.302(c)(3)] supported by collection and analysis of in-service experience.

'GM1 ML.A.302(c)(3)' provides detailed guidelines for the integration of this information into the AMP.

- If there is a CA(M)O involved, those points also have to be emphasised within the CA(M)E, as specified in Appendix V to AMC M.A.704, AMC1 CAMO.A.300 or AMC1 CAO.A.025.

Two different cases:

The escalation of AMP task intervals falls into the alternative instructions proposed by the owner/CA(M)O [GM1 ML.A.302(c)(2) (b)] and distinguishes in the following cases:

Case 1:

Escalation of safety-related task intervals, which consist of all mandatory tasks (Airworthiness Limitation Section) as well as certain non-mandatory tasks issued by the DAH (Design Approval Holder), tasks related to emergency equipment, critical components...

Case 2:

Escalation of non-safety-related task (e.g. task recommended by a Service Letter) intervals

Escalation approval:

The approval of the escalation is carried out by the CAMO or CAO [ML.A.302(b)(2)]. For declared AMP no approval is needed [ML.A.302(b)(1)].

Remarks:

- In all cases, task de-escalation may need to be considered based on the supporting data.

- Escalation should not be confused with 'permitted variations' to AMP intervals, which applies to a unique aircraft for a unique occasion [GM1 ML.A.302(c)(3)].

Last updated:

02/02/2021

Link:
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/48248>

What kind of alternative (other than escalation) or additional instructions can be introduced in the AMP?

Answer

For guidance on the escalation of AMP task intervals, please refer to [FAQ no.48248](#).

Examples of alternative/additional instructions to the Design Approval Holder's (DAH) Instructions for Continuing Airworthiness (ICA) are listed below [see point (7) of AMC M.A.302(d):

1. De-escalation of task intervals (i.e. 'more restrictive intervals'). Regardless of the source of the task, this may be eligible to indirect approval [see [FAQ n.19061](#)].
2. Additional scheduled maintenance tasks selected by the operator on voluntary basis (e.g. operator policy for interiors), or manufacturer recommendations outside ICA (e.g. Service Letter) linked to product improvements or maintenance practices... Depending on their nature, those tasks may be added, changed and deleted through the indirect approval [see [FAQ n.19061](#)].

Remark:

Additional and de-escalated tasks may originate from the reliability programme as indicated in point (4) of AMC M.A.302(g).

3. Concerning changes in task type (e.g. from General Visual Inspection to Detailed Inspection, or from Operational Check to Functional Check), by analogy with the escalation [see [FAQ no.48248](#)] EASA recommends that for safety-related tasks such changes are directly approved by the competent authority. For non-safety related tasks, the competent authority may accept an indirect approval.

For Part-ML aircraft, the principles of the AMP development are described in [FAQ n.43423](#).

Last updated:

02/02/2021

Link:
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/48249>
CAMO (Continuing Airworthiness Management Organisation)

Are deputies to nominated persons required in CAMO or CAO?

Answer

Part-M Subpart G, Part-CAMO and Part-CAO do not contain specific requirements for the identification of deputies to "nominated persons" as it is foreseen in Part-145 (145.A.30(b)(4)).

Nevertheless, the CAMO or CAO needs to take into account the conditions for the continued validity of the approval laid down in M.A.715, CAMO.A.135 or CAO.A.110, in particular in case of findings or in case of changes.

The CAMO or CAO should ensure that they remain in compliance even during short/medium absence of the nominated persons, this could be achieved by identifying in the CAME or CAE "one or several deputies" and the conditions under which the deputies will assume such responsibility. For longer absence of the nominated person, it is recommended to identify a new nominated person. For Part-M Subpart G organisations, the nomination and acceptance by the competent authority is done using the EASA Form 4. For Part-CAMO and Part-CAO approvals no EASA Form 4 is foreseen and the acceptance by the competent authority is formalised by the approval of an amendment to the exposition.

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19046>

Under which condition can a CAMO or CAO use the indirect approval procedure to amend AMP (Aircraft Maintenance Programme) task(s) under Part-M?

Answer

The indirect approval procedures may only be used for:

- non-safety-related tasks as described in case 2 of [FAQ n.48248](#) and example 3 of [FAQ n.48249](#)
- de-escalated tasks as described in example 1 of [FAQ n.48249](#)
- additional tasks as described in example 2 of [FAQ n.48249](#)
- editorial issues, typos, etc., (without having an effect on the AMP content)

In such case, as required by M.A.302(c) and M.B.301(c), the CAME (Continuing Airworthiness Management Exposition) or CAE (Combined Airworthiness Exposition) must include, and the competent authority shall approve, a procedure describing as a minimum:

- which AMP amendments are eligible for indirect approval;
- who in the organisation is responsible to issue the indirect approval;
- how the amendments are controlled; and
- how and when the competent authority is informed of an AMP amendment.

Based on M.A.302(c), the indirect approval may only be used when:

- the aircraft is managed by a CAMO/CAO or there is a limited contract between the owner and the CAMO/CAO for the development and approval of the AMP;
- and
- the aircraft managed by the CAMO/CAO is registered in the Member State ensuring the oversight of this CAMO/CAO (unless an agreement exists between the competent authority for the AMP and the competent authority of the CAMO/CAO).

Remark

AMPs regulated by Part-ML are not subject to an approval by the competent authority.

Last updated:

29/01/2021

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19061>

Does the CAMO or CAO compliance monitoring/quality system need to be subject to internal audit?

Answer

Yes, the compliance monitoring/quality system is part of the activities of the CAMO or CAO and therefore it should be monitored by internal audit.

Points M.A.712(b), CAMO.A.200(a)(6) or CAO.A.100(b) requires that the compliance monitoring/quality system monitors the compliance of the organisation with its relevant requirements and procedures.

The compliance monitoring/quality procedures are considered to be within the scope of this monitoring function. Therefore, the compliance monitoring/quality system should also be subject to audits and the CAMO or CAO audit programme/plan needs to reflect this.

Besides that, the audits conducted in respect of the compliance monitoring/quality system should satisfy the requirement of independence. This means that audits should be carried out by personnel not responsible for the functions, procedures or

products being checked.

So, the compliance monitoring/quality staff cannot audit the compliance monitoring/ quality system themselves because of the necessary independence of the audit. Therefore, to audit the compliance monitoring/quality system, it is acceptable:

- to use competent personnel from a different section/department in the same organisation not responsible for the compliance monitoring/quality function/ procedure, or,
- to contract the independent audit element of the compliance monitoring/quality system to another organisation or a qualified competent person, or,
- that the compliance monitoring/quality system is monitored and certified against an internationally recognised standards by a certification organisation.

The way the compliance monitoring/quality system is going to be audited has to be described in the CAME or CAE and approved by the competent authority.

For a small CAO, as defined in CAO.A.100(e), the quality system may be replaced by regular organisational review. Further information on the organisational review can be found in 'AMC1 CAO.A.100(f)' and 'Appendix II to AMC1 CAO.A.100(f)'.

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19047>

The requirement to establish a procedure to assess non-mandatory modifications/inspections pursuant to CAMO.A.315(b)(4) refers to the “use of the organisation’s safety risk management process”. What does this mean?

Answer

The CAMO has the obligation, for complex motor-powered aircraft and aircraft used by air carriers licensed in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1008/2008, to establish a procedure to assess non mandatory modifications and inspections (e.g. Service Bulletins).

This assessment should result in a decision to implement or not the recommendation provided in such non-mandatory information (e.g. perform the inspection, embody the modification, amend the aircraft maintenance programme (AMP)).

This assessment procedure should take into consideration several aspects, as the case may be, including but not limited to:

- the applicability to the operator’s fleet (e.g. type of operating environment, utilization, aircraft configuration);
- achievement of operator’s safety objectives;
- mitigating potential aviation safety risks already identified by the operator;
- mitigating potential aviation safety risks not yet apparent to the operator but identified by other operators or TC/STC holder, for aircraft in a similar operational environment;
- reliability improvement of the aircraft and components; and
- improvement of the effectiveness of the AMP.

In case of potential aviation safety risks, the CAMO should review the hazard(s) identified in the recommendation and the proposed maintenance action and its timeframe (i.e. timeline to embody the modification or amend the AMP). This is the main purpose of the expression “making use of the organisation’s safety risk management process”. If necessary, the CAMO will perform a safety risk assessment (e.g. in terms of probability and severity of consequences) and a review of the related mitigations.

Typically, SBs are issued for technical purposes (as mitigation or safety risk control). For instance, a SB could provide the following:

- an elimination of an identified hazard by the embodiment of a modification, or
- reducing the safety risk (i.e. the severity and/or likelihood) of the consequences of an identified hazard by the embodiment of a modification, or
- reducing the likelihood of the consequences of an identified hazard by performing repetitive inspections.

Since SBs are also used for other purposes (e.g. optional equipment installation, commercial retrofit) and not only for potential safety-related situations, it is not required to use safety risk management process for each SB.

The CAMO should use its safety risk management process to determine if the hazard identified in the SB applies to the managed fleet and what the associated risk is, and/or whether the proposed action (modification/inspection) are applicable, effective and reasonable. For clarity, it is not intended that the CAMO should redo the safety assessment performed by the design approval holder; the CAMO assessment should be tailored to its fleet and related operations.

The referred CAME procedure for the assessment of non-mandatory modifications and inspections should ideally describe the decision-making process and mandate to record the decision taken and its justifications (e.g. based on considerations of costs vs benefits such as safety or reliability).

The decision to embody a modification may require the change management process to be followed to ensure proper coordination between the aircraft operator, the CAMO and the approved maintenance organisation. For example, a modification that affects Mass and Balance, requires maintenance check flights, introduces revised flight manual procedures, maintenance manual procedures, changes to the AMP, which needs to be managed to ensure proper dissemination of the information, training, review of existing hazards, and review of risk assessment, as applicable.

Last updated:

04/07/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136743>

Part-145

Part-145: General

Is Part-M applicable to approved Part-145 organisations?

Answer

Yes, in addition to the Part-M or Part-ML provisions directly referred to in Part-145 (such as reference to point M.A.304 or ML.A.304 in 145.A.48), certain other requirements laid down in Part-M or Part-ML should also be considered by these organisations. Guidance on this subject is given in 'GM Article 4(1)'.

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19036>

What does the term 'occasional' mean in 145.A.75(c)?

Answer

Within the privilege described in 145.A.75(c) an aircraft maintenance organisation (AMO) may perform line maintenance activity (Part-145) in other-than-approved locations, provided it is considered as 'occasional'. There is no formal definition of 'occasional' in the regulation, AMC and GM, but this privilege should be used to support an operator with which the AMO is already in contractual relation, when this operator needs line maintenance service for a short period at a new location due to a **special occasion or particular reason** (e.g. one-time flights, short term contracts/flight destination, flight schedule changes, special event at a particular location such as European athletics championship in Berlin, 6-12 August 2018, etc.) or the owner needs supporting maintenance service for a short period at a new location due to a **special occasion or particular reason**.

Subject to the approval by the Competent Authority, the maintenance organisation should develop in the MOE (e.g. Chapter 2.24 Reference to Specific Maintenance Procedures) the generic procedures to be followed in such a case: how to assess whether the maintenance can be performed, availability of tools/ equipment/ material/ components/ maintenance data, staff, adequacy of the facilities, environmental conditions, quality system, record keeping, need to report these cases to the competent authority, etc. In

addition, the procedure should include the criteria (e.g. maximum service duration without gap in the continuity; limitation in the repetition of the need* at one given location) to classify the activity as 'occasional line maintenance'.

** In principle, the repetitive use of this privilege at the same location should not be considered, and for repetitive needs, an approved line station should normally be established at that location.*

Last updated:

02/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21265>

How to easily update the "EASA Form 1 – MF/145 Issue 2" to "EASA Form 1 – MF/CAO/145 Issue 3"?

Answer

Purpose of the FAQ

This FAQ is intended to recommend the industry and national competent authority (NCA) an easy way to implement the 'EASA Form 1 Issue 3', applicable from 24.03.2020, by the Maintenance organisations.

Description of the issue

The Regulation (EU) 2019/1383 updated the Appendix II to Annex I (Part-M) — Authorised Release Certificate — EASA Form 1 by changing the footer of the form in order to add the reference of the Part-CAO.

Some organisations may still have in stock hardcopies of EASA Form 1 Issue 2.

In such case, due to the fact that there is no change in the content of the EASA Form 1 or/and in its completion methodology, for the Part-145 and Part-M, Subpart F approved organisations, the change can be done by:

- crossing out the footer in an 'EASA Form 1 – MF/145 Issue 2' and replacing it by 'EASA Form 1 – MF/CAO/145 Issue 3'; or
- accompanying the Form 1 with a communication explaining that the footer should be read as 'EASA Form 1 – MF/CAO/145 Issue 3' in accordance with the MOE/MOM procedure; or
- by other means acceptable to the NCA.

Last updated:

23/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119322>

How did you install a Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) equipment without EASA form-1? How do you arrange Part-145 side actually?

Answer

Please check for the answer published [here](#).

Last updated:

06/12/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/134264>

Quality system

Does the Part-145 or Part-CAO quality system need to be subject to monitoring?

Answer

Yes, the quality system is part of the activities of the Part-145 organisation and therefore it should be monitored.

Point 145.A.65 (c) or CAO.A.100 (b) (1) requires that the quality system monitors that the activities are (being) performed in accordance with the approved procedures. The quality system procedures are included within these approved procedures. This implies that quality system must be subject to audits and the Part-145 or Part-CAO organisation audit programme/plan needs to reflect this.

Besides that, the audits of the quality system shall satisfy the requirement of independent audits. This is further explained in AMC 145.A.65(c)(1) point 11: the independence of the audits should be established by always ensuring that audits are carried out by personnel not responsible for the functions, procedures or products being checked. So, the quality manager cannot audit the quality system in terms of independence of the audit. For Part-CAO this subject is explained in AMC1 CAO.A.100(b).

Therefore, to audit the quality system, it is acceptable to:

- use competent personnel from a different section/department in the same organisation not responsible for the quality function/procedure, or,
- contract the independent audit element of the quality system to another organisation or a qualified competent person.

The way the quality system is going to be audited has to be described in the MOE or CAE and approved by the competent authority.

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19054>

Certification of maintenance

With respect to blend out repairs, is it required to record the depth and area dimensions of material removed during a blend out repair or is it sufficient to simply record that the damage has been repaired as per the SRM?

Answer

Yes, the dimensions of the damage and the removed/remaining material should be recorded. This is a very important information in order to assess whether further damage (adjacent or at the same spot) at a later stage would be allowable or not. In addition, it is a safeguard measure in order to be able to determine, during audits, whether the person correctly determined that the damage was within limits.

Last updated:

15/12/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19053>

Can the subcontractor of a Part-145 or Part-CAO organisation release maintenance?

Answer

One of the fundamentals of subcontracting activities is that, during such maintenance, the Part-145 approval is extended to include the subcontractor activities. Subcontracting can be done only if the Part-145 has approved procedures to do it (145.A.75(b)) and the MOE is amended to reflect this new subcontractor.

A certificate of release to service can be issued by a person from the subcontractor who has received a certification authorisation from the Part-145 organisation in accordance with the certification authorisation procedure of the MOE including the assessment of competence.

The certificate of release to service and the EASA Form 1 will always be issued under the maintenance organisation approval reference.

For maintenance by Part-CAO the situation is different. Only 'specialised services' (e.g. NDT) can be subcontracted to another organisation, in accordance with the appropriate procedure set out in the CAE and approved by the competent authority (CAO.A.095(a)(2)). In accordance with AMC1 CAO.A.025 the procedure should be part of chapter B.7 'Subcontracting'.

A certificate of release to service can be issued by a person from the other organisation who has received a certification authorisation from the CAO in accordance with the certification authorisation procedure of the CAE.

The certificate of release to service will always be issued under the CAO approval reference.

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19051>

Release to service of NDT tasks by Part-145 or Part-CAO organisations

Answer

This answer is separated in two tables. One table is for organisation holding a Part-145 approval and the second table is for organisations holding a Part-CAO approval.

Part-145:

Part-145 organisation	Certifying staff required	Qualification system	General Release procedure	Release procedure for an NDT inspection
Aircraft (class A)	The release of the aircraft maintenance carried out under A class rating has to be performed by certifying staff holding a Part-66 licence. (B1 or B3 or C or L certifying staff under the organisation's A rating.)	Licencing of personnel has to follow Part-66 regulation.	The release is either on the aircraft technical log or issuing an aircraft release to service statement.	A Part-145 organisation holding an A approval rating on a particular aircraft type and having in its approved scope of work NDT inspections for this aircraft type. This organization needs to have part-66 certifying staff and NDT personnel qualified in accordance with 145.A.30(f). In this case the NDT inspector performs the NDT task and signs off the work order. The aircraft is released by appropriately qualified B1, B3, C or L certifying staff under the organisation's A rating. Please note that the release may include not only the NDT task but also the associated tasks (removal of panels, blankets, wires, re-installation, etc), or the NDT task may be part of a base maintenance check.

Engines Class B	The release of the engine maintenance carried out under B class rating has to be performed by engine's certifying staff.	The certifying staff is qualified following the procedures established by the organisation in compliance with the competent authority requirements. Part-66 licence is not required.	The release of works performed under class B is done on an EASA Form 1 (or by means of an internal release document when this component is for the organisation's own use and the organisation has in place the related internal procedures in the MOE).	A Part-145 organisation holding a B rating approval on a particular engine type and having in its approved scope of work NDT inspections for this engine type. This organization needs to have "engine" certifying staff (qualified in accordance with company procedures) and NDT personnel qualified in accordance with 145.A.30(f). In this case the NDT inspector performs the NDT task and signs off the work order. The engine certifying staff releases the works performed to the engine (including NDT inspection) on an EASA Form 1.
Components Class C	The release of the component maintenance carried out under C class rating has to be performed by components certifying staff (CCS).	The certifying staff is qualified following the procedures established by the organisation in compliance with the competent authority requirements. The CCS is not required to have a Part-66 licence.	The release of works performed under class C is done on an EASA Form 1 (or by means of an internal release document when this component is for the organisation's own use and the organisation has in place the related internal procedures in the MOE).	A Part-145 organisation holding a C rating approval on a particular component and having in its approved scope of work NDT inspections for this component. This organization needs to have CCS and NDT personnel qualified in accordance with 145.A.30(f). In this case the NDT inspector performs the NDT task and signs off the Work Order / Engineering Order. The CCS releases the works performed to the component (including NDT inspection) on an EASA Form 1.

Specialised services	The release of the maintenance carried out under D1 class rating has to be performed by "specialised services" certifying staff.	The certifying staff is qualified following the procedures established by the organisation in compliance with EN4179, Part-66 licence is not required.	The release of works performed under class D1 rating is done on an EASA Form 1 or using another form of release to service (other than aircraft release to service) as defined by the organisation in the MOE in compliance with 145.A.50 and approved by the competent authority.	A Part-145 organisation holding a D1 approval on a particular NDT method. The approved scope of work will be NDT inspections on this method. This organisation needs to have NDT certifying staff qualified in accordance with 145.A.30(f). In this case the NDT certifying staff performs and releases the NDT task on an EASA Form 1 or using another form of release to service (other than aircraft release to service) as defined by the organisation in the MOE in compliance with 145.A.50 and approved by the competent authority.
----------------------	--	--	--	---

Note: In case of non-EU organisations approved by the EASA in accordance with Part-145, the Part-66 licence could be read as "Part-66 or national licence in accordance with Part-145 Appendix IV"

Part-CAO:

Part-145	Certifying staff required	Qualification system	General Release procedure	Release procedure for an NDT inspection
organisation				

Aircraft
(class
aeroplanes,
helicopter,
airships,
balloons or
sailplanes)

The release of the
aircraft maintenance
carried out under A
class rating has to
be performed by
certifying staff
holding a Part-66
licence.

Licencing of personnel
has to follow Part-66
regulation.

The release is either on the aircraft
technical log or issuing an aircraft
release to service statement.

A Part-CAO organisation holding
an aeroplanes, helicopter, airships,
balloons or sailplanes particular
aircraft type or and having in its
approved scope of work NDT
inspections for this aircraft type.

This organization needs to have
part-66 certifying staff and NDT
personnel qualified in accordance
with CAO.A.035(f).

In this case the NDT inspector
performs the NDT task and signs
off the work order. The aircraft is
released by appropriately qualified
B1, B3 or L certifying staff under
the organisation's aeroplanes,
helicopter, airships, balloons or
sailplanes rating.

Please note that the release may
include not only the NDT task but
also the associated tasks (removal
of panels, blankets, wires, re-
installation, etc), or the NDT task
may be part of a base
maintenance check.

Engines or Components other than complete engines Class Components	The certifying staff is qualified following the procedures established by the organisation, Part-66 licence is not required.		A Part-CAO organisation holding a components rating approval on a particular engine type or 'components other than complete engines' and having in its approved scope of work NDT inspections for this engine type. This organization needs to have "engine" or 'components other than complete engines' certifying staff (qualified in accordance with company procedures) and NDT personnel qualified in accordance with CAO.A.035(f). In this case the NDT inspector performs the NDT task and signs off the work order. The engine or 'components other than complete engines' certifying staff releases the works performed to the engine or 'components other than complete engines' (including NDT inspection) on an EASA Form 1.
The release of the engine maintenance carried out under components class rating has to be performed by 'engine's' or 'components other than complete engines' certifying staff.		The release of works performed under class components is done on an EASA Form 1 (or by means of an internal release document when this component is for the organisation's own use and the organisation has in place the related internal procedures in the CAE).	
Components Class C			A Part-145 organisation holding a C rating approval on a particular component and having in its approved scope of work NDT inspections for this component. This organization needs to have CCS and NDT personnel qualified in accordance with 145.A.30(f). In this case the NDT inspector performs the NDT task and signs off the Work Order / Engineering Order. The CCS releases the works performed to the component (including NDT inspection) on an EASA Form 1.
The release of the component maintenance carried out under C class rating has to be performed by components certifying staff (CCS).	The certifying staff is qualified following the procedures established by the organisation in compliance with the competent authority requirements. The CCS is not required to have a Part-66 licence.	The release of works performed under class C is done on an EASA Form 1 (or by means of an internal release document when this component is for the organisation's own use and the organisation has in place the related internal procedures in the MOE).	

Specialised
services

The release of the maintenance carried out under 'Specialised Services' class rating has to be performed by "specialised services" certifying staff.	The certifying staff is qualified following the procedures established by the organisation in compliance with EN4179, Part-66 licence is not required.	The release of works performed under class 'Specialised Services' rating is done on an EASA Form 1 or using another form of release to service (other than aircraft release to service) as defined by the organisation in the CAE in compliance with CAO.A.070(a) and approved by the competent authority (AMC1 CAO.A.070 (a)(1)).	A Part-CAO organisation holding a 'Specialised Services' approval on a particular NDT method. The approved scope of work will be NDT inspections on this method. This organisation needs to have NDT certifying staff qualified in accordance with CAO.A.035(f). In this case the NDT certifying staff performs and releases the NDT task on an EASA Form 1 or using another form of release to service (other than aircraft release to service) as defined by the organisation in the CAE in compliance with CAO.A.070 and approved by the competent authority.
--	--	--	--

Note: In case of non-EU organisations approved by the EASA in accordance with Part-145, the Part-66 licence could be read as "Part-66 or national licence in accordance with Part-145 Appendix IV"

Last updated:

01/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19055>

We are a maintenance organisation approved for component maintenance (B/C-rated Part-145 organisation, or Part-CAO with class "component"). Can we issue a "removed serviceable" EASA Form 1 for a component removed from an engine/component off-aircraft in our organisation?

Answer

The current point 2.6 of AMC2 145.A.50(d) or AMC1 CAO.A.070(a) refers to the issue of an EASA Form 1 for serviceable aircraft components removed from serviceable aircraft registered in a Member State (*).

This AMC provision is to be used only for components removed from serviceable Member State registered **aircraft**, not from engine/component off-aircraft, regardless of whether such engine/component is serviceable or not. Components removed from a higher assembly (engine or another component) off-aircraft are expected to undergo workshop maintenance in accordance with the relevant maintenance data before the EASA Form 1 (certifying such maintenance) is issued.

Note that an A-rated Part-145 maintenance organisation or a Part-CAO organisation with class "aircraft" can issue an EASA Form 1 following a "removed serviceable" procedure for a (sub)component removed from a higher assembly component when such higher assembly is still installed on (or temporarily removed from) serviceable Member State registered aircraft, following the procedure of the referred AMCs.

(*) means an aircraft which is registered in a Member State and holds a valid (R)CofA issued in accordance with [Reg. \(EU\) No 748/2012](#) and an ARC.

Last updated:

22/10/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140533>

We are a maintenance organisation approved for component maintenance (B/C-rated Part-145 organisation, or Part-CAO with class “component”). Can we issue an EASA Form 1 in accordance with point 145.A.50(d) after maintenance performed on an engine/component on-wing on a non-EU-registered aircraft?

Answer

Non-EU countries are sovereign to set acceptable procedures to be followed on aircraft under their register. They can establish that components maintained by organisations approved in accordance with Part-145 (or Part-CAO) of Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 and released with an EASA Form 1 can be installed on aircraft on their register.

Since component removed from third-country aircraft may be subject (under certain conditions) to off-wing component maintenance by Part-145 (or Part-CAO) organisation (with the issue of an EASA Form 1 after maintenance), there is no objection that a B/C-rated Part-145 organisation (or a CAO with class “component”) performs a work order and issues an EASA Form 1 to certify maintenance on engines/components installed on (or temporarily removed from) a non-EU-registered aircraft while this aircraft undergoes line or base maintenance. The B/C-rated Part-145 (or CAO) organisation needs for this an approved MOE procedure to conduct maintenance away from an approved location.

Note: In accordance with Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014, an appropriately approved organisation issuing an EASA Form 1 certifies that the requested maintenance has been properly accomplished on the component; but **this form does not provide permission for the installation of the component** on an EU-registered aircraft. Particular care is necessary for components originating from non-EU registered aircraft and intended for installation on EU-registered aircraft (ref. point 2.8 of AMC2 145.A.50(d)).

Last updated:

22/05/2025

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142008>

My maintenance organisation (B/C-rated Part-145 organisation or combined airworthiness organisation (CAO) with class “components”) has received a work order for the ‘overhaul’ of an engine or component. What conditions should be fulfilled in order to issue EASA Form 1 with “Overhauled” Status/Work in Block 11?

Answer

For reference: “Overhaul is defined as a process ensuring that the item conforms fully to all applicable service tolerances specified by the type certificate (TC) holder, equipment manufacturer, or other data approved/accepted by the Authority. It requires at least disassembly, cleaning, inspection, repair as necessary, reassembly, and testing.” (Paragraph 5, Block 11 of Appendix II to Annex I (Part-M) of [Regulation \(EU\) No 1321/2014](#)).

In case the appropriately rated approved maintenance organisation (AMO) has received a clear work order for an overhaul and holds the applicable maintenance data for the part (e.g. Component Maintenance Manual (CMM), if available), the AMO may proceed with the overhaul if:

1. The original equipment manufacturer (OEM) defines an overhaul process in the maintenance data (e.g. in the CMM). In this case, the AMO must follow it as the primary reference. The AMO can then certify the component as “Overhauled” in Block 11, describing the maintenance actions carried out in Block 12.
2. If no overhaul process is defined in the maintenance data, there are two options:
 1. Apply the EASA definition of “overhaul” by dismantling, cleaning, inspecting, repairing (as necessary), reassembling, and testing the component; or
 2. When, for example, a full disassembly or testing is not possible without causing damage and there are service tolerances specified for the part/component by the TC holder, equipment manufacturer, Instructions for Continuing

Airworthiness (ICAs), or other data approved/accepted by the Authority, perform **all possible maintenance actions** described in the available maintenance data.

We assume that, in either case, the AMO has ensured that the component meets all applicable service tolerances.

Therefore, under these conditions, it would be acceptable to certify the component as "Overhauled" in Block 11 of EASA Form 1.

It is worth noting that points "a" and "b" are effectively equivalent to an overhaul when the CMM already includes a sequence of disassembly, cleaning, inspection, repair (if necessary), reassembly, and testing, which mirrors the requirements of Appendix II to Part-M.

NB

- If a CMM exists for a certain part, and the AMO does not have access to it, the part cannot be released as "Overhauled" based only on other general documents such as an Engine Shop Manual (ESM).
- If a specific overhaul procedure is defined in the maintenance data but not fully followed, the part cannot be released as "Overhauled".
- In all cases, the AMO must clearly describe in Block 12 of EASA Form 1 the maintenance actions performed to achieve the "Overhauled" status, as well as the reference to the chapter(s) of the maintenance data used.

Last updated:

02/06/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142042>

Maintenance data

Shall the maintenance data be available and controlled at all times, even if there is no maintenance work going, or shall it be available only during the performance of maintenance?

Answer

Maintenance data has direct influence on many processes of the approved maintenance organisation (AMO) and contributes to demonstrate the overall capability of the organisation to perform maintenance.

The maintenance data either can be arranged directly by the AMO or provided by the customer/operator as specified by 145.A.45(a), M.A.609 or CAO.A.055(a). In both cases, the AMO should demonstrate that the maintenance data used, regardless of the source, is up-to-date. To discharge this responsibility, a procedure should be established to:

(a) control the amendment status of any documents being used;

and

(b) regularly check that all amendments are being received, e.g. by subscribing to a document amendment scheme (sufficient in case of direct access to the maintenance data through the DAH/OEM. The subscription to the maintenance data distribution system of the customer/operator is insufficient, additional independent verifications through the original author shall be done).

When the maintenance data is arranged directly by the AMO it shall be available and controlled continuously.

There are certain situations when the maintenance data can be obtained only through the customer/operator. One of the examples would be the maintenance data for the large aircraft. The maintenance data coming from the TC holder is usually customised because of the model/configuration/modification/order of aircraft, so it is normally not possible for the AMO to have this customised maintenance data directly from TC holder without having an aircraft of that type under the contract.

When the maintenance data is provided by the customer/operator, it shall be held and controlled by the AMO during maintenance on the concerned aircraft/component. Whenever the maintenance data is not available or not current, the maintenance shall not be performed and released.

Additionally, as part of the obligation for maintenance records, used maintenance data shall be:

- recorded (in compliance with 145.A.55(c), M.A.614(c) or CAO.A.090(b))

- Remark: Manuals issued by the (S)TC (Supplementary Type Certificate) holder such as AMM and CMM do not need to be stored as a record. Recording the revision status of such manual may be sufficient [AMC 145.A.55(c), AMC M.A.614(c)]; and
 - accessible for auditing purpose
- to demonstrate that the organisation worked in compliance with their respective requirements.

Last updated:

02/02/2021

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19104>**Personnel requirements****Can a certification maintenance requirement (CMR) be performed by the Flight Crew before flight?****Answer**

Normally the flight crew should not release CMR task unless that task is included in a "repetitive pre-flight airworthiness directive" under the conditions of 145.A.30(j)(3), M.A.606(h)(1) or CAO.A.040(c)(1)

In case of aircraft operated away from a supported location, the provisions of 145.A.30(j)(4), M.A.606(h)(2) or CAO.A.040(c)(2) could be used for CMRs as long as all the applicable conditions are met. In particular:

- sufficient practical training has been carried out.
- there is a procedure in the Maintenance Organisation Exposition, Maintenance Organisation Manual or Combined Airworthiness Exposition (CAE).

the task is considered "minor maintenance or a simple check" (AMC 145.A.30(j)(4) point 2(i) or AMC M.A.606(h)(2) point 2).

Last updated:

02/02/2021

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19105>**What is the meaning of the Protected Rights in the Appendix IV to Part-145?****Answer**

The protected rights mentioned in paragraph 2(a) of the Appendix IV to Part-145 were included in the Regulation 2042/2003 for the persons who were already working in a Part-145 organisation in a location situated outside the EU before the entry into force of Part-66. These protected rights allowed those persons to continue exercising (inside that particular Part-145 organisation) the privileges of the certification authorisation issued by that Part-145 organisation without the need to comply with paragraphs 1(c) to 1(f).

If this person changed the employment to a different Part-145 approved organisation after the entry into force of Part-66 (i.e. 28 November 2003), the previous certification authorisation is not valid and he/she needs to receive a new one from the new Part-145 approved organisation. In this case paragraph 2 of Appendix IV is not applicable anymore.

This implies that any new or extended authorisation granted by AMOs to their C/S after the entry into force of Part-66 must comply with paragraphs 1(c) to 1(f) in particular regarding the type training certificates.

Last updated:

23/01/2017

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21913>**What are the training requirements for personnel within a Part-145 organisation, other than those contained in Part-66?**

Answer

Requirement	Reference
The accountable manager shall demonstrate a basic understanding of Part-145 .	145.A.30(a) point 3.
The person or group of persons nominated responsible for ensuring that the organisation complies with Part-145 (including the Quality Manager) shall be able to demonstrate • relevant knowledge, background and satisfactory experience related to aircraft or components maintenance as applicable, • a working knowledge of Part-145,	145.A.30(b) point 3.
The organisation shall establish and control the competence of personnel involved in any maintenance, airworthiness review management and/or quality audits in accordance with a procedure and to a standard agreed by the competent authority. In addition to the necessary expertise related to the job function, competence must include an understanding of the application of human factors and human performance issues appropriate to that person's function in the organisation. This should include also: • Fuel Tank Safety training (AMC3 145-A-30(e) and Appendix IV to AMC 145.A.30(e) and 145.B.10(3)). • EWIS training (AMC 20-22)	145.A.30(e) and associated AMC/GM. Appendix IV to AMC 145.A.30(e) and 145.B.10(3). AMC 20-22.
The organisation shall ensure that personnel who carry out and/or control a continued airworthiness non-destructive test of aircraft structures and/or components are appropriately qualified for the particular non-destructive test in accordance with the European or equivalent Standard recognised by the Agency. Personnel who carry out any other specialised task shall be appropriately qualified in accordance with officially recognised Standards. By derogation to this paragraph those personnel specified in paragraphs (g) and (h)(1) and (h)(2), qualified in category B1, B3 or L in accordance with Annex III (Part-66) may carry out and/or control colour contrast dye penetrant tests.	145.A.30(f) and AMC 145.A.30(f).

By derogation to paragraphs (g) and (h), in relation to the obligation to comply with Annex III (Part-66), the organisation may use certifying staff qualified in accordance with the following provisions: 1. For organisation facilities located outside the Community territory certifying staff may be qualified in accordance with the national aviation regulations of the State in which the organisation facility is registered subject to the conditions specified in Appendix IV to this Part. 2. For line maintenance carried out at a line station of an organisation which is located outside the Community territory, the certifying staff may be qualified in accordance with the national aviation regulations of the State in which the line station is based, subject to the conditions specified in Appendix IV to this Part. 3. For a repetitive pre-flight airworthiness directive which specifically states that the flight crew may carry out such airworthiness directive, the organisation may issue a limited certification authorisation to the aircraft commander and/or the flight engineer on the basis of the flight crew licence held. However, the organisation shall ensure that sufficient practical training has been carried out to ensure that such aircraft commander or flight engineer can accomplish the airworthiness directive to the required standard. 4. In the case of aircraft operating away from a supported location the organisation may issue a limited certification authorisation to the commander and/or the flight engineer on the basis of the flight crew licence held subject to being satisfied that sufficient practical training has been carried out to ensure that the commander or flight engineer can accomplish the specified task to the required standard. The provisions of this paragraph shall be detailed in an exposition procedure. 5. In the following unforeseen cases, where an aircraft is grounded at a location other than the main base where no appropriate certifying staff are available, the organisation contracted to provide maintenance support may issue a one-off certification authorisation: (i) to one of its employees holding equivalent type authorisations on aircraft of similar technology, construction and systems; or (ii) to any person with not less than five years maintenance experience and holding a valid ICAO aircraft maintenance licence rated for the aircraft type requiring certification provided there is no organisation appropriately approved under this Part at that location and the contracted organisation obtains and holds on file evidence of the experience and the licence of that person. All such cases as specified in this point shall be reported to the competent authority within seven days of the issuance of such certification authorisation. The organisation issuing the one-off authorisation shall ensure that any such maintenance that could affect flight safety is re-checked by an appropriately approved organisation.	145.A.30(j) and associated AMC/GM. Appendix IV to Part-145.
In addition to the appropriate requirements of 145.A.30(g) and (h), the organisation shall ensure that certifying staff and support staff have an adequate understanding of the relevant aircraft and/or components, or both, to be maintained and of the associated organisation procedures. In the case of certifying staff, this shall be accomplished before the issue or reissue of the certification authorisation.	145.A.35(a) and AMC 145.A.35(a).
The organisation shall ensure that all certifying staff and support staff are involved in at least six months of actual relevant aircraft or component maintenance experience in any consecutive two-year period.	145.A.35(c) and AMC 145.A.35(c).
The organisation shall ensure that all certifying staff and support staff receive sufficient continuation training in each two-year period to ensure that such staff have up-to-date knowledge of relevant technology, organisation procedures and human factor issues.	145.A.35(d) and AMC 145.A.35(d).
The organisation shall establish a programme for continuation training for certifying staff and support staff, including a procedure to ensure compliance with the relevant paragraphs of 145.A.35 as the basis for issuing certification authorisations under this Part to certifying staff, and a procedure to ensure compliance with Annex III (Part 66).	145.A.35(e) and AMC 145.A.35(e).

Except where any of the unforeseen cases of 145.A.30(j)(5) apply, the organisation shall assess all prospective certifying staff for their competence, qualification and capability to carry out their intended certifying duties in accordance with a procedure as specified in the exposition prior to the issue or reissue of a certification authorisation under this Part.	145.A.35(f) and AMC 145.A.35(f).
The holder of a category A aircraft maintenance licence may only exercise certification privileges on a specific aircraft type following the satisfactory completion of the relevant category A aircraft task training carried out by an organisation appropriately approved in accordance with Annex II (Part-145) or Annex IV (Part-147). This training shall include practical hands on training and theoretical training as appropriate for each task authorised. Satisfactory completion of training shall be demonstrated by an examination or by workplace assessment carried out by the organisation.	145.A.35(n) and AMC 145.A.35(n).
The holder of a category B2 aircraft maintenance licence may only exercise the certification privileges described in point 66.A.20(a)(3)(ii) of Annex III (Part-66) following the satisfactory completion of (i) the relevant category A aircraft task training and (ii) six months of documented practical experience covering the scope of the authorisation that will be issued. The task training shall include practical hands on training and theoretical training as appropriate for each task authorised. Satisfactory completion of training shall be demonstrated by an examination or by workplace assessment. Task training and examination/assessment shall be carried out by the maintenance organisation issuing the certifying staff authorisation. The practical experience shall be also obtained within such maintenance organisation.	145.A.35(o) and AMC 145.A.35(o).
Pre-flight inspections (when the 145 organisation has an agreement with an operator) It should be demonstrated that the personnel carrying out pre-flight inspections have received appropriate training for the relevant pre-flight inspection tasks based on the operator's CAME.	ML.A.301(a) or M.A.301(a) and AMC M.A.301(a)

Last updated:

02/02/2021

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19100>**Part-66****Get a Part-66 licence**

What are the Part-66 licence categories?

Answer

In a Part-145 approved organisation, the different categories of Part-66 licences are:

LICENCE CATEGORY	For certifying the release to service of work performed on aircraft:	What:
	Minor scheduled line maintenance and simple defect rectification Divided into the following subcategories:	
A	• A1 Aeroplanes Turbine; • A2 Aeroplanes Piston; • A3 Helicopters Turbine; • A4 Helicopters Piston.	Line Maintenance

LICENCE CATEGORY	For certifying the release to service of work performed on aircraft:	What:
	Maintenance on aircraft structure, power plant and mechanical and electrical systems, avionics systems requiring simple tests to prove their serviceability and no troubleshooting Divided into	
B1	B1.1 for turbine aeroplanes, B1.2 for piston engine aeroplanes, B1.3 for Turbine helicopter and B1.4 for piston engine helicopter	Line Maintenance
B3	Maintenance on aeroplane structure, power plant and mechanical and electrical systems; and on avionics systems requiring only simple tests to prove their serviceability and not requiring troubleshooting limited to non-pressurized aeroplanes of 2 000 kg MTOM and below.	Line Maintenance
B2	Maintenance performed on avionics and electrical systems and electric and avionics tasks within powerplant and mechanical systems requiring only simple test and minor scheduled line maintenance and simple defect rectification The same as B2 but limited to the systems endorsed on the licence: Divided into the following 'system ratings':	Line Maintenance
B2L	communication/navigation (com/nav), instruments, auto flight, surveillance, airframe systems.	Line Maintenance
	Maintenance on aircraft structure, power plant and mechanical and electrical systems; radio, Emergency Locator Transmitters (ELT) and transponder systems; and work on other avionics systems requiring simple tests to prove their serviceability Divided into the following subcategories:	
L	L1C: composite sailplanes, L1: sailplanes, L2C: composite powered sailplanes and composite ELA1 aeroplanes, L2: powered sailplanes and ELA1 aeroplanes, L3H: hot-air balloons, L3G: gas balloons, L4H: hot-air airships, L4G: ELA2 gas airships, L5: gas airships other than ELA2.	Line Maintenance
C	Base maintenance C with respect to complex motor-powered aircraft and C with respect to other than complex motor-powered aircraft	Line Maintenance
	Support staff for:	
B1	Maintenance on aircraft structure, power plant and mechanical and electrical systems, avionics systems requiring simple tests to prove their serviceability and no troubleshooting (subdivided into B1.1 for turbine aeroplanes, B1.2 for piston engine aeroplanes, B1.3 for Turbine helicopter and B1.4 for piston engine helicopter)	Base Maintenance

LICENCE CATEGORY	For certifying the release to service of work performed on aircraft:	What:
B2	Maintenance on avionic and electrical systems and electric and avionics tasks within power plant and mechanical systems requiring only simple test and minor scheduled line maintenance and simple defect rectification	Base Maintenance
B2L	The same as B2 but limited to the systems endorsed on the licence: • communication/navigation (com/nav), • instruments, • auto flight, • surveillance, • airframe systems.	
B3	Maintenance on aeroplane structure, power plant and mechanical and electrical systems; and on avionics systems requiring only simple tests to prove their serviceability and not requiring troubleshooting limited to non-pressurized aeroplanes of 2 000 kg MTOM and below.	Base Maintenance
	Maintenance on aircraft structure, power plant and mechanical and electrical systems; radio, Emergency Locator Transmitters (ELT) and transponder systems; and work on other avionics systems requiring simple tests to prove their serviceability	
	Divided into the following subcategories:	
L	L1C: composite sailplanes, L1: sailplanes, L2C: composite powered sailplanes and composite ELA1 aeroplanes, L2: powered sailplanes and ELA1 aeroplanes, L3H: hot-air balloons, L3G: gas balloons, L4H: hot-air airships, L4G: ELA2 gas airships, L5: gas airships other than ELA2.	Base Maintenance

See points 66.A.3 and 66.A.20 of Annex III (Part-66) to Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 can be found on the Agency website

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/regulations#regulations-continuing-airworthi...> or in the eRules

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/document-library/easy-access-rules/easy-acce...>

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19017>

How to get an EASA Part-66 Licence (Category B1 or B2)?

Answer

1. In order to get an EASA Part-66 AML (Aircraft Maintenance License), an applicant needs:
 - i. Basic knowledge (66.A.25);
 - ii. Basic experience (66.A.30).
2. In order to get an aircraft type rating TR endorsed in the AML, an applicant needs:
 - i. Type Training (Theoretical and Practical) (66.A.45)
 - ii. On-the-job Training (OJT) for the first TR (66.A.45).

The following two schemes depict the most common paths and are for information only.

- The first scheme applies to Group 1 aircraft (B1 and B2 licence categories).

- The second scheme applies to other than Group 1 aircraft (B1 and B2 licence categories).

NOTE: Aircraft groups are described in 66.A.5.

These schemes do not override Part-66 requirements nor capture all the possibilities (various licences, educations and experiences). The start and end of each phase can vary depending on individual cases.

For further and detailed information:


- Refer to Part-66 and related AMC/GM; and
- Consult the Competent Authority where you intend to apply for the AML.

NOTE:

An AML issued by a country other than [EASA Member States](#) cannot be rendered valid as EASA Part-66 AML.


NOTE:

Part-66 licences issued by the countries other than EASA Member States are not mutually recognised in the European system.



FOR INFORMATION ONLY
Version 1 (24-06-2016)

Scheme 2: Part-66 Aircraft Maintenance Licence (AML) - B1 and B2 Other than Group 1 Aircraft -



Click on the pictures to zoom in.

Last updated:

02/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21067>

How can I apply for an EASA Part-66 licence? What is required at the time of the application?

Answer

The initial application for a Part-66 aircraft maintenance licence shall be made to the competent authority of one of the Member States (MS). Please contact this competent authority for an application Form (EASA Form 19) and specific details concerning the application.

The EASA Form 19 shall be submitted to the MS together with evidence of compliance with the requirements. MS will specify the related fees and how compliance with the requirements shall be demonstrated.

See 66.A.10, 66.A.15, 66.A.25, 66.A.30, 66.A.45 and 66.A.70 and related AMC/GM.

An application for amendment or renewal of a Part-66 aircraft maintenance licence (AML) shall be made to the competent authority of the MS who issued the licence. Please contact this competent authority for an application Form (EASA Form 19) and specific details concerning the application.

The EASA Form 19 shall be submitted to the MS together with evidence of compliance with the requirements. MS will specify the related fees and how compliance with the requirements shall be demonstrated.

See 66.A.10, 66.A.15, 66.A.25, 66.A.30, 66.A.40, 66.A.45, 66.A.50, and 66.A.70 and related AMC/GM.

Last updated:

01/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19083>

Who is allowed to issue EASA Part-66 licences? Can I apply for a Part-66 licence to EASA?

Answer

EASA is not a licensing authority and therefore does not issue any licences. Part-66 licences are issued by the competent authorities of the EU Member States, plus Switzerland, Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein. The list of the National Aviation Authorities and their contact details can be accessed here: <https://www.easa.europa.eu/the-agency/member-states> .

Last updated:

13/04/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19082>

I want to work in an organisation located within the EU. Do I need a Part-66 licence?

Answer

According to the current rules, a Part-66 licence is required for:

- certifying the release to service of maintenance of an aircraft;
- work in maintenance organisations as support staff.

For other activities within a maintenance organisation, a Part-66 licence is not required. No Part-66 licence exists for components (based on article 5 of Commission Regulation (EU) No. 2018/1142).

Remark: Privileges on the basis of national requirements may be added in the Part-66 licence in section XIV. national privileges.

Last updated:

14/09/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19014>

I am a colour-blind. Does this prevent me from getting a Part-66 licence or exercising my licence privileges?

Answer

Regulation (EU) 1321/2014 does not require any medical examination before applying for a Part-66 licence.

In the past some medical criteria were proposed in JAR-66, but these were removed in order to avoid conflicts with national rules. JAR 66.A.50 had requirements on:

- use of alcohol at work,
- effects of medicines,
- physical conditions, vision, ability to see colours,
- mental conditions.

Part-66 has only a provision to suspend, limit or revoke licences in case of carrying out maintenance or issuing a certificate of release to service when adversely affected by alcohol or drugs [66.B.500 point(7)].

Current 145.A.30(e) requests certifying staff to receive a human factor training and GM 1 145.A.30 (e) gives guidance about the elements of the training to be imparted:

4 - Human performance & limitations

4.1 Vision

4.2 Hearing

4.3 Information-processing

4.4 Attention and perception

4.5 Situational awareness

4.6 Memory

4.7 Claustrophobia and physical access

4.8 Motivation

4.9 Fitness/Health

4.10 Stress

4.11 Workload management

4.12 Fatigue

4.13 Alcohol, medication, drugs

4.14 Physical work

4.15 Repetitive tasks / complacency

Common sense recommends the certifying staff not to exercise the privileges of their certification authorisation if they know or suspect that their physical or mental condition renders them unfit to exercise such privileges (impact to the safe maintenance operations). In addition such recommendation may be covered and rendered mandatory by the national requirements of the Member State where you exercise your privileges. Typical examples are for intoxication (alcohol, drugs, etc.).

It is therefore recommended that you inform the management of your maintenance organisation:

- as you should not deviate from the national law;
- as the organisation shall establish and control the competence of personnel; (145.A.30(e) – necessary expertise related to the job function);
- as the organisation shall have a human performance programme in place (145.A.35(e)); and
- as the ICAO safety management system encourages to identify hazards and risks.

Please find an agreement with your company in order to list the maintenance tasks that you are allowed to carry out without jeopardising the aircraft safety.

Note: The same reasoning as explained above applies for any medical condition.

Last updated:

14/09/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19089>

Does EASA plan to propose changes to the implementing regulation to establish specific adaptations applicable to persons with learning difficulties (e.g. dyslexia, attention deficit disorder, hyperactivity,...) who wish to undertake aircraft maintenance training in a Part-147 approved training organisation as required to apply for Part-66 licenses?

Answer

Anybody able to pass the basic knowledge examinations and fulfil the basic experience requirements can get the related Part-66 licence. There are no additional conditions such as a medical certificate or any other proof regarding the mental or physical abilities. In other words, people with specific learning difficulties or physical impairments are not discriminated by Part-66 or Part-147.

Obtaining the licence does not give the certification privileges. Before granting such privileges, the maintenance organisation will have first to check the competence, including the assessment of the skills and abilities and considering the Human Factors principles. The scope of the certification authorisation will be commensurate to these competence/abilities. Please note that in some EU Member States additional occupational safety and health requirements may apply (working on heights, confined spaces, etc.).

EASA does not plan to propose amendments to the regulations to account for cases of people with special needs during examinations: a single regulation cannot cover all individual cases. If a Member State intends to introduce any such adaptation, Regulation EU 2018/1139 (the BR) includes the possibility for the Member States to grant an exemption under the Article 71(2), after evaluation of the individual conditions for the case.

As an additional information, the Agency already issued several positive recommendations for such exemptions (e.g. for candidates with confirmed dyslexia, i.e. 25% additional time). Please contact your competent authority for details.

For further information about the flexibility provisions under the BR, please see '[Safeguard & Flexibility Provisions](#)'.

Last updated:

01/02/2021

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19090>**How can I get a Part-66 licence valid in the EU by conversion?****Answer**

Either you are the holder of:

- a national licence [66.A.305] or an approved maintenance organisation authorisation [66.A.310], that was valid in the Member State before the entry into force of the EASA regulation introducing the relevant Part-66 categories (see entry into force of the amendments of the regulation), or
- JAR-66 licence, which will automatically be re-issued as Part-66 licences as they are deemed to have been issued in accordance with Part-66. This does only apply to JAR-66 licence issued by the countries listed on the [Mutual recognition page](#).

Please note that none of the bilateral agreements between the EU and third countries (at present US, Canada, Brazil and China and Japan) have the maintenance licences in their scope.

Furthermore, 66.A.70 allows conversion of qualifications valid in a Member State in very specific and limited cases.

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19019>**Basic Part-66 licence (without type rating)**

For personnel studying a qualification at a University or a degree in a country outside of the EU: I am studying aeronautics and I wish to obtain an EASA Part-66 licence? May I get a credit or may I get a licence based on my degree?

Answer

No, unless the basic knowledge got outside of the EU is acquired in a Part-147 training organisation approved by EASA, according to 66.B.405.

Last updated:

28/11/2013

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19018>**Which documentation is required to support the application demonstrating compliance with the experience requirements?****Answer**

Maintenance experience should be written up in a manner that the reader has a reasonable understanding of where, when and what maintenance constitutes the experience. A task-by-task account is not necessary, but at the same time a bland statement such as "X years maintenance experience completed" would not be acceptable. A maintenance log book detailing the experience is desirable and some competent authorities may require such a log book (see AMC 66.A.10).

Consequently, the format used to evidence the maintenance experience is not strictly defined in the rules and is left at the discretion of the competent authority issuing the licence. Hence, EASA advises you follow the instructions of the competent authority where you intend to apply for.

Last updated:

13/04/2015

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19084>

Where do I gain the required basic maintenance experience? Is it mandatory to gain the required maintenance experience in an EASA approved Part-145 organisation?

Answer

According to point 66.A.30(e), experience in aircraft maintenance gained in organisations not approved in accordance with Part-145 or Part-CAO – for example in the following environments: FAR-145, armed forces, coast guard, police, nationally approved organisations, organisations approved by non-EASA Member States, or in aircraft manufacturing, etc. - may be recognised to achieve the experience required in 66.A.30(a), when such maintenance is equivalent to that required by Part-66 as established by the competent authority.

However, **at least part of the basic experience shall be gained in an EASA-approved Part-145 or Part-CAO organisation** (or under the supervision of independent certifying staff): the AMC to point 66.A.30(e) states that as a minimum, experience in aircraft maintenance organisation(s) that is (are) approved in accordance with Part-145 or Part-CAO should be:

- (1) for categories A and L: 6 months;
- (2) for categories B1, B2, B2L, B3 and C: 12 months.

Consequently, please contact the competent authority where you intend to apply for a licence, in order to check whether the basic experience you have is equivalent to that required by Part-66, with detailed information on the type of aircraft, its operation and the nature of the work and respect, as a minimum, the periods set in this AMC for the experience gained in Part-145 and/or Part-CAO organisations.

Last updated:

22/05/2025

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19085>

I work as a mechanic in the military field on aircraft being also certified for civil operations. In order to obtain the Part-66 licence, why do I need additional experience of civil aircraft maintenance as required by 66.A.30(e) on top of my experience in the military field?

Answer

As stated in 66.A.30(e), for mechanics having a military background and seeking a Part-66 licence, the objective is to ensure adequate understanding of the civil aircraft maintenance environment, not only because of possible different aircraft technologies, but also because of practices linked to the civil environment.

Not only the technology or systems of the civil aircraft might differ from the military aircraft version configuration (e.g. no video entertainment system; no sliding chutes; different fuel or electrical systems) but the experience gained in the military environment might also significantly differ from the scope of work of the civil maintenance organisation, its procedures and policies (e.g. use and meaning of the certificate of release to service - EASA Form 1, standard parts, store and tools procedures, use of the maintenance documentation such as ADs, SB, SIL..., quality and safety management system; human factor aspects, continuing airworthiness record systems...).

In addition the interaction with the customers (i.e. the airlines) induces new practices such as use of the aircraft technical log book, MEL, aircraft defect rectification and deferment of items; use of customer documentation (e.g. MPD, MRB, SRM, IPC); interaction with the crew; how to behave with the passengers; special procedure such as (re)fuelling, de-icing /anti-icing; communication with the tower or moving on the apron.

Finally, the requirements for the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft might significantly evolve in the civil environment. To name a few, the following items can be reminded: ADs, SBs, operational directives, EASA requirements; records and archives; repairs and modifications (use of data, EASA/FAA rules; dual-release); special inspections (e.g. CPCS, EWIS); approved

maintenance programme and its effectiveness / reliability; occurrence reporting; understanding of MSG-3 methods ...

The military regulations widely differ from country to country, with certain countries having military rules similar to the EU ones, while others have very different rules. The 12-month additional civil maintenance experience average (as per AMC 66.A.30(e)), has been agreed by the Member States and accepted as a standard way to demonstrate compliance with the rule to achieve mutual recognition and adequate degree of standardisation.

Last updated:

13/04/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19086>

I have completed my EASA Part-66 modules for B1 and I have passed all the exams, but I still lack experience to get my licence. Is there a time limit to get the licence ? Will the certificate expire in a few years if I do not get the experience?

Answer

According to Commission Regulation (EU) No 1149/2011 of 21 October 2011 (amending Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003), the basic examinations shall be passed and experience shall be acquired within the ten years preceding the application for an aircraft basic licence.

The new regulation also states that for the purpose of time limits related to basic knowledge examinations, basic experience acquired before the Regulation applies, the origin of time shall be the date by which this Regulation applies, which is 01/08/2012 (which means until 31/07/2022).

Last updated:

28/11/2013

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19021>

Categories of a Part-66 licence

I hold a Category A1 Part-66 licence. What are the requirements to extend my licence to Category B1.1?

Answer

The requirements to extend a Part-66 licence with a category A1 to B1.1 are:

- the knowledge demonstration of those basic modules, which are of higher level for B1.1 (see Part-66 Appendix I); and
- the demonstration of experience required by Appendix IV to Part-66:

Two years of practical maintenance experience on operating aircraft in the B1.1 category (not in the A1 category) is needed before applying for the extension. This experience need to be accumulated within the 10 years preceding the application.

The experience requirement will be reduced by 50% if the applicant has completed an approved Part-147 course relevant to the category extension according to Appendix IV of Part-66.

See 66.A.10, 66.A.25, 66.A.30 and related AMC/GM.

Last updated:

01/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19088>

I already hold a Part-66 licence and I would like to include an additional basic (sub)category? Which additional (sub)modules are required to be passed for the addition of that new (sub)category?

Answer

According to 66.B.100(b), the competent authority shall verify that all required modules of Appendix I or Appendix VII to Part-66 related to that new (sub)category sought are met. Credit can be granted as regards to the basic knowledge of the (sub)category for which the licence has been already issued.

This means that a comparison of the basic knowledge (gap analysis) will have to be done between the different (sub)categories. Such a comparison has not been yet done once and for all in Commission Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 due to the different potential cases (wide diversity of (sub)categories).

Therefore, such a comparison should be done by the Member State that has already issued the Part-66 licence before the applicant is enrolled in such a “gap” basic knowledge course.

Please contact your competent authority, which may have already performed this comparison. Some competent authorities may have already posted such comparison(s) on their websites; however, to be sure that the comparison relevant to your case is acceptable to the competent authority who issued your licence.

In addition, the applicant will have to comply with the additional experience requirements for the new (sub)category sought, as detailed in Appendix IV to Part-66.

Last updated:

01/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19093>

Type ratings of a Part-66 licence

What is a difference between examination and assessment? Why are there two different examination standards, respectively in Part-66 Appendix III, points 4 and 5?

Answer

Examination is a written form of demonstration of a certain level of theoretical knowledge by the student based on achievement of the learning objectives, usually performed on completion of a theoretical training course or a portion of a course. The student shall demonstrate, to the levels identified in the table in Appendix III, the detailed theoretical knowledge of the aircraft's applicable systems, structure, operations, maintenance, repair, and troubleshooting according to approved maintenance data, as well as the use of manuals and approved procedures, including the knowledge of relevant inspections and limitations. The standard, format, pass mark, etc. are defined in Appendix III, 4.1. The examination shall be performed by the appropriately trained and approved examiner.

Assessment is a practical form of measuring the competence of the student by evaluating three major factors associated to the learning objectives: knowledge, skills and attitude, usually performed on completion of a practical training course. The assessment should focus on the competencies relevant to the aircraft type and its maintenance. The principles on how to perform the competence assessments are given in the AMCs to Part-66, Appendix III. The assessment shall be performed by appropriately trained and approved assessors.

Regarding Part-66 Appendix III, point 5., “Type Examination Standard” does not apply to the examination performed as part of type training. This point only applies to those cases where type examination is performed as a substitute for type training, which means it is intended for the examinations conducted by (or on behalf of) the national competent authority on those aircraft that do not require a type training (typically Group 2, Group 3 and Group 4 aircraft according to Appendix I to the AMCs to Part-66). So, it is true that the examiners authorised by the national competent authority shall not have been involved in the applicant's training. In all other cases AMC to Part-66 Appendix III applies, which means that the roles of the assessor and the instructor may be combined for the practical elements, depending on the size of the organisation.

Regarding the roles of examiners and assessors, these are different functions (which does not prevent that one person can't be authorised both as examiner and assessor). Normally, these functions should not be confused. The expression “The examination shall be oral, written or practical assessment based, or a combination thereof, ...” applies only for Section 5, i.e. “Type Examination Standard”.

Last updated:

01/02/2021

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19094>**I have attended a type training, may I immediately ask my authority to endorse it on my licence?****Answer**

Yes, if the following conditions are met for the theoretical + practical parts of type training:

- the course has been attended and the exams passed in a Part-147 approved training organisation,
- or in another organisation, provided the course has been directly approved by the authority who issued the licence as per 66.B.130,
- and for B1, B2 and L5 licences, in case where the aircraft type is the first in a licence category or subcategory, an OJT training has been performed (derogation for Group 2 and 3 aircraft see 66.A.45(d)).

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19029>**I hold a licence with a type rating and I wish to add the rating of a similar aircraft of the same manufacturer. For example: I have a type rating on Airbus A320 Series, and I wish to add the rating on A330 Series. Do I need a complete course?****Answer**

If aircraft types of the same manufacturer have different type ratings as stated in Appendix I to AMC to Part-66, there is a gap of knowledge gap preventing the endorsement of the second aircraft type. E.g. the Airbus A330 (GE CF6) is a different rating to the Airbus A318/A319/A320/A321 (CFM56).

If the Airbus A318/A319/A320/A321 (CFM56) is previously endorsed or the criteria for endorsement are met (based on conversion or type training) the Airbus A330 (GE CF6) can be endorsed (within the time limits) following either

- a complete theoretical + practical Airbus A330 (GE CF6) course, or
- a differences training course, theoretical and practical for Airbus A330 (GE CF6) compared to Airbus A318 (CFM56) (and/or A319/A320/A321) as described in Appendix III point 1(c).

Those training courses may either be provided by a Part-147 training organisation or by the competent authority.

Remark: A Part-147 organisation difference training is not required for variants within the same aircraft type rating, for example: from A320 to A321. Nevertheless, some training to cover the differences may be necessary. This may be provided by an approved maintenance organisation, before issuing the certifying staff authorisation, (see AMC to Paragraph 1(c) of Appendix III to Part-66 'Aircraft Type Training and Examination Standard. On-the-Job Training').

Last updated:

14/09/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19030>**I just got an empty Part-66 licence. I plan now to get type ratings. Are 2 weeks practical training sufficient?****Answer**

As per the new Regulation (EC) No. 1149/2011, the practical element of training is no longer a question of time. The duration of the practical training should be adequate in order to complete the contents required by paragraph 3.2 of Appendix III to Part-66.

For aeroplanes with a MTOM equal or above 30.000 kg the duration for the practical element of a type rating training course should not be less than two weeks.

In addition, for B1 and B2 licences, where the aircraft is the first in a licence category or subcategory, an on the job(OJT) training shall be performed.

Last updated:

14/09/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19031>

The Appendix III of Part-66 states that a type training course shall be started and finished within 3 years before the application for a type rating, is this still valid if I started the course before 1 August 2012?

Answer

Type training courses started and finished before 01 Aug 2012 can be used for rating endorsement application until 31 July 2015.

Any theoretical type training course finished after 01 Aug 2012 can be used for rating endorsement application until 3 years after they were started (even in the case where they were started before 01 Aug 2012).

Any practical type training course finished after 01 Aug 2012 can be used for rating endorsement application until 3 years after they were started (even in the case where they were started before 01 Aug 2012).

Last updated:

13/11/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19032>

Is it mandatory to go to a Part-147 approved training organisation to get type training? Can we do this training in a Part-145 approved organisation or at the aircraft manufacturer?

Answer

Only approved Part-147 organisations are entitled to conduct type training courses in accordance with Article 6 of the Commission Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014. However, according to Appendix III to Part-66, other than Part-147 organisation (including Part-145 maintenance organisations and manufacturers) can be approved by their competent authorities to provide theoretical element (theoretical training and examination) and/or practical element (practical training and assessment) of aircraft type training. This so called "direct" approval may be given by the competent authority in accordance with 66.B.130 provided:

- This is a one-time approval on a case-by-case basis for a single course or a predefined group of courses i.e. Part-145 approved maintenance organisation cannot receive a permanent approval for aircraft type training.
- The course and the assessment comply with the same standard valid for approved Part-147 organisations; this standard is described in paragraph 1 to 4 of Appendix III to Part-66.
- No Part-147 Certificate of Recognition can be issued for the purpose of the mutual recognition between Member States. However, an appropriate training certificates can be issued after successful completion of both elements.

Directly approved aircraft type training course is only valid for Part-66 AML type rating endorsement by that Member State, which means it cannot be used for aircraft type endorsement by other Member States (no mutual recognition of the certificate), unless this other competent authority has approved the course as well.

In the case of type training for airships in Group 1, the courses shall be directly approved by the competent authority in all cases. The competent authority shall have a procedure to ensure that the syllabus of the airship-type training covers all the elements contained in the maintenance data from the Design Approval Holder (DAH) (66.B.130(b)).

Last updated:

01/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19087>

I have passed the aircraft type rating training (TRT) in an approved EASA Part-147 organisation, although I have not completed the basic knowledge training. Is this TRT valid for life? Would it be possible to endorse it on my Part-66 licence as soon as I get one?

Answer

Aircraft type rating training must have been started and be completed within the 3 years preceding the application for a type rating endorsement (Part-66, Appendix III, paragraph 1).

It does not make sense to attend in the first instance a TRT course with the intent of getting this TRT later endorsed on the maintenance licence for two main reasons:

- At the time the TRT is gained, the holder has no licence and it may take more than 3 years before the applicant is compliant with the basic knowledge (66.A.25), as well as the experience requirements (66.A.30). Therefore the applicant runs the risk to get its TRT certificate expired at the time he applies for the licence and the TRT endorsement; and
- From an intellectual point of view, it is not logical to demonstrate maintenance competence on a specific aircraft type without having acquired the basic knowledge, skills and attitude related to the maintenance and the technologies used in aviation, in general.

Legally speaking the situation is not forbidden. However be sure that you get your licence within the three-year timeframe from the date you **started** the TRT course [see Part-66 Appendix III 1.(a)(iv) and (b)(v)].

Last updated:

08/09/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19092>

OJT (On the Job Training) for a Part-66 licence

Tasks listed in Appendix II of Part-66 for an OJT are not suited to large aircraft. Shall we select the OJT tasks only from this list?

Answer

Not only, because it is required that:

- the tasks for an OJT must be representative of the aircraft: this means that the tasks listed in Appendix II which are representative of the aircraft or another model in the type rating should be kept and those not representative be disregarded,
- some tasks should be selected from each paragraph of the Appendix II list: this means that it is not necessary to perform exactly 50% in each ATA chapter,
- new tasks more representative of the type of aircraft may be added by the maintenance organisation,
- the OJT tasks should be selected because of their frequency, safety, novelty: tasks selected among those frequently carried out by the organisation on this type or more related to safety should be deleted.

Note: See [AMC to Section 6 of Appendix III to Part-66 point 4 and 5](#)

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19034>

How tasks for OJT shall be selected for different licences?

Answer

The AMC states that the tasks are representative of the licence (sub)category applied for. This means that:

- the tasks should identify whether they relate to a B1.1, B1.3 licence ..., to a B2 or L5,
- and be adapted to the privilege of each licence category / subcategory as defined in 66.A.20(a):
 - for a B1 licence: aircraft structure, power plant and mechanical and electrical systems + work on avionics system with simple

test but not including trouble shooting;

- and those related to a B2: avionics, aircraft electrical system tasks and avionics/electrical tasks within mechanical and power plant systems; or
- and those related to a L5: aircraft structure, power plant, mechanical and electrical systems, radio, Emergency Locator Transmitters (ELT), transponder systems and other avionics systems requiring simple tests to prove their serviceability.

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19035>

Since the OJT is intended for the first aircraft type endorsement within a given licence (sub)category, does this mean that it can be performed on different aircraft types typical for that (sub)category?

Answer

OJT shall be performed on the aircraft type for which the applicant is seeking type endorsement. The objective of the OJT is to gain the required competence and experience in performing safe maintenance **on that particular aircraft type**.

However, a certain number of tasks may be performed on other aircraft type(s) (typically from the same manufacturer), only in the cases where such tasks are very similar to the tasks applicable to the aircraft type for which the candidate seeks the type endorsement. The AMC to section 6. of Appendix III to Part-66 states: *"Tasks should be selected among those applicable to type of aircraft and licence (sub)category applied for."* Tasks applicable to the aircraft type may be found also on other aircraft types, perhaps not many, but some may fulfil the requirement. A good example would be same engine types installed on different aircraft types (i.e. CFM56 installed on A320 Family and B737). The location of LRUs, oil servicing, IDG, generator, filter change, engine standard practices, etc., those tasks often do not depend on the specific aircraft type (even could be performed off-wing or on spare engine), except the tasks belonging to the airframe - engine interface. The similar can also be applied for the same type of APU installed on different aircraft types or a limited number of other components/systems. Consequently, this may be acceptable, if properly justified to the competent authority within the MOE Chapter 3.15. **This flexibility provision is applicable for a limited number of tasks and should not be used to conduct the entire OJT on other aircraft type(s) showing similarities.**

Last updated:

02/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19097>

How can I carry out my OJT in a Part-145 approved maintenance organisation (AMO) whose principal place of business is located outside the EASA Member States?

Answer

The endorsement of the first aircraft type rating, within a given category/sub-category, requires satisfactory completion of the corresponding On-the-Job-Training (ref. 66.A.45(c)).

The OJT **shall be approved by the competent authority who has issued the licence**(ref. Part 66, Appendix III, sec. 6).

It shall be carried out in a maintenance organisation approved under Part-145 with A rating or and the procedures for OJT should be included in the exposition (MOE chapter 3.15 "OJT procedure", approved by the competent authority of the maintenance organisation. However, since these procedures are approved by the competent authority of the maintenance organisation, and providing training is not one of the privileges of a maintenance organisation, they can only be used when the licensing authority (competent authority issuing the license) is the same as the competent authority of the maintenance organisation. In other cases, it is up to the licensing authority to decide whether it accepts such procedures for the purpose of approving the OJT (ref. AMC to Section 6 of Appendix III to Part-66).

For the Part-145, whose principal place of business is located outside the EASA Member states, the competent authority of the maintenance organisation is EASA. In such case, the OJT procedures cannot be included in the MOE, due to the fact that EASA is not a licensing authority.

The possibility still exists in this case that a licensing authority may directly approve OJT procedures, which have to be included in a separate document outside (and not being part) of the MOE.

Consequently, personnel working in these AMOs, or the AMOs wishing to support its staff on this matter, should:

- Option A: apply directly to the licensing authority who has issued the license for the approval of an OJT (to be proposed in a document outside the MOE). This option should normally be considered by organisations and not by individuals.
- Option B: find an agreement to follow an already approved OJT at another organisation, which was approved by the same licensing authority who has issued the license. Possibility also exists to follow an OJT which was approved by any other licensing authority, however in such a case the final acceptance of this OJT for the purpose of endorsing the first type rating in the license remains at the sole discretion of the competent authority issuing the license.

It is recommended that prior to starting any OJT, the licensing authority who has issued the license is contacted to verify its acceptance of any possible intended option.

Last updated:

02/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/46840>

Privileges of a Part-66 licence

I am the holder of a B1.2 licence (i.e. “aeroplane piston”). Can I exercise my privileges for piston-engine non-pressurised aeroplanes of 2000 kg MTOM and below (i.e. category B3)?

Answer

By default, a category B3 licence is included in a category B1.2 licence because the basic knowledge requirements (66.A.25(a)) and the basic experience requirement (66.A.30) for a B3 licence are covered by the similar requirements of a B1.2 licence.

Provided that the qualification requirements are fulfilled, the B1.2 licence holder can release maintenance tasks performed on piston-engine non-pressurised aeroplanes of 2000 kg MTOM and below.

In particular the B1.2 licence holder would have to meet 66.A.20(b), which means that:

- the applicable requirements of Part-M, Part-ML, Part-145 and/or Part-CAO will be complied; and
- in the preceding two-year period he/she has 6 months of maintenance experience in accordance with the privileges granted by the aircraft maintenance licence or; met the provision for the issue of the appropriate privileges; and
- he/she has the adequate competence to certify maintenance on the corresponding aircraft; and
- he/she is able to read, write and communicate to an understandable level in the language(s) in which the technical documentation and procedures necessary to support the issue of the certificate of release to service are written.

AMC 66.A.20(b)(2) and GM 66.A.20(b)2 gives further explanations on the 6-months maintenance experience in the last 2 years, including **demonstration of experience on at least one aircraft type per aircraft structure (metal, composite or wood)**¹

¹ - “Aeroplane” does not include “helicopter”.

Last updated:

01/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19091>

Can I have endorsed in my Part-66 licence aircraft types for which the Basic Regulation is not applicable?

Answer

The competent authority of the Member State issuing the licence may include in the Annex (Section XIV) of EASA Form 26 types for which the Basic Regulation is not applicable. The privileges endorsed for these types are based only on the national rules. The use of Section XIV of EASA Form 26 is optional.

EASA does not have any information about these types. If you want to get information about them, please contact the [competent authority](#).

Last updated:

22/03/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19022>

Point 66.A.20(b)(2) requires in the preceding 2 years, 6 months of experience or to meet the provisions for the issue of the appropriate privileges. What does it mean? Does it affect the validity of the Part-66 licence?

Answer

The “validity” of the Part-66 licence is not affected by point 66.A.20(b)(2). The licence itself remains valid 5 years from the last renewal.

Nevertheless, compliance with point 66.A.20(b)(2) is required to ensure that the maintenance privileges are exercised by certifying staff that hold sufficient recent experience.

If you do not meet this point anymore, you lose your rights to exercise your privileges of certifying staff or support staff.

Therefore, as holder of an aircraft maintenance licence, to exercise your certification privilege in accordance with 66.A.20(b)(2), please ensure:

- You have accumulated 6 months of experience in the previous 2 years;

Note: see also AMC 66.A.20(b)(2) for possible reductions of experience, in particular for independent certifying staff.

Demonstration of experience should be made on the particular or similar aircraft. Guidance on ‘similar’ aircraft is also provided in AMC 66.A.20(b)(2).

or

- You can demonstrate that in the last 2 years, you have met the provisions for the issue of appropriate privileges, which means (refer to 66.A.45), as applicable to the case:

- 1) going to a type-training course again (the need for OJT has to be assessed on case-by-case basis);

or

- 2) when the aircraft endorsement does not require type training (aircraft belonging in Group 2, 3 or 4):

- a) pass a type evaluation, including practical assessment;

or

- b) when no type evaluation is required for aircraft endorsement, for example:

- a B2/B2L license endorsed with a full group 3 or 4 rating; or
- for L-category licences (other than L5),

being able to demonstrate, in the last 2 years, practical experience, which shall include a representative cross section of maintenance activities relevant to the licence subcategory (B2/B2L, L1, L1C, L2, etc.)

Note: “A representative cross section of maintenance activities” means representative cross-section of the tasks listed in Appendix II to AMC to Annex III (Part-66) “Aircraft Type Practical Experience and On-the-Job Training - List of Tasks”.

“Demonstrate” means having a record thereof, such as a logbook.

Note: GM 66.A.20(b)2 will be reviewed and amended according to this interpretation through rulemaking task RMT.0735.

Last updated:

14/11/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19023>

As a category A certifying staff at line, can my authority allow me to carry out more tasks than those specified in AMC 145.A.30(g)?

Answer

The list of typical tasks to be carried out by a category A certifying staff at the line shown in the AMC include a (r) stating: "Any other task agreed by the competent authority as a simple task for a particular aircraft type. This may include defect deferment when all the following conditions are met:

- there is no need for troubleshooting; and
- the task is in the MEL, and
- the maintenance action required by the MEL is agreed by the competent authority to be simple.

When these conditions are met, your authority may allow other tasks to be carried out under AMC 145.A.30(g).

Last updated:

28/01/2021

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19028>**Part-147****Basic training**

Is it possible to grant a Part-147 approval to a training organisation which intend to conduct only training on one or only several modules?

Answer

No, a Part-147 approval can only be granted to an organisation which plans to conduct training on all the modules related to a (sub)category of an aircraft maintenance licence, so that a full understanding of the training needs, interfaces and examination relative to that (sub)category of licence is achieved.

However, some modules may be sub-contracted as mentioned in 147.A.145(d).

It does not mean that the Part-147 organisation is not allowed to conduct courses on just one module. In particular, in the case of limitations resulting from the conversion process, limitations can be lifted through the teaching and/or examination of one module or a part of a module.

Last updated:

13/04/2015

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19071>

I have completed a part of my basic training course (including some module examinations) in an approved Part-147 organisation. I'm moving to another country and would like to continue my basic training in a Part-147 organisation located in the country where I move in. Is this possible? What will happen with my certificates? Can I get the maximum reduction of the experience required for the Part-66 licence?

Answer

There are several scenarios possible depending on the particular case. Here are some most probable cases for category A, B1, B2, B2L, B3 or L:

Case No 1 (baseline – standard case): The applicant completes the whole basic knowledge course (including the training, practical assessments and basic modules examinations) in an approved Part-147 maintenance training organisation.

Result: The Certificate of Recognition (CoR) of the basic course completion is issued by the organisation. The applicant can apply for the Part-66 licence with 1 or 2 years of maintenance experience (66.A.30).

Case No 2: The applicant completes the basic training in two different Part-147 AMTO (including the examinations).

Result: The CoRs for the successful examination of each individual module are issued (by different AMTO), but not the CoR for the basic course completion. The applicant does not benefit from the experience reduction and have to fulfil the requirement of 2 or 3 years of experience (if recognised as skilled worker) or 1, 2, 3 or 5 years (66.A.30).

- It may happen that some of the competent authorities would give the complete credit on experience in case the applicant can prove that: the training completed in different organisation covers in total the Appendix I or Appendix VII syllabus; and
- all the practical assessments are performed and passed successfully; and
- all interactions between the modules have been correctly addressed; and
- there was a right proportion of theoretical and practical training for each subject.

As this demonstration requires a significant investment, the applicant is invited to directly contact the competent responsible for performing such an investigation.

Case No 3: The applicant has completed a full basic training course in one approved Part-147 organisation. Unfortunately, the candidate was not in a position to successfully pass the full examination process (all modules) in that organisation and had to pass the missing portion of the examination in another approved Part-147 organisation.

Result: In this case the applicant would receive a CoR for basic training only as well as the CoRs related to the modules successfully passed in that approved Part-147 organisation. The examination for the missing modules may be successfully passed in another approved Part-147 organisation(s) with issuance of the related CoRs thereof. The combination of all these CoRs may be sufficient for the competent authority to recognise the training course as successfully “completed” and to grant the maximum credit for the experience (only 1 or 2 years needed, see case No 1) for the issue of the license.

Case No 4: The applicant did not attend a Part-147 basic training course but only took examinations in one or more approved Part-147 organisation(s).

Result: The applicant would receive several CoRs for the successful examination of individual modules from one or more approved Part-147 organisations. No credit of experience as per 66.A.30 will be granted (except for skill workers – 2 or 3 years). Standard 1, 2, 3 or 5 years of experience will be required.

Further information is given in AMC to Appendix III to Part-147 “Certificates of Recognition referred to in Annex IV (Part-147) – EASA Forms 148 and 149.

Last updated:

01/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19079>

Is it possible to grant a Part-147 approval to a training organisation which intend to conduct only basic knowledge examinations?

Answer

No, a Part-147 approval can only be granted to an organisation which can prove its capability to conduct training and examinations on a complete syllabus of at least one (sub)category of the Part-66 licence. Only in the case the organisation holds the approval for the complete basic training course, it may conduct basic examinations not being an integral part of the approved basic training course.

Last updated:

13/04/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19070>

Is it possible to grant a Part-147 approval to an organisation applying only for basic knowledge training?

Answer

Yes, in such case Form 148 shall be used as template for the Certificate of Recognition, which specifies “Basic training course” or “Basic examination”. In the particular case where all modules are not conducted, the certificate shall state only “Basic training course” and the modules conducted be mentioned on the certificate including the date(s) of the training module(s).

Reference: 147.A.145

Last updated:

29/01/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19068>

Part-147 approved organisations have the privilege to carry out basic examinations on behalf of the competent authority. Does this imply that the said authority has to supply or approve examination questions?

Answer

No, the competent authority does not have to supply examination questions. However, as part of the oversight, the authority must sample check and review the organisations' question data bank and the examination process.

Last updated:

13/04/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19074>

Type training

Is it possible to perform aircraft type training in two different organisations? Can I do my practical portion of the type training in a Part-145 organisation?

Answer

Only a Part-147 organisation has the privilege (if approved by its competent authority) to provide aircraft type training courses. This comprises both the theoretical and practical element of the aircraft type training, including the related examinations and assessments. This means that the practical element of the aircraft type training shall be completed in a Part-147 organisation.

However, the aircraft type training may be conducted physically in a Part-M Subpart F, Part-145 or Part-CAO organisation under the control (and as a part of the approval) of a Part-147 organisation issuing the Certificate of Recognition. It is not the privilege of the Part-M Subpart F, Part-145 or Part-CAO organisation to conduct aircraft type training courses on its own.

In addition, the theoretical and practical element of the aircraft type training can be conducted by two different approved Part-147 organisations. The competent authority endorsing the type rating on the license should be convinced that the interfaces have been correctly addressed before proceeding thereof (66.B.115(b) refers).

In the special case where the aircraft type course is directly approved by the competent authority in accordance with the procedure 66.B.130 (i.e. only on a case by case basis – special authorization not granted for long term periods), the training can be conducted outside the scope of a Part-147 organisation. As a consequence, the certificate issued is not mutually recognized between Member States, which means it can only be used for aircraft type endorsement by the licensing authority who issued that direct approval.

Last updated:

01/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19080>

How should the 50% of tasks required for practical training be selected? Should it be 50% of tasks as per glossary (e.g. LOC, FOT, SGH, R/I, etc.)?

Answer

The selection of 50% of tasks cannot be selected according to the glossary. Paragraph 3.2 of Appendix III to Part-66 clearly states that 'the tasks selected shall be representative of the aircraft and systems both in complexity and diversity. In addition, the practical training should particularly address the tasks which cannot be explained by theoretical training only. While relatively simple tasks may be included, other more complex tasks shall also be incorporated and completed as appropriate to the aircraft type.

Regarding the way to read the table in paragraph 3.2, the lines aims at covering the main systems so that no line relevant to the particular aircraft type should be omitted in the selection. Inside each line applicable to the aircraft type, half or more of the crosses can be selected. From a learning point of view, selecting 2 simple tasks as LOC and SGH would not be "representative", while selecting LOC and TS, for example, would be much more appropriate.

When selecting the tasks, the usage of filtering method based on the criteria similar to that described in AMC to paragraph 3.1(d) of Appendix III to Part-66, point 5 f) is recommended.

Last updated:

13/04/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19081>

What is the minimum duration of the practical element of the aircraft type training?

Answer

The duration of the practical training should ensure that the content of training required by paragraph 3.2 of Appendix III to Part-66 is completed. However, for aeroplanes with a MTOM equal or above 30000 kg, AMC to paragraph 1(b), 3.2 and 4.2 of Appendix III to Part-66 recommends the duration of the practical element of a type rating training course be not less than two weeks, unless a shorter duration meeting the objectives of the training and taking into account pedagogical aspects (maximum duration per day) is justified to the competent authority. This means that the duration of the a/c type practical training is not the main driver as justified by the status of that AMC. According to point 3.2 (b) Appendix III to Part-66 (having the status of requirement), the duration should be based on the content sufficiently representative in diversity and complexity in order to gain the needed competence.

Last updated:

01/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19078>

Examination

Can an examination be limited to some modules only, or one module only or part of a module only?

Answer

As mentioned in the previous question, for some particular cases, the basic training need to be conducted and the relevant examination to be passed on some modules only or one module or part of a module (this is typically the case where the holder of a licence applies for removing some limitations mentioned in his/her licence).

However, the Part-147 organisation should be capable of conducting the full course relative to the (sub)category sought, so that they can run the examination.

Last updated:

13/04/2015

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19072>

Should examiners be specialists in the subjects, or can they be responsible for the proper conduct of the examination without being responsible for the content?

Answer

“Examiner” should be here understood as “invigilator” (i.e. the personnel responsible for merely running the examination).

The examiners (invigilators) are not required to be experts in the subjects examined when relative to the MCQs in accordance with Appendix II to Part-66. However, the assessment of essay questions as part of the basic knowledge has to be conducted by knowledgeable personnel with the help of a standard reply. Eventually, the invigilators must be trained to the examination process.

Examiners should demonstrate a clear understanding of the examination standard required by Part-66 and have a responsible attitude to the conduct of examinations such that the highest integrity is ensured. (GM 147.A.105(g)).

Regarding the type training examination and assessment standard as well as type examination standard as described in Part-66, Appendix III, paragraphs 4 and 5, the theoretical element examination can follow the same principle as above; however, for the practical element assessment, the examiner(s) must be appropriately qualified. Further provisions are available in Appendix III to AMC to Part-66.

Last updated:

13/04/2015

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19075>

What is the maximum number of students attending the examination?

Answer

147.A.100(b) defines the facility requirements for the instructions of theory and the conduct of knowledge examinations. Point 1 deals with the facility requirement for knowledge training whereby the number of students shall not exceed 28. Point 2 defines the facility requirements for the examination purposes, where the maximum number of students attending the knowledge examination is not limited. The number of students attending the knowledge examination is indirectly limited only by the size, layout and arrangement of the accommodation in order to fulfil the following requirements:

- ... no student can read the paperwork or computer screen of any other student from his/her position during examinations (147.A.100(b)2), and
- Examination candidates shall be separated from each other so that they cannot read each other's examination papers. (66.B.200(h)).

Consequently, as long as the facility and examination standard as well as the integrity of the examination can be ensured, the number of candidates attending the examination may not be limited. In case of a larger number of candidates, two or more examiners may be used to ensure the integrity of the examination, such as separation of the candidates, no potential cheating, no speaking to each other, only examination paper on the table, no examination paper removed from the room, etc.

Last updated:

13/04/2015

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19077>**Others**

Shall a Part-147 approved organisation have a mandatory occurrence reporting system according to Regulation (EU) No 376/2014?

Answer

Article 4 of Regulation (EU) No 376/2014 defines the persons and organisations obliged to report occurrences under the “mandatory reporting system”. Personnel working at/for organisations approved in accordance with EASA Part-147 are not listed in paragraph 6 of article 4, therefore such organisations are not required to implement mandatory/voluntary reporting systems according to Regulation (EU) No 376/2014. This does not prevent any organisation or person involved in aviation activities, including maintenance training activities, to report any safety occurrence or other safety information they consider relevant.

Such reports would be to the voluntary reporting system to be established by all competent authorities according to Article 5.2 of Regulation (EU) No 376/2014.

Typically, a Part- 147 approved training organisation having implemented a Safety Management System (SMS) on a voluntary basis would have such a voluntary occurrence reporting system.

The European Commission (EC) published [Guidance Material](#) for Regulation (EU) No 376/2014. Paragraph 3.3 further elaborates on the organisations affected by that regulation.

An [online service developed by the EC](#) allows organisations and individuals to report aviation safety occurrences to aviation authorities.

Last updated:

02/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21037>

Part-147 approved organisations can also give courses outside the scope of Part-66. Can these courses be certified? (e.g. continuation training for the purpose of the certifying staff privileges as required by M.A.607, 145.A.35 or CAO.A.040, task training, NDT, engine run, HF, SMS, etc.)

Answer

Courses outside the scope of Part-66 cannot be part of the Approval Schedule of the approved Part-147 organisation. This does not prevent a training organisation to provide such courses. The scope, content and the delivery methods of these courses will not be reviewed by the Agency or the EASA Member States, as part of the audit scope of the Part-147 organisation. However, when Part-M, Part-ML, Part-145 or Part-CAO requires the staff to be trained, the appropriateness of such training being delivered would be assessed during the audits of these particular organisations.

Last updated:

01/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19073>

How can I become an EASA aircraft maintenance instructor?

Answer

Part-147, in particular, 147.A.105 (f), state that the experience and qualifications of instructors, knowledge examiners and practical assessors shall be established in accordance with criteria published or in accordance with a procedure and to a standard agreed by the competent authority. There are no additional requirements or guidance published in EASA rules regarding the experience and qualification of instructors, except that it is recommended that potential instructors be trained in instructional techniques.

The eligibility of candidates to a permanent or temporary (contracted independent) instructor's position must be assessed in regards to the minimum qualifications defined by the concerned Approved Part 147 Training Organisation. The Organisation's procedures should detail these minimum qualifications and associated eligibility criteria in terms of technical knowledge, pedagogical and instructional skills and working experience.

EASA does not issue Instructor licences or equivalent, and permanent or contracted instructors can only exercise instruction privileges through the approval of a Training Organisation. Instructors are nominated by the approved organisation, which keep detailed records of their qualifications and are audited by the authority. Their authorised scope of activity is then stated on Terms of Reference provided to the instructors, as well as on the instructor/ examiners/ assessors approved list.

For any further questions, we advise you to contact the training organisation Quality Assurance Dept. and/ or the Competent Authority (the one who granted the approval), in order to enquire about the possibility to be nominated as an instructor.

Last updated:

27/02/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45488>

Should the Part-147 organisation's quality system be audited?

Answer

147.A.130(b) states that the approved Part-147 organisation shall establish a quality system including:

1. an independent audit function to monitor training standards, the integrity of knowledge examinations and practical assessments, compliance with and adequacy of the procedures, and
2. a feedback system of audit findings to the person(s) and ultimately to the accountable manager referred to in 147.A.105(a) to ensure, as necessary, corrective action

This means that the quality system itself should be independently audited. The competent authority cannot perform this function on behalf of the organisation.

Within its approved procedures, the organisation has to monitor the quality system's procedures. This implies that quality system monitoring itself must be subject to internal audits:

- no conflict of interest is allowed - it is not permitted that such a function be performed by quality system's staff;
- This can be also outsourced;
- the right level of the auditor(s)' position within the organisation shall be met in order to assure the objective of 147.A.130(b)2. (e.g. conflict of hierarchy, which could hinder an efficient and transparent report to the accountable manager).

In addition, the audit programme/plan needs to reflect this regulatory aspect.

The EASA Flight Standard Directorate consistently applies that policy during their standardisation inspections.

Last updated:

01/02/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19076>

Air Operations

Air Operations - General

In the definition of 'commercial operation' published in Art. 2 of Regulation (EU) 965/2012 (introduced by the amending Reg. (EU) 2018/1975), what is the meaning of the term "control"?

Answer

Reference: Reg. (EU) 965/2012, Article 2:

"commercial operation" shall mean any operation of an aircraft, in return for remuneration or other valuable consideration, which

is available to the public or, when not made available to the public, which is performed under a contract between an operator and a customer, where the latter has no control over the operator.'

Pursuant to Article 140(2)(a) of Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 (the New Basic Regulation), 'commercial operation' shall still be understood as a reference to point (i) of Article 3 of Regulation (EC) No 216/2008. This is a transitional provision until not later than 12 September 2023, when the implementing rules adopted on the basis of Regulations (EC) No 216/2008 and (EC) No 552/2004 shall be adapted to this Regulation. The same definition of 'commercial operation' has already been transposed in Article 2 of Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations and is applicable as of 9 July 2019.

Last updated:

02/09/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19129>

Would there be a restriction that requires baby bassinets to be removed and stowed during in-flight turbulent weather conditions? Where is it documented?

Answer

Reference: CS-25 (Large Aeroplanes)

Baby bassinets are currently included in a certification process of the particular aircraft in which they will be installed; baby bassinets are not certified as a separate device and they are not certified for taxi, take-off, landing and turbulent weather conditions. Placards advising on their stowage during taxi, take-off, landing and turbulence are required either at the location where baby bassinets will be fixed to the aircraft structure (e.g. bulkhead) or a clearly visible instruction advising on the same must be in place on the baby bassinet itself.

Because of the standard fixation of the unit, they are not stable during turbulence, they may swing up and down, and therefore they must be stowed during turbulence.

The placarding requirements are related to the general certification requirements on placarding and intended function in accordance with Certifications Specifications and Acceptable Means of Compliance for Large Aeroplanes CS-25 ([ED Decision 2012/008/R](#)) and the marking requirements as specified in the approval of the equipment. The applicable reference paragraph is CS 25.1301, 25.1541. There is no specific mention of baby bassinets, however, equipment installed in an aircraft must meet the applicable requirements of the certification basis, the equipment specifications (if available) or aircraft manufacturer specifications (if available), or NAA requirements applicable to the operation of the aircraft.

For any questions on certification matters, do not hesitate to contact EASA Certification directorate.

Last updated:

14/02/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19128>

What are the essential requirements?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) 2018/1139, Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations

Essential requirements are high-level safety objectives and obligations put on persons and organisations undertaking aviation activities under Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 (the Basic Regulation). Detailed rules are then adopted by the European Commission based on technical advice from EASA to further detail how to achieve these objectives and obligations. For example, the implementing rules for air operations (i.e. Reg. (EU) No 965/2012) have been developed in order to ensure uniform implementation of essential requirements related to air operations.

The Basic Regulation has annexes containing essential requirements for:

- airworthiness (Annex II),
- environmental compatibility related to products (Annex III)
- aircrew (Annex IV),
- air operations (Annex V),
- qualified entities (Annex VI),
- aerodromes (Annex VII),
- ATM/ANS and air traffic controllers (Annex VIII), and
- unmanned aircraft (Annex IX).

The Essential Requirements can be amended by the European Commission where necessary for reasons of technical, operational or scientific developments or evidence.

Last updated:

02/09/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19109>

What do 'grandfathering', 'transition measure' and 'opt-out' mean?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011, Regulation (EU) No 965/2012

These terms refer to certain legal concepts used in aviation safety regulations, in particular Reg. (EU) No 1178/2011 on aircrew and Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations.

'Grandfathering' designates the legal recognition and acceptance of certificates issued on the basis of national legislation by national authorities prior to the entry into force of a specific regulation. For example, in Reg. (EU) No 1178/2011, the conditions for the grandfathering of JAR-compliant and non-JAR-compliant pilot licences and medical certificates are set forth in its Articles 4 and 5. In Reg. (EU) No 965/2012, the conditions for grandfathering of EU-OPS AOCs are set forth in Article 7(1).

Grandfathering measures are included in the Cover Regulation to assist Member States in the transition from national rules to unified EU rules. In the case of aircrew licensing, provisions on grandfathering consider some national certificates issued in compliance with given regulations and by a certain date as being in compliance with the new Aircrew Regulation (i.e. Reg. (EU) No 1178/2011).

A 'transition measure' is a provision helping the national competent authorities and regulated entities to gradually adapt to the new EU rules. Several examples can be found in the Aircrew Regulation, such as in Article 11c (in relation to the obligation of Member States regarding the transfer of records and certification processes of those organisations for which the Agency is the competent authority) and in Article 4 (1) — the obligation of Member States to adapt grandfathered pilot licences to the new format by a certain date.

The 'opt-out' is a form of transition measure applicable to Member States. Opt-out provisions allowed Member States to decide not to implement an EU regulation or certain provisions thereof for a certain period of time, delaying the date of application of the new regulation (or certain provisions thereof) within that Member State. For example, the opt-out provisions contained in the Aircrew and Air Ops regulations required the Member State to notify the European Commission and EASA of the 'opt-out', describing the reasons for such derogation and the programme for the phasing out of the opt-out and achieving full implementation of the common requirements.

Read more on [opt-in and opt-out](#).

Last updated:

02/09/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19111>

What is the difference between 'entry into force' and 'date of applicability' in the Cover Regulations?

Answer

Many Commission Regulations adopted in EASA domains contain two different dates, usually under the heading “entry into force”. The example below is from Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations:

Article 10

Entry into force

1. This Regulation shall enter into force on the third day following that of its publication in the Official Journal of the European Union.

It shall apply from 28 October 2012.

The entry into force of an EU regulation represents the date when the regulation has legal existence in the EU legal order and in the national legal order of each Member State.

It is common practice that the regulation enters into force 20 days after its publication in the Official Journal of the EU. That is the case when the legislator simply uses the expression “This Regulation enters into force on the 20th day after its publication in the Official Journal of the European Union.” Shorter periods are also used, as was the case in the example above.

Sometimes the date of entry into force is also the date of applicability of a regulation, meaning that from the date when it enters into force, the regulation is also applicable; it can be fully invoked by its addressees and is fully enforceable.

However, due to the complexity of the domains that are regulated, a period of time may be needed between the date the regulation enters into force, i.e. it legally exists, and the date it can actually be applied, i.e. the date when it is enforceable and the legal rights and obligations can be effectively exercised.

This period of time (*vacatio legis*) is deliberately introduced for Member States, competent authorities, operators, organisations, licence holders and any other addressees or beneficiaries of the regulations to prepare their systems, processes, procedures, documentation, etc. for compliance with the new rules.

Vacatio legis is also a period given for the addressees of the regulation to adjust to the upcoming rights and obligations and take the necessary measures to benefit from the legal effects of the regulation, namely for the purposes of mutual recognition of certificates and approvals in the aviation internal market.

In those cases, it is common practice of the legislator to establish two different dates under the article on entry into force. One date establishes the legal existence of the act (**entry into force**); the second date establishes the date when it becomes applicable (**applicability**).

The date of applicability therefore represents the date from which the regulation can produce rights and obligations on the addressees and can be directly enforced towards the courts, administrations, national governments, etc. This means that before the date of applicability, obligations or privileges can neither be exercised nor enforced.

The same understanding is shared by the Legal Service of the Commission, which has also clarified in EASA Committee that the privileges provided for in a regulation can only be exercised as of the applicability date chosen by the legislator. Persons subject to the relevant regulation (including national aviation authorities) may prepare themselves for such an effective date (adapting their procedures and practices), but can neither enjoy the privileges nor enforce the obligations.

Legal consequences

This means that Member States cannot start delivering authorisations, approvals, certificates, etc. issued in accordance with the new regulations and at the same time producing all the legal effects of the regulation from the date of entry into force of the regulation, **but only from the date of its applicability**. However, during the gap period existing between the date of entry into force and the date of applicability, Member States and competent authorities can prepare the process towards the issuance of such authorisations, approvals, and any other certificates in accordance with the new provisions.

In addition, during the period of *vacatio legis*, an option that Member States and competent authorities can consider, in order to avoid issuing certificates on the last day before the date of applicability, is to issue the new certificates in accordance with the new regulation while clearly indicating in those certificates that they are only valid as of a certain date that would coincide with the

date of applicability of the regulation on the basis of which those certificates are issued. This means that those new certificates may be issued, but are not yet effective and cannot be mutually recognised among Member States until the common date of applicability established by the regulation. Until they become effective, licence holders, organisations and operators should still retain and use the certificates already issued under the previous regime. Competent authorities are only obliged to accept the new certificates once the regulation has become applicable.

Last updated:

02/09/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19112>

When will the new rules on air operations be applicable?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations and its amendments

Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 entered into force on 28 October 2012.

Article 10 of the Air OPS Regulation includes an opt-out provision allowing Member States to postpone the applicability of Annexes I to V until 28 October 2014. This means that entire Annexes and/or specific parts of the Annexes will not be applicable if a Member States chooses to opt-out. The Agency has published an overview of the opt-out period applied by Member States [here](#).

The amendments to the Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 have different applicability dates:

- Commission Regulation (EU) No 800/2013 on non-commercial operation became applicable on 25 August 2013 and the opt-out period is 3 years.
- Commission Regulation (EU) No 71/2014 on operational suitability data was published on 27 January 2014; it entered into force on the twentieth day following that of its publication and must be applied not later than 18 December 2017 or two years after the approval of the operational suitability data, whichever is the latest.
- Commission Regulation (EU) No 83/2014 on flight and duty time limitations and rest requirements was published on 29 January 2014, entered into force on the twentieth day following that of its publication and shall apply from 18 February 2016 and from 17 Feb 2017 for ORO.FTL.205(e).

Once the Implementing Rules have been adopted, it is still possible that transition measures defer their applicability to a later date. Therefore, the exact date of applicability of each requirement will depend on the transition measures adopted by the European Commission. Until the date the new Implementing Rules apply, Member States' national rules and EU-OPS remain in force.

Last updated:

14/02/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19113>

What is the comitology procedure?

Answer

Please refer to the information provided by the European Commission on [comitology](#).

[More information](#)

Last updated:

02/09/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19114>

Why can't I find EU-OPS on the EASA website?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations, associated Decisions (AMC/GM)

EU-OPS was the basis for the creation of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations, which is the currently applicable regulation in the field of air operations with aeroplanes and helicopters.

EU-OPS is published in the Official Journal of the EU as [Regulation \(EC\) No 859/2008](#) of 20 August 2008 amending Council Regulation (EEC) No 3922/91 as regards common technical requirements and administrative procedures applicable to commercial transportation by aeroplane.

Last updated:

02/09/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19116>

What is the status of 'Implementing Rules', 'Acceptable Means of Compliance' (AMC), 'Certification Specifications' (CS), 'Alternative Means of Compliance' (AltMOC), 'Guidance Material' (GM), 'Special Conditions' and 'Frequently Asked Questions'(FAQ)?

Answer

Implementing rules (IRs) are binding in their entirety and used to specify a high and uniform level of safety and uniform conformity and compliance. They detail how to comply with the essential requirements of the Basic Regulation and regulate the subject matters included in its scope. The IRs are adopted by the European Commission in the form of Regulations. EU law is directly applicable (full part of Member States' legal order).

Detailed implementation aspects are included as Certification Specifications (CS) or Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC).

Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC) are non-binding. The AMC serves as a means by which the requirements contained in the Basic Regulation and the IRs can be met. The AMC illustrate a means, but not the only means, by which a requirement of an implementing rule can be met. Satisfactory demonstration of compliance using a published AMC shall provide for presumption of compliance with the related requirement; it is a way to facilitate certification tasks for the applicant and the competent authority. However, NAAs and organisations may decide to show compliance with the requirements using other means. Both NAAs and the organisations may propose alternative means of compliance (AltMoCs). 'Alternative Means of Compliance' are those that propose an alternative to an existing AMC. Those AltMoC proposals must be accompanied by evidence of their ability to meet the intent of the IR. Use of an existing AMC gives the user the benefit of compliance with the IR.

Read more on the difference between [AMC and AltMoC](#).

Certification Specifications (CS) are non-binding technical standards adopted by EASA to meet the essential requirements of the Basic Regulation. CSs are used to establish the certification basis (CB) as described below. Should an aerodrome operator not meet the recommendation of the CS, they may propose an Equivalent Level of Safety (ELOS) that demonstrates how they meet the intent of the CS. As part of an agreed CB, the CS become binding on an individual basis to the applicant.

Special Conditions (SC) are non-binding special detailed technical specifications determined by the NAA for an aerodrome if the certification specifications established by EASA are not adequate or are inappropriate to ensure conformity of the aerodrome with the essential requirements of Annex VII to the Basic Regulation. Such inadequacy or inappropriateness may be due to:

- the design features of the aerodrome; or
- where experience in the operation of that or other aerodromes, having similar design features, has shown that safety may be compromised.

SCs, like CSs, become binding on an individual basis to the applicant as part of an agreed CB.

Guidance Material (GM) is non-binding explanatory and interpretation material on how to achieve the requirements contained in the Basic Regulation, the IRs, the AMCs and the CSs. It contains information, including examples, to assist the user in the correct understanding and application of the Basic Regulation, its IRs, AMCs and the CSs.

Frequently Asked Questions: FAQs are published on the EASA website and cover a wide range of material. Although the information contained in the FAQs is a summary of existing law or procedures, it may contain the results of a more complex interpretation of IR or other rules of law. In such cases there is always an internal quality consultation within the Agency prior to the publication of the FAQ on the website. The EASA FAQs are necessary to share information and enable to get a common understanding.

The FAQs are not additional GM.

Last updated:

02/09/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19117>

Does Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations also apply to non-commercial operations?

Answer

References: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations as amended by Regulation (EU) No 800/2013; Reg. (EC) No 216/2008

Yes, non-commercial operations with aeroplanes and helicopters are covered by Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations. The applicable rules are determined by the complexity of the aircraft being used: Annex VI (Part–NCC) applies to non-commercial operations with complex motor-powered aircraft) and Annex VII (Part–NCO) applies to non-commercial operations with other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft.

The definition of complex motor-powered aircraft is found in Article 3 of Reg. (EC) No 216/2008. Pursuant to Article 140(2)(a) of Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 (the New Basic Regulation), 'complex motor-powered aircraft' shall still be understood as a reference to point (j) of Article 3 of Regulation (EC) No 216/2008. This is a transitional provision until not later than 12 September 2023, when the implementing rules adopted on the basis of Regulations (EC) No 216/2008 and (EC) No 552/2004 shall be adapted to this Regulation. The definition is as follows:

"complex motor-powered aircraft" shall mean:

(i) an aeroplane:

- with a maximum certificated take-off mass exceeding 5 700 kg, or
- certificated for a maximum passenger seating configuration of more than nineteen, or
- certificated for operation with a minimum crew of at least two pilots, or
- equipped with (a) turbojet engine(s) or more than one turboprop engine, or

(ii) a helicopter certificated:

- for a maximum take-off mass exceeding 3 175 kg, or
- for a maximum passenger seating configuration of more than nine, or
- for operation with a minimum crew of at least two pilots,

or

(iii) a tilt rotor aircraft".

The definition for 'commercial operation' is in Article 2 of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012:

"(1)(d) 'commercial operation' means any operation of an aircraft, in return for remuneration or other valuable consideration, which is available to the public or, when not made available to the public, which is performed under a contract between an operator and customer, where the latter has no control over the operator".

Training flights fall under either Part-NCC or Part-NCO, depending on the complexity of the aircraft used for the non-commercial operations.

In addition, Part-SPA applies to any operation requiring a specific approval (e.g. low visibility operations, transport of dangerous goods, performance-based navigation and more).

Finally, Annexes II (Part-ARO) and III (Part-ORO) contain the authority requirements and respectively the organisation requirements. Annex III applies to operators of complex motor-powered aircraft, both commercial and non-commercial.

Last updated:

02/09/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19123>

I am not familiar with the Air ops rules' structure. Which parts apply to which operators?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations and the associated Decisions

This is determined by the nature of your flight, and in the case of non-commercial operations, by the type of aircraft used. The following diagram indicates under which requirements your flight should be operating.

Commercial operations	Commercial air transport (CAT) operations	Technical rules: Part-CAT	
		Operator rules: Part-ORO	
	Specialised operations (aerial work)	Technical rules: Part-SPO	
		Operator rules: Part-ORO	
Non-commercial operations	Non-commercial operations other than SPO (e.g. business/corporate flights, leisure flights, private flights, training flights)	With CMPA:	Technical rules: Part-NCC Operator rules: Part-ORO
		With Ot-CMPA:	Technical rules: Part-NCO
	Specialised operations (aerial work)	With CMPA:	Technical rules: Part-SPO Operator rules: Part-ORO
		With Ot-CMPA	Technical rules: Part-NCO

Part-SPA (specific approvals) applies to all types of operations, as the case may be.

CMPA = complex motor-powered aircraft

Ot-CMPA = other-than complex motor-powered aircraft

Last updated:

02/09/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19124>

How can I find out where a rule from EU-OPS / JAR-OPS 3 has been transposed in the new Regulation (EU) 965/2012 on Air Operations and its amendments, as well as its associated EASA Decisions, and if any changes have been

introduced?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations, associated Decisions (AMC/GM)

The Agency has published a cross-reference table to assist industry in transitioning to the new rules. This table contains detailed information on the transposition of EU-OPS / JAR-OPS 3 provisions (both Section 1 and Section 2 - for aeroplanes, TGL 44) into the new Implementing Rules (IR), Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC) and Guidance Material (GM):

- new rule reference and rule title;
- old rule reference and rule title;
- indication of any differences to EU-OPS / JAR-OPS 3 provisions by stating “No change”, “Amended”, “New” or “Not transposed”; and
- short description of the differences, if any, between the old and new rules.

With this [cross-reference table](#) one can analyse in detail where and how the old provisions have been transposed into the new regulatory framework.

Last updated:

14/02/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19125>

Which operational requirements (EU/EASA Parts) apply to flight activities carried out by an aircraft designer or aircraft manufacturer?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations

At the present stage no EU operational requirements exist for flights related to design and production activities (“manufacturer flights”). Instead these flights are regulated under national law. This is laid down in Paragraph 3 of Article 6 of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 as follows:

“By way of derogation from Article 5 of this Regulation and without prejudice to point (b) of Article 18(2) of Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 and to Subpart P of Annex I to Commission Regulation (EU) No 748/2012 concerning the permit to fly, the following flights shall continue to be operated under the requirements specified in the national law of the Member State in which the operator has its principal place of business, or, where the operator has no principal place of business, the place where the operator is established or resides:

(a) flights related to the introduction or modification of aeroplane or helicopter types conducted by design or production organisations within the scope of their privileges; (...)”

Last updated:

02/09/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19127>

Where can I find a list of alternative means of compliance that have been adopted by operators and NAAs in the EU?

Answer

In the [Information on Alternative Means of Compliance notified to the Agency](#) page there is a list with all the AltMoCs adopted by the Member States.

Last updated:

20/05/2019

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/97716>**Definitions****What are critical phases of flight?****Answer***Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012, Annex I Definitions*

Annex I (Definitions) of the Regulation (EU) 965/2012 on air operations contains definitions for critical phases of flight for aeroplanes and helicopters:

“Critical phases of flight’ in the case of aeroplanes means the take-off run, the take-off flight path, the final approach, the missed approach, the landing, including the landing roll, and any other phases of flight as determined by the pilot-in-command or commander.

‘Critical phases of flight’ in the case of helicopters means taxiing, hovering, take-off, final approach, missed approach, the landing and any other phases of flight as determined by the pilot-in-command or commander.”

As one can see from these definitions, for helicopters taxiing is defined as a critical phase of flight, while for aeroplanes it is not. Rules for activities considered acceptable during critical phases of flight are provided in the Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations – in Annex III (Part-ORO), Annex IV (Part-CAT), Annex VI (Part-NCC), Annex VII (Part-NCO) and Annex VIII (Part-SPO). Basically, these implementing rules require crew members during critical phases of flight:

- to be seated at his/her assigned station; and
- not to perform any activities other than those required for the safe operation of the aircraft

Last updated:

18/12/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19133>**What are 'Sterile Flight Deck Procedures'?****Answer***Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations, Annex I (Definitions) and Annex III (Part-ORO)*

The term 'Sterile Flight Deck' is used to describe any period of time when the flight crew members shall not be disturbed e.g. by cabin crew, except for matters critical to the safe operation of the aircraft and/or the safety of the occupants. In addition, during these periods of time the flight crew members should focus on their essential operational activities without being disturbed by non-flight related matters, i.e. flight crew members should avoid non-essential conversations, should not make non-safety related announcements towards the passengers, etc.

Sterile flight deck procedures are meant to increase the flight crew members' attention to their essential operational activities when their focused alert is needed, i.e. during critical phases of flight (take-off, landing, etc.), during taxiing and below 10 000 feet (except for cruise flight).

The sterile flight deck procedures were published in Regulation (EU) 2015/140 as an amending regulation to (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations. EASA published the associated AMC and GM with ED Decision 2015/005/R.

Last updated:

18/12/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19134>

What is the difference between 'commercial operation' and 'commercial air transport (CAT) operation'?**Answer**

Reference: Regulation (EC) No 216/2008, Regulation (EU) No 965/2012

The term 'commercial operation' is now defined in Article 2 of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 as follows (previously in Reg. (EC) No 216/2008):

“‘Commercial operation’ means any operation of an aircraft, in return for remuneration or other valuable consideration, which is available to the public or, when not made available to the public, which is performed under a contract between an operator and a customer, where the latter has no control over the operator.”

The term 'commercial air transport (CAT) operation' is defined in Article 3 of Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 as follows:

“‘Commercial air transport’ means an aircraft operation to transport passengers, cargo or mail for remuneration or other valuable consideration.”

The two definitions make it clear that 'commercial operations' include 'CAT operations'. Specialised operations (SPO) are another type of commercial operations. They are also defined in Article 2 of Reg. (EU) No 965/2012.

Last updated:

20/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19131>

Part-ARO

AMC2 ARO.GEN.305(c) Oversight programme (c) stipulates that audits should include at least one on-site audit within each oversight planning cycle. What is meant by an 'on-site audit' in this sentence? Could it be so that every audit undertaken by an NAA could be performed while sitting in the NAA's office and reviewing operator's documents and procedures and only one of those audits should be undertaken in a way that NAA inspectors actually visit an operator on-site?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations, Annex II (Part ARO, ARO.GEN and ARO.RAMP)

There is no further guidance on how many on-site audits should actually be performed. This decision depends on the confidence of the authority in the operator, on results of past certification and/or oversight activities required by ARO.GEN and ARO.RAMP and on the assessment of associated risks. The number of on-site audits is therefore part of the oversight responsibility of the authority.

Last updated:

14/02/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19139>

How do the provisions on wet-leasing articulate with Regulation (EU) No 452/2014 on Third Country Operators (TCO)?**Answer**

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012, Annex III (Part ORO)

The TCO authorisation issued by the Agency is no substitute for requirements regarding wet-lease agreements between EU and third country operators that are contained in Part ORO of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations. For wet-lease agreements, the TCO operator must demonstrate equivalence to EU safety requirements. Before entering into a wet-lease agreement, the EU operator should demonstrate to the authority that (1) the TCO has a valid AOC, (2) that safety standards of the TCO regarding continuing airworthiness and air operations are equivalent to the EU continuing airworthiness requirements of Reg. (EU) No 1321/2014 and (3) the aircraft has a standard Certificate of Airworthiness (CofA) issued in accordance with ICAO Annex 8.

Last updated:

20/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19137>

Must the competent authority check and approve the content of the operator's Safety Management Manual?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations, Annex II (Part ARO), Annex III (Part ORO)

As stated in ORO.AOC.100, an operator has to submit, as part of its application for an AOC, a description of its management system, including the organisational structure, which constitutes its safety management manual, whose content is described in AMC1 and AMC2 to ORO.GEN.200(a)(5).

The Competent Authority has to check the content of the operator's Safety Management Manual (SMM) as mentioned in ARO.GEN.310(a) and in the corresponding AMC to ARO.GEN.310.

Information on the content of the operator's Safety Management Manual (SMM), which can be part of the Operations Manual or included in a separate manual, can be found in AMC1 and AMC2 to ORO.GEN.200(a)(5). It should be noted that the SMM is not required to be approved according to ORO.GEN.200(a)(5) and the related AMCs. Nevertheless, changes affecting the operator's management system are required to be approved (ORO.GEN.130 + GM1) and these changes would have to be reflected in the operator's manual dealing with Safety management.

Last updated:

20/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19138>

How do the provisions on code-sharing articulate with the Regulation applying to Third Country Operators (Part TCO)?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012, Annex III (Part-ORO)

Regarding code-sharing, Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations requires from the EU Operator, who wishes to enter into a code-sharing agreement with a third country operator (TCO), compliance with the requirements of Annex III to Regulation (EU) No 965/2012. This means the TCO as a code-share partner will undergo comprehensive audits for the initial verification of compliance and continuous compliance with the applicable ICAO standards [AMC1 ORO.AOC.115(a)(1)]. These audits can be performed either by the EU operator itself or a third party provider. The AMC (AMC2 ORO.AOC.115(b)) refers to the possibility of using industry standards. The audit will focus on the operational, management and control systems of the TCO (see AMC1 ORO.AOC.115(a)(1)).

Continuous compliance of the code-sharing TCO with the applicable ICAO standards will be performed on the basis of a code-share audit programme (see AMC1 ORO.AOC.115(b)).

This means that the audit and verification requirements contained in Part-ORO of Regulation 965/2012 cannot be substituted by a

TCO authorisation issued by the Agency. For code-share, an EU operator must, in addition to the TCO authorisation, audit and monitor the TCO.

Last updated:

22/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19135>

Part-ORO

ORO.GEN

ORO.GEN.110 (a): “The operator is responsible for the operation of the aircraft in accordance with Annex IV to Regulation (EC) No 216/2008”. Is this requirement met when an Operator follows the Implementing Rules (965/2012)?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations, Annex III (Part-ORO)

The Essential Requirements (ER) are as applicable as the implementing rules.

The operators are responsible for checking that they comply with all the Essential Requirements contained in Annex IV of the Regulation (EC) 216/2008.

Some implementing rules make a direct reference to the Essential Requirements. This is the case when an ER is not further developed in the implementing rules.

Last updated:

20/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19144>

What are the responsibilities of the AOC holder required to implement a management system in accordance with ORO.GEN.200 in regards to continuing airworthiness management and contracted maintenance?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations, Annex III (Part-ORO); Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 on continuing airworthiness, Part-M

1. Continuing airworthiness management

The EU licensed air carrier hereafter referred to as ‘the operator’, needs to consider both the relevant Part-ORO rules that will become fully applicable on 29 October 2014 and the applicable Part-M requirements. For these operators, the Part-M Subpart-G approval is an integral part of the AOC (as defined in Part-M, M.A.201(h)).

The Part-M requirements have not yet been amended to align with the management system framework adopted for air operations. However the operator should ‘scrutinise’ all its activities under its hazard identification and risk management processes, including the continuing airworthiness activities. It is the operator’s responsibility to ensure that hazards entailed by any continuing airworthiness management task are subject to the applicable hazard identification procedures and that related risks are managed as part of the operator’s management system procedures.

If the operator’s continuing airworthiness activities do not comply with the new management system requirements adopted with Part-ORO the competent authority may not raise any finding in reference to Part-M Subpart G, but may do so under Part-ORO should it consider that the operator’s safety risk management process does not sufficiently capture those risks stemming from the continuing airworthiness management activities that may impact the safety of operations. The integration of safety management across all activities will lead to increased efficiency and effectiveness in hazard identification and risk management as compared to a system where activities are being dealt with in isolation through separate management systems. This will improve the

assessment of risks identified and ensure better allocation of resources to address these risks, by eliminating conflicting or duplicating procedures and objectives.

When it comes to assessing compliance with Part-ORO competent authorities should acknowledge that implementing effective safety risk management capabilities for all activities subject to the approval will take time and therefore a balanced approach for checking compliance is needed to enable a smooth transition towards the new management system requirements.

Considering the benefits of taking a holistic, integrated approach to management system for effective safety management, competent authorities should also not mandate the implementation of separate management systems for the different approvals of the same organisation. Competent authorities should instead focus on assessing whether the management system implemented is adequate as regards the size, nature and complexity of the activities it is deemed to cover.

2. Maintenance

The issue is slightly different in the area of contracted maintenance: As the Part-145 requirements have not yet been amended to align with the management system framework adopted for air operations, the maintenance organisation may not have established a management system to effectively identify maintenance specific hazards and manage related risks. However, the operator would still need to consider such hazards and risks entailed by contracted maintenance, as it would do for any other contracted activity that has an impact on aviation safety, under its own management system. Once Part-145 organisations will have implemented the new management system requirements including safety risk management, the operator will be able to establish an interface with the hazard identification and risk management processes of the maintenance organisation and consider the contracted organisation's capability to properly address maintenance specific hazards and risks for their own safety risk management.

This FAQ addresses the case of EU licensed air carriers, meaning operators holding both an AOC in accordance with Regulation (EU) No. 965/2013 and an operating licence in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1008/2008

Last updated:

20/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19145>

Is there a difference between safety risk management (SRM) and SMS?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations, ICAO Annex 19

ICAO defines SMS as "a systematic approach to managing safety, including the necessary organisational structures, accountabilities, policies and procedures."

While SRM is an essential element within a management system for safety, it is not the only element required. To be effective, SRM needs a structured approach and an organisational framework with clearly defined policies, safety responsibilities and accountabilities. Such framework is essential to facilitate and encourage hazard identification, ensure a structured & consistent approach to risk assessment, as well as for allowing informed decisions to be made at the right organisational level, e.g. in relation to risk acceptability or different risk mitigation options. For example, the organisation needs to put in place policies, procedures and mechanisms for internal safety reporting and then maintain the conditions for allowing such reporting to take place.

Also, in order to ensure that the organisation is continually managing its risks it needs to monitor how well it performs, both in terms of effectiveness of risk controls implemented and effective compliance with applicable requirements. This is part of safety assurance, which is another component of an SMS as per ICAO Annex 19.

Additionally the organisation has to train their staff to fulfil their duties, including those related to any safety management task and to properly communicate on any safety relevant issue.

All this should lead to ensuring a systematic approach to SRM and help fostering the necessary 'culture' within the organisation to enable careful management and sound understanding of risk, including in day-to-day activities.

In conclusion, SRM, while being a core element of any management system for safety, should not be singled out as the only element required to implement such system.

See also the FAQ on SMS versus management system above.

Last updated:

11/09/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19147>

Why do the EASA Air Operations rules use the term ‘management system’ (ORO.GEN.200) and not ‘safety management system’ (SMS), like in ICAO Annex 19? Is there a difference between the two concepts?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations, Annex III (Part-ORO)

In the area of SMS the Agency promotes consolidated general requirements for an organisation’s management system. The starting point for drafting the ‘first extension’ rules are the essential requirements attached in the annexes to the Basic Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2018/1139) and these refer to ‘management system’, cf. the essential requirements for air operations (Annex V, point 8.1 (c)):

“(…) the aircraft operator must implement and maintain a management system to ensure compliance with the essential requirements set out in this Annex, manage safety risks and aim for continuous improvement of this system;” (…)

The underlying concept is that for managing safety it is essential to take a holistic approach and to implement the new safety risk management (SRM) related processes while making use of and integrating these into the already existing management system (e.g. quality system as per JAR-OPS/ EU-OPS). For example, the internal audit process (compliance monitoring) is kept as an essential element of the management system, while ICAO Annex 19 is not that clear about it.

Hence, organisations should be encouraged to integrate the new SRM elements into their existing system and articulate these with the way the organisation is managed, addressing every facet of management, as any organisational change and any decision (even in areas such as Finance, Human Resources) will need to be assessed for their impact on safety. Such integrated approach to management is much more efficient for monitoring compliance, managing risks and maximising opportunities.

Finally, it is not required that organisations adapt their terminology to that used in Part-ORO: Should they wish to refer to SMS, QMS or SQMS etc., this is possible as long as they can demonstrate that all requirements are met. In the same vein, they can still use the title ‘quality manager’, although the rules refer to compliance monitoring manager.

Last updated:

20/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19146>

If an operator is considered complex , may a person hold the position as a Safety Manager and at the same time be one (or more) of the nominated persons as described in ORO.GEN.210(b), taken into account the size and complexity of the operator?

Answer

There is no guidance indicating that the safety manager may not be a nominated person in the organisational set up of a complex operator.

However, when assessing the organisational set-up of a complex operator, please consider also GM1 ORO.GEN.200(a)(1) point (b): “Regardless of the organisational set-up it is important that the safety manager remains the unique focal point as regards the development, administration and maintenance of the operator’s safety management system”.

In summary, the role of the safety manager is not addressed at the level of implementing rules. The acceptable means of compliance describe the functions of the safety manager in complex operators. The guidance material emphasises on the

importance of having a unique focal point for the operator's safety management system.

It is for the operator to determine if the combination of the safety manager function with that of a nominated person allows to fulfil the management functions of the nominated persons post associated with the scale and scope of the operation. It is then for the competent authority to assess if such organisational set-up corresponds to the size of the operator and the nature and complexity of its activities, taking into account the hazards and associated risks inherent in these activities.

For the assessment of the appropriateness of the organisational set-up, the competent authority should also be satisfied that the operator complies with ORO.GEN.210(c) "The operator shall have sufficient qualified personnel for the planned tasks and activities to be performed in accordance with the applicable requirements."

Last updated:

26/05/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19148>

I am looking for the acceptance of post holders, particularly the Safety manager. In the AMC we agreed on the functions of the Safety manager, but did we agree on his or her acceptance?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations, Annex II (Part ARO, ARO.GEN.310, ARO.GEN.330), Annex III (Part ORO, ORO.GEN.130)

Part ORO does not mention anymore the notion of acceptance/acceptability of nominated persons. This is now replaced by the notion of changes requiring prior approval or changes not requiring prior approval.

During the initial certification process, nominations of personnel in general are considered to be part of the verification of compliance performed by the competent authority and therefore covered by the issuance of the AOC.

Regarding changes to certified organisation, the notion of changes requiring prior approval/changes not requiring prior approval applies and therefore, a formal approval of certain change is required. Guidance is provided through GM1 ORO.GEN.130(a) and GM3 ORO.GEN.130(c). Likewise, upon initial certification, the competent authority may agree with the organisation on a more specific scope of changes that do not require prior approval, on the basis of ARO.GEN.310(c), and within the limits of the applicable requirements. Items not required to get a prior approval are managed by the organisation based on a procedure approved by the competent authority for the management of such changes. In any case, these changes have to be notified to the competent authority which will verify compliance with the applicable requirements (cf. ORO.GEN.130(c) and ARO.GEN.330(c)).

Regarding the specific case of the safety manager, it should be noted that there is no requirement for a safety manager at an implementing rule level. The nomination of a safety manager is one means to comply with the IR objective. Therefore, a change in safety manager is not listed in the GMs to ORO.GEN.130: A change in safety manager is not considered a change requiring a prior approval from the competent authority, unless, the accountable manager fulfils the role of safety manager, in which case a change would obviously require prior approval.

The above references are those to Regulation (EU) No 965/2012; the same provisions are included in Regulation (EU) No 290/2012 (ARA/ORR).

Last updated:

14/02/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19140>

Regarding ORO.GEN.200, could a commercial operator of complex motor powered aircraft, such as the Cessna Citation Bravo that operates within Europe and with no SPAs, be considered non-complex?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations, Annex III (Part ORO)

As defined in AMC1 ORO.GEN.200(b) the criterion in terms of full-time equivalents (FTEs) is the first one to be checked. This relates not only to the required organisational capability to implement and maintain a management system in line with Part ORO, but also to the fact that the larger the organisation gets, the more complex its procedures, communication and feedback channels will be, hence the need for robust processes related to hazard identification, safety risk management, performance measurement etc. For an organisation up to 20 FTEs, it is important to assess the 'risk profile' of the organisation in relation to the way it operates and this may justify the need for robust management processes for safety. The AMC defines the most relevant ones. The extent of contracting, the number, complexity and diversity of aircraft operated and type of operations (CAT, commercial, local, standard routes, hostile environment etc.) are all to be considered. It is important to note that the complexity criteria are included in an AMC to Part ORO and this makes a strong point as to the responsibility of the operator to make the assessment and justify the option chosen (complex or non-complex management system) to the satisfaction of the competent authority. If the option is to implement the provisions applicable to complex organisations, having details of management system implementation included in the form of AMCs to ORO.GEN.200, the operator may apply for an alternative means of compliance should it consider any of the elements of these AMCs inadequate for its specific type of organisation and operations.

Last updated:

14/02/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19143>

ORO.MLR

How should an operator use external material in relation with its operations manual (OM)?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations, Annex III (Part ORO)

AMC1 ORO.MLR.100 states that when the operator chooses to use material from other sources, either this material is copied or the OM should contain a reference to the appropriate section of this material.

In any case, this material from another source is considered to be part of the OM and therefore should meet all the general requirements applicable to the OM. It includes:

- (c) of ORO.MLR.100, which states that the OM shall be kept up-to-date;
- (d) of ORO.MLR.100, which states that the personnel shall have easy access to the portions of the OM relevant for their duties;
- (c)(3) of AMC1 ORO.MLR.100, which states that the content and amendment status of the manual is controlled and clearly indicated;
- (d)(3) of AMC1 ORO.MLR.100, which states that the OM should include a description of the amendment process which specifies the method by which the personnel are advised of the changes.

Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 does not define any specific way to achieve this; therefore it is left to the operator to identify the best way to achieve these objectives. It is then the responsibility of the operator's competent authority during the initial certification process/evaluation of change process to determine if the solution chosen by the operator allows meeting these requirements.

Last updated:

11/09/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19149>

ORO.FTL

Status of the EASA FAQ: What is the legal status of the EASA FAQ? My own understanding of this document is that it has no legal standing at all, insofar as it is neither an Implementing Rule (IR), Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC), Alternative Means of Compliance (AltMoc) nor

even Guidance Material (GM).

Answer

EASA is not the competent authority to interpret EU Law. The responsibility to interpret EU Law rests with the judicial system, and ultimately with the European Court of Justice. Therefore any information included in these FAQs shall be considered as EASA's understanding on a specific matter, and cannot be considered in any way as legally binding.

The answers provided represent EASA's technical opinion and also indicate the manner how EASA is evaluating, as part of its standardisation continuous monitoring activities, the application by national competent authorities of the respective regulatory provisions.

In the margins of its future rulemaking activities, EASA will consider the opportunity to include some of these FAQ in Subpart FTL as GM.

Last updated:

13/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47556>

Applicability of FTL requirements of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012: Why should we comply with the FTL requirements of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012, since we have a policy in our company that says otherwise?

Answer

Regulation (EU) No 965/2012, including Subpart FTL, is mandatory in all Member States (MS).

This means that an operator cannot maintain a 'policy' it has had before the date of application of Subpart FTL of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012, unless the policy has been found compliant with that Regulation.

The competent authority of the operator is responsible for checking for compliance and for taking enforcement measure when a non-compliance is found.

Last updated:

13/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47557>

Applicability of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012: What is the meaning of "applicable national flight time limitation legislation" in Article 8 (4) of Regulation 965/2012?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 as amended by Regulation (EU) No 83/2014

Topic: Applicability of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012

Article 8(4) of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 stipulates that specialised operators continue to comply with *applicable national flight time limitation legislation* until EU implementing rules are adopted and apply.

'*Applicable national flight time limitation legislation*' is understood to mean the national law of the Member State in which the operator has its principal place of business, or, where the operator has no principal place of business, the place where the operator is established or resides.

Last updated:

13/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47558>

Collective Labour Agreements (CLA) - Regulation (EU) No 83/2014: Our company has a Collective Labour Agreement (CLA) and an approved IFTSS. Both contain rules about FDP's, DP's and rostering. Which one is leading?

Answer

Recital (4) of Regulation (EU) No 83/2014 stipulates that: 'The provisions of this Regulation do not preclude and should be without prejudice to more protective national social legislation and CLA concerning working conditions and health and safety at work.'

This means that more protective measures concerning FDP, DP and rostering, agreed under a CLA, are 'leading'.

Last updated:

13/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47559>

Applicability of Subpart FTL (see also ORO.AOC.125): Does Subpart FTL apply in relation to non-revenue flights (ferry flights)?

Answer

Any flight conducted by an AOC holder falls under Subpart FTL with the exception of:

- some non-revenue flights such as: non-commercial, test, training, delivery, ferry and demonstration flights;
- air taxi, single pilot and emergency medical services operations by aeroplane; and
- CAT operations by helicopter, including HEMS.

However, aircraft positioning conducted by an AOC holder, immediately before or after a CAT sector counts as FDP and sector.

Last updated:

13/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47560>

Acclimatisation ORO.FTL.105(1): How should we determine the state of crew member acclimatisation in complex rotations?

Answer

Acclimatised crew members

A crew member is considered to be acclimatised to the time zone of the reference time for the first 48 hours.

In the following example there are 4 departure places: A, B, C and D and the crew member is in a known state of acclimatisation all the time.

- between A and B there is a 2-hour time difference
- between A and C – a 4 hour-time difference
- between A and D – a 6-hour time difference

Day 1: The crew member starts acclimatised at A and finishes at B. The reference time is the local time at A, because the crew member is acclimatised at A and reports at A. The time difference between A and B is 2 hours. That means that after resting at B, the crew will be considered acclimatised at B.

Day 2: The crew member reports at B acclimatised to the local time at B for an FDP to C. At C the crew member has a rest period and becomes acclimatised to C. He/she has now covered 4-hour time difference, but in 2 days.

Day 3: The crew member reports at C acclimatised to the local time at C for an FDP to D. At D the crew member has a rest period and becomes acclimatised to D. He/she has now covered 6-hour time difference.

Day 4: The crew member reports again considered to be acclimatised at D. The local time at D is the reference time. The FDP between D and A covers 6-hour time difference. Crossing 6-hour time difference in one day (one FDP) induces time zone de-synchronisation. If the rotation finishes at A, the rest requirements in CS FTL.1.235 (b)(3)(i) are applicable.

Unknown state of acclimatisation

After the first 48 hours of the rotation have elapsed, the crew member is considered to be in an unknown state of acclimatisation.

The crew member only becomes acclimatised to the destination time zone, if he/she remains in that destination time zone for the time established in the table in ORO.FTL.105 (1).

During that time the crew member may have the rest in accordance with CS FTL.1.235(b)(3) and/or take other duties that end in different time zones than the first arrival destination, until he/she becomes acclimatised in accordance with the values in the table in ORO.FTL.105(1). In the case of duties to different time zones, the state of acclimatisation should be determined in accordance with GM1 ORO.FTL.105(1) (d)(3).

Where the rotation continues with duties to/from subsequent destinations, the greatest time difference from the reference time should be used for the purpose of rest in accordance with CS FTL.1.235(b)(3)(i).

Time elapsed since reporting (h) in the tables ORO.FTL.105 (1) and CS FTL.1.235 (b)(3)(i) is the time that runs from first reporting at home base to the reporting at destination and includes the FDP from home base to destination plus layover time.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47576>

Accommodation ORO.FTL.105 (3): Can the airport crew lounge be considered as “accommodation” for the purpose of standby or split duty? Can a hotel room for several crew members of the same gender be considered as “accommodation” for the purpose of standby and split duty?

Answer

As long as an airport crew lounge or a shared hotel room fulfils all criteria of ORO.FTL.105 (3) it could be used as accommodation.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47577>

Disruptive schedule ORO.FTL.105(8): Which criteria should be applied to determine a duty as disruptive if there is a time zone difference between the reporting point and the place where the duty finishes?

Answer

The criteria to be applied is the reference time e.g. the local time (LT) where the crew member reported for duty.

Example with “Late type” of Disruptive schedule:

LT in A = LT in B + 1 hour.

Day 1: The crew member starts the FDP acclimatised to A. He/she reports at 15:00 (LT-A) and finishes FDP in B at 23:30 (LT-B). It is a ‘Late finish’ because he/she is acclimatised to A, and FDP finishes at 00:30 (LT-A).

Rest in B. After resting in B, which is within two hours’ time difference from A, the crew member gets acclimatised to B.

Day 2: The crew member reports in B at 15:00 (LT-B) and finishes FDP in A at 00:30 (LT-A). It is not a late finish, because he/she is acclimatised to B, and the FDP finishes at 23:30 (LT-B).

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47578>

Definition of duty and duty period, ORO.FTL.105 (10), ORO FTL 105 (11): Must the time for self-preparation (e.g. preparing for the checks

associated with initial or recurrent training) be entered in the schedule of the crew members and recorded?

Answer

The time needed for self-preparation, is not a duty and is not recorded.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47579>

Single day free of duty ORO FTL 105 (23): A 'single day free of duty' consists of one day and two local nights. Does the last day of several consecutive days free of duty need to contain at least one day and two nights?

Answer

Whenever one of the local days prescribed by Clause 9, Directive No 2000/79/EC, is assigned as a single day, it must contain two local nights. Whenever consecutive local days are assigned, the last day may not contain a local night. However, from a fatigue management perspective, planning the last day to end at midnight, reduces the restorative effect of that last day to a minimum. Rising before midnight to report at 00:01 on the last day could generate sleep debt.

The term 'single day free of duty' has been included in Regulation No 965/2012 in order to enable the implementation of Directive No 2000/79/EC, in particular its Clause 9:

'Clause 9

Without prejudice to Clause 3, mobile staff in civil aviation shall be given days free of all duty and standby, which are notified in advance, as follows:

- (a) at least seven local days in each calendar month, which may include any rest periods required by law; and*
- (b) at least 96 local days in each calendar year, which may include any rest periods required by law.'*

Clause 9 above employs the term 'local day' i.e. a period of 24 hours finishing at 00:00 LT. At the same time, a 'single day free of duty' is a period of one day, including two local nights, that may finish between 06:00 and 08:00 LT, depending on the local night start and end times.

Last updated:

09/04/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47580>

Sector ORO.FTL.105 (24), (see also ORO.FTL.205 (f)(6)): In an abnormal or emergency situation a take-off might not be executed meaning that a sector was not completed. Such situation is likely to increase flight crew workload and fatigue. How could this be mitigated?

Answer

In such cases, in order to mitigate the increased workload and fatigue, the commander has the possibility to exercise commander's discretion and decide on reducing the maximum daily FDP or increasing the minimum rest period.

ORO.FTL.205 (f)(6) requires operators to implement a non-punitive process for the use of commander's discretion.

Also, if as a result of such situation a flight crew member feels unfit due to fatigue, he/she may discontinue his duties on the aircraft for the day.

Regulation (EU) No 376/2014 on the reporting, analysis and follow-up of occurrences in civil aviation, requires the ability for crew members to report fatigue.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47581>

Changes to a published roster: Is it possible to make changes to a published roster?

Answer

Yes, provided that the changes do not breach the limitations of the operator's Individual Flight Time Specification Scheme (IFTSS).

All changes must be notified to the crew member before the pre-flight rest period commences so that the crew member is able to plan adequate rest as required by ORO.FTL.110 (a).

In support of this requirement the minimum period of time for notification of changes should be established by the operator and available in the Operations manual

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47582>

Change of FDP after reporting: Can a rostered FDP be changed (re-planned) after crew members have reported?

Answer

There are no specific provisions and conditions for such changes except in unforeseen circumstances, where, on the day, a Commander may use the provisions of Commander's Discretion:

- to continue with an FDP which exceeds the maximum FDP that the crew will operate or reduces the minimum rest period, or
- to reduce the actual FDP and/or increase the rest period, in case of unforeseen circumstances which could lead to severe fatigue.

The operator may not plan or change an FDP at any time such that it exceeds the maximum applicable FDP.

FTL rules build upon the predictability of rosters so that crews can plan and achieve adequate rest (ORO.FTL.110 (a) and (g)). Operators are expected to plan sufficient capacity, at their operating bases, to deal with disruptions normally expected in daily operations using the specific FTL provisions (e.g. stand-by, reserve). Therefore, FDP changes after reporting should be an infrequent event as such changes can create roster instability and may generate fatigue. An aircrew member remains at all times under the responsibilities set out in CAT.GEN.MPA.100 (c)(5) to report unfit to fly, if s/he suspects fatigue which may endanger flight safety.

If changes to planned duties are to be made on the day of operation, all applicable limits apply: in particular the limits established pursuant to ORO.FTL. 205(b), (d), (e) or ORO.FTL.220. If a duty has not been planned with an operator's extension under ORO.FTL. 205(d), it cannot be changed into a duty with such extension on the day of operation.

In addition, the operator must ensure that the impact on forward duties and days off, and importantly on cumulative limits, is accounted for.

EASA recommends that changes made on the day of operation to duties and FDP's are monitored through appropriate performance indicators that operators use to demonstrate they fulfil all the required elements within ORO.FTL.110. The 33% exceedance threshold on the max FDP as set out in ORO.FTL.110 (j) may not always be adequate to capture negative trends.

EASA also recommends that appropriate performance indicators for FDP changes after reporting be part of the operator's approved IFTSS to ensure that any resulting fatigue hazards are properly identified and mitigated.

Last updated:

18/11/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47583>

Roster publication, (see also AMC1 ORO.FTL.110(a) and ORO.GEN.120): Are airline operators allowed to publish monthly rosters in less than 14 days in advance?

Answer

According to AMC1 ORO.FTL.110 (a), rosters should be published 14 days in advance.

This requirement is an acceptable means of compliance (AMC). The AMC is one example of how operators could demonstrate compliance with this rule.

In accordance with ORO.GEN.120, an operator may use an alternative means of compliance.

It is therefore possible to use an alternative means of compliance (AltMoc) for the publication of rosters, provided the operator has demonstrated that the requirements of ORO.FTL.110 (a) are met.

An alternative means of compliance requires prior approval from the competent authority.

The competent authority must notify all approved alternative means of compliance to EASA.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47584>

Reporting times ORO.FTL.110(c), (see also ORO.FTL.205(c)): Can the pre-flight reporting time for non-augmented flight crew members reporting for the same FDP be different?

Answer

No. The pre-flight reporting time for all non-augmented flight crew members reporting for the same FDP is the same.

The minimum reporting times, which have been defined by the operator in the Operations manual for different types of aircraft, operations and airport conditions, shall always apply to all flight crew.

Reporting time for the same FDP may be different between flight crew and cabin crew in accordance with ORO.FTL.205(c).

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47585>

Operational robustness ORO.FTL.110(j): How should operational robustness be assessed?

Answer

The operator is required to have measures in place to protect the integrity of schedules and of individual duty patterns.

The operator must monitor for exceedances to the planned flight duty periods and if the planned flight duty periods in a schedule are being exceeded more than 33% during a scheduled seasonal period, change a schedule and/or crew arrangements.

Operational robustness should be measured through performance indicators to determine if the planning is realistic and the rosters are stable.

The operator may measure the cases where a rostered crew pairing for a duty period is achieved within the planned duration of that duty period.

Performance indicators may also be established to measure the following:

- difference between planned and actual flight hours;
- difference between planned and actual duty hours;
- difference between planned and actual number of days off;

- number of unscheduled overnights;
- number of roster changes per scheduled seasonal period;
- use of commander's discretion;
- changes of schedule carried out after published roster

With regard to operator's responsibilities, in particular operational robustness of rosters, we also recommend guidance material to ORO.FTL.110 developed by UK CAA.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47586>

Flying activities outside an AOC (see also ORO.FC.100): How will activities as an instructor or an examiner performed by an operating crew member in their free time be considered for the purpose of duty time and rest periods?

Answer

The purpose of Subpart-FTL is to ensure that crew members in commercial air transport operations are able to operate with an adequate level of alertness. It does not regulate the activities performed by crew members in their free time.

Nonetheless, it is the responsibility of crew members to make optimal use of the rest periods and to be properly rested so they will not perform duties when unfit due to fatigue.

A crew member in commercial air transport operations may be required to report to the operator his/her professional flying activities outside the commercial air transport operation to allow the operator to discharge its responsibilities (ORO.FTL.110) appropriately.

An operator should establish its policy with regard to crew members conducting these kinds of activities.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47587>

Deviation from the applicable CS ORO.FTL.125 (c) (see also ARO.OPS.235): What does a deviation from the applicable CS mean or derogation from an implementing rule?

Answer

The flight time specification schemes of an individual operator (IFTSS) may differ from the applicable CS / IRs under strict conditions.

The operator has a number of steps to follow before implementing a deviation/derogation.

Additionally, the competent authority has a number of steps to follow before approving a deviating/derogating IFTSS.

All the steps are described in this [Evaluation Form](#) (link) developed by EASA to facilitate NAAs and operators in this process.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47588>

Flight time specification scheme for air taxi operations, (see also Articles 2 (6) and 8(2) of Regulation (EU) no 965/2012): An air taxi operator has both an aeroplane with less than 19 seats and one aeroplane with more than 20 seats. What FTL regulation shall the crew who is flying both types follow?

Answer

The operator implements Subpart ORO.FTL for its operations with aeroplanes of 20 seats or more.

For air taxi operations with aeroplanes of 19 seats or less, the operator complies with EU OPS, Subpart Q.

However, the aim of the requirements is to ensure that crew members are able to operate at a satisfactory level of alertness. Fatigue accrued during an operation in one fleet might impact on the performance of a crew member when conducting a following flight in the other fleet.

Therefore, from a fatigue management perspective, it makes sense to apply a common FTL scheme under Subpart ORO.FTL consistently to pilots in such operations.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47589>

Approval of Individual Flight Time Specification Schemes (IFTSS), (see also ARO.OPS.235):

Answer

May a competent authority give ONE approval for an individual flight specification scheme to be used by three different operators with three AOCs?

No. Each operator needs its own approved individual flight time specification scheme.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47813>

Unknown state of acclimatisation GM1 ORO.FTL.205(b)(1): If the crew member is in an unknown state of acclimatisation, what is the reference time?

Answer

In that case, there is no reference time. For crew members in an unknown state of acclimatisation Table 3 in ORO.FTL.205 (b)(2) or Table 4 ibidem applies. These Tables do not contain any reference time.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47590>

Unknown state of acclimatisation ORO.FTL.205(b)(3): What are the daily FDP limits when crew members are in an unknown state of acclimatisation under fatigue risk management (FRM)?

Answer

Table 4 in ORO.FTL.205 (b)(3) establishes the limits of the maximum daily FDP when crew members are in unknown state of acclimatisation and the operator has implemented FRM.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47591>

Mixing FDPs extended without in-flight rest and FDP's extended due to in-flight rest ORO.FTL.205 (d) ORO.FTL.205 (e): Is it possible to roster two extended FDPs without in-flight rest and one extended FDP with in-flight rest in 7 consecutive days?

Answer

Yes. The limit of two extensions of up to 1 hour in 7 consecutive days specified in ORO.FTL.205 (d) (1) only applies to the use of extensions without in-flight rest by an individual crew member.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47592>

Planned FDP extensions ORO.FTL.205(d): Must planned extensions be included in the operator's roster?

Answer

Published duty rosters may or may not include extended FDPs.

However, FDPs extended in accordance with ORO.FTL.205 (d) must be planned and notified to crew members in advance i.e. allowing each crew member to plan adequate rest.

The time limit for notification of a planned extended FDP to an individual crew member need to be established by the operator in line with ORO.FTL.110 and specified in the OM-A.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47593>

Planned FDP extensions ORO.FTL.205(d) (see also ORO.FTL.105(1)): Can a crew member acclimatised to the local time of the departure time zone ('B' state), but not acclimatised to the local time where he/she starts the next duty ('D' state), be assigned a planned extended flight?

Answer

While it may be legal to roster an extended FDP (no in-flight rest) to a crew member who is not acclimatised to the local time where the actual duty starts, the actual operational environment may be such that it would be very fatiguing for a particular crew member to perform that FDP.

Although operations on an extended FDP are possible under ORO FTL.1.205(d), the operator still needs to comply with the fatigue management obligations stemming from ORO.FTL.110 and especially to ensure that the crew members are sufficiently rested to operate.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47594>

Commander's discretion ORO.FTL.205(f): Do we need to use Commander's discretion if actual FDP is going to last more than planned but less than the maximum daily FDP allowed?

Answer

No. If the actual FDP is less than the maximum allowed, commander's discretion is not needed.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47595>**Commander's discretion ORO.FTL.205(f): When should commander's discretion be used?****Answer**

Commander's discretion may be used to modify the limits on the maximum daily FDP (basic or with extension due to in-flight rest), duty and rest periods in the case of unforeseen circumstances in flight operations beyond the operator's control, which start at or after the reporting time.

Considering the ICAO definition of 'unexpected conditions', unforeseen circumstances in flight operations for the purpose of ORO.FTL.205(f) are events that could not reasonably have been predicted and accommodated, such as adverse weather, equipment malfunction or air traffic delay, which may result in necessary on-the-day operational adjustments.

Commanders cannot be expected to exercise discretion without an understanding of the events that constitute unforeseen circumstances. It is therefore necessary that they receive appropriate training on the use of commander's discretion along with how to recognize the symptoms of fatigue and to evaluate the risks associated with their own mental and physical state and that of the whole crew.

Operators should ensure that sufficient margins are included in schedule design so that commanders are not expected to exercise discretion as a matter of routine

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47598>

Commander's discretion ORO.FTL.205(f), (see also ORO.FTL.205 (d)): 1. What is the maximum FDP extension allowed under commander's discretion? 2. How would commander's discretion apply when the FDP of a non-augmented crew has already been extended in accordance with ORO.FTL.205 (d))?

Answer

1. Up to 2 hours for two pilot crew and up to 3 hours for augmented crew.

2. For a two pilot extended FDP operation, the use of commander's discretion is always based on the maximum daily FDP table ORO.FTL.205 (b) (1).

For example, when 1 hour has already been added to the maximum daily FDP in accordance with ORO.FTL.205 (d), then only 1 hour is left for commander's discretion.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47599>

Commander's discretion ORO.FTL.205(f): Referring to commander's discretion, do I need to consider the reporting time and number of sectors?

Answer

Yes. The commander needs to consider the actual number of sectors that the crew members will complete as this may be different from the plan. This FDP calculation would be based on the time the crew member actually reported.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47600>

Conversion/line checks Post flight duty ORO.FTL.210: How should briefings and debriefings during conversion/line checks be accounted for?

Answer

In accordance with the definition of duty, conversion/line training is duty.

Any duty (including the briefing and debriefing for training purposes) after reporting for a duty that includes a sector or a series of sectors until the aircraft finally comes to rest and the engines are shut down, at the end of the last sector on which the crew member acts as an operating crew member, is considered flight duty period.

Post flight duties, on the other hand (including debriefings also for training purposes), are considered as duty period.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47601>

Post-flight duty AMC1 ORO.FTL.210(c): What should the operator do if the actual post flight duty time is longer than the established time in the OM?

Answer

The operator needs to implement a monitoring system to ensure that the minimum time period for post-flight duties is adequate since rest or shortened rest could potentially impact fatigue.

The commander or a cabin crew member should inform the operator where the post-flight duties have taken longer than planned and this is then accounted for in duty and rest periods.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47602>

Positioning for purposes other than operating ORO.FTL.215 (b): How should time spent to travel from the place of rest or home base to a simulator (when outside the base) be taken into account?

Answer

The time spent to travel from a place of rest or home base to a simulator, at the request of the operator, counts as a duty period.

Any transfer of a non-operating crew member from one place to the other at the request of the operator is called positioning and is counted as a duty period.

Travel from a crew member's private place of rest to the reporting point at home base and vice versa, and local transfers from a place of rest to the commencement of duty and vice versa are travelling, but not positioning, and so not counted as duty period.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47603>

Positioning ORO.FTL.215: Does positioning begin when the crew member arrives at the airport/train station or when the aeroplane/train leaves?

Answer

Positioning begins after reporting at the designated reporting point.

The operator should publish reporting times taking into account the time necessary for completing the travelling procedures depending on the mode of transportation (e.g. registration of passengers and baggage, security checks, etc.).

First example: Crewmember 1 is required to position from A to B on the commercial flight of an airline other than the airline which Crewmember 1 is flying for. This commercial flight is departing at 10:00, but airport A is an international airport and the time necessary for passenger and baggage registration and security checks is 2h before departure time. In this case, the positioning begins 2h before departure time.

Second example: Crewmember 2 is required to position from A to B on a high speed train. This train is departing at 10:00 and the time necessary for passenger and baggage registration and security checks is 15 minutes before departure time. In this case, the positioning begins 15min before departure time.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47604>

Positioning ORO.FTL.215: Shall a positioning between active sectors count as a sector for a pilot or cabin crew?

Answer

No, any positioning within an FDP does not count for the sector calculation of the FDP limit but counts towards the FDP.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47605>

Split duty ORO.FTL. 220: Is it possible to have more than one split duty within one FDP?

Answer

No. ORO.FTL.220 provides for a break on the ground which implies a single break on the ground, for the purpose of extending the basic daily FDP.

A Member State can propose an amendment to ORO.FTL.220, in particular, and to the implementing rules, in general, in accordance with Article 71 of Regulation (EU) 2018/1139.

Last updated:

21/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47606>

Standby ORO.FTL.225(a) (see also CS FTL.1.225 and GM1 CS FTL.1.225(a)): Can a standby be finished before the planned “end time notified in advance”, after a notification during the standby (saying that there will be no assignment) and the rest period be initiated at the time of the notification of the new standby end?

Answer

Yes. According to ORO.FTL.225 (a), a time period with a start and end time, during which a crew member must be available to be contacted to receive an assignment, must be defined.

A crew member may, during the standby period, be notified that standby has ceased. CS FTL.1.225 establishes further conditions.

GM1 CS FTL.1.225 (a) explains that a minimum rest period according to ORO.FTL.235 should be provided after the notification of the revised end of the standby period.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47607>**Reserve ORO.FTL.230: Can a reserve, during which no flight was assigned, be considered as a day off afterwards?****Answer**

No, a reserve period may not retrospectively be considered as part of a recurrent extended recovery rest period.

Last updated:

09/04/2019

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47608>**Rest prior to an FDP ORO.FTL.235 (a): If a crew member with office duties spends one day in the office, what should be the duration of the rest before his/her reporting for an FDP?****Answer**

The minimum rest period at home base before undertaking an FDP shall be in accordance with ORO.FTL.235 (a) (1) and (2).

Time spent at the office is duty time in accordance with ORO.FTL.105 (10).

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47609>**Rest prior to a duty other than FDP ORO.FTL.235 (a): What is the duration of the rest period prior to a duty without FDP?****Answer**

The term 'minimum rest period' under the Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 is only used for the recovery period before an FDP.

Otherwise, it is an off-duty period. The Regulation does not contain requirements for off-duty periods prior to a duty without FDP.

Example: FDP1 – off duty – DP1 – off duty – DP2 – rest – FDP2.

Nevertheless, the operator needs to be able to demonstrate they have considered the fatiguing nature and cumulative effects of these duty periods under their operator responsibilities as they can generate fatigue that could affect crew member's ability to rest prior to his/her next FDP.

Also, the national law of the Member State regarding working time (as required by Council Directive 2000/79/EC) would be applicable and should be reviewed as it may contain minimum rest periods for crew members based in that Member State.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47610>**Reduction of recurrent extended recovery rest by commander's discretion ORO.FTL.235(d) (see also ORO.FTL.205(f)): Can the extended recovery rest period be reduced with commander's discretion?****Answer**

No, commander's discretion cannot be applied to an extended recovery rest period

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47611>

Increase of interval between two recurrent extended recovery rest periods by commander's discretion ORO.FTL.235(d) (see also ORO.FTL.205(f)): May the crew member exercise his/her discretion to finish back at home base exceeding the 168 hours' time between two extended recovery rest periods? For example, a crew member is planned to finish his last FDP flying back to home base, two hours prior to reaching 168 hours. There is a departure delay which occurred after reporting. As a result, the crew member would exceed the 168 hours by 1 hour.

Answer

No. Extension of the 168 hours between two recurrent extended recovery rest periods is not allowed.

The operator must better plan duties and rest times. The Regulation does not say that exactly 168 h must be reached; they are not a target, they are a maximum threshold.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47612>

Increase of interval between two recurrent extended recovery rest periods ORO.FTL.235(d): Can the 168h limit between two extended recovery rest periods be extended? For example, a crew member reports at Paris on Monday at 7am and ends a series of flights in Singapore, on Sunday, at 8 pm; he/she should be given his/her extended recovery rest period in Singapore, but might be willing to come back to his/her base, hence infringing the 168h limit through positioning.

Answer

No. The 168h limit between two extended recovery rest periods can only be extended through an amendment of ORO.FTL.235 (d).

A Member State can propose an amendment to ORO.FTL.235 (d), in particular, and to the implementing rules, in general, in accordance with Article 71 of Regulation (EU) 2018/1139.

Last updated:

21/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47613>

Re-planning of recurrent extended recovery rest period ORO.FTL.235 (d): Is re-planning of a recurrent extended recovery rest period allowed and when?

Answer

Yes. This is provided that re-planning of rest is completed and notified before the rest period has started and the re-planning practices do not conflict with a crew member's opportunity to plan adequate rest as required by ORO.FTL.110 (a).

In any case, the time between the end of one recurrent extended recovery rest period and the beginning of the next recurrent extended recovery rest period cannot be more than 168 hours.

Operator's procedures for re-planning should describe by which means the opportunity for crew members to plan adequate rest is provided in the case of re-planning.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47614>**Record keeping ORO.FTL.245: Do records required in ORO.FTL.245 have to reflect planned or actual FDP, DP and rest?****Answer**

Planned rosters may differ substantially from achieved rosters.

In order to ensure appropriate oversight of FTL by the competent authority, operators need to maintain (for a period of 24 months) records of the actual values of flight times, FDP, rest periods and days free of all duties.

According to AMC1 ORO.FTL.110 (j) on operational robustness operators should establish and monitor performance indicators for operational robustness rosters.

This can only be done if operators keep records of both, planned and achieved rosters.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47615>

Home base change CS FTL.1.200(b): Is it correct to understand that if a crew member is asked to report for an FDP at a reporting point other than his/her home base without extension of his/her recurrent extended recovery to 72h incl. 3 local nights, immediately prior to that FDP, the home base has not been changed for the purpose of Subpart FTL?

Answer

Yes. In such case, the requirements for reporting out of home base apply.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47616>

Consecutive night duties CS FTL.1.205(a)(1): What does 'consecutive' mean in the context of the requirements and limits of CS FTL.1.205?

Answer

'Consecutive' is referring to two night duties only separated by a rest period.

Two night duties would not be considered as 'consecutive', if there is a recurrent extended recovery rest period between them or if they are separated by rest periods surrounding a non-night duty

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47617>

Night duties CS FTL.1.205(a)(2), (see also GM1 CS FTL.1.205 (a)(2)): Is it necessary to have an 'approved' FRM to operate long night duties (FDP over 10hrs)?

Answer

No, for night duties of over 10 hours an appropriate fatigue risk management applies. Guidance for that is provided in GM1 CS FTL1.205 (a) (2).

A FRM compliant with ORO.FTL.120 is only required in two cases: reduced rest and crew members in unknown state of acclimatisation on a longer FDP.

Additionally, the approval of FRM is not a stand-alone approval. FRM, if required, is approved as a constituent part of the IFTSS approval.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47618>

In-flight rest CS FTL.1.205(c) : Is it possible to extend the FDP, if not all pilots get an in-flight rest?

Answer

CS FTL.1.205(c)(1)(ii) specifies that, for the purpose of FDP extension, each crew member needs to have an in-flight rest period.

First example where an extension of the FDP due to in-flight rest is possible:

Pilot 1 and Pilot 2 commence a FDP from A to B (1:30 h sector). When arriving at B, a third pilot (Pilot 3) joins the crew and they fly from B to C (11 h sector).

The length of the flight from B to C allows each crew member on board (pilots 1, 2 & 3) to have the minimum in-flight rest period during cruise phase: 2 consecutive hours for the flight crew members at control during landing and consecutive 90-minute period for the third pilot.

Second example, where an extension of the FDP due to in-flight rest is not possible:

Pilot 1 and Pilot 2 commence a FDP from A to B (7 h sector). When arriving at B, a third pilot (Pilot 3) joins the crew and they fly from B to C (5 h sector).

The length of the flight from B to C does not allow each crew member on board (pilots 1, 2 & 3) to have the minimum in-flight rest period during cruise phase: 2 consecutive hours for the flight crew members at control during landing and consecutive 90-minute period for the third pilot.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47619>

Maximum daily FDP with the use of extensions due to in flight rest CS FTL.1.205(c)(2): Why does the 'maximum daily FDP with the use of extensions due to in flight rest' not take into account the start of FDP at reference time?

Answer

An extended duty period will usually involve operating during the WOCL. The in-flight rest opportunity during the WOCL mitigates the absence of reduction of the FDP based on the reference time.

The limits of CS FTL.1.205(c) (2) are therefore irrespective of the WOCL of crew members, on the condition that the minimum flight crew is augmented and in-flight rest facilities, meeting certain standards, are available to provide recuperative sleep

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47620>

Delayed reporting CS FTL.1.205(d)(1): Is it possible to inform crew members of a delay without giving the new reporting time?

Answer

No. An actual reporting time must be given when the crew member is informed that the delayed reporting procedure is activated.

If an operator does not have a delayed reporting procedure, then it can't be used.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47621>

Delayed reporting CS FTL.1.205(d)(1)(iii): Why does delayed reporting with a delay of less than 4 hours not account for the WOCL? Is there any scientific evidence for this?

Answer

There is no scientific evidence, on the basis of which a delay of less than 4 hours does not take the WOCL into account.

In any case, operator's procedures on delayed reporting should avoid or minimise the negative effect of WOCL encroachment.

Importantly, the maximum FDP will never become longer due to a delayed reporting time:

- If the delay is less than 4 hours – the maximum FDP as originally planned, remains the same.
- If the delay is more than 4 hours – the maximum FDP will be shorter than the originally planned FDP, because the delayed reporting time has a limiting effect on it.

Procedures for delayed reporting must be described in the OM, including a notification time that allows the crew member to continue his/her rest when the delayed reporting procedure is activated.

A delayed reporting procedure may be triggered by the operator, while the crew member is still at home or in the suitable accommodation facility, when prior to the beginning of a flight duty period an unforeseen event occurs which will delay the planned flight departure.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47624>

Split duty (see also ORO.FTL.205 (b)(2) and ORO.FTL.220): Can split duty be scheduled when crew members are in an unknown state of acclimatisation?

Answer

Yes, but any extension of the FDPs limits in Table 3 of ORO.FTL.205 (b)(2) falls under the requirement for a FRM.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47625>

Split duty CS FTL.1.220 (b): Are the 30 minutes for post and pre-flight duties as well as travelling counted in total or 30 min for post flight

duties, 30 min for travelling after post flight duties, 30 min for travelling before pre-flight duties and 30 min for pre-flight duties?

Answer

CS FTL.1.220 (b) instructs the operator to specify actual times for post and pre-flight duties and for travelling in its operations manual. The minimum for the total is 30 minutes.

The operator must demonstrate how travelling in both directions, and post and pre-flight duties are accomplished in the time defined in the OM.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47627>

Split duty CS FTL.1.220(d): Should suitable accommodation be provided for a split duty?

Answer

CS FTL.1.220 (b) instructs the operator to specify actual times for post and pre-flight duties and for travelling in its operations manual. The minimum for the total is 30 minutes.

The operator must demonstrate how travelling in both directions, and post and pre-flight duties are accomplished in the time defined in the OM.

Suitable accommodation as defined in ORO FTL 105 (4) is required to be provided for a break of 6 hours or more or for a break that encroaches the WOCL.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47628>

Rest after airport standby or other-standby CS FTL.1.225 (a)(1)& CS FTL.1.225 (b)(4): What is the basis for rest calculation after a standby followed by an FDP? Is it the reporting time for standby or the "actual reporting time" for the assigned FDP?

Answer

The minimum rest period depends on the length of previous duty.

Airport standby counts as duty for the purpose of ORO.FTL.235. Therefore the rest calculation after airport standby followed by an FDP is based on the reporting time for that standby. This also applies to airport duty.

Other standby does not count as duty for the purpose of rest (it counts partly as duty for the purpose of ORO.FTL.210 only). Therefore the rest calculation after other-standby followed by an FDP is based on the reporting time for the assigned FDP

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47630>

Airport standby CS FTL.1.225 (a)(2)(ii): Why does CS FTL.1.225 (a)(2)(ii) not stipulate the maximum duration of airport standby?

Answer

The maximum duration of airport standby is defined indirectly by the limits of the combined duration of airport standby and FDP.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47631>

Airport standby CS FTL 1.225(a)(2)(ii), (see also ORO.FTL.205 (b)&(d); CS FTL 1.205 (a) (2)): We understand that the limit of 16 hours is not applicable when airport standby is followed by a FDP with in-flight rest. Does that mean that there is no limit for that kind of situation?

Answer

Yes, there is no limit.

The limit of 16 hours only applies to basic maximum daily FDPs without in-flight rest under ORO.FTL.205 (b) and to extended daily FDPs without in-flight rest under ORO.FTL.205 (d).

Furthermore, the operator applies appropriate fatigue risk management to actively manage the fatiguing effect of night duties of more than 10 hours in relation to the surrounding duties and rest periods

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47632>

Other-standby followed by an FDP CS FTL.1.225(b)(2): How shall an operator expect a crew member to use whole or part of a standby for sleep when there are disturbance factors like difficulty to fall asleep, disturbed sleep due to sick children, waking-up by external noise, etc.?

Answer

According to CS FTL.1.225 (b)(2), the operator designs its standby procedures in a certain way. The expectation is on the design of the procedure by the operator, not on the individual crew member.

The expectation on the crew member is to follow the procedure to the best of his/her abilities and in good faith at all times.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47633>

Awake time CS FTL 1 225 (b)(2): Who is responsible for making sure that the 18h are not exceeded? The crew member or the operator? Can the operator fully transfer the responsibility to the crew member?

Answer

The operator is only required to have established such procedures (control mechanisms) so as to prevent situations where the combination of standby and FDP would lead to more than 18 hours awake time.

18 hours awake time is mentioned in the context of the combination of other-standby prior to an FDP and the FDP itself. A simple mathematical equation between the sum of the standby time and FDP, on the one hand, and the time awake on the other, is not possible to do, because the start time of the awake period is an unknown value i.e. the operator may be unable to verify how long a crew member has been awake.

It is reasonable for the operator to expect crew members to manage their rest and sleep opportunities during pre-duty rest periods and while on standby in order to be able to perform FDP.

The procedure and expectation for the crew to rest appropriately during their standby should also be included when training crew on FTL and fatigue management.

The following are examples of what an operator should consider when designing procedures:

- the duties and rest periods prior to the scheduled standby;

- the time of the day in which the rest period prior to the scheduled standby occurs;
- a minimum of 8 hours' sleep opportunity before or within the scheduled standby, during which the crew member is not disturbed;
- the length of the standby and the subsequent FDP;
- the time for post flight duties and for travelling to the suitable accommodation if away from home base;
- provision of training and advice to crew members

The NAAs are responsible for verifying that the above procedures have been established and are effective.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47639>

Other-standby CS FTL.1.225(b)(2), (see also CAT.OP.MPA.210(a)(3)): Would using a controlled rest procedure while the flight crew member is at his/her assigned station break the 18-hour awake time?

Answer

No. Controlled rest procedure is a countermeasure to manage unexpected fatigue, whilst the 18-hour awake time target is part of the operator roster planning procedures.

According to CAT.OP.MPA.210 (a)(3) controlled rest organised by the commander, if workload permits, shall not be considered to be part of a rest period for purposes of calculating flight time limitations nor used to justify any extension of the duty period.

Under CS FTL.1.225 (b)(2), the operator designs standby procedures in a way that makes unexpected fatigue unlikely by avoiding excessive awake times.

The frequent use of controlled rest after having been called from other-standby could indicate that the standby procedure does not fulfil the expectation to avoid excessive awake times.

Controlled rest procedure to manage unexpected fatigue should be described in the operations manual. (ref. AMC3 ORO.MLR.100).

The operator should be able to monitor the use of controlled rest to evaluate effectiveness of mitigation strategies.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47640>

Other-standby CS FTL.1.225(b)(3): How is the time spent on other-standby before an assignment accounted for?

Answer

According to CS FTL.1.225 (b) (3), 25% of time spent on other-standby counts as cumulative duty.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47641>

Other-standby CS FTL.1.225 (b), (see also ORO.FTL.105 (25)): Is it possible during other-standby to assign an FDP with a reporting time after the rostered end of that standby period has elapsed?

Answer

It is possible during other-standby to assign a duty that will start after the rostered end of the standby period.

Duties assigned during other-standby should in principle start within the operator's defined response time from the call. For example, a cabin crew while on home standby between 08:00h and 14:00h (as planned in the roster) receives a call at 13:55 h to report for duty at 14:55 h since the operator's response time is 60 min. The response time between the call and reporting is considered a continuation of the standby, notwithstanding the rostered end of the standby; this time also includes travelling to the reporting point.

Operators describe their procedures and practices regarding standby, including reporting after the rostered standby period ends, in the OM-A. In doing so, they take into account that the Regulation provides a number of cumulative protections to crew member from excessive periods of combined standby and duty:

1. Operators shall only use the rostered standby availability period to place their call for duty. ORO.FTL.105 (25) defines standby as the period of time during which a crew member is required by the operator to be available to receive an assignment for a flight;
2. The maximum duration of other-standby is 16 hours. In its OM-A however, the operator may specify shorter periods considering its type of operation and the impact of the time spent on standby on the duty that may be assigned. Under the obligations of ORO.FTL.110 (b & e), operators must carefully evaluate what duration of standby is safely allowable within their particular operation;
3. The combination of standby and FDP do not lead to more than 18 hours awake time (see FAQ # 60);
4. The maximum FDP is reduced, if the standby period ceases after the first 6 hours (or 8 hours in case of extended FDP);
5. A crew member is always able to consider whether his/her duties on board an aircraft will be performed with the necessary level of alertness (CAT.GEN.MPA.100(c))

If no duty has been assigned during the rostered standby availability period, other-standby is followed by a rest period in accordance with ORO.FTL.235.

Last updated:

09/04/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47642>

Other-standby modified to airport standby CS FTL.1.225, (see also ORO.FTL.105 (25)): Can other-standby be modified to airport standby during the standby? For example, can a pilot on home standby be required to go to the airport to continue on airport standby? What limits must be used?

Answer

Yes. During a standby period any duty may be assigned (ORO.FTL.105 (25)). That includes airport standby or duty at the airport.

Limits for assignment of airport standby after home standby are not explicitly mentioned in CS FTL.1.225.

The assignment of airport standby is considered as airport duty and the subsequent FDP counts from the airport reporting time as stated in ORO.FTL.225 (d).

If the other-standby lasts less than 6 hours, the maximum FDP counts from reporting for the airport standby. If the other-standby lasts more than 6 hours, a reduction is applicable to the subsequent FDP.

If an FDP is assigned during the airport standby, the combination of home standby and FDP does not lead to more than 18 hours awake time.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47643>

Reserve and other-standby CS FTL.1.230: While a crew member is on reserve, can his/her assignment be changed and continue as a home

standby?

Answer

No, but the crew member can be assigned a home standby after the end of the reserve period.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47644>

Reserve CS FTL 1.230(b): Is there any rest requirement after a reserve period, if there is no assignment of duty period during the reserve?

Answer

Reserve times do not count as duty period for the purpose of ORO.FTL.210 and ORO.FTL.235.

That means that there is no requirement for a minimum rest period after reserve, if no duty has been assigned.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47645>

Reserve CS FTL.1.230 (d): Is it necessary to have an FRM to protect an 8-hour sleep opportunity during reserve?

Answer

No. Operators are however encouraged to apply appropriate fatigue risk management techniques to be able to fulfil their responsibilities under ORO.FTL.110.

The techniques described in the ICAO Fatigue Management Guide for Airline Operators may be useful reference to assist operators developing their approach.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47646>

Reserve CS FTL 1.230(d): Should the period of 8 hours run consecutively or is it possible to break it in two different periods?

Answer

The period of 8 hours consists of 8 consecutive hours.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47647>

Rest between disruptive schedules CS FTL.1.235(a)(1), (see also ORO.FTL.105(8)): The rule for transition between late finish/night duty and early start says that the rest between the FDPs needs to include a local night. Does this mean that the rule only applies if the late finish/night duty and the early duty are FDP's?

Answer

It depends on the type of the early duty following a late or night duty.

If an early duty is a standby or a duty at the airport that leads to an FDP, then the rest period before that early duty must include a local night.

Otherwise, the rest period between the 2 other duties or between a FDP and other duty (e.g. night training in a simulator) does not need to include 1 local night.

Nevertheless, Subpart FTL provides a system of measures which jointly act to reduce the risk of increased fatigue and reduced alertness and performance levels of crew members, and to mitigate the acute disruption of the sleep pattern in the case of disruptive schedules.

For example, the operator must avoid practices that cause a serious disruption of an established sleep/work pattern, such as alternating day/night duties (ORO.FTL.110).

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47648>

Rest compensation for time zone differences CS FTL.1.235(b)(3)(i): How should we count the time elapsed (h) since reporting for the first FDP in a rotation involving at least 4 hour time difference to the reference time?

Answer

Elapsed time (h) should be counted from the first FDP including at least 4 hour time difference to the reference time, as the rest compensation for time zone differences is given when the crew becomes affected by the time zone differences.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47649>

Reduced rest CS FTL.1.235(b)(3)(ii), (see also ORO.FTL.235 (c) and (e)): Is it possible to reduce the 14h rest away from home base following an FDP involving a 4-hour time difference or more?

Answer

No. CS FTL.1.235 (b)(3)(ii) does not foresee a reduction of the 14h rest away from home base to compensate for time zone crossing.

ORO.FTL.235 (c) describes the conditions under which the minimum rest periods according to ORO.FTL.235 (a) and (b) may be reduced.

ORO.FTL.235 (e) establishes the rest periods to compensate the effects of time zone crossing.

Additional rest periods to compensate the effects of time zone crossing shall be specified in flight time specification schemes.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47650>

Rest to compensate for time zone differences CS FTL.1.235(b)(4): What does Eastward-Westward or Westward-Eastward transition mean?

Answer

For the purpose of CS FTL.1.235 (b) (4), 'Eastward-Westward and Westward-Eastward transition' means the transition at home base between a rotation in one direction and a rotation in the opposite direction, each involving a 4-hour time difference or more.

At least 3 local nights of rest at home base are provided between such alternating rotations.

However, irrespective of where the transition occurs - at home base or away from home base, the operator, using safety risk management processes, should monitor rotations in opposite directions in terms of their impact on crew members' circadian rhythm and fatigue, and provide sufficient rest to crew members between such rotations.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47651>

Monitoring Time Zone Differences CS FTL.1.235(b)(5): Does the requirement to monitor combinations of rotations require FRM in accordance with ORO.FTL.120?

Answer

No. FRM is not required. However, CS FTL.1.235 (b)(5) requires that fatigue risks arising from combinations of rotations be monitored under the operator's management system.

The techniques described in the ICAO Fatigue Management Guide for Airline Operators (associated to ICAO Doc 9966) may be useful reference to assist operators developing their approach.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47652>

Reduced rest CS FTL.1.235(c)(5): Is it possible to apply reduced rest to two consecutive rest periods?

Answer

Yes. Up to 2 reduced rest periods in any 168 hours are allowed. They may be consecutive.

Reduced rest is only possible under FRM, as part of an approved IFTSS.

Last updated:

12/07/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47653>

Nutrition ORO.FTL.240: Are nutrition provisions subject to a specific NAA's approval and can they be documented elsewhere in the OM-A, not necessarily Chapter 7.

Answer

Nutrition is part of the operator's individual flight time specification scheme (IFTSS) which is subject to approval by the competent authority under ARO.OPS.235 (a).

Chapter 7 of the OM-A is the place where the operator describes its IFTSS. Nutrition opportunities during duty periods are therefore to be included under that Chapter.

In cases where nutrition provisions are documented elsewhere in the OM-A, the operator should provide references in Chapter 7 to those nutrition provisions to enable aircrew to easily trace and read about the applicable nutrition arrangements. Irrespective of the place where nutrition opportunities are described in detail, they are part of the IFTSS and subject to NAA's approval.

IFTSS is customised to the operator's specific operating conditions e.g. routes and airports served, specific rest requirements and duty length. The latter in turn impacts nutrition opportunities – timing, duration and other arrangements.

The content of the OM need be presented in a form that can be used without difficulty by crew members. The same applies to the operator's IFTSS.

Last updated:

08/04/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/95252>

Fatigue management training ORO.FTL.250 AMC1 ORO.FTL.250: What should be the minimum requirements for a fatigue management instructor? Is a CRMi course enough? Is a safety manager ready and without other training to deliver a course? Can someone that has received a few hours course in accordance with AMC1 ORO.FTL.250 repeat the course to others?

Answer

Although ORO.FTL does not contain prescriptive requirements determining the qualification of fatigue management instructors, those instructors are an operator's personnel and hence, need to acquire at least the knowledge specified in AMC1 ORO.FTL.250.

Any operator needs to demonstrate to the competent authority that their personnel has acquired at least the knowledge as per the syllabus in AMC1 ORO.FTL.250.

In essence, the fatigue management training is a competency-based training. The operator should identify what training and competences are needed for each personnel group: aircrew, instructors, rostering and management staff to perform their roles effectively, and what means of measuring the level of competency attained by each person who receives the training is available.

For example, a fatigue management instructor must have the training required by AMC1 ORO.FTL.250. The operator may, in addition to that, require that the instructor also complete training normally required for FRM inspectors in accordance with AMC5 ARO.GEN 200(a) (2).

Recommended fatigue management training topics for specific groups of employees can be found in the ICAO Doc 9966 Manual for the Oversight of Fatigue Management Approaches/Second Edition 2016.

Operators who aim to establish a system for fatigue risk management (FRM), should consider including the following additional subjects, for aircrew, FSAG members, FRM instructors, FRM auditors, managers, according to their functions:

- the science behind FRM;
- requirements of Part-ORO with respect to FRM;
- components of the FRM of that particular operator and its functioning;
 - FRM predictive, reactive and proactive processes
 - roster fatigue metrics
 - fatigue safety performance indicators
- employees' responsibilities with respect to the FRM;
- use of fatigue reporting systems and implementing mitigations;
- collection of fatigue data (both subjective and objective) to feed the FRM system.

The content and frequency of fatigue management training should be proportional to the operator's fatigue risk exposure. For example, a scheduled airline and an on-demand night cargo operator are likely to establish different syllabus and frequency for their aircrew training. Also, an airline with crew members commuting long hours to/from their home base, should particularly focus on the use of company's airport or hotel crew rooms for fatigue mitigation of disruptive schedules when providing fatigue management training.

Last updated:

09/04/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/95253>

Reporting point ORO.FTL.105 (2): The global COVID-19 pandemic necessitated, on a number of occasions, a change to the typical aircrew reporting point. How should the operators address this change?

Answer

Aircrew typically used to report for duty at a crew room, at their home base or at outstation. The global COVID-19 pandemic caused disruptions in flight operations and necessitated, on a number of occasions, a change to the typical aircrew reporting point. Here below are some considerations that operators and aircrew should account for when addressing such change.

Notification to crew members. The operator must inform the crew about any change of the reporting point prior to operating as this is part of operator's responsibilities under ORO.FTL.110.

Travelling time to the reporting point. Due to the change of reporting point, the otherwise duty time may turn into travelling time, thus extending the usual travelling time that a crew member is accustomed or prepared for. Therefore, the operator should make sure that the impact of the change of reporting point on traveling time and consequently on crew fatigue is not significant. The operator SMS has to manage the change of reporting point by assessing the potential negative impact on aircrew fatigue levels, based on evidence of adequate time frames and/or a comparison between the time necessary to report to the new point and the typical reporting point. In assessing the impact, the operator should account for additional operational factors e.g. standby call out times. The operator should address reporting at a place other than a crew room in the OM.

Commencement of duty. Duty starts from reporting for duty at the reporting point designated by the operator e.g. when the crew member checks-in in a crew room. In cases where the crew member is required by the operator to commence an activity prior to entering a crew room or a non-public area of an airport, so as to obtain flight documents at a check-in counter or ticket office, pass a security checkpoint or update the EFB, the duty starts at the point of commencing this activity. At airports where the crew members can access the non-public area or reach the departing gate through more than one security checkpoints, the operator should make sure that commencement time is the same for the same duty.

Aircrew briefing. The time for aircrew briefing is a duty time no matter where it takes place. If the briefing takes place at the gate where other people are also present, the operator should arrange for a secluded place considering security matters among other things. The size of the crew should not prevent crew members from talking to each other without disturbing and being disturbed. If the briefing takes place on board the aircraft, the operator should ensure that certain conditions are present, such as running APU/GPU, no disturbance from ground personnel or cleaning staff. Where the operator provides EFB, the briefing material should already be uploaded to it or if, new material is to be downloaded, the crew must be provided with means to do so.

Reporting times. The operator should specify in the OM reporting times that account for the type of operation, ground duties, size and type of the aircraft and the airport conditions (GM1 ORO.FTL.205(a)(1)). Ground duties include pre-flight duties (briefings; provision of documentation; transport to the aircraft parking stand, etc.).

Last updated:

07/02/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/135897>

Individual crew members' records of flight time and duty periods ORO.FTL.245, (see also ORO.FTL.105):

Answer

Our employer does not provide individual records of the time spent for e-learning and for certain administrative tasks such as visa renewal.

The purpose of subpart FTL is to mitigate the risks related to fatigue. Therefore, maintaining crew member's records is to ensure compliance with the requirements of that subpart.

A proper implementation of ORO.FTL.245 would fully account for the term 'duty' i.e. any task assigned by the operator must be recorded in crew members' individual records.

The time required for crew training at the behest of the operator and when required by Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 is a duty.

For example, the time needed to complete an e-learning task, if assigned by the operator, is to be notified in advance and

recorded as duty time.

The same applies to some ground activities, such as administrative tasks, (including the visa renewal, a second passport when required) or training (briefing or debriefing when required).

Tasks that are part of pilot's individual responsibility such as renewal of the medical certificate need not be rostered or registered.

In accordance with ORO.FTL.245 records of duties are maintained for a period of 24 months. Moreover, in accordance with ORO.MLR.115, records of crew member training, checking & qualifications must be retained for 3 years.

These records are necessary for the operator and crew member to be able to not only account for a particular duty, but also for the cumulative limits stipulated in ORO.FTL.210 (a).

Last updated:

08/02/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47814>

Must the time for all training at the behest of the operator be entered in the schedule of the crew members and recorded?

Answer

To any training at the behest of the operator regardless of the method (e-learning¹) or self-study or otherwise) that an aircrew member is assigned to by the operator the following applies:

1. It is a duty and the time spent on training task constitutes a duty period.
2. It cannot be considered a rest period or a day free of all duty or an annual leave period (ORO.FTL.105).

E-learning¹ or self-study may be included as a single duty period in the CM roster with start and end times or assigned as a number of hours to be used over certain time (week(s) or month(s)), by the crew member to study the training material, in parts or at once, at the crew member discretion.

When assigning a number of hours, the operator should notify the crew member concerned in advance, specifying the allocated hours and time period for completion of the training. The training methods described above should comply with all daily or cumulative duty limits and rest requirements of [Commission Regulation \(EU\) No 965/2012](#) and of [Council Directive 2000/79/EC](#) of 27 November 2000 (WTD), considering the period allocated for completion². The policy and description on how these training methods are managed should be clearly documented in the operations manual (OM). As part of their shared responsibilities with regard to crew fatigue, the crew members should manage their time and tasks considering other assigned duties and rest requirements as per ORO.FTL.115 (b).

As part of their shared responsibilities with regard to crew fatigue, the operator should ensure that the training duties are assigned in a way that enables crew members to fulfil their flight duties to a satisfactory level of safety under all circumstances. The operator should in particular provide rest periods of sufficient time prior to the next flight duty/duties and an adequate number of hours and period of time to enable a successful fulfilment.

¹ ICAO Circular 356 definition: E-Learning – is the delivery of a learning, training or education programme by electronic means.

² ORO.FTL.205; ORO.FTL.210; ORO.FTL.235; CS FTL.1.235; WTD Annex Clause 8 & 9.

Last updated:

11/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139223>

Passenger Safety

Use of baby bassinets on board

Use of baby bassinets on board

Answer

Reference: Certification Specifications and Acceptable Means of Compliance for Large Aeroplanes CS-25 (ED Decision 2012/008/R) is available on EASA website.

Provision of a baby bassinet is a cabin service provided by an airline to a parent travelling with a baby for the purpose of relieving the parent from holding the lap-held baby for a long period of time, especially on long-haul and ultra-long-haul flights.

Baby bassinets are included in the certification process of the aircraft in which they will be installed. They are not certified as separate devices, therefore an aircraft may not have a baby bassinet at all. The choice is up to the airline. The airline may choose to have a permanently installed 'baby bed' on its aircraft and its use during taxi, take-off, landing and turbulence will be described in the attached placards.

If baby bassinets are available on board, their number in the cabin depends on the cabin arrangement of the aircraft and locations where the bassinets can be safely attached/positioned. The number of baby bassinets at one location, usually at a bulkhead, depends on the available space, the weight the bulkhead can hold and the number of oxygen masks for the adults and babies located in that individual row.

Baby bassinet is not a child restraint device. Baby bassinets are not certified for taxi, take-off, landing and turbulent weather conditions. They may swing up and down and are not stable during turbulence, therefore the baby must be removed from the baby bassinet during turbulence and secured as instructed by your cabin crew members.

Airlines carrying baby bassinets on board may have varying policies on their use, therefore it is necessary to check the airline's website or get in contact with the airline. The International Air Transport Association (IATA) may also be able to provide more information.

Certification placarding requirements

Placards advising on the stowage of baby bassinets during taxi, take-off, landing and turbulence are required either at the location where baby bassinets will be fixed to the aircraft structure (e.g. bulkhead) or a clearly visible instruction advising on the same must be placed on the baby bassinet itself.

The placarding requirements are related to the general certification requirements on placarding and intended function in accordance with Certifications Specifications and Acceptable Means of Compliance for Large Aeroplanes CS-25 (ED Decision 2012/008/R) and the marking requirements as specified in the approval of the equipment. For any questions on certification matters, please contact the EASA Certification directorate.

Last updated:

25/02/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/71607>

Use of Child Seats on Board

Can I use a child seat on board for my baby/child? What about a rear-facing child seat?

Answer

EASA cares for the safe transport of babies and children by air and encourages the use of child seats on board an aircraft. Having a child seat on board an aircraft requires an assessment of several aspects, such as the aircraft seat itself, if the aircraft seat is forward-facing or rear-facing, how the child seat can be safely secured on the aircraft seat, the distance between seat rows where the child seat is intended to be placed, etc. Practically all child seats allowed on board are those that have been tested and certified for the use in cars. There may be limitations for their use in cars and there are also limitations for their use in an aircraft cabin. Depending on the specifics of the child seat, but also on the specifics of the aircraft seats and of the aircraft cabin arrangement, the operator decides which child seats are accepted on board its aircraft and which ones cannot be accepted due to safety reasons.

Rear-facing child seats are recommended for the use in cars for babies and children up until the age of 4. The use of a rear-facing (also referred to as 'aft-facing') child seat on board an aircraft may however be limited due to the distance between passenger seat rows (so-called 'seat pitch'). Airlines are free to order from an aircraft manufacturer an aircraft with a cabin arrangement of their choice (including the distance between seat rows) provided it is compliant with the existing aircraft certification rules. Each cabin arrangement must be approved by EASA and must comply with the applicable safety standards including emergency evacuation. EU legislation however does not specify a prescriptive figure related to the minimum distance between seats (i.e. seat rows), aircraft designers comply with the standards using a range of biometrics.

It is the operator's responsibility to establish procedures for its operation which are subject to the approval or acceptance by the National Aviation Authority of that EU Member State. Please, contact your airline for information on types of child seats and their use on board the airline's aircraft. You may also wish to visit the EASA webpage 'Travelling with children'.

Extract from the EU rules on air operations related to the acceptance of child seats on board:

CAT.IDE.A.205 Seats, seat safety belts, restraint systems and child restraint devices

(a) Aeroplanes shall be equipped with:

- (1) a seat or berth for each person on board who is aged 24 months or more;
- (2) a seat belt on each passenger seat and restraining belts for each berth except as specified in (3);
- (3) a seat belt with upper torso restraint system on each passenger seat and restraining belts on each berth in the case of aeroplanes with an MCTOM of 5 700 kg or less and with an MOPSC of nine or less, having an individual CofA first issued on or after 8 April 2015;
- (4) a child restraint device (CRD) for each person on board younger than 24 months;
- (5) ...

AMC1 CAT.IDE.A.205 Seats, seat safety belts, restraint systems and child restraint devices

CHILD RESTRAINT DEVICES (CRDs)

(a) A CRD is considered to be acceptable if:

(1) it is a 'supplementary loop belt' manufactured with the same techniques and the same materials as the approved safety belts;
or

(2) it complies with (b).

(b) Provided the CRD can be installed properly on the respective aircraft seat, the following CRDs are considered acceptable:

(1) CRDs approved for use in aircraft according to the European Technical Standard Order ETSO-C100c on Aviation Child Safety Device (ACSD);

(2) CRDs approved by EASA through a Type Certificate or Supplemental Type Certificate;

(3) Child seats approved for use in motor vehicles on the basis of the technical standard specified in point (i) below. The child seat must be also approved for use in aircraft on the basis of the technical standard specified in either point

(ii) or point (iii):

(i) UN Standard ECE R44-04 (or 03), or ECE R129 bearing the respective 'ECE R' label; and

(ii) German 'Qualification Procedure for Child Restraint Systems for Use in Aircraft' (TÜV/958-01/2001) bearing the label 'For Use in Aircraft'; or

(iii) Other technical standard acceptable to the competent authority. The child seat should hold a qualification sign that it can be used in aircraft.

(4) Child seats approved for use in motor vehicles and aircraft according to Canadian CMVSS 213/213.1 bearing the respective label;

(5) Child seats approved for use in motor vehicles and aircraft according to US FMVSS No 213 and bearing one or two labels displaying the following two sentences:

(i) 'THIS CHILD RESTRAINT SYSTEM CONFORMS TO ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY STANDARDS'; and

(ii) in red letters 'THIS RESTRAINT IS CERTIFIED FOR USE IN MOTOR VEHICLES AND AIRCRAFT';

(6) Child seats approved for use in motor vehicles and aircraft according to Australia/New Zealand's technical standard AS/NZS 1754:2013 bearing the green part on the label displaying 'For Use in Aircraft'; and

(7) CRDs manufactured and tested according to other technical standards equivalent to those listed above. The devices should be marked with an associated qualification sign, which shows the name of the qualification organisation and a specific identification number, related to the associated qualification project. The qualifying organisation should be a competent and independent organisation that is acceptable to the competent authority.

(c) Location

(1) Forward-facing child seats may be installed on both forward-and rearward-facing passenger seats, but only when fitted in the same direction as the passenger seat on which they are positioned. Rearward-facing child seats should only be installed on forward-facing passenger seats. A child seat should not be installed within the radius of action of an airbag unless it is obvious that the airbag is de-activated or it can be demonstrated that there is no negative impact from the airbag.

(2) An infant/child in a CRD should be located in the vicinity of a floor level exit.

(3) An infant/child in a CRD should not hinder evacuation for any passenger.

(4) An infant/child in a CRD should neither be located in the row (where rows are existing) leading to an emergency exit nor located in a row immediately forward or aft of an emergency exit. A window passenger seat is the preferred location. An aisle passenger seat or a cross aisle passenger seat that forms part of the evacuation route to exits is not recommended. Other locations may be acceptable provided the access of neighbour passengers to the nearest aisle is not obstructed by the CRD.

(5) In general, only one CRD per row segment is recommended. More than one CRD per row segment is allowed if the infants/children are from the same family or travelling group provided the infants/children are accompanied by a responsible adult sitting next to them in the same row segment.

(6) A row segment is one or more seats side-by-side separated from the next row segment by an aisle.

(d) Installation

(1) CRDs tested and approved for use in aircraft should only be installed on a suitable passenger seat by the method shown in the manufacturer's instructions provided with each CRD and with the type of connecting device they are approved for the installation in aircraft. CRDs designed to be installed only by means of rigid bar lower anchorages (ISOFIX or equivalent) should only be used on passenger seats equipped with such connecting devices and should not be secured by passenger seat lap belt.

(2) All safety and installation instructions should be followed carefully by the responsible adult accompanying the infant/child. Operators should prohibit the use of a CRD not installed on the passenger seat according to the manufacturer's instructions or not approved for use in aircraft.

(3) If a forward-facing child seat with a rigid backrest is to be fastened by a seat lap belt, the restraint device should be fastened when the backrest of the passenger seat on which it rests is in a reclined position. Thereafter, the backrest is to be positioned upright. This procedure ensures better tightening of the child seat on the aircraft seat if the aircraft seat is reclinable.

(4) The buckle of the adult safety belt must be easily accessible for both opening and closing, and must be in line with the seat belt halves (not canted) after tightening.

(5) Forward-facing restraint devices with an integral harness must not be installed such that the adult safety belt is secured over the infant.

(e) Operation

(1) Each CRD should remain secured to a passenger seat during all phases of flight unless it is properly stowed when not in use.

(2) Where a child seat is adjustable in recline, it must be in an upright position for all occasions when passenger restraint devices are required.

Extract from the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) guidance on the approval and use of

child restraint systems (ICAO Document 10049):

2.4.3 The seat pitch or the available space between two rows of seats may also be an issue and particularly significant for aft-facing CRS as they are further reclined and take up more horizontal space. The inability to be effectively installed using existing aircraft seat belts may also render motor vehicle CRS ineffective on board. The location of anchor points can also be problematic. This includes the location of the aircraft seat belt attachment to the aircraft seat, as a CRS must translate forward until the belt path angle allows for belt tension forces to restrain the device.

Note: CRS stands for 'child restraint system' and means the same as 'child restraint device'.

Last updated:

31/10/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/48276>

Passenger safety briefing

Is there any requirement on what language(s) should be used for information provided to passengers via safety briefings and announcements?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 Air Operations, Annex III: Part-ORO is available on EASA website. ICAO Doc 10086 Manual on information and instructions for passenger safety is available on ICAO website.

Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 mandates the operator to ensure that briefings and demonstrations related to safety are provided to passengers in a form that facilitates the application of the procedures applicable in case of an emergency and that passengers are provided with a safety briefing card on which picture type-instructions indicate the operation of emergency equipment and exits likely to be used by passengers. It is therefore the operator's responsibility to choose the languages to be used on its flights, which may vary depending on the destination or a known passenger profile. It is indeed difficult, if not impossible, to accommodate every 'required' language on board as this differs on daily basis from a flight to flight. For example, a German airline has a flight departing from Frankfurt to Rome and it is assumed that the most required languages on this flight will be German and Italian. The passenger profile may, however, be such that these languages are not 'desired' on this flight as passengers do not necessarily speak or understand any of the two languages (passengers may be e.g. Irish, Canadian, Russian, Chinese, Iranian, Egyptian, Pakistani, Latvian, Finnish, Croatian, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Czech, Slovak, etc., or there is a large group of e.g. Japanese tourists). It is therefore a practice of some operators to employ 'language speakers', i.e. cabin crew members speaking certain languages, who mainly operate their language-desired route(s). The aircraft may also have an option of a multi-language pre-recorded set of public announcements, the operator may choose this feature when modifying the cabin systems on its aircraft configuration.

ICAO Doc 10086 recommends that information provided to passengers via safety briefings, announcements and safety demonstrations should be transmitted in the language of the operator and in English to promote appropriate communication with passengers. Further, that in order to cover the largest percentage of passengers on board on international flights, the operator should consider the use of English and the use of the official language of the State of departure and destination. In addition, the operator should consider the language(s) of the passengers on board and assign language-qualified cabin crew members or interpreters on board the aircraft, on specific routes. The operator should verify that emergency exit-row occupants comprehend the language spoken by the crew.

Last updated:

25/09/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/48610>

Part-CAT

Are there any requirements for loadmasters?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations, Annex IV (Part-CAT)

There are no specific provisions for loadmasters, either in terms of their duties or in terms of their qualification. The only provision applicable to loading is in Part-CAT:

CAT.POL.MAB.100 Mass and balance, loading

CAT.POL.MAB.105 Mass and balance data and documentation, stating:

- The loading of an aircraft shall be performed under the supervision of qualified personnel in a way that is consistent with the results of mass and balance calculations.
- The person supervising the loading of the aircraft shall confirm by hand signature or equivalent that the load and its distribution are in accordance with the mass and balance documentation given to the commander.
- The person who prepared the mass and balance documentation must be named on it.
- The operator has to specify principles and methods for the loading and the mass and balance system in use in its Operations Manual.

Regarding the categorization of such personnel, a loadmaster can be either ground personnel or a crew member if the operator assigns him/her duties on board (as it is the case for some cargo operators), but certainly not flight crew.

Of course this does not prevent a flight crew member to be also qualified as a loadmaster, but he or she would be flight crew independently from being a loadmaster at the same time.

Please note that in accordance with ORO.GEN.110(e), it is the operator's responsibility to "ensure that all personnel assigned to, or directly involved in, ground and flight operations are properly instructed, have demonstrated their abilities in their particular duties and are aware of their responsibilities and the relationship of such duties to the operation as a whole".

Last updated:

14/02/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19162>

Referring to Annex II - AMC 20-6 rev.2, on ETOPS Applicability, is an ETOPS operational approval required or not for aircraft with a seating configuration of 19 or less and not exceeding 180 minutes at the approved one-engine-inoperative (OEI) speed (in still air) from an adequate aerodrome?

Answer

"The acceptable means of compliance for operators seeking an ETOPS operational approval to operate aeroplanes with a maximum passenger seating configuration of 19 or less, in excess of 180 minutes at the approved one-engine-inoperative (OEI) speed (in still air) from an adequate aerodrome is AMC 20-6. For operations in excess of 120 minutes at the approved OEI, refer to the below"

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations, Annex IV (Part CAT)

Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 must be considered, especially point CAT.OP.MPA.140, which states:

"(a) Unless approved by the competent authority in accordance with Annex V (Part SPA), Subpart F, the operator shall not operate a two-engined aeroplane over a route that contains a point further from an adequate aerodrome, under standard conditions in still air, than the appropriate distance for the given type of aeroplane among the following:

[...].

for performance class A aeroplanes with an MOPSC of 19 or less, the distance flown in 120 minutes or, subject to approval by the competent authority, up to 180 minutes for turbojet aeroplanes, at the OEI cruise speed determined in accordance with (b);"

Therefore, a specific ETOPS approval under Part-SPA (Annex V to Regulation (EU) No 965/2012) is not required to operate between 120 and 180 minutes from an adequate aerodrome; nevertheless, an operator is required to hold an approval based on the provisions contained in AMC1 CAT.OP.MPA.140(c). Without this approval, an operator cannot operate in excess of 120 minutes from an adequate aerodrome.

Last updated:

20/08/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19164>

NPAs CDFA-SA with IAP instrument approach procedure expressing minima as a "DA/H" should have an "ADD-ON" or not? Am I allowed to go a little below the "DA/H" while performing a missed approach/going around?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations, Annex IV (Part CAT)

Please note that the rules on CDFA are now specified in the following rule of Regulation (EU) 965/2012: CAT.OP.MPA.115 Approach flight technique - aeroplanes. To this implementing rule, three AMCs and one Guidance Material are assigned.

AMC1 CAT.OP.MPA.115 (a)(5) specifies the following: "This DA/H should take into account any add-on to the published minima as identified by the operator's management system and should be specified in the OM (aerodrome operating minima)." This means that the use of any add-on is left to the responsibility of the operator.

Usually, the operator should avoid going below DA/H if the missed approach is initiated. Therefore, (a)(7) specifies: "The operator should establish a procedure to ensure that an appropriate callout is made when the aeroplane is approaching DA/H. If the required visual references are not established at DA/H, the missed approach procedure is to be executed promptly."

Last updated:

14/02/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19165>

What is the meaning of 'where applicable' in relation to the data link recording requirements in CAT.IDE.A.195, CAT.IDE.H.195, NCC.IDE.A.170, NCC.IDE.H.170, SPO.IDE.A.150 and SPO.IDE.H.150?

Answer

- The requirement to record data link communication messages stated in paragraphs CAT.IDE.A.195, CAT.IDE.H.195, NCC.IDE.A.170, NCC.IDE.H.170, SPO.IDE.A.150 and SPO.IDE.H.150 should be understood as follows: if an aircraft is equipped with data link communication equipment and it is going to use this equipment during part or the entire flight (when also required to be equipped with a CVR and first issued with an individual CofA on or after the applicability date stated in the relevant paragraph), then it must also have a working data link recording function. The expression 'where applicable' in CAT.IDE.A.195(a) is to indicate that the requirement applies when information enumerated in CAT.IDE.A.195(a)(1) is exchanged or could be exchanged via data link replacing voice during the flight. This is also valid for the expression 'where applicable' in CAT.IDE.H.195(a), NCC.IDE.A.170(a), NCC.IDE.H.170(a), SPO.IDE.A.150(a) and SPO.IDE.H.150(a).
- Examples where this requirement would not apply include but are not limited to:
 - the case where the aircraft is only operated in airspace where no data link communication service is offered and therefore only voice communications are used between the aircraft and ATS;
 - the case where the airborne data link communication equipment is not compatible with the data link services of the airspace where it is operating and therefore, voice remains the means of communication between the aircraft and ATS;
 - the case where the data link communication equipment is disabled permanently and in a way that it cannot be enabled again during the flight and therefore voice remains the means of communication between the aircraft and ATS.

Note:

Commission Regulation (EU) No 29/2009 requires aircraft performing IFR flights above Flight Level 285 in the airspace of most EASA Member States to 'have the capability to operate some data link services by February 2020 , except for older aircraft and State aircraft.

Last updated:

20/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19201>

AMC1 (a) to CAT.IDE.A.280 says, "Batteries used in the ELTs should be replaced (or recharged, if the battery is rechargeable) when the equipment has been in use for more than 1 cumulative hour". What should be understood by "in use for more than 1 cumulative hour"?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations, Annex IV (Part CAT)

"In use for more than 1 cumulative hour" should be understood as an hour of cumulative ELT operation, whatever the purpose may be (testing, intended or unintended transmitting).

Last updated:

14/02/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19168>

Does the operator need an exemption to CAT.OP.MPA.160 to use the passenger cabin as a cargo compartment?

Answer

The passenger cabin is not approved for as a cargo compartment and it does not meet the applicable requirements for the transportation of cargo. This is in accordance with the type certification of the large aeroplanes certified for passenger transport. The carriage of cargo in the cabin beyond already approved stowage areas is therefore neither covered by the approval of the aircraft nor by the approval of the seats and that is the reason why an exemption is needed. Additionally, limitations and/or procedures must be introduced to compensate for the non-compliance related to smoke detection or fire suppression means.

The details as to what extent cargo can be carried in a passenger compartment without additional certification are also provided by the relevant EASA Special Condition on this subject, recognized by both Boeing MOM-MOM-20-0239-02B and Airbus FOT 999.0028/20.

AMC2 CAT.OP.MPA.160 (b) (2) specifies the need for approved restraint equipment to secure the intended cargo. However, the term "cargo" in this AMC refers to anything that belongs to the passenger traveling in the adjacent seat but it is not a piece of luggage (e.g., a musical instrument that may have to be restrained to the seat). Thus, the AMC was never intended to facilitate the use of the cabin as a cargo compartment.

Last updated:

24/04/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/113210>

Is there any regulatory statement by which it is required for all European aeroplanes to carry a defibrillator on board?

Answer

By means of the ED Decision 2021/005/R the AMC/GM to CAT.IDE.A.220 and CAT.IDE.A.225 have been updated in line with the existing evidence and expert opinion. The use of automated external defibrillators (AED) is essential to increase the chances of

survival in case of a cardiac arrhythmias such as ventricular fibrillation (VF) and non-perfusing ventricular tachycardia (VT) when used in the first 10 minutes.

AMC1 CAT.IDE.A.220 (b) (4) stipulates that the aircraft operators should carry automated external defibrillator (AED) on board all aircraft equipped with a first-aid kit and required to carry at least one cabin crew. When operating multi-deck aircraft, operators should assess if additional equipment is needed on each deck.

Last updated:

04/08/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19169>

What are the obligations when carrying AED's (Automated Emergency Defibrillators) on board as per CAT.IDE.A.220 and CAT.IDE.A.225?

Answer

AED (Automated Emergency Defibrillators) can be considered as carry on board medical equipment. The provision where the AED will be stowed should be certified (capable to carry the load and placarded accordingly). If the AED is stowed in a stowage as for passenger luggage we would not necessarily ask for full 25.853 compliance especially when considered as carry on board equipment. If you want to certify it (being part of the modification) then compliance to the applicable CS requirements must be demonstrated.

In addition, you should have a look into the guidance material to Part CAT 140. Here you will find some information related to the electro mechanical interference of medical equipment.

If the AED is considered as carry on board medical equipment, there is no need for a certified installation. The operator is however obliged to conduct an assessment as per AMC1 CAT.GEN.MPA.140.

Last updated:

09/06/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136618>

Part-SPA

SPA.HERMS.110 Equipment requirements for HERMS operations specifies: "The installation of all helicopter dedicated medical equipment and any subsequent modifications and, where appropriate, its operation shall be approved in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1702/2003". Does it mean that even a defibrillator or an oxylog has to be approved in accordance with Regulation (EC) 1702/2003 or (EU) 748/2012? Or does it mean that only the fix installed medical equipment, such as a stretcher or a fix provision, has to be approved?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations, Annex V (Part SPA)

It is not the medical equipment itself that has to be approved in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 748/2012, but its installation on the helicopter. Therefore, if it is a fixed installed equipment, it has to be approved; if it is removable, the housing or any other part which is installed has to be approved. In general terms, the principle applied here is that no kind of equipment (medical or not, installed or not) shall affect the airworthiness or the safe operation of the aircraft even in the case of failures or malfunctions.

This means, for example, that if the equipment is powered by a power source of the aircraft, there shall be no adverse effect on the power source itself or on other systems or parts of the aircraft, or that the equipment is checked and cleared against electromagnetic interference.

Last updated:

14/02/2014

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19174>**Dangerous Goods**

Is there a European regulation on dangerous goods training requirements or should each European country follow its own national regulations?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations, Annex III (Part ORO), Annex IV (Part CAT), Annex V (Part SPA), Annex VI (Part NCC), Annex VII (Part NCO)

European rules regarding the transport of dangerous goods can be found in the Commission Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations (Air OPS). Air OPS Regulation substitutes the EU-OPS Regulations. So far, only the rules for commercial air transport and non-commercial operations have been published in Annexes I to VII of the Air OPS. The rules on aerial work (specialised operations) will follow later to complete it.

Apart from the implementing rules which are comprised in the Regulation (EU) 965/2012, the Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC) and Guidance Material (GM), which are published as [EASA Decisions](#) on the Agency's website, should be taken into account as well (namely Decisions 2012/015/R through to 2012/019/R, respectively the amended ones 2013/017/R through to 2013/022/R).

The requirements in ORO.GEN.110, CAT.GEN.MPA.200, SPA.DG.105, NCC.GEN.150 and NCO.GEN.140 are more general, whereas the related AMC/GM (especially AMC1 SPA.DG.105(a) in [ED Decision 2013/020/R on Part SPA](#)) include more specific details.

The requirements stipulated in Part I, Chapter 4 of the ICAO Doc 9284-AN/905, Technical Instructions for the Safe Transport of Dangerous Goods by Air, mentioned as a further reference in the Air OPS Regulation, must also be complied with.

In addition, national aviation authorities are responsible for approving the dangerous goods training in their countries and therefore they have to establish the conditions under which they shall be approved. For detailed information on training requirements (including the type of training interaction - classroom or computer-based training), each operator should contact the national aviation authority in their country of registration.

Last updated:

14/02/2014

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19170>

Q2: What are the rules concerning the carriage of portable air concentrators (POC) on board? Can they be used during the whole flight?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations, Annex IV (Part CAT); Regulation (EC) No 1107/2006 on the right of disabled persons and persons with reduced mobility when travelling by air

Portable air concentrators (POC) do not contain oxygen as such; they only concentrate the oxygen in the surrounding area. Therefore they should not be confused with oxygen bottles/cylinders. Under the European regulations, POCs do not have to be approved to be carried and used on board.

As POCs contain batteries, they fall under the definition of portable electronic devices (PEDs).

In accordance with the European regulations (AMC1 CAT.GEN.MPA.140 (b)(2)(i)), medical equipment necessary to support physiological functions (i.e. POCs) does not need to be switched-off during any phases of the flight.

Regulation (EC) No 1107/2006 establishes the rights of disabled persons and persons with reduced mobility when travelling by air. Article 4(3) of this Regulation requires an air carrier or its agent to make publicly available the safety requirements and relevant information on restrictions. For more information on Regulation (EC) No 1107/2006, please refer to the Commission's interpretative guidelines on this regulation from 11.06.2012, which has been published on the Commission's website and can be accessed using this [link](#).

If passengers have special needs, they should request more information from the airline at the time of booking.

Last updated:

14/02/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19173>

Q1: What are the rules for passengers using bottled oxygen on board an aircraft?

Answer

[NOTE: Q1 and Q2 must be read together as they are closely related.]

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations; Regulation (EC) No 1107/2006 on the right of disabled persons and persons with reduced mobility when travelling by air

Article 10 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2006 establishes the rights of disabled persons and persons with reduced mobility when travelling by air. The Regulation also stipulates that air operators should provide assistance, including transportation of medical equipment subject to dangerous goods legislation. Article 4(3) of this Regulation requires an air carrier or its agent to make publicly available the safety requirements and relevant information on restrictions. Annex II to the Regulation stipulates that the relevant legislation on dangerous goods can be invoked to limit the transport of mobility equipment. For more information on Regulation 1107/2006, please refer to the Commission's interpretative guidelines on this regulation from 11.06.2012, which has been published on the Commission's website and can be accessed [here](#).

Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 of 5 October 2012 on Air Operations (Air OPS Regulation) refers to Annex 18 of the Chicago Convention and the Technical Instructions for the Safe Transport of Dangerous Goods by air when relating to their carriage on board. For safety reasons, oxygen/air cylinders or bottles are considered dangerous goods and fall under Annex 18 of the Chicago Convention; therefore, the provisions under Part 8 of the ICAO Technical Instructions must be applied to passengers who intend to carry these items with them on board. Oxygen/air cylinders for medical use of no more than 5 kg gross weight and never containing liquid oxygen are allowed in checked and carry-on baggage or on the person, with approval of the operator. In addition, the operator must provide the pilot-in-command with written information on their number and location on board. The valves and regulators of oxygen bottles must be protected from damage which could cause inadvertent release of the contents. Under the ICAO Technical Instructions, spare oxygen cylinders of a similar size are also allowed to ensure an adequate supply for the duration of the journey. The operator's Operations Manual, which has been approved by the National Authority, will contain procedures on the use of oxygen bottles.

Nevertheless, for safety reasons, national authorities may decide to prohibit all oxygen bottles, irrespective of their size, from being carried on board by passengers. Where the national authorities allow oxygen bottles of less than 5 kg to be taken on board, it is still left to the discretion of the operator to accept them, also due to safety reasons (oxygen is highly flammable and it cannot be guaranteed that the bottles/valves have been maintained properly).

If passengers have special needs, they should request more information from the airline at the time of booking.

Last updated:

14/02/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19172>

Which operators have to establish and maintain dangerous goods training programmes? Which training programmes should be approved by the authority?

Answer

The rule reference is ORO.GEN.110 (j). All operators subject to ORO.GEN.005 must establish and maintain dg training programmes in all cases. The approval, however, is only necessary if:

- It is a CAT operation
- The operator is transporting dangerous goods and performing:
 - Commercial specialised operations:
 - Non-commercial operations with complex motor-powered aircraft; or
 - Non-commercial specialised operations with complex motor-powered aircraft.

There is also an alleviation in ORO.GEN.110 (k) for operators of sailplanes, balloons, and certain single-engined propeller-driven airplanes and single-engined other-than motor-powered helicopters of 5700 Kg or less of MCTM and an MOPSC of 5 or less operating in a flight taking off and landing at the same aerodrome/operating site under VFR by day, where the requirement is that operators shall ensure that the flight crew has received an appropriate training or briefing to enable them to recognise undeclared dangerous goods brought on-board by passengers or as cargo (refer to the rule for more information).

Last updated:

28/04/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/20496>

Part-NCC/NCO**Are there differences between the European Air Ops rules for NCC and ICAO SARPs?****Answer**

There are some differences between European Air Ops rules for NCC and ICAO Annex 6 SARPs. However, none of these differences would result in a lower safety level than intended by ICAO.

The following list describes differences generated by Regulation (EC) 216/2008 and Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations.

Differences generated by Reg. (EC) 216/2008:

- Aircraft category (difference in drawing the line between complex and non-complex aircraft): some aircraft are considered complex in the European rules, while at ICAO level, they are considered non-complex; European rules exceed ICAO standards.
- Oversight: European rules assign oversight responsibilities to the State of the Operator and not to the State of Registry; European rules achieve the safety target with an alternative method.
- Declaration: the operator requirement to declare itself to the competent authority supports authorities to discharge their responsibilities; European rules exceed ICAO standards.

Differences generated by Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations:

- List of specific approvals: European rules exceed ICAO standards; ICAO may require this list by November 2018.

Last updated:

20/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/20077>

Do NCC operators with non-EU registered aircraft need to maintain two different Operations Manuals?**Answer**

The European provisions for the structure of the Operations Manual are specified in AMC2 ORO.MLR.100. The structure is very

flexible and – where needed – could be amended through [an alternative means of compliance](#).

It is strongly advised that the operator work with a single Operations Manual, which should address the specified minimum items of the State of the Operator and the State of Registry.

Last updated:

20/11/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/20076>

My operations manual (OM) uses a template provided by a recognised industry standard. Is this sufficient for me to be compliant with the rules?

Answer

An OM template helps an operator to organise its procedures and information that the personnel need in order to accomplish their safety tasks. However, the operator has to make sure that its OM reflects the specificity of its operation – be it commercial or non-commercial. At the same time, the manual should cover the areas described in Subpart ORO.MLR.

In parallel with that, the operator has to ensure also that the operation itself – not just the manual – is compliant with the applicable rules. The requirements related to the operations manual are only a part of the applicable rules.

Last updated:

20/12/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/44669>

What is the intent of the declaration?

Answer

The intent of the declaration is to:

- a. have the operator acknowledge its responsibilities under the applicable safety regulations and that it holds all necessary approvals;
- b. inform the competent authority of the existence of an NCC or an SPO operator; and
- c. enable the competent authority to fulfil its oversight responsibilities in accordance with ARO.GEN.300 and 305.

When the NCC operation is managed by a third party on behalf of the owner, that party may be the operator in the sense of Article 3(13) of the Basic Regulation (EU) 2018/1139, and therefore has to declare its capability and means to discharge the responsibilities associated with the operation of the aircraft to the competent authority.

In such a case, it should also be assessed whether the third party operator undertakes a commercial operation in the sense of Article 2(1)(d) of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012.

Last updated:

20/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/20078>

How can an NCC operator establish if its organisation is complex or non-complex?

Answer

[AMC1 ORO.GEN.200\(b\) 'Management system. Size, nature and complexity of the activity'](#) provides criteria to determine if an operator belongs to the group of complex organisations or the one of non-complex organisations. These criteria are based on the

assessment of the size, nature and complexity of the operator's activity.

The idea behind this AMC is to provide some basic criteria for an organisation (an operator) to establish which AMCs on management system they should follow — the more 'comprehensive' ones for complex organisations, or those including some specific 'alleviations' for the non-complex ones.

It is important to note that the assessment of organisational complexity is not only a function of size, but it also needs to consider the specific activities, the operating environment, the scope, the variety of different aircraft types operated, the contracted activities, etc. Therefore, the AMC includes some specific risk criteria.

The fact that this AMC is included in Part-ORO indicates that it is the operator's responsibility to determine the right 'layout' of their management system. The competent authority will need to validate this determination during the oversight activities, and it may challenge the operator on the option retained (complex or non-complex).

At the same time, AMC1 ORO.GEN.200(b) does not include any overly detailed complexity criteria. This is because it is impossible to address all cases and, more importantly, it is not the intent that the AMC be used as a substitute for the operator's own risk assessment.

The main 'alleviations' for a non-complex operator are the following:

- The operator may use simple procedures and tools for its safety risk management process (e.g. checklists), and safety performance monitoring and measurement (no need to perform extensive safety studies, surveys, etc.).
- The accountable manager or a person with an operational role in the organisation may fulfil the role of safety manager.
- The organisation does not need to have a safety review board.
- The accountable manager may also be the compliance-monitoring manager if he or she has demonstrated to have the required competence and that the independence of the internal audits is maintained.
- Simple checklists may be used to document compliance monitoring audits and inspections.

Before the operator decides which AMCs to follow, it should demonstrate proper understanding of the risks entailed by its activities. Upon initial implementation of the EASA management system framework, the organisation will normally start describing and analysing its activity and processes, to determine not only how best to implement the management system framework, but also where to focus the risk management efforts. Not investing in this step will lead to inefficient/costly management system implementation and require subsequent rework.

Such system description and related analysis will be an effective means for identifying hazards proactively. It will also create a baseline for the management of changes and will allow identifying safety performance requirements for safety relevant processes, as well as related performance indicators and controls in order to manage the defined performance goals.

Last updated:

20/12/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/20080>

Is the European State of the Operator principle for NCC operations in contradiction to the Chicago Convention?

Answer

The standards and recommended practices (SARPs) of ICAO Annex 6, Part II are based on the State of Registry (SoR) principle.

The European rules for NCC operations are based on the State of the Operator (SoO) principle.

This does not constitute a contradiction to the Chicago Convention but rather establishes a complementary safety instrument, particularly when a European operator uses third-country registered aircraft.

The SoR is responsible for the oversight of the aircraft in its registry. The EU SoO is responsible for the oversight of operators having their principal place of business in an EU Member State. Although the EU SoO is the competent authority for the operators having their principal place of business in an EU Member State, the EU SoO and the foreign SoR should cooperate in order to ensure proper oversight of these operators, in compliance with the ICAO requirements.

When the SoR and the SoO are both EU Member States, they oversee the aircraft, as well as the organisations and personnel involved in their operation in a complementary manner and according to the same rules. The European regulatory framework permits both the SoR and the SoO to duly exercise their respective oversight responsibilities and to take the appropriate enforcement actions. Oversight and enforcement are therefore ensured at all times, irrespective of the EU Member State in which the aircraft is registered or where the operations take place. It is at all times legally clear which EU Member State is responsible for each aspect of the safety oversight of any aircraft registered in an EU Member State and operated by an operator having its principal place of business in an EU Member State acting as SoO.

Last updated:

17/02/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/20072>

Is a CAMO required for a European NCC operator using a third-country registered aircraft?

Answer

European Implementing rules for continuing airworthiness (EU) 2014/1321 do not apply to **European NCC operators for third-country registered aircraft** unless the regulatory oversight has been delegated to an EU Member State.

In particular, tasks related to the continuing airworthiness management do not need to be implemented by a CAMO in the sense of Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014. However, the essential requirements established in Annex V of Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 (the "Basic Regulation") must be complied with. For airworthiness, the elements required in Annex V point 6 must be ensured by an organisation as required in point 8.8.

In short, European NCC operators of third-country registered aircraft need to ensure that an organisation is managing the continuing airworthiness of their aircraft and that this organisation is able to demonstrate that the aircraft comply with the continuing airworthiness requirements contained in Annex V of Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 (the "Basic Regulation"). This organisation does not need to be a CAMO; it can be the operator itself or any other organisation or natural person under the responsibility of the operator.

Please also see [FAQ 47404](#).

Last updated:

20/12/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/20074>

Why are non-commercial operations treated in two Parts, i.e. Part NCC (non-commercial with complex motor-powered aircraft) and a Part NCO (non-commercial with other-than-complex motor-powered-aircraft)?

Answer

The rules concerning non-commercial operations are developed separately for complex motor-powered aircraft (MPA) and other-than-complex MPA because it does not make sense to have the same requirements apply to operations with an Airbus 320 for example and a Cessna 172. This way, the principle of proportionality of rules is preserved.

Last updated:

14/02/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19176>

Which requirements does an ATO need to follow? Is Part ORO applicable?

Answer

An ATO is required to comply with Part-ORA of Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 and either Part-NCC or Part-NCO of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012, depending on the aircraft being operated. Part-ORO is not applicable to ATOs.

Last updated:

26/05/2014

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19178>

What is the meaning of the term NCC?**Answer**

NCC stands for non-commercial operations with complex motor-powered aircraft. The term 'complex motor-powered aircraft' is defined in the Article 2(1)(d) of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations (previously in Reg. [\(EC\) No 216/2008](#)).

Last updated:

20/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/20069>

Which is the competent authority responsible for the oversight of the NCC operations in Europe?**Answer**

NCC.GEN.100 specifies the following: "The competent authority shall be the authority designated by the Member State in which the operator has its principal place of business or is residing".

This means that the State of the Operator (SoO) designates the competent authority for NCC operators. Here are some examples:

1. For a European NCC operator with aircraft registered in a Member State, the Competent Authority is designated by the State of the Operator.
2. For a European NCC operator with third-country registered aircraft, the Competent Authority is designated by the State of the Operator. These operators may also have to comply with rules of the third-country State of Registry (SoR) if this State has not delegated its responsibilities to the European State of the Operator.
3. For a third-country NCC operator having its principal place of business in a third country and performing operations with aircraft registered in a Member State, the Competent Authority is designated by the State of the Operator (the third country SoO). However, these operators may also have to comply with rules of the EU Member State (State of Registry) related to the aircraft if the State of Registry has not delegated its responsibilities to the State of the Operator.

For cases under (2) and (3), the State of Registry and the State of the Operator need to coordinate their safety and security oversight actions in accordance with ICAO SARPs (3.4.2.1.2 of ICAO Annex 6 Part II).

To avoid interferences with the responsibility of a third-country State of Registry for specific approvals, Part-SPA SPA.GEN.100 specifies that the European competent authority shall not issue operational approvals when they are required by Annex 6 and issued by the third-country State of Registry.

EASA has published a draft Guidance Material (GM) related to this topic, in order to make it easier for declared operators (NCC and SPO) to determine which their competent authority is. The GM can be found in the draft AMC&GM related to Opinion 04/2017, published for information '[draft GM proposed to Annex I Definitions](#)'.

Last updated:

20/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/20073>

Which Annexes of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 are applicable to NCC operations?**Answer**

The following Annexes contain applicable rules for NCC operations:

- Annex I – Definitions
- Annex II – Part-ARO
- Annex III – Part-ORO
- Annex V – Part-SPA
- Annex VI – Part-NCC.

Last updated:

20/11/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/20070>

May a European NCC or NCO operator use third-country registered aircraft?**Answer**

Yes, this is permitted.

Last updated:

05/10/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/20071>

Which pilot licence is required for flying a third-country registered aircraft in the EU?**Answer**

European pilots or pilots flying for a European operator will have to hold a European licence irrespective of whether the aircraft is EU registered or registered in a third country.

It should be noted that European NCC pilots are entitled to fly with foreign licences in non-commercial operations until 8 April 2016.

Last updated:

20/11/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/20075>

Why do European rules require a list of specific approvals?**Answer**

Appendix V of the Authority Requirements ([Part-ARO](#)) contains a list of specific approvals for non-commercial operations and specialised operations. This list replicates in a proportionate manner the OpSpecs template for CAT operations.

The reasons for this list are to standardise the documentation of specific approvals for non-commercial operators and to support ramp inspectors in their oversight activities.

Last updated:

20/11/2015

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/20079>**Do the European rules recognise if an operator conforms to European industry standards?****Answer**

The European rule recognises the compliance with European industry standards.

The declaration form specified in the Organisation Requirements (Part-ORO, Appendix 1) requires operators to declare if they conform to an industry standard. Any compliance with a recognised European industry standard should be taken into account by the competent authority when planning and implementing their risk-based oversight activities. The competent authority may adapt its oversight programme, in order to avoid duplication of specific audit items.

This is further described in AMC1 ARO.GEN.305(b);(d);(d1) 'Oversight programme' and AMC1 ARO.GEN.305(b);(c);(d);(d1) 'Oversight programme'.

Last updated:

20/11/2015

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/20081>**How should I start building my SMS if I have a very small organisation (up to 2-3 persons) and I operate a complex aeroplane or helicopter?****Answer**

A good starting point would be to describe your regular operation, the daily business. The description of your operation will give direction to your organisation's effective SMS and will become its foundation.

This description should simply be a checklist containing the day-to-day activities, as it provides the understanding necessary to identify and manage the risks associated with the operation.

The analysis of your daily operation should consider the following aspects (this list is not exhaustive):

- What is the frequency of your flights?
- What aircraft type(s) do you have in your fleet?
- What are your departure & destination points?
- What is specific to the aerodromes you use?
- Which are the routes on which you fly – more or less the same routes or very different routes?
- Do you carry passengers?
- What type of operation do you perform on those routes? Be as specific as you can.
- Do you have a system that helps you prepare your flight?
- How do you plan and calculate the necessary fuel supply?
- Do you have any specific approvals (e.g., LVO, PBN, etc.)?
- Are your pilots' training and qualifications compliant with the requirements? How about the other employees involved in operation?
- Are the operational procedures and any flight documents current and available to all the personnel involved in operation?
- How do you ensure that the necessary information is communicated to the right persons involved in operation?
- How do you ensure aircraft maintenance?
- What do you do if any of the elements above changes for one reason or another? Are you prepared to cope with that change and minimise its effects in your daily operation? How do you deal with such changes?
- Make sure you include the aspect of disruptive changes in your analysis.

- Have you set up the minimum levels of acceptance to which every key operational activity (e.g. scheduling, planning, flight execution, fuel consumption, training, aircraft maintenance) can go? In other words, have you set up your performance expectations?

The last two questions will lead to the second step in building your SMS:

- What could be the main potential risks associated to each of the elements above – what could go wrong with these daily variables?

Identifying the key elements of risk in this day-to-day operation will help you to spot more easily the strengths and weaknesses in your regular business, the errors, as well as the good practices.

The third step is then to choose/apply adequate mitigation measures to reduce the risks inherent to your daily operation:

- Make a list of solutions to reduce each risk to an acceptable level. Consider to use the Risk register checklist proposed in GM3 ORO.GEN.200(a)(3) for your safety risk management/assessment.

A fourth step is to assess whether the mitigation measures that you have prepared are effective and help you to achieve the required level of safety.

- Keep evidence of any occurrence, identify their cause, and see if they are repetitive and if they have anything in common.
- Find ways to prevent them from reoccurring by addressing the “root cause”.
- Check how well your solutions helped in preventing the reoccurrence of that event.

A fifth step ensures that the whole process becomes cyclic, and that you learn from your previous experience in order to make your operation safer and more efficient.

- Run this check once a year or after an event or change in the aspects mentioned above.

Does this scheme address your needs and help you to have a safe operation?

Last updated:

20/12/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/44670>

We are an aero-club authorised by Member State X to perform skydiving operations. We operate a non-complex aircraft dry-leased from an operator registered in Member State Y. Our skydivers and the tandem passengers are registered members of the aero-club; there is no profit distributed outside our organisation. Which Parts of Regulation (EU) 965/2012 apply to us? Which is our competent authority?

Answer

As an organisation (aero club) approved under the national legislation of Member State X, the national legislation of State X applies to you, to the skydivers, to the tandem passengers and all other registered members. Reg. (EU) No 1178/2011 on aircrew is not applicable to aero clubs that do not provide training for one of the Part-FCL licences and ratings — LAPL, PPL, CPL or ATPL.

The **operation of the aircraft** must be performed in accordance with Part-NCO of Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations, as the aircraft you operate is a non-complex aircraft.

The **competent authority** for the oversight of your dry-leased aircraft is the State of registry, that is, the state where your aircraft is registered (see Reg. (EU) No 965/2012, NCO.GEN.100 ‘Competent authority’). However, the competent authority of Member State Y may delegate its oversight tasks to the competent authority of Member State X.

Last updated:

20/12/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/44671>

Does an NCO operator established in an EU Member State and operating an aircraft registered in a third country need to comply with the Airworthiness Directives (AD) issued by EASA, in addition to the ADs issued by the State of Registry?

Answer

Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 NCO.GEN.145 point (b) states: ‘The operator shall implement [...] (b) any relevant mandatory safety information issued by the Agency, including airworthiness directives.’

For NCO operations in the EU of a third country-registered aircraft, only the ADs mandated by the State of Registry apply — not the EASA ADs.

The word ‘relevant’ in point (b) of NCO.GEN.145 should be understood as ‘if applicable’ and allows to distinguish the different situation of an aircraft registered in an EASA Member State (ADs issued by EASA are relevant to these aircraft) as opposed to third-country registered aircraft, on which ADs mandated by the third-country State of Registry should be applied (refer to Annex 8 to the Chicago Convention).

It is common that ADs first issued by the State of Design are identically (or very similarly) issued or adopted by all States of Registry concerned. By European law (article 77 of Reg. (EU) 2018/1139, the so-called Basic Regulation (BR)), EASA performs State of Design functions on behalf of the EASA Member States.

Note 1: In accordance with Article 83-bis of the Chicago Convention, if agreed, the country where an aircraft is registered may transfer the oversight functions (including airworthiness) to the country of the aircraft operator. If, in such case, the operator is established or resides in an EASA Member State, EASA ADs are relevant to this aircraft.

*Note 2: In accordance with article 77 of the BR, **aircraft registered in an EASA Member State** are required to comply with EASA-issued or adopted ADs. As per [ED Decision No. 2/2003](#), EASA adopts ADs issued by the State of Design unless the Agency decides differently. Read more about ADs applicable to EASA Member State-registered aircraft in the [EASA FAQ page on ADs](#).*

Last updated:

06/03/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/79890>

Part-SPO**How to distinguish between a ‘commercial’ SPO operator and a ‘non-commercial’ SPO operator?****Answer**

‘Commercial’ or ‘non-commercial’ operation - Reference: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations: Article 5

A commercial SPO operator is an operator who performs or intends to perform commercial non-transport operation such as specialised operations by receiving remuneration or other valuable consideration against those services.

Sometimes the distinction between ‘commercial’ and ‘non-commercial’ is not easily evident, especially when the remuneration or another way of compensation is not formalised e.g. a farmer comes with its own aircraft to spray crops to another farmer, against some compensation agreed verbally between the parties.

A clear example of non-commercial SPO operator is a farmer spraying his crops with his plane.

Competent authorities responsible for the oversight of SPO operators and operations should assess carefully each individual case to establish if there is a commercial operation, resorting if necessary to information otherwise available to social security or taxation bodies.

Specialised operations (SPO) are not commercial air transport (CAT) operation; hence, passengers cannot be transported during a SPO mission flight. However, task specialists may be carried during such a flight.

Last updated:

06/06/2017

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22595>**Are we a 'complex' or 'non-complex' operator considering the fact that we have five FTEs and four types of non-complex helicopters?****Answer***Size and complexity of the operator - Reference: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations: ORO.GEN.200 (b)*

AMC1 ORO.GEN.200 (b) paragraph (a) defines how to assess if an operator is complex or non-complex:

The operator is non-complex if its workforce is less than 20 full time equivalents (FTEs). However, point AMC1 ORO.GEN.200 (b) paragraph (b) indicates that an operator with less than 20 FTEs may also be considered complex if, for example, it performs high-risk commercial SPO or operates in a challenging environment (offshore, mountainous area, etc.).

Prior to sending a declaration an operator should check with the competent authority, if their assessment of complexity is correct.

Last updated:

06/06/2017

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22596>**Can I use third-country registered aircraft for my SPO operations?****Answer***Third country registered aircraft - References: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations; Reg. (EU) No 748/2012 on initial airworthiness*

In accordance with ORO.SPO.100 (b), the aircraft used in commercial SPO (SPO-COM) shall have a certificate of airworthiness (CofA) issued by an EU Member State in accordance with Reg. (EU) No 748/2012 or shall be leased-in in accordance with ORO.SPO.100 (c). This means that operators conducting SPO-COM must operate aircraft registered in an EU MS or, alternatively, leased-in aircraft registered outside the EU.

In non-commercial SPO operations (SPO-NCC and SPO-NCO), there is no requirement with regard to the State of registration of aircraft.

For operations, such as parachute dropping, sailplane towing or aerobatic flights with non-complex motor powered aircraft, eligible for the exemption under SPO.GEN.005 (c), there is no requirement with regard to the registration of aircraft either.

Last updated:

06/06/2017

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22597>**We operate a helicopter that is Annex II aircraft according to the Basic Regulation. How should we continue to conduct SPO now? Do we need any exemption?****Answer***Annex II aircraft - Reference: Reg. (EU) 2018/1139 (The Basic Regulation): Annex I*

The use of Annex I aircraft in SPO activities is not regulated at EU level. You may be allowed to continue carrying out SPO with you Annex I helicopter or aeroplane, if this is permitted under your country national regulation. Please ask your competent authority what conditions apply to SPO operations with Annex I aircraft in your country.

Note, however, that any authorisation or certificate required by your national legislation may not be recognised by other Member States.

Last updated:

21/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22598>

Why may a SPO operator not carry on board passengers on an aerobatic flight?

Answer

Passengers - Reference: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations: Article 5(7)

Except for crew members, persons other than those indispensable to the mission shall not be carried on board of flights, which take place immediately before, during or immediately after specialized operations and are directly connected to those operations.

When SPO related rules apply to a flight or a number of flights, passengers (fare paying or not) cannot be carried on board such flights. In some SPO operations, the concept of “passenger” and “task specialist” do blend into each other. Therefore, for regulatory and risk mitigation purposes persons carried on board are considered task specialists, even if their “task” is to enjoy 0-G flight, a tandem jump, or a looping. The rules call for task specialists to be instructed on their tasks, including the risks connected to those tasks of which they are not sufficiently or at all informed.

If passengers are being transported, the flight has to be performed in accordance with Part-CAT or Part-NCC or Part-NCO, as applicable.

Last updated:

21/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22599>

Now, thanks to Art. 6 (8) of Reg. (EU) 965/2012, I operate non-commercially a twin turbo-propeller aircraft below 5.7 t MCTOM in accordance with Part-NCO. May I also carry out non-commercial specialised operations with the same aircraft under Part-NCO?

Answer

Twin turboprops at or below 5.7 t MCTOM - Reference: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on Air Operations: Article 6(8)

The derogation of Art 6(8) of Regulation 965/2012 does not apply to non-commercial specialised operations or to commercial operations. It is only applicable to ‘pure’ non-commercial operations of complex motor-powered aeroplanes with a maximum certificated take-off mass (MCTOM) at or below 5 700 kg, equipped with turboprop engines. When operating such aircraft the operators shall comply with Part-NCO, instead of Part-NCC and Part-ORO.

Last updated:

06/06/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22600>

Is it permissible for me to determine myself whether the operations I conduct are eligible for the alleviation of SPO.GEN.005 (c)?

Answer

Limited operations - Reference: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations: SPO.GEN.005 (c)

The purpose of SPO.GEN.005 (c) is to alleviate certain flights that might otherwise be qualified as commercial (where compliance with Part-SPO is required) to comply with the less demanding rules of Part-NCO.

The operator must check with the competent authority whether the operations it conducts are eligible for the alleviation of SPO.GEN.005 (c). The competent authority makes the final determination.

Last updated:

06/06/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22601>

What do the terms ‘marginal activity’, ‘direct cost’, ‘annual cost’ and ‘organisation created with the aim of promoting aerial sport or leisure aviation’ mean?

Answer

‘Marginal activity’, ‘Direct cost’... - Reference: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations: SPO.GEN.005 (c)

These terms are used in SPO.GEN.005 (c) as well as in Article 6, paragraph 4a of Reg. (EU) No 965/2012.

Their meaning, in the context of Reg. (EU) No 965/2012, can be found in the guidance material placed under Article 6, paragraph 4a. The same meaning is also applicable for the purpose SPO.GEN.005 (c).

As regards ‘marginal activity’, AMC1 ARO.OPS.300 also applies in the case of parachute dropping, sailplane towing or aerobatic flights. This is because whenever a competent authority publishes criteria specifying to which extent it considers an activity marginal and how this is being overseen, the nature of flight (introductory, parachute dropping, sailplane towing or aerobatic flights) has little importance.

Last updated:

06/06/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22602>

Are we high-risk or non-high-risk commercial specialised operator?

Answer

Reference: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations: Article 2 (8)

Each competent authority may decide for their territory which commercial SPO operation poses a high risk, in particular to third parties on the ground. If you operate in the Member State where you are residing or your organisation is established or has its principal place of business, this is your competent authority; if you operate in another Member State, this is the competent authority designated by that Member State.

Even if the competent authority has not established its list of high-risk commercial SPO operations, the operator must determine through a risk assessment whether a particular operation is posing high risk to third parties on the ground in the event of an

emergency.

The competent authority should publish and regularly update the list of high-risk SPO for their territory.

For more information, please refer to various publications about the high-risk SPO operations in the Member States available on this webpage, including the [Guidelines for cross-border high-risk commercial SPO](#).

Last updated:

21/03/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22603>

Do I need two authorisations, if the lists of high-risk commercial SPO of different Member States differ?

Answer

Reference: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations: ARO.OPS.150 (f)

No, you do not. Where the cross-border SPO operation you are planning to carry out is on the list of high-risk SPO established by the competent authority of the place of operation, you shall seek authorisation from your own competent authority, irrespective of whether that authority considers this particular operation 'high risk' or not. This is because in the EU the HR authorisation issued by your competent authority under Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 is recognised as valid by the competent authority of another Member State.

For that purpose, the competent authorities involved will coordinate the validation process. The safety considerations of the competent authority of the place where the operation will be conducted need to be accounted for; both competent authorities need to be satisfied with the operator's risk assessment and standard operating procedures - SOPs.

For more information, please refer to various publications about the high-risk SPO operations in the Member States available on this webpage, including the [Guidelines for cross-border high-risk commercial SPO](#).

Last updated:

21/03/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22604>

What is the meaning of "applicable national flight time limitation legislation" in Article 8 (4) of regulation 965/2012?

Answer

Cross-border commercial SPO - Reference: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations: Art. 8(4)

Article 8 (4) of Regulation 965/2012 foresees that specialised operators continue to comply with applicable national flight time limitation legislation until EU implementing rules are adopted and apply.

In the context of Part-SPO, the intent of 'applicable national flight time limitation legislation' with regard to specialised operators is understood to mean the national law of the Member State in which the operator has its principal place of business, or, where the operator has no principal place of business, the place where the operator is established or resides.

Last updated:

06/06/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22605>

My SPO operations fall under Part-SPO. What type of certification shall I expect from my competent authority – AOC or other type?

Answer

AOC or other certification - Reference: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations: Part-ORO and Part-SPO

You are not required to obtain an air operator certificate (AOC). You are however required to submit a declaration to your competent authority. Please make sure that the Declaration is properly completed.

In addition, depending on the operations you conduct, you might need a specific approval for one or more of these: RVSM, MNPS, RNP AR APCH, LVO and DG.

In some cases of high-risk commercial SPO, an authorisation may be required.

Last updated:

06/06/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22606>

Who must submit a declaration?**Answer**

Declaration - Reference: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations: ORO.DEC.100

Every SPO operator (commercial and non-commercial), except NCO-SPO, submits a declaration.

An operator may perform both commercial and non-commercial flights with complex motor-powered aircraft based on one declaration.

Operators are not required to submit a declaration before each flight, but must submit a new declaration in the case of changes.

Last updated:

06/06/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22607>

Is the skydiving activity itself under the scope of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012?**Answer**

Skydiving/parachute dropping

Parachutes are completely outside Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 (the Basic Regulation), on account that they are not an aircraft.

In addition, the way people do skydiving (parachute jumps/tandem jumps) does not belong to the scope of Regulation 965/2012.

Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 applies to the flight operation of bringing parachutists at the required level for the execution of the jumps.

Last updated:

30/04/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22608>

Can I fly an aeroplane for commercial parachute dropping operation with my PPL (A)?

Answer

Parachute dropping - Reference: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations: Art. 6(4a); Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 on Aircrew: Art. 3(2)

The holder of an LAPL or a PPL may conduct parachute-dropping flights, only if the conditions stipulated in Art 6 (4a) of Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 are met.

In all other cases, only pilots who hold at least a CPL can conduct SPO flights in accordance with Part-SPO.

Holders of a PPL (A) with instructor/examiner ratings may receive remuneration for providing training, testing and checking related to LAPL (A) and PPL (A), as well as associated ratings and certificates.

The PPL holder cannot receive remuneration for conducting operations other than those listed in FCL.205.A of Reg. (EU) No 1178/2011, as well as for any of the flights mentioned in Article 6 (4a) of Reg. (EU) No 965/2012.

Last updated:

06/06/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22609>

Is 'MOPSC' (Maximum Operational Passenger Seating Configuration') applicable in case of parachute dropping, where only task specialists are carried?

Answer

MOPSC - Reference: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations: SPO.IDE.A.130

For the purpose of SPO.IDE.A.130, only one of the two values is used: either MCTOM of more than 5 700 kg or MOPSC of more than nine.

MOPSC is established for operational purposes. Where MOPSC is not established or is not relevant for a particular operation, the value of MCTOM should be used.

Last updated:

06/06/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22610>

How is a ramp inspector supposed to know the nature of a particular SPO flight (commercial or non-commercial)?

Answer

Declaration - Reference: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations: ORO.DEC.100

A declaration is not meant to provide information about the nature of a flight at a particular moment. The ATS flight plan, if applicable, and/or the Journey log contain information on the nature of a particular flight.

Last updated:

06/06/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22611>

If I hold an AOC and want to perform SPO activities (commercial and non-commercial) with the same aircraft registered

on my AOC, do I have to submit a declaration too?**Answer**

Mixed operations - Reference: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations: ORO.DEC.100

Yes. SPO operations are not covered by the AOC certification process. Therefore, an AOC holder when conducting SPO missions will have to comply fully with Part-SPO and its associated procedures. This means that the AOC holder must submit a declaration, as well as apply for a high-risk authorisation, if it performs high-risk commercial SPO activities. The aircraft used for the SPO activities are listed on the declaration and in the operations manual.

However, you do not have to submit a declaration, if you operate NCO-SPO i.e. non-commercial specialised operations with other-than complex motor-powered aircraft.

Last updated:

06/06/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22612>

Must an operator holding specific approvals (SPAs) for its CAT operations apply for the same SPAs when it also conducts specialised operations?**Answer**

Specific approvals (SPA) for mixed operations - Reference: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations: ARO.OPS.200(b)

Duplications should be avoided whenever possible. However, a separate SPA approval might be needed if:

- (a) for its specialised operations the operator has a different training programme or has different operating procedures;
- (b) the validity of the SPA included in the OPSSPECS has expired; or
- (c) for its specialised operations the operator will use aircraft that are not included in its AOC and for which it does not have any SPA yet.

The operator does not have to duplicate in its operations manuals the procedures and training for the SPA used for SPO when they are the same as the ones used for CAT operations; a cross-reference, specified in its operations manual, to the place where the training and operating procedures are already detailed, is enough.

Last updated:

06/06/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22613>

Is it allowed to perform specialised operations with a permit-to-fly or is a CofA mandatory at all times?**Answer**

Permit-to-fly - Reference: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012: ORO.SPO.100 (b); SPO.GEN.140; and NCO.GEN.135

Aircraft used in commercial specialised operations that fall under Part-SPO, must have a certificate of airworthiness (CofA) in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 748/2012 or may be wet leased-in from a third country operator or dry leased-in by an EU operator while being registered in a third country.

For commercial specialised operations as well as for any other specialised operation that fall under Part-SPO, the original certificate of airworthiness (CofA) need to be carried on each SPO flight (SPO.GEN.140 (a) (3)).

According to AMC1 SPO.GEN.140(a)(3) a permit to fly may (PtF) be used in SPO operations, if issued in accordance with the applicable airworthiness requirements and subject to compliance with the flight conditions established by the competent authority.

The applicable airworthiness requirements are those contained in Commission Regulation (EU) No 748/2012 (Part-21 thereof). Part-21 contains a list of purposes for which a PtF may be issued under certain conditions. For example, a mission for air racing may be possible with PtF. Please check with your competent authority if the purpose of the SPO mission complies with that list and those conditions.

For non-commercial specialised operations falling under Part-NCO, NCO.GEN.135 (a) (3) requires the original certificate of airworthiness (CofA) be carried on each flight.

According to AMC1 NCO.GEN.135 (a) (3) a PtF may be used in NCO operations, if issued in accordance with the applicable airworthiness requirements and subject to compliance with the flight conditions established by the competent authority.

The applicable airworthiness requirements are those contained in Part-21. Part-21 contains a list of purposes for which a PtF may be issued under certain conditions. For example, a non-commercial flying activity on individual non-complex aircraft or types for which a certificate of airworthiness or restricted certificate of airworthiness is not appropriate (mainly, but not limited to, the so-called 'orphan' aircraft) may be possible with PtF. Please check with your competent authority if the purpose of the SPO mission complies with that list and those conditions.

Last updated:

06/06/2017

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22614>

Can we integrate the processes for a permission under Part-SERA and with high-risk authorisation (HRA) under Part-ARO?

Answer

Yes, it is possible, but this decision belongs to the competent authority. Competent authorities may, for example, consider the following option:

- for flights over the congested areas of cities, towns or settlements or over an open-air assembly of persons, issuing only HRA. If such flights are to be operated below 300m, the HRA may integrate the permission under Part-SERA, without a separate procedure; and
- for flights elsewhere and not over an open-air assembly of persons,
 - below 150 m, issuing permission under Part-SERA only. This permission may integrate potential risks under Part-SPO;
 - above 150 m, requiring neither HRA nor permission.

Last updated:

18/12/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/68109>

Can we integrate the processes for a permission under Part-SERA and with high-risk authorisation (HRA) under Part-ARO?

Answer

Yes, it is possible, but this decision belongs to the competent authority. Competent authorities may, for example, consider the following option:

- for flights over the congested areas of cities, towns or settlements or over an open-air assembly of persons, issuing only HRA.

If such flights are to be operated below 300m, the HRA may integrate the permission under Part-SERA, without a separate procedure; and

- for flights elsewhere and not over an open-air assembly of persons,
 - below 150 m, issuing permission under Part-SERA only. This permission may integrate potential risks under Part-SPO;
 - above 150 m, requiring neither HRA nor permission.

Last updated:

21/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/97764>

Can I carry out 'limited operations' with aircraft having FC/PtF for NCO ?

Answer

Reference: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations, Article 6 (4a) and SPO.GEN.005(c)

The term 'Limited operations' (used in Regulation (EU) No 2015/1536) refers to certain specialised operations of other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft (SPO-NCO), such as competition flights, flying displays, parachute dropping, sailplane towing and aerobatic flights. Under strict conditions specified in Article 6 (4a) and SPO.GEN.005(c) of Reg. (EU) No 965/2012, those operations may be conducted in accordance with Part-NCO, and in particular subpart E thereof.

AMC1 NCO.GEN.135 (a) (3) specifies that an aircraft may be operated with a permit to fly issued in accordance with the applicable airworthiness requirements.

Thus, in the case of aircraft registered in an EU Member State and used in SPO-NCO, the permit to fly (PtF) is issued in accordance with Commission Regulation (EU) 748/2012 (Part-21 thereof) depending of the purpose.

If the above conditions are met, it is possible to perform the so called 'Limited operations' under Part-NCO and its subpart E as long as the aircraft have a PtF for non-commercial flying under Part-21 and the operation is compatible with or is covered by the corresponding flight conditions (FC).

For aircraft registered in a third country, the same applies, except that the PtF/FC must be issued in accordance with that third country legislation.

Last updated:

21/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/97765>

Does Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 also apply to third-country operators that conduct specialised operations in an EU Member State?

Answer

Third country operators – non-EU countries and non-EEE countries - Reference: Reg. (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations

Specialised operations (SPO) performed by third-country operators into, within, or out of the EASA Member States are not subject to Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 (Part-SPO) or Commission Regulation (EU) No 452/2014 (Part-TCO), unless conducted under an approved wet lease-in agreement signed by an EU commercial SPO operator (ORO.SPO.100). For stand-alone third-country SPO, EU law does not require prior safety authorisation for such operations, however those operations (and their aircrew and aircraft) must comply, as per Article 59 of Regulation (EU) 2018/1139, with the applicable ICAO standard – or to the extent that there are no such standards with the essential requirements of the above-mentioned Regulation – as well as EU requirements regarding use of the airspace when operating in the Single European Sky.

In addition, in case the aircraft performing such operations is registered in an EASA Member State, the crew must comply with the EU aircrew requirements, unless responsibilities for the regulatory oversight of the aircraft has been transferred by the EASA

Member State to the third country concerned. For further details concerning conditions for conducting SPO by a TCO in EASA Member States, including eventual need for obtaining permits for conducting this type of professional activity, please contact the Member State of the intended operations, as EASA is not responsible for oversight of these type of operations.

Last updated:

06/05/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/22615>

Helicopter operations

Do additional equipment for HEC (ropes, harnesses) now require an airworthiness approval?

Answer

Reference: AMC1 SPO.SPEC.HEC.100

AMC3 27.865; AMC3 29.865

The deletion of paragraph (c)(3) of AMC1 SPO.SPEC.HEC.100 was made in anticipation of a change in SPO.SPEC.HEC.105, [as proposed in Opinion 04/2017](#). Paragraph (c)(3) was identical to the current paragraph (c)(3) of AMC1 SPO.SPEC.HESLO.100.

The proposed changes in the rules are consistent with the current certification memorandum on Personnel carrying device systems (PCDS) and also consistent with the latest amendments to CS 27/29, by not requiring airworthiness approvals for simple PCDS.

Ropes, nets and harnesses may still be manufactured according to officially recognised standards. The acceptable means of compliance no longer explicitly says so, but the situation hasn't changed.

Last updated:

12/10/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/48795>

How do I train the pilots if I plan to operate HEC with a video camera and no mirrors / bubble window?

Answer

Reference: SPO.SPEC.HEC.105; AMC1 SPO.SPEC.HEC.100, paragraph (d)(5)(i)(C)

You use the camera during HEC training. You don't need to install a mirror or bubble window for the training unless you plan to operate with them. The AMC doesn't override the rule.

Last updated:

12/10/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/48796>

Which standards are applicable to Helicopter terrain awareness systems (HTAWS)?

Answer

Reference: SPA.HOFO.160(c)

HTAWS are currently mandated under SPA.HOFO.160(c), which requires HTAWS to 'meet the requirements for class A equipment as specified in an acceptable standard'.

The only defined standards for H-TAWS are TSO-C194 and ETSO-C194, which both refer to Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics (RTCA) document DO-309. Any H-TAWS meeting these standards, or coming with improved features, is acceptable.

UK CAP 1519 specifications are considered to introduce improvements to the existing standards. They are designed to reduce false warnings. They also introduce Helicopter Flight Envelope Warnings (H-FEWs) in addition to basic HTAWS functions. A CAP 1519 compliant HTAWS is therefore acceptable.

The HTAWS rulemaking task (RMT.708) may change the requirements for HTAWS in the future.

Last updated:

12/10/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/48797>

Special Categories of Passengers (SCPs)

Who is an SCP?

Answer

References: Regulation (EC) No 1107/2006 is available on EUR-Lex website. Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 and Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 and the study EASA 2008.C.25 are available on EASA website.

SCPs are passengers who, when carried on a flight, require special conditions, assistance and/or devices and their situation needs appropriate attention and adaptation to their particular needs. These passengers shall not be allocated, nor occupy, seats that permit direct access to emergency exits or where their presence could impede crew members in their duties, obstruct access to emergency equipment or impede evacuation of the aircraft.

Under the EU law, aircraft operators are ultimately responsible for the safe operation of the aircraft and for the safety of passengers on board. Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 on air operations mandates the operator (airline) to establish procedures for its air operation. The operator's procedures, and the operator's activities overall, are under the oversight of the Competent Authority (CA) of the individual EU Member State. The CA has the necessary powers and allocated responsibilities for the certification and oversight of persons and organisations subject to Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 and its implementing rules.

The EU rule on SCPs states the following:

CAT.OP.MPA.155 Carriage of special categories of passengers (SCPs)

Regulation (EU) No 965/2012

- (a) Persons requiring special conditions, assistance and/or devices when carried on a flight shall be considered as SCPs including at least:
 - (1) persons with reduced mobility (PRMs) who, without prejudice to Regulation (EC) No 1107/2006, are understood to be any person whose mobility is reduced due to any physical disability, sensory or locomotory, permanent or temporary, intellectual disability or impairment, any other cause of disability, or age;
 - (2) infants and unaccompanied children; and
 - (3) deportees, inadmissible passengers or prisoners in custody.
- (b) SCPs shall be carried under conditions that ensure the safety of the aircraft and its occupants according to procedures established by the operator.
- (c) SCPs shall not be allocated, nor occupy, seats that permit direct access to emergency exits or where their presence could:
 - (1) impede crew members in their duties;
 - (2) obstruct access to emergency equipment; or
 - (3) impede the emergency evacuation of the aircraft.
- (d) The commander shall be notified in advance when SCPs are to be carried on board.

The rule is complemented by Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC) and Guidance Material (GM) which address aspects such as the factors the operator should take into account when establishing procedures for carriage of SCPs, information provided to

SCPs, conditions for safe carriage of unaccompanied children, a passenger capable of assisting in case of an emergency, seating allocation, etc. The EU provisions are available on EASA website (the link 'Easy Access Rules for Air Operations' contains the rule and the AMC and GMs in one document):

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/regulations#regulations-air-operations>

The rules for air operations on SCPs have been developed under the EASA rulemaking tasks RMT.0269/0270 involving a rulemaking group. The track of this rulemaking activity is available on EASA website:

Terms of Reference (ToR) MDM.072 (a) & (b) (RMT.0269 & RMT.0270):

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/document-library/terms-of-reference-and-group-compositions/tor-mdm072-b-rmt0269-rmt0270>

Notice of Proposed Amendment NPA 2014-01

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/document-library/rulemaking-subjects/carriage-special-categories-passengers-scps>

Comment Response Document CRD 2014-01

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/document-library/comment-response-documents/crd-2014-01>

ED Decision 2016/004/R

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/document-library/agency-decisions/ed-decision-2016004r>

Study on Carriage by Air of Special Categories of Passengers (SCPs), EASA 2008.C.25:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/document-library/research-projects/easa2008c25>

Additional information

Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 on common rules in the field of civil aviation and establishing a European Union Aviation Safety Agency specifies the mandate entrusted to EASA by the European Parliament and by the Council:

<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32018R1139>

Regulation (EC) No 1107/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council contains the European provisions on rights of disabled persons and persons with reduced mobility (PRMs) when travelling by air: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=LEGISUM:l24132>. Questions on this regulation should be addressed to the European Commission.

Last updated:

04/11/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/105660>

I am tall or have other circumstances. Do I belong to the group of SCPs?

Answer

References: Regulation (EC) No 1107/2006 is available on EUR-Lex website. Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 and the study EASA 2008.C.25 are available on EASA website.

Regulation (EC) No 1107/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council on rights of disabled persons and persons with reduced mobility (PRMs) when travelling by air does not include the height of an individual in the definition of 'disability or a person with reduced mobility'. Hence, the EU rules on air operations - Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 - do not include a height of an individual (i.e. a tall passenger) in the 'special categories of passengers (SCPs)'.

Air operators are free to order from an aircraft manufacturer an aircraft cabin/seat configuration they wish, provided that such cabin/seat configuration meets the certification safety requirements. The space between seat rows (so-called 'seat-pitch') is a matter of aircraft certification process*. *Questions on aircraft certification matters should be addressed to EASA Certification Directorate.

EASA has conducted a study on Carriage by air of special categories of passengers, reference EASA 2008.C.25, which, amongst others, concludes that aircraft designers must take into account the increasing percentage of tall passengers. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32018R1139>

There may be passengers who do not fall into the category specified by the EU regulations on PRMs and SCPs referenced above, however they may have certain individual circumstances where intervention of the air operator or the Competent Authority may be beneficial or required. Most airlines offer various forms of assistance to passengers with certain requirements. For example, persons suffering from certain specific allergies (not necessarily food-related) are not considered disabled and do not fall into the SCP category either. However, passengers with any such circumstances may contact the operator, or the Competent Authority, to seek a solution prior to their travel.

Last updated:

04/11/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/105661>

Level of Involvement (LOI)

What is the expected timeframe for the introduction of the level of involvement concept at the Agency?

Answer

In March 2015, EASA issued the first Notice of Proposed Amendment, which is the document issued by EASA to propose a change to the regulation and get the feedback from all stakeholders.

The Agency received 350 comments, that are now being analysed and taken into account in drafting the final Opinion that will go to the European Commission

Early 2016, EASA expects to issue an Opinion, which is a formal proposal made to the European Commission, the body entitled to change the impacted regulation.

The European Commission has its own review process, hence an update of regulation EU 748/2012 and its annex (Part-21) in order to introduce the level of involvement concept is not foreseen before 2017.

Last updated:

23/11/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/20097>

Airspace Usage requirements

Airspace Usage requirement (ACAS II v7.1)

What does the Commission Regulation (EU) No 1332/2011 require by 01 December 2015?

Answer

By 01 December 2015 aircraft with an individual certificate of airworthiness issued before the 1st of March 2012 shall be equipped with collision avoidance logic version 7.1 (ACAS II V7.1) .

Last updated:

04/12/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/20185>

Is it possible to be exempt from the requirement to be equipped with collision avoidance logic version 7.1 (ACAS II V7.1) for a limited period of time, for only one flight, for the execution of a ferry flight per maintenance purposes, for the execution of a non-commercial air transport flight (i.e. general aviation flight) or for a State flight? And what if I have technical difficulties to upgrade my aircraft before 01/12/2015?

Answer

Compliance with Commission Regulation (EU) No 1332/2011 is required by 01 December 2015 and no general exemptions provisions were included in the regulation that would permit continued operations or for the execution of a single flight, for whatever reason. Furthermore, the regulation does not distinguish the nature of the flight, therefore all flight with aircraft above 5700 kg or authorise to carry more than 19 passengers are within the scope of the regulation.

However, if operation within European Airspace with a non-compliant aircraft after the 01/12/2015 is necessary and an upgrade to ACAS II version 7.1 has been planned, it may be possible, based on Article 71 of the Basic Regulation for an exemption to be issued for a limited duration of time. Dependent upon the aircraft registration and the authority responsible for its operations will dictate from whom the exemption has to be requested.

- If the aircraft is registered in an EU member state or is registered in a third country and an EU member state is responsible for the operations, an Article 71 exemption from the national aviation authority responsible for the operation should be requested.
- If the aircraft is not on a European register or a non EU state is responsible the operational approval, exemptions need to be requested from each European State in whose airspace the aircraft is intended to be operated.

In both cases no Permit to Fly is necessary. Finally, operators should be aware that the likelihood of receiving such an exemption from each and every member state is very limited. However, in accordance with Article 3(2) of the regulation, states shall ensure that operation of state aircraft comply with the objective of regulation, therefore states may introduce specific measures to meet these objectives.

Last updated:

10/05/2019

Link:
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/20186>

I voluntarily installed ACAS II V7.0 on my aircraft even it was not required to. Do I have to upgrade to ACAS II V7.1?

Answer

Operators that have voluntarily installed TCAS II 7.0 prior to the applicable effective dates of the Commission Regulation 1332/2011 are not affected. They do not need to upgrade their aircraft to ACAS II V7.1, but any 'new' voluntary installations must install ACAS II V7.1.

Last updated:

04/12/2015

Link:
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/20187>

Airspace Usage requirements – DLS/CPDLC (controller-pilot data link communication)

Where do I find a copy of the Commission Regulation (EC) No 29/2009 known as the DLS IR?

Answer

The Commission Regulation (EC) No 29/2009 can be found on the EASA website on the [Regulations](#) page under:

- [ATM/ANS interoperability - Air Traffic Management/Air Navigation Services](#)

The latest consolidated version can be found on [EUR-Lex](#):

- <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:02009R0029-20...>

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115354>**What is the DLS IR applicability?****Answer**

The DLS IR is applicable to all IFR (Instrument flight rule) GAT (general air traffic) flights operating above FL 285 within airspace as identified in Annex I of the regulation.

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115355>**What is the DLS IR mandating for operators?****Answer**

The DLS IR mandates CPDLC (controller pilot data link communication) capability for aircraft operating above FL 285. Aircraft capability is understood as the aircraft being properly equipped and flight crew appropriately trained as agreed with the operator's Competent Authority.

Note: CPDLC operation does not require a specific approval in accordance with Part-SPA of the Commission Regulation (EU) 965/2012.

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115356>**If my aircraft installation is compliant with the DLS IR requirements, however the flight crew is not trained, what do I indicate in the flight plan?****Answer**

As CPDLC capability requires both aircraft equipage and appropriately trained flight crew, if one of these conditions is **not** fulfilled, operators should not indicate CPDLC ATN (Aeronautical Telecommunication Network) VDL (Very High Frequency Data Link) Mode 2 capability in the flight plan. Furthermore, in that case operators should not plan flights above FL285 in the applicable airspace.

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115357>**If I am not compliant with the DLS IR requirements, may I file the flight plan above FL 285?****Answer**

DLS IR mandates CPDLC capability for aircraft operating above FL 285. If such capability does not exist (aircraft is not equipped or crew is not trained) and if the aircraft is not exempted, flight plan should indicate flight profiles below FL 285 within the airspace where the DLS IR is applicable.

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115358>**Is the CPDLC equipage requirement mandatory only for EU operators?****Answer**

The DLS IR is an airspace requirement and is applicable for all IFR GAT flights operating above FL285. This includes all flights operated by EU and Non EU operators within the airspace defined in Annex I, regardless the State of registration.

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115359>**Is there specific technology I need to use to demonstrate compliance with the DLS IR?****Answer**

The performance required by the DLS IR is that defined in the Eurocae standard ED-120 - 'Safety and Performance Requirements Standard for Air Traffic Data Link Services in Continental Airspace'). The technology currently and consistently deployed in Europe to meet this required performance is ATN VDL Mode 2 (as defined in the ICAO Annex 10 — Aeronautical Telecommunications — Volume III, Part I (Digital Data Communication Systems)).

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115360>**If I use CPDLC via FANS-1/A am I compliant with the DLS IR?****Answer**

CPDLC via FANS-1/A cannot ensure the performance requirements mandated through the DLS IR, the only system currently capable to achieve this is ATNVDL Mode 2. Additionally, the FANS 1/A versus ATN B1 CPDLC message set may be different (i.e. certain messages not used) within a certain operational context.

Note 1: FANS-1/A are CPDLC capable installation designed in accordance with the relevant interoperability specifications in Eurocae standard ED-100/ED-100A.

Note 2: Aircraft with a first CofA prior to 1 January 2018 and equipped with FANS 1/A data link prior to this date are exempted from compliance.

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115361>**Do I need to indicate my ATN VDL Mode 2 CPDLC capability in the flight plan?****Answer**

If the aircraft has ATN VDL Mode 2 CPDLC capability and the crew are appropriately trained, the operator should enter the J1 designator in item 10 of the flight plan in accordance with the provisions of the ICAO PANS-ATM (ICAO Doc 4444 'Procedures for Air Navigation Services (PANS-ATM)', Sixteen Edition 2016), as transposed by the Commission Regulation (EC) No 1033/2006 on 'requirements on procedures for flight plans in the pre-flight phase for the single European sky'.

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115362>

How do I demonstrate my aircraft's compliance with the DLS IR?

Answer

One means to demonstrate compliance with the DLS IR is to have evidence that the aircraft design is compliant with CS-ACNS (Certification Specifications and acceptance means of compliance - Airborne Communications, Navigation and Surveillance). Such evidence of compliance can normally be found in the Airplane Flight Manual (AFM)

CS-ACNS is a means, however not the only means to comply with the DLS IR.

If there is no relevant statement in the AFM, operators should check with the type certificate holders (TCHs) or the supplemental type certificate holders (STCHs) as to the CPDLC installation compliance details.

- Link to [CS-ACNS](#)

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115363>

Is there a requirement for operators to ensure that their aircraft's CPDLC installation is multi-frequency capable?

Answer

Airborne multi-frequency capability is a requirement as stated in Article 6 'Obligations of operators for data link communications' of the DLS IR through reference to ICAO Annex 10 Volume III, where the need for "auto-tune" capability (also known as multi-frequency) is addressed.

EASA SIB 2019-13 'Controller Pilot Data Link Communications over Very High Frequency Data Link Mode 2 – Airborne Multi-Frequency Capability', provides more information and recommendations on this topic.

- Link to [EASA SIB 2018-13](#)

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115364>

How can I determine if my aircraft is CPDLC multi-frequency capable?

Answer

Operators can check:

- the AFM, which should contain a statement such as "The aircraft ATC Data Link system does support multi-frequency operation as defined in ARINC Specification 631-5." or

- directly with the type certificate holder (TCH) or with the supplemental type certificate holder (STCH) if the system was installed by an STCH. or
- check the aircraft documentation for the indication that the system supports CPDLC multi-frequency operation (e.g. ARINC Specification 631-5 or higher)

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115365>**Does my aircraft need to be listed on the aircraft CPDLC 'white list' or 'log-on list' to be compliant with the DLS IR?****Answer**

An aircraft is technically compliant with the DLS IR if it has been demonstrated that the aircraft datalink installation is compliant with CS-ACNS, no further demonstration of compliance is required. Being included in the so-called 'white list' or 'log-on list' is not a regulatory requirement.

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115367>**Is my aircraft supposed to be able to record CPDLC communications?****Answer**

On board recording of CPDLC messages is required, however, this depends upon age and operations undertaken.

For **European operators**, compliance with the communication recording capability in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 is required for newly manufactured aircraft as follows:

- on or after 08 April 2014 for CAT operations
- on or after 01 January 2016 for other-than-CAT operations

For **Third Country Operators (TCO)**, compliance with the requirements of ICAO Annex 6 is required (i.e. newly manufactured aircraft on or after 01 January 2016 and new CPDLC installations).

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115366>**Are there any exemptions available for operators through the regulatory framework of the DLS IR?****Answer**

The DLS IR provides operators with a number of conditions under which permanent exemptions (where applicable) from the requirement to equip with data link capability are possible.

These conditions can be summarised as follows:

1. operator/aircraft falls under one of the criteria listed in Article 3(3) of the DLS IR, or
2. the aircraft type/model is listed [EC Implementing Decision 2019/2012](#)

Even if the DLS IR equipage requirements are not applicable for some operators, they may still choose to comply with the DLS

IR. In this case, compliance with all applicable parts of the DLS IR is expected.

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115368>

Do I need to communicate to EASA or any other organisation that my aircraft is meeting the criteria for exemptions and is hence exempted?

Answer

There is no formal reporting requirement for an operator if their aircraft meet one of the exemption conditions as defined in Article 3(3) of the DLS IR, or the aircraft type/model is listed EC Implementing Decision 2019/2012. However, it is recommended that operators advise their National Aviation Authority where the aircraft is registered.

Operators should reflect the CPDLC exemption status in the flight plan as detailed in [EASA SIB 2020-03](#).

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115369>

How should I reflect the CPDLC exempted status in the flight plan?

Answer

The operator should declare its CPDLC exempt status when filling the flight plan by including letter “Z” in item 10 and the indicator “DAT/CPDLCX” in item 18 of each flight plan.

For further details on how to reflect the CPDLC exempt status in the flight plan please check the [EASA SIB 2020-03](#).

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115370>

If I have CPDLC equipment, which is temporarily inoperative, can I benefit from a DLS IR temporary exemptions?

Answer

In accordance with Article 3(3) flights with equipment temporarily inoperative may continue to operate within the applicable airspace. However, these operations are to be within the limits and conditions of the MEL (Minimum Equipment List), and the flight plan should also reflect that the aircraft is exempt during this temporary inoperative period.

If the operator decides to declare its CPDLC exempt status, flight plan should reflect that the aircraft is exempted by including letter “Z” in item 10 and the indicator “DAT/CPDLCX” in item 18 of each flight plan.

For further details on how to reflect the CPDLC exempt status in the flight plan please check the [EASA SIB 2020-03](#).

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115371>

Where can I find more information on MEL for CPDLC?**Answer**

Conditions for operation and rectification interval should be in accordance with the operator's MEL that is approved by the operators National Aviation Authority. As such, we recommend you initially contact your National Aviation Authority. Note that the MEL is based on the MMEL specific for the aircraft/model and cannot be less restrictive.

Specific information regarding the MMEL for aircraft type/model can be obtained from the aircraft Type Certificate Holder (TCH) or Supplemental Type Certificate Holder (STCH)

For any further information on MMEL please send your request to [mmel \[at\] easa.europa.eu](mailto:mmel@easa.europa.eu).

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115372>

I have a delivery flight from an aircraft manufacturer and I will fly through the airspace where CPDLC equipage is mandated. Is my flight restricted below FL285 within the airspace affected or can I benefit from exemption?**Answer**

Delivery flights are exempted in accordance with Article 3(3) of the DLS IR. You may operate above FL 285, however, your flight plan should reflect that the aircraft is exempted by including letter "Z" in item 10 and the indicator "DAT/CPDLCX" in item 18 of each flight plan.

For further details on how to reflect the CPDLC exempt status in the flight plan please check the [EASA SIB 2020-03](#).

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115373>

If my aircraft is compliant with the DLS IR and the flight crew trained, however my aircraft also qualifies for CPDLC exemptions, what shall I insert in the flight plan?**Answer**

If the operator voluntarily decides to comply with DLS IR (aircraft capable + crew trained), J1 designator should be used in item 10 of the flight plan in accordance with ICAO PANS-ATM. In this case, even if the aircraft is eligible for CPDLC exemption, the flight plan should not reflect CPDLC exempt status.

If the operator decides to declare its CPDLC exempt status, flight plan should reflect that the aircraft is exempted by including letter "Z" in item 10 and the indicator "DAT/CPDLCX" in item 18 of each flight plan.

In this case, J1 designator should not be used in the flight plan even if the aircraft is technically capable. Nonetheless, if properly equipped and compliant with the DLS IR, operators are encouraged to use the CPDLC capability on board.

For further details on how to reflect the CPDLC exempt status in the flight plan please check the [EASA SIB 2020-03](#).

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115374>

Who should I ask if I have further questions on CPDLC equipage exemption?**Answer**

For any further information on CPDLC exemption please send your request to atm [at] easa.europa.eu.

Last updated:

11/06/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/115375>

Airspace requirements – SPI (Surveillance performance and interoperability)

Where do I find a copy of the Commission Regulation (EU) No 1207/2011 laying down requirements for the performance and the interoperability of surveillance for the Single European Sky (SES) which is known as the SPI IR?

Answer

A copy of the regulation and its amendments can be found on the EASA website on the 'Regulations' page under:

- [ATM/ANS interoperability - Air Traffic Management/Air Navigation Services](#)

The latest consolidated copy of the SPI IR can be found on EUR-Lex:

- [Commission Implementing Regulation \(EU\) No 1207/2011](#)

Last updated:

02/11/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119355>

Are there any acceptable means of compliance (AMC) and guidance material (GM) to the SPI IR?**Answer**

AMC and GM to the SPI IR can be found on EASA website on the 'Regulations' page under ATM/ANS interoperability - Air Traffic Management/Air Navigation Services.

Link to the AMC/GM to the SPI IR:

- [AMC and GM to Commission Implementing Regulation \(EU\) No 1207/2011 - Issue 1](#)

Last updated:

02/11/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119356>

What is the scope of the SPI IR with regards to airspace users?**Answer**

The SPI IR is applicable to all operators, operating as general air traffic (GAT) under instrument flight rules (IFR), that are conducting flights in the Single European Sky (SES) airspace.

It is also applicable to all other operators, operating as GAT in the SES airspace, whose aircraft are equipped with Mode S transponders.

Last updated:

02/11/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119357>**What is the deadline to equip my aircraft with a Mode S transponder?****Answer**

Operators operating as general air traffic under instrument flight rules are required to equip their aircraft with Mode S transponders, in accordance with the SPI IR requirements by the following deadlines:

Aircraft with a first CofA issued **prior to 7 June 1995**:

- Aircraft with a first CofA issued prior to 7 June 1995, have to be:
 - ELS capable prior to 7 December 2020

Aircraft with a first CofA issued **on or after 7 June 1995**:

- Aircraft with a MTOM of 5700 kg or less **and** with a maximum cruising TAS 250 kts or less have to be:
 - ELS capable prior to 7 December 2020
- Rotorcraft (e.g. helicopters) with a MTOM exceeding 5700 kg **or** with a maximum cruising TAS greater than 250 kts have to be:
 - ELS capable prior to 7 December 2020,
 - and**
 - ADS-B out capable prior to 7 December 2020 or 7 June 2023 (where there is a retrofit programme in place prior to 7 December 2020)
- Fixed wing aircraft (aeroplanes) with a MTOM exceeding 5700 kg **or** with a maximum cruising TAS greater than 250 kts have to be :
 - ELS capable prior to 7 December 2020,
 - and**
 - ADS-B out capable prior to 7 December 2020 **or** 7 June 2023 (where there is a retrofit programme in place prior to 7 December 2020)
 - and**
 - EHS capable prior to 7 December 2020 **or** 7 June 2023 (where there is a retrofit programme in place prior to 7 December 2020)

CofA means certificate of airworthiness.

ELS means Mode S elementary surveillance capability.

EHS means Mode S enhanced surveillance capability.

MTOM means maximum certified take-off mass.

TAS means true air speed.

Further information can be found in the [AMC and GM to the SPI IR](#).

Last updated:

02/11/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119358>**Does the SPI IR mandate only ADS-B out capability?****Answer**

The SPI IR does not only mandate ADS-B out capability, but also requires Mode S elementary surveillance ('ELS') equipage, and depending on the aircraft characteristics 'Mode S enhanced surveillance ('EHS') equipage. (see previous question on implementation deadlines)

The equipage requirements as defined in Article 5(5) (a), (b) and (c) provide a progressively more demanding installation requirements depending upon aircraft characteristics. Details of these requirements can be found in Annex II Part A, Part B and Part C of the SPI IR.

For further information, please consult [AMC2 of Article 5](#).

Last updated:

02/11/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119359>

Is the SPI IR equipage requirements mandatory only for EU operators?

Answer

The SPI IR is an airspace requirement that is applicable to all GAT operations undertaken by EU and Non EU operators, within the Single European Sky (SES) airspace, **regardless of the State of operator**.

Last updated:

02/11/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119360>

How do I demonstrate my aircraft is in compliance with the SPI IR?

Answer

The aircraft capability is to be compliant with the requirements defined in points (5) (a), (b) and (c) of Article 5 and in particular in Part A, Part B and Part C of Annex II.

[AMC2 of Article 5](#) on 'Interoperability requirements' contains further information on how to comply with these requirements.

Evidence of compliance can normally be found in the Aircraft Flight Manual (AFM) or as a Flight Manual Supplement.

If there is no relevant statement in the AFM, operators should contact with the type certificate holders (TCHs) or the supplemental type certificate holders (STCHs).

Last updated:

02/11/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119361>

Does the SPI IR allow operators to postpone implementation?

Answer

The SPI IR permits a deferral of the compliance deadline, through transitional arrangements, to 7 June 2023, for aircraft with a first Certificate of Airworthiness issued prior to 7 December 2020 for the installation of ADS-B out or ADS-B out and Mode S Enhanced Surveillance (EHS) only.

These transitional arrangement are:

1. a retrofit programme is established prior to 7 December 2020 , that demonstrates compliance with the ADS-B out or ADS-B out and EHS requirements;
2. aircraft operators have not benefitted from any Union funding granted to bring such aircraft in compliance with the ADS-B out or EHS and ADS-B out requirements.

For further information, please consult [AMC3 of Article 5](#).

Last updated:

02/11/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119362>

Does the SPI IR allow for any exemptions from the mandatory equipage requirements?

Answer

There are no exemptions possibilities provided for in the SPI IR.

Although some stakeholders would refer to them as equipage 'exemptions', Article 5(5) provides some relief from compliance with the ADS-B out and with ADS-B out and EHS (for fixed wing aircraft) requirements for aircraft with a maximum certified take-off mass exceeding 5700 kg or with a max cruising true air speed greater than 250 kts, when the aircraft meets at least one of the following conditions:

- aircraft received their first CofA prior to 7 June 1995,
- aircraft are flown to undergo maintenance,
- aircraft are flown for export,
- aircraft operation ceases in the Single European Sky by 31 October 2025.

It should be noted that for all the above cases, compliance with Mode S ELS equipage is required, in accordance with Article 5(5) (a).

Further details are provided in the [GM4 Article 5 Interoperability requirements](#).

Last updated:

02/11/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119363>

Do I need to submit my retrofit programme to EASA or my competent authority for approval?

Answer

SPI IR **does not require** operators to submit their retrofit programmes to EASA or their competent authority for approval, in order to benefit from a deferred compliance in accordance with the conditions specified in Article 5(5).

For further details, please see [AMC 3 Article 5](#) on transitional arrangements.

However, operators should have the retrofit programme and required evidence in place prior to 7 December 2020 and make it available upon request to their competent authority.

Last updated:

02/11/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119364>

Do I need to notify EASA that my aircraft benefits from retrofit programme implementation deferral or is 'exempt'?

Answer

SPI IR does not require operators to notify EASA, or any other entity, that their aircraft benefit from the transitional arrangements (retrofit programme).

Also notification is not required in the cases where the certain equipage requirements of the SPI IR are not applicable (e.g. aircraft flown to undergo maintenance, for export or when operation ceases in the Single European Sky by 31 October 2025).

Nonetheless, the appropriate equipage and operational status, including the correct designator for the functioning surveillance systems, should be indicated in the flight plan.

Last updated:

02/11/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119365>

How should I reflect in the flight plan the status of my aircraft that are benefiting from the transitional arrangements?

Answer

The appropriate equipage and operational status, including the correct designator for the functioning surveillance systems, should be inserted in items 10b and 18 of the flight plan accordingly.

Operators of aircraft, which are not equipped with Mode S EHS and/or ADS-B out, making use of the retrofit programme deferral provision, should insert the designators SUR/EUADSBX or SUR/EUEHSX or a combination thereof, in Item 18 of the flight plan.

For information on the correct designators to be used for the functioning surveillance systems, to be indicated in item 10b of the flight plan, please refer to [Commission Regulation \(EC\) No 1033/2006](#).

For further information, please check [AMC1 Article 14a Flight Plans](#).

Last updated:

02/11/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119366>

If I have a transponder function, which is temporarily inoperative, may I continue to operate?

Answer

Article 5(5) of the SPI IR defines the conditions to allow limited operations in Single European Sky airspace, where the required capability is temporary inoperative.

The specific relief of **3 consecutive days** is only applicable for the ADS-B out or ADS-B out and Mode S EHS capability being inoperative. No relief is provided for inoperative Mode S ELS systems. Operations are to be within these limits and under the conditions specific in the operators MEL (Minimum Equipment List).

The flight plan shall reflect that the aircraft is not compliant during this temporary inoperative period by inserting SUR/EUADSBX or SUR/EUEHSX or a combination of thereof, as necessary, in Item 18 of the flight plan. The remaining functioning surveillance capability should be indicated in the flight plan field 10b as appropriate.

For further information, please see [AMC1 Article 14a Flight Plans](#).

Last updated:

02/11/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119367>

Is there any more information on MEL for the SPI IR?

Answer

Conditions for operations in the Single European Sky airspace with temporarily inoperative transponder function can be found in Article 5(5) of the SPI IR. Such conditions could be potentially supplemented by conditions for operation and rectification interval as required by the operators' Competent Authority (CA). We recommend you initially contact your CA. It should also be noted that the MEL is based on the Master Minimum Equipment List (MMEL) specific for the aircraft/model and cannot be less restrictive.

You can find specific information regarding the MMEL for your aircraft type/model from the aircraft Type Certificate Holder (TCH).

If your surveillance equipment (transponder) has been installed using a Supplemental Type Certificate (STC), you should contact the STC holder (STCH) to obtain the relevant information and documentation.

With regards to EASA documentation, [CS-MMEL Issue 2](#) (Certification Specifications and guidance material for Master Minimum Equipment List), includes the references to the changes introduced by the amendment to the SPI IR.

For any further information on MMEL please send your request to [mmel \[at\] easa.europa.eu](mailto:mmel@easa.europa.eu).

Last updated:

02/11/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119368>

Who should I ask if I have further questions on the SPI IR?

Answer

For any further information on the SPI IR, please send your query to [atm \[at\] easa.europa.eu](mailto:atm@easa.europa.eu).

Last updated:

02/11/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119369>

Airspace Usage Requirements - PBN (Performance-based navigation)

What is the geographical scope of the PBN IR? In what airspace does the Regulation apply?

Answer

The PBN IR introduces the gradual implementation of PBN flight procedures to support safer, greener, and more efficient aircraft operations. The Regulation is binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all European Union (EU) Member States. More concretely, it applies in the airspace described in points (a) and (b) of Article 1(2), i.e.:

1. over the territory where the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) applies;
2. in any other airspace where Member States are responsible for the provision of air traffic services (ATS) within the ICAO EUR and AFI regions.

Member States may also apply the PBN IR in other ICAO regions, on condition that they inform the Commission and the other Member States.

The PBN IR may already apply or become applicable in other States with which the EU has signed binding agreements that require compliance with EU legislation in the field of civil aviation or its transposition into national law, e.g., European Economic Area (EEA), European Free Trade Area (EFTA), and the European Common Aviation Area (ECAA) Agreements. In this regard, the PBN is already binding in all [EASA Member States](#) and will equally apply in the Western Balkans, i.e., Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Kosovo (without prejudice to positions on status, which is in line with UN Security Council Resolution 1244(1999) and the International Court of Justice Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independence).

In addition, the PBN IR applies in several overseas territories (see the TFEU) and in a number of other overseas territories where special arrangements for association apply. To find out more about the status of applicability in a particular airspace, it is recommended to contact the Aviation Authorities of the State concerned.

Last updated:

24/03/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/134929>

Can conventional navigation procedures be used after 6 June 2030?

Answer

The PBN IR expressly excludes the use of conventional navigation procedures as from 6 June of 2030, except in the event of PBN contingencies, i.e., situations where, for unexpected reasons beyond the control of ATM/ANS service providers, GNSS or other methods used for performance-based navigation are no longer available.

From 6 June 2030, PBN will be the normal means of navigation, supplemented with navigation supported by CAT II/III landing systems, where necessary.

Last updated:

19/01/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/134930>

Is EGNOS the only SBAS to be considered for the implementation of RNP APCH procedures down to LPV minima?

Answer

The PBN IR requires implementation of approach procedures to LPV minima on condition that they are within an appropriate SBAS coverage provided by a certified service provider.

European Geostationary Navigation Overlay Service (EGNOS) is mentioned as a possibility, as the SBAS coverage may be available through other augmentation systems due to geographical considerations. In this regard, Recital (5) states the following: *"the use of satellite-based augmentation systems (SBAS), in particular in the form of the European Geostationary Navigation Overlay Service (EGNOS), should be promoted"*.

Since the PBN IR requirements are generic, they do not limit the deployment to areas where EGNOS coverage exists.

The guidance material published by EASA ([Annex II to ED Decision 2018/013/R](#)) refers to EGNOS, as the navigation service provider has been certified by EASA and the service covers most of the locations where the PBN IR applies.

Last updated:

24/03/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/134935>

Does the PBN IR require the publication of SBAS approach procedures down to CAT I minima (LPV-200)? Are higher LPV minima acceptable?

Answer

The PBN IR requires the publication of localiser performance with vertical guidance (LPV) minima, without an explicit reference to category I (CAT I) minima.

The publication of 3D approach procedures based on SBAS may not enable precision approach operations down to CAT I

minima at all locations. In this regard, the actual LPV minima will depend on the performance of the SBAS service around the aerodrome (i.e., availability of the EGNOS APV-I or LPV-200 service level), the aerodrome infrastructure, and the application of the flight procedure design criteria.

Last updated:

24/03/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/134931>

Are CAT I approach procedures to be based solely on SBAS as from 6 June 2030? Can landing systems (ILS/GLS) still be used to enable CAT I approach operations after the deadline?

Answer

As the PBN IR requires exclusive use of PBN after 6 June 2030, SBAS will be the normal means to enable approach operations to CAT I minima. A minimum number of the existing instrument landing systems (ILS) will continue to enable operations to CAT I minima in the event of PBN contingencies, which, in this case, refer to situations where, for unexpected reasons beyond the control of ATM/ANS service providers, SBAS approaches are no longer available.

GBAS landing systems (GLS) CAT I procedures are out of the scope of the PBN IR, since they are neither PBN nor conventional approach procedures; hence, GLS CAT I procedures can be used in normal conditions and without limitations after 6 June 2030.

Last updated:

24/03/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/134933>

Are helicopter-only procedures required at heliports?

Answer

Landing surfaces other than instrument runways are not addressed by the PBN IR. In this regard, heliports having their own landing areas to operate, i.e., FATO and TLOF, rather than runways, are not within scope of the PBN IR. Instrument approach procedures, standard instrument departures (SID) and standard arrival routes (STAR) at heliports are excluded from the PBN IR, and, therefore, there are no specific requirements for CAT H procedures at locations where there are no instrument runways, i.e., locations dedicated to helicopter-only operations.

Last updated:

24/03/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/134936>

Are specific approach procedures for helicopters (CAT H approach procedures) required by the PBN IR?

Answer

It should be noted that helicopters may approach down to instrument runways by using instrument approach procedures designed for CAT A aeroplanes. Additionally, at the same runway where aeroplanes operate, specific procedures designed for helicopters and designated as CAT H may be available. Where helicopter-only procedures (CAT H) are available to approach a runway, these are normally designed and authorised for airspeeds lower than those established for Category A aeroplanes to take advantage of helicopter capabilities. In those cases, Category H procedures should not be promulgated on the same charts as joint helicopter/aeroplane procedures.

When helicopters operate down to the same instrument runways as aeroplanes, the corresponding flight procedures (CAT A or

CAT H) are addressed by the PBN IR and should be compliant by the 2020 or the 2024 deadline, as applicable.

Last updated:

24/03/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136254>

How does the repeal of COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) No 716/2014 impact the implementation of PBN in the single European sky?

Answer

The repeal of Regulation (EU) No 716/2014 (the 'PCP Regulation') resulted in the deletion of the ATM functionality No1 (AF#1) with a view to avoiding inconsistencies and duplication of PBN requirements in the European Union's legislation. Consequently, the PBN IR has become the only PBN regulatory reference in the EU.

The repeal brings additional flexibility for planning purposes, as implementers of standard instrument departures (SID) and standard arrival routes (STAR) in terminal manoeuvring areas (TMA), previously referred to in the PCP Regulation, can now choose between RNP 1 routes and RNAV 1 routes, depending on local performance needs. In addition, the implementation of arrival and departure routes within the terminal airspace of the airports referred to in point 1.2.1 of the Annex to Regulation (EU) No 716/2014 (known as PCP airports) is subject to the same deadlines as any other aerodrome targeted by the PBN IR. Hence, the implementation of SID and STAR at PCP airports can take place gradually, i.e., it should also start with the replacement of, at least, one established arrival/departure route by 25 January 2024 and finish with the replacement of all routes with RNAV 1 or RNP 1 routes by 6 June 2030, except if retained in support of PBN contingencies, i.e., except in situations where, for unexpected reasons beyond their control, PBN SID and STAR are no longer available.

As for PBN approaches at PCP airports runways, implementation of procedures in accordance with the requirements of the RNP approach (RNP APCH) specification can be postponed until 25 January 2024.

Last updated:

24/03/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/134937>

Third Country Operators (TCO)

Third Country Operators - General

Are approvals obtained in the field of aviation security (e.g., ACC3) considered in the TCO authorisation process?

Answer

No. TCO is a flight safety (not an aviation security) assessment. To this end, TCO addresses security-related issues only to the extent that these are relevant to flight safety and part of an ICAO standard applicable to air operators pursuant to ICAO Annex 6 (reinforced cockpit door, security training programs, etc.). ACC3 is subject to a separate EU regulation that is unrelated to the TCO Regulation.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19589>

How long should we expect the process to take for the initial TCO authorisation?

Answer

Although article TCO.300 (b)(1) of the TCO Regulation requires operators to submit their application at least 30 days before the intended starting date of operation, it is highly recommended to submit the application well in advance of the intended operation in order to allow for sufficient lead time for the technical assessment. Pursuant to article ART.200(b), EASA shall complete the assessment within 30 days, after the operator has submitted a complete application and has submitted all relevant material requested by the Agency. . Where EASA decides to conduct further assessments, to invite operators for a meeting or to perform an on-site audit, the timeline of 30 days does not apply and the TCO authorisation process can take several months, especially where the technical assessment results in findings that must be closed before EASA can issue the authorisation.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19586>

How is the economic aspect of the approval (commercial traffic rights - air services agreement) split from the EASA Safety oversight element?

Answer

EASA TCO only takes over the safety-related part of foreign operator assessment, whereas operating permits (commercial traffic rights) will continue to be issued by individual Member States. EASA does not (and cannot) issue operating permits and these remain an area of national responsibility. A valid TCO Authorisation is a prerequisite before a Member State can issue an operating permit.

Last updated:

18/12/2019

Link:
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19543>

Does EASA collect any fees or charges to operators under Part-TCO?

Answer

For the vast majority of Third Country Operators (TCOs), the process to obtain an EASA TCO authorisation remains entirely free of charge. Flat fees apply for specific activities performed in the context of the initial authorisation and continuous monitoring of TCOs. In 2023 the following charges apply. The amounts are subject to annual update in accordance with EASA' Fees and Charges Regulation (EU) 2019/2153.

- 11.060 Euro (flat fee) for technical meetings held at EASA's headquarters in Cologne, and
- 21.014 Euro (flat fee) plus staff travel costs for on-site visits to third country operators.

EASA organizes technical meetings and on-site visits only when deemed necessary, according to the criteria set in the TCO Regulation and following a risk-based approach.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/107555>

Applications for TCO a Authorisation

Who has access to the EASA TCO web-interface?

Answer

The person who has been explicitly nominated as contact point in the EASA form "Application for Third Country Operators Authorisation" will be your organisation's Master User for the TCO web-interface. This Master User may register and manage additional Users within your organisation.. EASA recommends that for redundancy reasons at least two users are registered for each operator.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19572>

What is the responsibility of the operator's focal point the so-called TCO Master User?

Answer

The Master User (MU) is the User EASA's primary point of contact and shall be an agent or employee of the organisation, duly authorised/empowered by senior management to represent the operator. He/she should have direct access to technical information. Therefore, remotely located personnel (e.g. station managers) or lawyers/consultants are not ideal candidates to act as MU and often cause delays in the process.

The MU is the only user that has the privilege to submit technical questionnaires to EASA. An operator can only appoint one MU. The MU is responsible for the administration and management of the organisations' staff users' accounts. For redundancy reasons the MU shall appoint at least one staff user.

The MU shall terminate access of staff users to the web-interface upon termination of employment with the current employer when access to the TCO web interface is not needed or following a breach of any of the policies governing the "Terms of Reference" of the web-interface.

When the MU intends to terminate function, he/she shall coordinate the succession with EASA.

The MU shall maintain technical data submitted to EASA current at all times, (e.g., aircraft types, individual airframes, relevant certificates). The MU shall always be attentive to the email notifications received from the TCO web-interface (even after the initial issuance of the authorisation).

The MU is responsible for the follow up of non-compliance findings where applicable.

Furthermore, the MU should ensure that a proper system is put in place to respond/act immediately upon receipt of 'TCO Alert' messages, which are triggered when an aircraft submits a flight plan to EU territories for an aircraft that is not (yet) authorised under Part-TCO.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/137704>

How do we get our EASA TCO authorisation document when the authorisation process is completed?

Answer

Once your technical data has been reviewed and processed (and the outcome is positive) you will receive the original EASA TCO authorisation document as hard copy and in pdf format along with the specifications that are associated with the authorisation. Furthermore, the documents will be published on the TCO web-interface..

The authorisation remains valid subject to the conditions specified in the associated technical specifications which are published electronically.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19573>

Where can I find the TCO technical specifications associated with my TCO authorisation?

Answer

The latest TCO technical specifications associated with your TCO authorisation and the list of authorised aircraft will always be available on-line in the TCO web-interface when you are authorised.

Last updated:

14/03/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19574>

What is the "TCO authorisation number" mentioned on the TCO authorisation?

Answer

The TCO authorisation number (example: EASA.TCO.ABC-0567.01) is the official number of the authorisation document and is composed as follows: - EASA.TCO specifying the type of official EASA document - ABC-0567 corresponding to your TCO Code (unique identifier allocated to you upon application) - 01 the version of your authorisation.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19575>

What are the technical requirements needed to access the EASA TCO web interface?

Answer

You will need internet access and an internet browser. The EASA TCO web-interface supports the most common internet browsers.

To use the EASA TCO web-interface your browser must support JAVA script and SSL (Secure Sockets Layer) in order to secure confidential communication. In order to correctly view and complete the application forms on the TCO web-interface you must have Adobe® Reader® (version 8 or higher) installed on your computer. This can be downloaded free-of-charge from

<http://www.adobe.com>.

Last updated:

24/11/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19571>

Will Member States or EASA be responsible for the authorisation of special approvals, e.g. for Low Visibility Operations (LVO)?

Answer

When an operator receives the TCO authorisation from EASA, the authorisation is accompanied by technical specifications. Normally, EASA will authorise the operator to perform all types of operation for flights to the EU, for which the operator holds an

approval from its competent authority (e.g. LVO, EDTO, PBN, DG). Where necessary, EASA will exclude certain operations, by means of a technical limitation. The scope of the TCO authorisation can never exceed the scope of operations approved in the underlying air operator certificate (AOC) (Operations Specifications) issued by the competent authority of the operator.

Whenever there is a difference between the operations specifications associated to AOC and the specification associated to scope and privileges granted in the TCO Authorisation, the more limiting specification one should apply (AMC1 TCO200(b)).

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19578>

Is there any effect on an operator who applies for a TCO authorisation if an EASA Member State is not ICAO compliant with a specific ICAO standard?

Answer

In order to be authorised, an operator must comply with all relevant ICAO standards, unless covered by either a) or b) below:

- a) For reasons of equal treatment, EASA will not require compliance with those ICAO standards for which any EASA Member State has filed a difference to ICAO.
- b) EASA has granted an exemption upon application of the operator in accordance with Article 76(4) of the Basic Regulation (EU) No 2018/1139. (GM1 TCO.200(a)).

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19579>

Are EU Member States involved in related processes?

Answer

Individual EU Member States no longer perform their own safety assessments of third country operators as part of the process to grant operating permits. However, EASA Member States will continue to take care of the following, as applicable:

- Commercial agreements (traffic rights), operating permits
- Insurance coverage
- Noise-abatement provisions
- Aviation security regulations
- Exemptions from Dangerous Goods Regulations
- Local aerodrome procedures (steep approach, Enhanced Vision Systems (EVS), etc.)

Last updated:

24/11/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19591>

How can we obtain operating permits for commercial operations to EASA Member States?

Answer

EU Member States will continue to issue operating permits for commercial air transport operations in accordance with their national regulations. The TCO authorisation issued by EASA is a prerequisite to apply for such operating permits.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19595>**Which aircraft should be notified in the TCO Web Interface as part of our TCO application?****Answer**

You should only notify aircraft listed in Operations Specifications associated to your AOC that are intended to be used for commercial air transport to EU territories. These aircraft must be authorised by your Civil Aviation Authority for flights to EU territories. To give an example, if you were an airline operating a regional turboprop fleet and a long-haul fleet, and you only intended to use your long-haul fleet to the EU, then only enter your long-haul fleet in the TCO web-interface. If your long-haul fleet consisted of sister aircraft A, B and C and you only intend to use aircraft A and B for flights to EU territories, do not notify aircraft C.

Aircraft planned to be added to your fleet in the future should not be notified to us, until they are endorsed in the Operations Specifications of your AOC. Aircraft withdrawn from operations to the EU and/or withdrawn from your fleet should be deleted in the TCO web-interface without undue delay.

You can amend the aircraft list in your Basic Operator Data (BOD) questionnaire in the TCO web-interface any time. It is important that the aircraft list is kept up to date at all times to avoid potential problems, e.g., during ramp inspections.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19596>**We have applied for an EASA TCO Authorisation, but it has not yet been granted. Can we operate to the EU before we have received an EASA TCO authorisation?****Answer**

No. You can only operate to the EU once EASA has issued your TCO Authorisation. Furthermore, EU Member States cannot issue operating permits for your commercial flights as long as you do not hold a TCO authorisation.

For ambulance flights and for flights in the public interest (e.g., humanitarian) the process for one-off notification flights is available (TCO.305).

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19560>**What is the difference between the EASA TCO Authorisation and an operating permit issued by an EASA member State?****Answer**

The TCO Authorisation is a safety authorisation issued by EASA following a technical assessment. This technical authorisation issued by EASA is a mandatory prerequisite when applying with any EASA Member State for commercial traffic rights (operating permits), which continue to be issued directly by Member States.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21600>

Which information must an air operator provide during the administrative TCO application?**Answer**

In addition to the application form, which is available on the EASA website, the applicant operator must provide its AOC, the complete set of Operations Specifications and a Certificate of Incorporation or similar document.

Last updated:

18/12/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19563>

Where do I find the TCO application form?**Answer**

[Application for Third Country Operator Authorisation \(TCO authorisation\)](#)

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19565>

How do I submit my technical data?**Answer**

Once your application has been accepted EASA will provide you with a personal login and password that will allow you access to the EASA TCO web-interface. This will allow you to start the technical part of the authorisation process. At this stage you will be requested to submit the technical information and any related additional information as requested.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19569>

How do I get access to the EASA TCO web-interface?**Answer**

Upon reception of the TCO application, credentials (Login and password) will be provided to your nominated TCO contact person by email, together with the link to the EASA TCO web-interface.

Last updated:

24/11/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19570>

Can you explain the steps involved in the TCO application process, beginning with how the carrier should initiate contact to apply, through to the issuance of the TCO authorisation?

Answer

1. The operator should follow the process published on the EASA website and submit its administrative TCO application form (TCO.300(a)(b)(c)).
2. Once EASA has received the administrative application and has determined that the operator is eligible to apply, the operator receives log-on credentials to the web-based TCO software application.
3. Once logged-on to the web-based TCO software application, the operator completes an electronic questionnaire and uploads specific operational documents as requested by the Agency (TCO.300(d)).
4. EASA then evaluates all the submitted information and decides if a further in-depth assessment is necessary (ART.200).
5. As soon as the assessment is successfully completed and any non-compliance finding that may have resulted from the assessment has been closed, the operator will receive its TCO authorisation document and associated technical specifications.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19564>**How much in advance should an application for TCO authorisation be submitted before the intended starting date of our EU operations?****Answer**

TCO.300 (b)(1) requires the application at least 30 days before the intended starting date of operation. Therefore, it is highly recommended that you submit the application well in advance of the intended operation.

ART.200 requires EASA to complete its initial assessment within 30 days after all documents pursuant to TCO.300(c) and (d) have been submitted. Furthermore, under ART.200(b), EASA may need to conduct a further assessment, and it may decide to invite operators for a meeting or to perform an on-site audit. In this case, the TCO Authorisation process can take several months, especially when the technical assessment results in findings that have to be closed before EASA can issue the authorisation.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19576>**How can I submit my application form?****Answer**

You can send it

- by email to tco.applications [at] easa.europa.eu (tco[dot]applications[at]easa[dot]europa[dot]eu) with copy to tco [at] easa.europa.eu; or
- by regular mail to the following address:
European Union Aviation Safety Agency Applications and Procurement Services Department Postfach 10 12 53 D-50452 Köln, Germany

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19566>

Applicability

Is a TCO authorisation issued by EASA required to perform commercial air transport operations to the United Kingdom?

Answer

No. As a result of the decision of the United Kingdom to leave the European Union, foreign air operators are no longer required to hold an EASA TCO authorisation to operate to the United Kingdom and EASA does no longer have a mandate to issue authorisations for this purpose.

For further information, you may wish to contact the UK Civil Aviation Authority via TCO [at] caa.co.uk (e-mail) to enquire on UK TCO related issues.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/122935>

We run a helicopter operation and are contracted for aerial work in the EU. Do I have to apply for a TCO Authorisation?

Answer

No. Special operations, such as aerial work is outside the scope of TCO authorisation. For activities which do not fall under commercial air transport, as covered in ICAO Annex 6, third country operators must apply for permission with the concerned Member State.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19553>

Our operation is currently subject to an operating ban in accordance with the EU Air Safety List (Reg. (EC) No 2111/2005). Can we nevertheless apply for a TCO authorisation?

Answer

Operators that are subject to an operating ban or restriction in accordance with Reg. (EC) No 2111/2005 are eligible to apply for a TCO authorisation. The authorisation process will require an audit to be performed at the operational premises of the operator. Once EASA has finished its assessment, it will present the results to the European Commission for consideration. EASA cannot issue an authorisation until the European Commission has lifted the operating ban under the Air Safety List Regulation (EC) No 2111/2005. Note: When the operator is subject to an operating ban due to the State of the Operator not performing adequate oversight, EASA must coordinate with the European Commission before processing the application for a TCO authorisation (ART.205).

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19554>

We are a non-EU AOC holder with no plans to fly commercially to the EU. However, our maintenance facility is located in the EU. Do I need a TCO authorisation when flying there?

Answer

No – as long as these flights to-and-from the maintenance facility are non-commercial (ferry flights). These flights shall be designated a non-commercial (General Aviation) flights in the ATS flight plan (GM1 TCO.100).

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19552>

How will the provisions on code-sharing that are laid down in the EU Rules for Air Operations interact with Part-TCO?

Answer

In order to comply with the code-sharing requirements of Regulation (EU) No. 965/2012, it is not sufficient to hold only a TCO authorisation. Code-share provisions apply in addition to the requirements of Part-TCO. Therefore, a third-country operator who shares codes with an EU carrier will be subject to both sets of requirements and their related AMC [ORO.AOC.115/ARO.OPS.105]. In practice, the third-country operator will be obliged to undergo comprehensive audits for the initial and continuous verification of compliance with the applicable ICAO Standards [AMC1 ORO.AOC.115(a)]. The audits can be performed either by the EU operator itself, or by a third-party provider [AMC2 ORO.AOC.115(b)], which includes the possibility of using industry standards such as IOSA. The audit will focus on the operational, management and control systems of the TCO [AMC1 ORO.AOC.115(a)(1)]. Ensuring that the code-sharing third-country operator continues to comply with the applicable ICAO Standards, will be achieved through a code-share audit programme [AMC1 ORO.AOC.115(b)].

A third country operator that does not intend to perform flights under its own AOC to aerodromes located in an EU territory is not required to hold a TCO authorisation when entering into a code-share agreement with an EU operator (GM1 TCO.100).

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19539>

Leasing scenario 1. We plan to wet lease-out one of our aircraft to an EU operator. The operations will be performed under our own AOC, with our crew and under our full operational responsibility. Do we need a TCO authorisation?

Answer

Yes. A third country operator that leases out aircraft under a wet-lease agreement falls within the scope of TCO.100 and is required to hold a TCO authorisation for aircraft under its air operator certificate (AOC) that are used to fly to the territory subject to the provisions of the Treaties (GM1 TCO.100).

In addition to this, you will need to comply with the European requirements for leasing as laid down in Reg. (EC) No 965/2012.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19555>

Leasing, scenario 2. Could you specify if the lessor must have a TCO authorisation in the following situation? A third country operator (lessee) uses an aircraft wet leased-in from a non-EU carrier operating flights under the AOC of the lessor, using the flight number of the third-country operator.

Answer

The lessor (non-EU carrier) needs a TCO authorisation (GM1 TCO.100).

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19557>

Leasing, scenario 3. Could you specify if the lessor must have a TCO authorisation in the following situation? A third country operator (lessee) uses an aircraft for commercial air transport operations to the EU that is dry leased-in from another non-EU or EU operator (lessor).

Answer

No. The aircraft lessor does not need a TCO authorisation, but the third country operator (lessee) must hold a TCO authorisation. Rule of thumb: it is always the operating carrier that performs flights under its responsibility with aircraft under its AOC that needs a TCO authorisation (GM1 TCO.100).

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19558>

Leasing, scenario 4. Please specify which of the two operators must have a TCO authorisation in the following situation: A third country operator (lessee) uses an aircraft wet leased-in from an EU carrier (lessor) operating flights to the EU under the AOC of the lessor, and using the flight number of the third-country operator.

Answer

Neither the lessee (TCO) nor the lessor (EU carrier) need a TCO authorisation, because the flights are performed under the responsibility of an operator that does not fall under the definition of a third country operator (GM1 TCO.100).

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19556>

Which EU operating rules are applicable to third country operators?

Answer

(TCO.200) Third country operators intending to perform commercial air transport operations (into, out or within the EU) are subject to Part-TCO. In addition, they must comply with the Standardised European Rules of the Air (SERA) and Airspace Usage Requirements (AUR). The State Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP), the Single European Sky (SES) implementing rules and in particular the Interoperability rules also apply. There are also other Regulations under the responsibility of the European Commission that need to be followed, including:

- Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1206/2011 of 22 November 2011 (requirements on aircraft identification for surveillance for the Single European Sky), as amended by Regulation (EU) 2020/587
- Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1207/2011 of 22 November 2011 (requirements for the performance and the interoperability of surveillance for the single European sky), as amended by Regulation (EU) No 1028/2014, Regulation (EU) 2017/386, Regulation (EU) 2020/587 and Regulation (EU) 2022/2;
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 29/2009 of 16 January 2009 (requirements on data-link services for the single European sky), as amended by Regulation (EU) No 441/2014, Regulation (EU) No 2015/310, Regulation (EU) 2019/1170 and Regulation (EU) No 2020/208;
- Commission Decision (EU) 2019/2012 of 29 November 2019 (exemptions on data link services requirements);

- Commission Implementing Regulation (EC) No 1079/2012 of 16 November 2012 (requirements on air ground voice channel spacing for the single European sky), as amended by Regulation (EU) No 657/2013, Regulation (EU) 2016/2345 and Regulation (EU) 2017/2160;
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 1332/2011 of 16 December 2011 (common airspace usage requirements and operating procedures for airborne collision avoidance) [ACAS II 7.1], as amended by Regulation (EU) 2016/583.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19559>**Do AOC holders certified by an EASA Member State need to apply for a TCO authorisation?****Answer**

No. AOC holders certified by an EU Member State or an associated State (Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway, Switzerland) do not require a TCO authorisation (Article 2 of TCO Regulation (EU) No 452/2014).

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19590>**Are there any territories related to the EU to which a third country operator can fly without holding a TCO authorisation?****Answer**

A third country operator can fly to the following territories without holding a TCO authorisation:

- Greenland and Faroe Islands
- French Polynesia
- French Southern & Antarctic Territories
- New Caledonia and Dependencies
- Wallis and Futuna Islands
- Saint Pierre and Miquelon
- Aruba
- Bonaire
- Curaçao
- Saba
- Saint-Barthélemy
- Saint Eustatius
- Sint Maarten (part of the island that forms part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands)

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19593>**Will the TCO authorisation cover the transport of forbidden Dangerous Goods?****Answer**

The TCO authorisation does not cover the transport of forbidden DGs. Exemptions issued by each of the concerned states in

accordance with paragraph 4.2 of Annex 18 to the Chicago Convention are required for this operation.

Last updated:

18/12/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21340>

For a flight requiring diplomatic clearance, does it need to be performed under a TCO authorisation?

Answer

A flight that has been arranged by means of a diplomatic clearance does not fall under the scope of TCO.100 and does not require a TCO authorisation (GM1 TCO.100).

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21865>

My principle place of business (POB) is in an EU overseas territory which is not listed in the scope of Commission Regulation (EU) No 452/2014. Do I need a TCO authorisation to fly to territories which are in the scope of Commission Regulation (EU) 452/2014 ?

Answer

Yes a TCO authorisation is required, if your principle place of business (POB) is in one of the following territories (i.e. an EU overseas territory which is not listed in the scope of Commission Regulation (EU) No 452/2014), unless your air operator certificate has been issued by an EASA Member State (Article 2(4) of TCO Regulation (EU) No 452/2014).

- Greenland and Faroe Islands
- French Polynesia
- French Southern & Antarctic Territories
- New Caledonia and Dependencies
- Wallis and Futuna Islands
- Saint Pierre and Miquelon
- Aruba
- Bonaire
- Curaçao
- Saba
- Saint-Barthélemy
- Saint Eustatius
- Sint Maarten (part of the island that forms part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands)

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19594>

Is a TCO authorisation required by Business Aviation Operators?

Answer

Generally, yes. If you perform commercial air transport under an Air Operator Certificate (AOC) (operating aircraft for hire to transport passengers, cargo or mail) (e.g. under U.S. 14 CFR Part 135) then a TCO authorisation is required. If you file flight

plans using the flight types “N” or “S” then you are conducting commercial air transport operations and must hold a TCO authorisation issued by EASA in order to operate to EU territories.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19544>

We are a U.S. 14 CFR Part 91 operator. Are we subject to a TCO authorisation?

Answer

For operations performed strictly within the classification of Part-91, EASA does not require an authorisation under Part-TCO. These flights shall be designated a non-commercial (General Aviation) flight in the ATS flight plan.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19546>

We are a U.S. 14 CFR Part 125 Operator. Do we need a TCO authorisation issued by EASA for operations to EU territories?

Answer

U.S. 14 CFR Part 125 Operators are not eligible to apply for a TCO authorisation. An FAA Part 125 Operating Certificate is not an Air Operator Certificate (AOC) as defined in ICAO Annex 6, Part I. An ICAO-compliant AOC is required for commercial air transport operations to EU territories. United States 14 CFR Part 125 Operators may conduct non-commercial, general aviation flights to EU territories in line with provisions stipulated in the AIP of the State of destination. Make sure the type of flight is correctly denoted in item no. 8 of the ATS flight plan ('G' for general aviation).

Last updated:

23/11/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21597>

I plan to overfly EU territories without intending to land. Is a TCO authorisation required?

Answer

No. A TCO authorisation is only required for intended landings in EU territories.

Last updated:

23/11/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19547>

I plan a technical fuel stop in EU territories. Is a TCO authorisation required?

Answer

Yes. The intended use of an aerodrome located in the territory subject to the provisions of the Treaties as a technical stop (e.g. for the purpose of refuelling or crew change) as part of a Commercial Air Transport operation falls within the scope of TCO.100

and requires a TCO authorisation (GM1 TCO.100).TCO authorisation

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19548>

I plan to fly from a non-EU departure airport to a non-EU destination airport and I intend to file a destination alternate airport in the territory of an EASA Member State. Can I do this without holding a TCO authorisation?

Answer

Yes. The selection and use of an aerodrome located in the territory subject to the provisions of the Treaties as an alternate aerodrome for the case of an in-flight diversion does not fall within the scope of TCO.100 and does not require a TCO authorisation. An in-flight diversion may become necessary out of safety considerations on a flight that was initially intended to serve an aerodrome outside the EU (GM1 TCO.100).

After landing at the EU aerodrome, it is permissible for the aircraft to leave the EU to the planned destination or to any other aerodrome outside the EU with the passengers and/or cargo on board. The operator shall however not unload any cargo or passengers at the EU aerodrome and shall not take any additional payload on board.

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19549>

We are a U.S. 14 CFR Part 135 operator. Do I need to hold an authorisation if I intend flying commercially to Europe?

Answer

Yes. Part-TCO is fully applicable to flights conducted under an U.S. 14 CFR Part 135 certificate. Note: The international standards laid down in the ICAO Annexes exceed the requirements of U.S. 14 CFR Part 135 in several aspects, including but not limited to crew training requirements and the implementation of Safety Management Systems.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19550>

Do non-scheduled charter operators need a TCO authorisation?

Answer

Yes. The TCO authorisation TCO Regulation (EU) No 452/2014 does not differentiate between scheduled and non-scheduled commercial air transport operations. All operators that engage in commercial air transport need to apply for a TCO authorisation.

For air ambulance flights and other urgent flights performed in the public interest where the urgency of the mission justifies bypassing the regular TCO assessment process (e.g. humanitarian missions or disaster relief operations), please consult the section for "One-off" notification flights pursuant to article TCO.305.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19551>

One-off notification flights

What type of operations may be performed under a one-off notification?

Answer

According to article TCO.305, the following operations may be conducted under a one-off notification:

1. Flights that are performed in the public interest, to address an urgent need, such as humanitarian missions and disaster relief operations;
2. Air ambulance flights: The use of an aircraft to move sick or injured patients between healthcare facilities and/or deliver patient medical care.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21603>

Under which conditions may I apply for a one-off notification?

Answer

The following conditions shall be met by an applicant (operator) in order to satisfy the one-off notification requirements:

EASA is notified prior to the intended date of the first flight. The operator will need to file and submit the appropriate 'One-off notification' form and provide the necessary supporting documents to EASA; and

The operator provides evidence that the planned operation meets the criteria for "One-off notification flights"; and

The operator is not subject to an operating ban pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 2111/2005 of the European Parliament and of the Council; and

The operator is not subject to rejection, suspension or revocation of a TCO authorisation on safety grounds, and

The operator must not have filed a 'One-off notification' with the Agency within the previous 24 months.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21604>

Where do I find the One-off notification form?

Answer

The One-off notification form may be found [here](#).

Last updated:

25/11/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21607>

What information must an air operator provide with the one-off notification form?

Answer

In addition to the one-off notification form, which is available on the EASA website, the applicant operator must provide its AOC,

Operations Specifications and the valid certificate of airworthiness of the aircraft intended to be used under the one-off notification. Furthermore, the operator shall provide evidence that the planned operation meets the criteria for “One-off notification flights”.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21608>

What is a one-off notification?

Answer

Article 3 of the TCO Regulation (EU) No 452/2014 requires all third country operators engaging in commercial air transport operations to EASA Member States to hold an authorisation issued by EASA.

One-off notification is referring to article TCO.305 “One-off notification flights“ of the TCO regulation.

This article provides a way to derogate from Article 3 r to perform air ambulance flights or flights that are performed in the public interest, to address an urgent need, such as humanitarian missions and disaster relief operations ;without first obtaining an authorisation issued by EASA.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21602>

How do I apply for a one-off notification?

Answer

The dedicated application form may be found [here](#).

The filled form together with the requested supporting documents must be submitted to EASA via the dedicated ‘one-off’ email address.

Upon receipt of the application form and the supporting documents, EASA will send the applicant an automated acknowledgment email. The received acknowledgment email will serve as a proof that EASA has received a ‘one-off notification’ application. This acknowledgement may be used temporarily by operators, in conjunction with the application form and the submitted documents, to support their request for operating permits from the concerned EU Member States.

Within 14 days the operator must apply for a regular TCO authorisation, otherwise EASA will remove the privilege to perform one-off notification flights.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21610>

How long is a ‘one-off notification’ valid?

Answer

It is important to remember the following critical milestones in the ‘one-off notification’ process:

The operator must formally apply to the Agency for a standard TCO authorisation **within 14 days** after the date of the ‘one-off

notification'; and

Flights may only be performed under the 'one-off notification' for a maximum period of **twelve (12) consecutive weeks** (= 84 calendar days) following the date of the 'one-off notification', or until such time as the Agency has taken a final decision on the formal TCO application (see point 1. above).

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21613>

Under which circumstances may I re-apply for a one-off notification?

Answer

A 'one-off notification' may be filed only once every 24 months by an operator.

The conditions to be met for a re-application are identical to the ones applicable for the first 'one-off notification' filed with EASA.

Last updated:

18/12/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21611>

What happens if I did not apply formally for a TCO authorisation within 14 days following the 'one-off notification date'?

Answer

The 'one-off notification' privileges will be removed. All commercial air transport operations must stop with immediate effect.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21614>

What happens following the submission of the 'one-off notification' accompanied with the provided application form and supporting documents?

Answer

The concerned EU Member State will review the application form and the submitted documents to evaluate and decide on the request for the operating permits. In case of a refusal, the EU Member State will inform EASA accordingly.

EASA will also review the received application form and the supporting documentation. Should this review be unsatisfactory (e.g. no valid Air Operator Certificate, operations are requested that are not approved on the operations specifications documents, false declaration, etc.) EASA will immediately remove the privileges given under the 'One-off notification' and inform the Member States. All commercial air transport operations must then stop with immediate effect.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21612>

What happens if EASA has not taken any decision on my formal TCO application for a TCO authorisation within the consecutive twelve (12) weeks (84 calendar days) following the 'one-off notification date'?

Answer

The 'one-off notification' privileges will be removed until the Agency has come to a final decision concerning the TCO application. All commercial air transport operations must stop with immediate effect until further notice.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21615>

What happens if EASA takes a negative decision regarding my formal TCO application for a TCO authorisation within the consecutive twelve (12) weeks (84 calendar days) following the 'one-off notification date'?

Answer

The 'one-off notification' privileges will be removed. All commercial air transport operations must stop with immediate effect.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21616>

How can I submit my one-off notification form and the supporting documents?

Answer

Only by email on the following address: TCO_one_off [at] easa.europa.eu (TCO_one_off[at]easa[dot]europa[dot]eu)

Last updated:

25/11/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21609>

Technical Issues

Does EASA require us to keep current a registry of aircraft?

Answer

All relevant operator information, including the aircraft used for flights under the TCO authorisation, is required to be kept up to date during the initial application and for as long as the TCO authorisation is valid. This is normally done by the operator, using the TCO web-interface.

No prior approval by EASA is required for an aircraft of the same type and variant to be added to an already-authorised fleet.

Should you wish to add a new aircraft type or variant (as identified by a different ICAO type designator), then prior approval from EASA must be obtained. This request needs to be submitted 30 days before the planned date of first use of the new aircraft type (TCO.315).

It is at the discretion of EASA to allow selected Business Aviation operators to start operation with a new type of aircraft without having to wait for prior approval. These operators will receive specifications for so-called "TCO Business Aircraft", which combine aircraft of different types as long as they all meet specified criteria. Details are explained in the specifications associated to the TCO authorisation of the affected operators.

In general, all changes that require EASA to issue a new authorisation document or new technical specifications associated to the

TCO authorisation will require prior approval by EASA.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19584>

Can EASA issue a TCO authorisation in the absence of any aircraft compliant with the applicable standards of the Annexes to the Chicago Convention?

Answer

No, if an applicant for a TCO authorisation does not declare at least one aircraft compliant with all applicable technical standards of the Annexes to the Chicago Convention, EASA will not issue a TCO authorisation and will mark the aircraft as 'Not authorised' in the online TCO web-interface.

Should a TCO authorisation holder remove all authorised aircraft from the aircraft listing in the web-interface, then EASA will render the TCO authorisation invalid.

Last updated:

14/03/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21111>

My aircraft is not fitted with a reinforced cockpit door. Can I use it for flights to the EU?

Answer

Chapter 13 "Security" of Annex 6 to the Chicago Convention is fully applicable in the EU.

If your aircraft falls under the criteria for a reinforced cockpit door listed therein, but it is not equipped with one, it cannot be used for commercial air transport operations to the EU.

Last updated:

18/12/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19580>

Can EASA issue a TCO authorisation to an operator with open SAFA ramp inspection findings?

Answer

Yes. However, Commission Regulation (EU) No 452/2014 (the 'TCO Regulation') stipulates that EASA shall take into account ramp inspections, as well as other recognised information on safety aspects with regards to third country operators. Open SAFA findings may indicate systemic non-compliances and warrant further focused assessments to be performed by EASA. If evidence gathered during such an assessment confirms a non-compliance with an ICAO standard, EASA may raise a separate finding under Part-TCO. This finding will need to be closed before issuance of a TCO authorisation.

Last updated:

24/11/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19588>

Can EASA issue a TCO authorisation in case for one or more aircraft, a non-compliance is found with the applicable

standards of the Annexes to the Chicago Convention?

Answer

Yes, as long as at least one aircraft is compliant with the applicable standards of the Annexes to the Chicago Convention applicable to air operators, EASA may issue a TCO authorisation. Any non-compliant aircraft and/or types of aircraft will be marked as 'Not authorised' in the online TCO web-interface.

Last updated:

18/12/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21112>

Are there recognised industry standards or third-party audit programmes (e.g., ISO 9001, IOSA, IS-BAO, Air Charter Safety Foundation IAS, etc.) that, if accomplished, may ease the assessment process for operators requesting authorisation?

Answer

Conformity with industry standards (when fulfilling the requirements set out in TCO.200 and to the extent that they cover the scope defined in TCO.200(a)(1) and in the absence of safety concerns) may result in a certain bonus rating in the TCO risk-based approach. However, conformity with an industry standard does not substitute for the demonstration of compliance with specific international aviation safety (ICAO) standards by the operator, and does not replace a TCO assessment performed by EASA.

Last updated:

24/11/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19583>

Initial Airworthiness

Instructions for Continued Airworthiness (ICA)

Case of a company being the original equipment manufacturer (OEM) - so supplier for a Type Certificate Holder (TCH) - and having their own DOA. If we take the example of the Component Maintenance Manual (CMM), provided that the CMM is in that case considered as an ICA, could you clarify if the OEM DOA can or cannot make changes to the CMM using e.g. Part 21 / Subpart E?

Answer

The supplier DOA cannot make a stand alone change to the CMM under Subpart E. According to 21.A.90C(b) such stand-alone changes can be made only by the DAH (in this case the TCH).

However, if the DAH has identified the specific CMM as ICA, they may also recognise the updated CMM as ICA (refer also to AMC3 21.A.7(a) DAH responsibility to check the supplier data which is part of the ICA or referenced with the ICA).

If the change to the CMM is not recognised as ICA, it may still be 'acceptable' for the DAH. When the DAH confirms this (see GM3 21.A.7(a)) the respective change to the CMM can be considered applicable maintenance data under M.A.401(b)(4).

Last updated:

04/07/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136688>

Standalone changes to ICA: could it be clarified which are the expectations in terms of DOA's involvement activities before release of the standalone changes to the ICA (review by compliance verification engineer, other Office of Airworthiness involvement, etc.)?

Answer

When subject to 21.A.90C(c) the stand-alone changes to ICA do not need to be processed as changes to the type design under Part 21/Subpart D, the expected DAH/DOA procedures should still address:

- preparation;
- proof reading;
- verification of technical consistency;
- verification of feasibility (when relevant); and
- approval for release.

In such a case, a CVE or airworthiness function involvement is not required. (see GM1 21.A.239(a), para. 3.1.5, Note).

Last updated:

04/07/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136689>

The applicability of 21.A.7 AMCs/GMs is not clear in the case of TCH without new production. Could you please clarify?

Answer

Indeed, this has not been clarified at the level of the respective AMC/GM. Certain parts of the AMC/GM may raise questions on 'retroactive' application.

1. In regard to the topic of ICA identification, AMC2 21.A.7(a) Identification of ICA and AMC 1 21.A.7(b) Identification of a complete set of instructions for continued airworthiness (ICA), should be applied for:
 - new design approvals (TC/STC) certified after the 18th of May 2022
 - for existing design approvals at the next opportunity of a TCDS/STC/STCDS update.
2. In regard to the topic of ICA format, GM2 21.A.7(b) ICA — format, should be applied for a new design approval (S)TC applied after the 18th of May 2022.

Last updated:

04/07/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136690>

With reference to AMC2 21.A.7(a) point (d): '(d) If the maintenance data made available by a DAH includes data from an operator (i.e. in order to customise the data for the operator, and created under the authority of the operator), the operator's data should be identified as such, and the DAH is not required to additionally evaluate it. Could you give an example for operators' data included in ICA?

Answer

Sometimes, the Type Certificate Holder (TCH) offers a service to the operator to publish the ICA for the operator fleet. This fleet may include design changes (e.g. Supplemental Type Certificates) or repairs which have not been developed / approved by the respective TCH but by other design approval holders. If these design changes or repairs have their own ICAs, these ICAs are outside TCH responsibility.

Last updated:

04/07/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136691>

With reference to GM2 21.A.7(a) point (4): '(4) If the ICA are defined at aircraft level, the following principles apply to the other supplier data that is not related to the ALS nor to scheduled maintenance: (i) If the supplier data includes a maintenance instruction for an action identified in the aircraft-level ICA, including an engine or propeller, this supplier data should be referenced in the aircraft-level ICA and should be made available like any other ICA. As an alternative to linking such supplier data to the aircraft-level ICA (e.g. with cross references), it is possible to include the relevant data directly into the aircraft ICA. In such a case, the supplier data is not part of the aircraft ICA since the aircraft ICA already contain all the required information. [...]' What does it mean "In such case the supplier data is not part of the ICA, since the aircraft ICA already contain all the required information"? Is that avoiding duplication and potential disagreement?

Answer

Indeed, the purpose is to have a better control on supplier data (avoiding duplication and potential disagreements).

Last updated:

04/07/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136692>

With reference to GM2 21.A.7(a) point (4), what does it mean "In such case the supplier data is not part of the ICA, since the aircraft ICA already contain all the required information"? Is that avoiding duplication and potential disagreement?

Answer

The GM2 21.A.7(a) point (4) states:

'(4) If the ICA are defined at aircraft level, the following principles apply to the other supplier data that is not related to the ALS nor to scheduled maintenance:

If the supplier data includes a maintenance instruction for an action identified in the aircraft-level ICA, including an engine or propeller, this supplier data should be referenced in the aircraft-level ICA and should be made available like any other ICA. As an alternative to linking such supplier data to the aircraft-level ICA (e.g. with cross references), it is possible to include the relevant data directly into the aircraft ICA. In such a case, the supplier data is not part of the aircraft ICA since the aircraft ICA already contain all the required information.

[...]'

Indeed, the purpose is to have a better control on supplier data (avoiding duplication and potential disagreements).

Last updated:

04/07/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136733>

What is the purpose of the point (a)(2)(vii) in the AMC1 21.A.7(c)?

Answer

The AMC1 21.A.7(c), point (a)(2)(vii), states:

'If all ICA are made available to EASA at the time of entry into service, they should also be furnished at this time to the aircraft operator / aircraft owner and made available to any other person(s) required to comply with any of those instructions in accordance with points 21.A.21(c)(4), 21.A.44 and 21.A.7, without using the provision to delay certain parts of the ICA beyond the entry into service. For an EU holder/applicant, this should be supported as part of the DOA/ADOA procedure.'

The purpose is to ensure that the ICA will be available to the aircraft operator / aircraft owner at the time of entry into service.

AMC1 21.A.7(c) is providing three options for the availability of ICA (depending on the nature of the respective ICA):

- option 1 - available at the time of design approval;
- option 2 - available at the entry into service; and
- option 3 - available after the entry into service.

In all three options, there is a provision making clear that 'availability' refers to availability to the owner / operator - i.e. it will not be sufficient to be available to EASA.

Last updated:

04/07/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136734>

With reference to AMC1 21.A.7(c) point a3 ix, does that mean EASA wants to see all ICA which are furnished (irrespective what option) at entry into service?

Answer

The AMC1 21.A.7(c), point (a)(3)(ix), states:

'(ix) It is assumed that for those ICA that are made available to EASA at the time of entry into service, they are also at the same time furnished to the aircraft operator / aircraft owner and made available to any other person(s) required to comply with any of those instructions in accordance with points 21.A.21(c)(4), 21.A.44 and 21.A.7. This is to satisfy EASA that such a delayed publication will not have an adverse effect on the continuing airworthiness of any individual aircraft. To allow the timely review and incorporation of a delayed part of the ICA into continuing airworthiness activities and processes (e.g. amendment of the aircraft Maintenance Programme) by the person or organisation responsible for the aircraft continuing airworthiness or for performing maintenance, the Agency considers that the delayed ICA should typically be made available two years before the actual ICA has to be used, when using normal revisions as a format. However, shorter time margins may be acceptable, provided that the format used ensures the prompt notification of the availability of the delayed ICA or the ICA itself, but they should not be less than 1 year before the ICA has to be used.'

This quoted point is belonging to Option 3 regarding the ICA availability - i.e. ICA available after the entry into service (EIS). Here the meaning is not that all ICA have to be seen by EASA (even if some are delayed) at EIS but that those which are not delayed - i.e. those available at EIS - should not be available only to EASA but should be available to owners/operators as well (see also the answer to the question 6, above).

EASA does not need to see systematically ICA furnished at EIS, ICA is an obligation of the approval holder. EASA may request involvement in the post-approval activities for ICA via a certification plan or dedicated actions raised.

See also AMC1 21.A.7(c) point a(3) (vi) and (vii).

Last updated:

04/07/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136735>

Can design approval holder's (DAH's) SB or Vendor Service Bulletins (VSB) be ICA or is this limited to Manuals, like CMMs?

Answer

In general, DAH's SB and VSB could be an ICA, depending on the instructions contained.

The guidance material refers to CMMs as an example for supplier data, but that does not exclude other documents per se (refer to AMC2 21.A.7(a) Identification of ICA, para (b)).

Last updated:

04/07/2022

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136736>

For scheduled tasks like restoration or functional check, which are performed off-aircraft, are the Aircraft Maintenance Manual “remove” and “install” instructions, as part of the ICA, enough?

Answer

If you have a restoration or a functional check you need accomplishment procedures to perform this task, remove / replace is not enough here (refer to GM1 21.A.7(a) Scope of ICA, their publication format and typical ICA data, para (c) and GM2 21.A.7(a) Determination of which supplier data is part of the ICA, para (a)(2) and (a)(4)(ii)).

Last updated:

04/07/2022

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136737>

With reference to GM1 21.A.90C Stand-alone changes "[...] When a non-ALS ICA change is triggered by a change to the type design, this does not affect the overall classification of the type certificate change as per point 21.A.91 [...]." What is the purpose of this paragraph?

Answer

This is a simplification. For non-ALS ICA update/amendments resulting or done as part of a physical/functional change, this would not have in itself an impact on the classification of this change to type certificate - e.g. if the type certificate change is minor (based on the design / functional criteria) it remains minor regardless the impact on non-ALS ICAs.

However, as a stand-alone non-ALS ICA change this may have an impact on the classification (see Appendix A to GM 21.A.91 Examples of major changes per discipline).

Note: For an ALS ICA update (either as standalone or as part of a change) this will typically trigger the major classification.

Last updated:

04/07/2022

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136738>

With reference to GM1 21.A.90C 'Also, when the ICA are completed after the product (or change to the product) was approved, this is considered to be a stand-alone change to the ICA.' Is this to be understood that non-ALS ICA provided at EIS (and even after EIS) should be handled as standalone?

Answer

Indeed, this is correct.

Last updated:

04/07/2022

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136739>

Does point 21.A.90C(c) imply that we may encounter non-ALS changes which can be minor with/without additional work to demonstrate compliance and major? Should a TCH process start with the identification of the affected requirements,

to determine, for non-ALS ICA changes, if they can take benefit of point 21.A.90C(c)?

Answer

In general, type certificate changes can be minor without showing of compliance, minor with showing of compliance and major.

For non-ALS ICA changes, the GM1 21.A.90C is proposing a different perspective on how the stand-alone changes have to be considered:

'[...] Stand-alone changes are usually straightforward changes, and are not considered to require additional work in order to show compliance. However, they must be managed in accordance with a process accepted by EASA under point 21.A.239 or point 21.A.14(b), for discharging the obligation to keep the ICA up to date and to cover aspects like preparation/verification/release in accordance with their respective AMC/GM material.'

Examples of changes that may require additional activities in order to show compliance are changes to the CDCCL, and EWIS ICA.'

Also, App. A to GM 21.A.91, section 10, is listing cases where compliance needs to be demonstrated (in this respect, the section contains examples of **major changes**).

The TCH process may document this kind of approach - i.e. a list of examples of stand-alone changes which require additional compliance demonstration as either major or minor. When a change is within the list, a classification on airworthiness criteria should be performed (with the identification of applicable requirements).

Last updated:

04/07/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136740>

With reference to GM1 21.A.90C, what is meant by the terminology “to provide alternatives”?

Answer

The GM1 21.A.90C states:

*'Changes to the ICA are considered to be stand-alone changes when they are not directly prepared together with a change to the type design. Stand-alone changes to the ICA are usually prepared and issued, for example, for the purpose of making corrections, improvements, to include feedback from users, or **to provide alternatives**.*

['...']'

'to provide alternatives' should be understood, for example, to provide alternative ways to execute certain tasks.

It is to be noted that AMC2 21.A.7(a) is mentioning 'additional or optional maintenance information'. The distinction between such information and 'alternative' may not always be clear and the DAH should clarify this by indicating if the 'alternative' is ICA or is actually non-ICA. This distinction will dictate the treatment under 21.A.7 requirements or not (e.g. availability).

Last updated:

04/07/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136741>

How does a Part 145 Maintenance Organisation know, if a Component Maintenance Manual (CMM) is released / approved by the design approval holder (DAH)?

Answer

A CMM is becoming ICA only when identified as such by the DAH - see AMC2 21.A.7(a), point (b)

When a CMM is identified as ICA, the DAH should perform the necessary verifications as for any other ICAs, however may choose to rely, in whole or in part, on the supplier's process under certain conditions - see AMC3 21.A.7(a). The provision '[...] may carry out a complete check[...]' should not be seen out of its context. In the case the DAH is not doing the check they are relying on their supplier to do this check (to say this differently: the DAH will authorise the supplier to do the check). The activity will be controlled under 'supplier control processes'. Similar methodology may be used for non-ICA supplier data but referenced together with the ICA - see GM3 21.A.7(a). For other non-ICA supplier data not referenced, but which can be used, the acceptability methodology is not further defined in GM3 21.A.7(a), however, this acceptability status may be documented in the form of a list.

The identification of the approval status of the manual for a component or article through a 21.A.265(h) statement in the CMM is not preferred as one CMM may potentially be recognised by several DAHs (e.g. same equipment used by different TCHs). However, this approval status may be then displayed on the level of a list - see GM3 21.A.7(b).

Last updated:

04/07/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136742>

Can manufacturers of raw materials obtain a Production Organisation Approval (POA) under Part 21 Subpart G?

Answer

Manufacturers of raw materials are not required to hold and cannot obtain a production approval. Only organisations responsible for the manufacturing and subsequent release of a 'product', 'parts' and 'non-installed equipment' as defined in the [Basic Regulation](#) Article 3 (3), (4), and (29) are required to hold a POA, if and as specified by [Regulation \(EU\) No 748/2012](#), and are therefore eligible to apply for such an approval.

Last updated:

18/07/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19007>

How to use information and communication technologies for performing remote audits on to DOA, LoA/POA, AMO, CAMO, CAO and AMTO holders?

Answer

Please see [FAQ](#) published under Continuing Airworthiness.

Last updated:

19/07/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116562>

How to remotely conduct in real-time tasks for the issuance of an 'EASA Form 1' for prototype and new produced parts, appliances, and products other than complete aircraft, using information and communication technologies (ICT)?

Answer

Objective of this FAQ:

This FAQ provides technical guidance on the use of remote ICT to support the issuance of 'EASA Form 1' for prototype and new

produced parts, appliances and products other than complete aircraft. It is the responsibility of the production organisation to assess whether the use of remote ICT constitutes a suitable alternative to the physical inspection of the part, appliance or product in accordance with the applicable requirements. The production organisation intending to use the remote ICT for those purposes should first discuss its feasibility with the competent authority.

I. Terminology:

In the context of this FAQ the following terminology will be used:

- “Issue of an EASA Form 1” means “issue of an EASA Form 1” under Part-21, Subpart G by a certifying staff, “raise an EASA Form 1” under Part-21, Subpart F by an authorised person and “validation of an EASA Form 1” under Part-21, Subpart F by an inspector of the competent authority, except the cases of issuance of an EASA Form 1 for correction of error(s) on a previously issued certificate and for re-certification of an item from “prototype” to “new” provided that the design data has not changed;
- “Authorised staff” means “certifying staff” as defined in Part-21, Subpart G, “authorised person” and “competent authority inspector” as defined in Part-21, Subpart F;
- “Item” means any part, appliance or product other than a complete aircraft;
- “Applicable design data” means “non-approved design data” in case of prototype and “approved design data” in case of new produced item;
- “Task” means any inspection, test and/or verification, as described in a written procedure, needed to be performed by an authorised staff before signing an EASA Form 1;
- “Remote ICT” means any real-time video and audio communication tools using information and communication technologies (ICT), which aim at enabling performance of the tasks by the authorised staff from a location different than where is located the item (on-site).

II. Regulatory context:

According to:

- point 21.A.130(a), the holder of a letter of agreement issued in accordance with Part 21, Subpart F;
 - point 21.A.130(d), the competent authority in the context of Part-21, Subpart F; and
 - point 21.A.163(c), the holder of a production organisation approval (POA) in accordance with Part 21, Subpart G
- may issue an EASA Form 1 for produced items in order to certify their conformity to the applicable design data and, in case of new items, their condition for safe operation.

The EASA Form 1 has to be issued by appropriately qualified authorised staff.

Part 21 does not require that the authorised staff has to be on-site when issuing the EASA Form 1, nor how the production organisation and the competent authority shall determine whether the part/appliance/product other than aircraft conforms to the applicable design data and, in case of a new item, is in condition for safe operation. These should be detailed in a written procedure accepted by the competent authority.

Part 21 requires:

- in point 21.A.130 (d) that the competent authority validates the EASA Form 1 after inspections performed in according to 21.B.135(b), “if it finds after inspection that the product, part or appliance conforms to the applicable design data and is in condition for safe operation”; and
- in point 21.A.165(c) that the POA holder has to:
 2. “determine that other products, parts or appliances are complete and conform to the approved design data and are in a condition for safe operation before issuing an EASA Form 1...”
 4. “determine that other products, parts or appliances conform to the applicable data before issuing an EASA Form 1...”.

Typically compliance with these requirements is ensured through on-site presence of the authorised staff in order to guarantee appropriate access to the item, as needed.

However, compliance with these requirements may be also ensured in certain circumstances, determined as per the considerations described in chapter III, by remotely conducting the tasks which are needed before issuance of an EASA Form 1 by the use of remote ICT. The following considerations should be used as a guideline when the on-site presence of the authorised staff is to be replaced by virtual presence, using remote ICT.

III. Use of remote ICT to support the issuance of EASA Form 1

Remote ICT may have limitations that could render it unsuitable for some applications. Accordingly, careful consideration and risk management should be applied when making a determination when to use it. These considerations, listed below, are however not exhaustive and should not be treated as a checklist.

1. General considerations

- As an overarching principle, it needs to be determined whether the nature of the tasks to be performed by the authorised staff allows the use of remote ICT;
- the facility where the item is located:
 - a) should be referred to in the EASA Form 65 or EASA Form 55, directly or indirectly by reference to the corresponding section of the manual or production organisation exposition, or
 - b) in case of a POA, should be a facility from where a production organisation exposition's procedure related to point 21.A.139(b)1(xv) authorises the issuance of the EASA Form 1;
- The complexity, novelty, and safety criticality of the item to be released with the EASA Form 1, should be taken into account;
- The level of competence and experience of the personnel in the use of the particular procedures and equipment that will be used to conduct the tasks before issuing the EASA Form 1;
- Previous experience of the organisation / confidence in the organisation's Inspection system / Quality system / Management system; and
- The appropriateness of the inspection and test instruments and/or equipment, especially if used to evaluate qualitative aspects of a product, part or appliance.

2. Equipment and Setup Considerations

- The suitability of video resolution, fidelity and field of view for the task being conducted;
- The need for multiple cameras, imaging systems or microphones and whether the person performing or witnessing the tasks can switch between them or direct them to be switched and has the possibility to stop the process, ask a question, move equipment, etc.;
- The controllability of viewing direction, zoom and lighting;
- The appropriateness of audio fidelity for the evaluation being conducted;
- Whether real-time, uninterrupted communication between the person(s) authorised to remotely witness the activity (authorised staff) and the personnel conducting it exists at the location where the item is located;
- The need for unique testing devices or equipment (for examples, fast-frame cameras, special lighting conditions, sensitive listening devices, mobile phones with cameras for HD video calls);
- Whether personnel have been adequately trained in the proper set up, validation and use of the technology, tools and/or equipment to be used; and
- The need for recording the audio and video data, as well for retention of them or other information.

3. Cybersecurity considerations

There are cases where the facilities, where the tasks has to be performed, are subject to strict security limitations. When using remote ICT for the tasks needed before issuing an EASA Form 1, it is the responsibility of the organisation to provide an equivalent level of security, thus the IT security responsible person within the organisation should concur to the ICT technology before proceeding.

4. Documenting the use of remote ICT

The documented processes (procedures) developed by the holder of a letter of agreement or a POA should be accepted by the competent authority and describe:

- The risk assessment process needed to determine the appropriateness of the remote ICT taking into account the above mentioned considerations;
- The tasks to be performed, including preparation activities, inspections, tests, verifications to be done, personnel involved in the remote ICT activity and their level of competence;
- How authorised staff access to all necessary data (e.g. drawings, schematics, datasheets, etc.) needed to determine that the item conforms to the applicable design data, needs to be guaranteed;
- How remote ICT will be used in real-time (not pre-recorded) so that the authorised staff may direct the performance of the tasks as if conducted in-person, on-premises, with the aid of the equipment or the personnel supporting the activity at the remote location;
- Procedures for conducting a re-inspection if the equipment malfunctions or the process fails to yield acceptable results. A re-

inspection using remote ICT may be accomplished after correcting the malfunction or process, or by an actual on-site inspection;

- How the authorised staff should record and communicate any difficulties or concerns regarding the process so that the organisation can improve its programme;
- How use of remote ICT will be documented in the required records; and
- How IT security is maintained throughout the remote ICT process (data protection and intellectual property of the organisations also need to be safeguarded).

Last updated:

19/07/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116563>

EASA STC's being presented for approval when the pre-mod configuration is not EASA approved. What are EASA changes embedded in Non-EASA approved design?

Answer

Points 21.A.101 and 21.B.107 of Annex I of Regulation (EU) 748/2012 require that the changed product complies with the applicable certification basis. Therefore, the applicant needs to demonstrate that the change for which EASA has received an application is compliant with the EASA certification basis at a product level. It is not sufficient for the applicant to demonstrate compliance of the change at only change level.

The change, for which the applicant has requested EASA approval, must include all affected parts of the non-approved change that builds the interface to the EASA approved product and all affected compliance demonstration (influences on the product and the non-approved interface change).

A limitation is likely to be necessary so that the STC cannot be installed on an EASA registered product as long as the interface change is not yet EASA approved.

Last updated:

24/11/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/47411>

Design Approval: FAA Supplementary Type Certificates (STC) approved by National Aviation Authorities (NAAs) before 28-09-03 are deemed to be approved by EASA. If the NAA has limited the approval in scope compared to the original FAA STC such that it does not cover all the models, how can we apply for an extension of the scope?

Answer

Any model, derivate or configuration not included within the 'Grandfathered' STC will need an approval by EASA or accepted through the provisions of the EU/US BASA (and TIP). The FAA would have to examine the differences between the FAA STC and the EASA/NAA STC and classify the modification as either 'Basic' or 'Non-Basic' in accordance with the TIP. 'Basic' modifications are accepted under the TIP and there would be no re-issue of an EASA STC. 'Non-Basic' modifications require an application to EASA, through the FAA. Minor modifications are also accepted through provisions of the BASA/TIP and no EASA approval is issued.

Last updated:

24/11/2021

Link:

According to point 21.A.95(c), minor changes to a type-certificate can be approved using Certifications Specifications which became applicable after those incorporated by reference in the type-certificate, provided that they do not affect the demonstration of compliance. Could you please clarify under which conditions the demonstration of compliance is not affected?

Answer

The 'demonstration of compliance' mentioned in point 21.A.95(c) is to be read as the 'demonstration of compliance' which the applicant would have performed in case 'the type certification basis and environmental protection requirements incorporated by references in the TC' are demonstrated compliant as required by point 21.A.95(b)(1).

If a later amendment of the CS is elected to be used as the certification basis for the minor change, the demonstration of compliance as per point 21.A.95(b)1 still needs to be covered.

This means that an analysis needs to be performed on the differences between the 'the type certification basis and environmental protection requirements incorporated by references in the TC' and the later amendment of the CS for the following items:

- Any applicable Special Condition needs to be covered appropriately;
- Any applicable Equivalent Level Of Safety needs to be covered appropriately;
- Any later CS paragraph needs to be applicable to the particular aircraft and compliance demonstration needs to be feasible.

Last updated:

24/11/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/111630>

Why and how must Parts and Appliances be marked, when are the letters EPA required, and which exceptions are acceptable?

Answer

To comply with EASA Part-21, Subpart D, 21.A.109, Subpart E, 21A.118A (b) and Subpart M, 21A.451(a) and (b), it is the obligation of the respective Holders of a Minor Change Approval, a STC, or a Major Repair Design Approval, to specify the required markings, including EPA letters as applicable, in their Design (read, 'Approved Data'), according EASA Part-21, Subpart Q.

Subpart Q, 21.A.804(a), and related GM, require proper identification of each Part and Appliance that is designed or redesigned, including parts designed to be incorporated in repairs (21A.451), by 'permanent and legible marking' hereof, and is applicable for Design Organisations and Manufacturers.

21.A.804(a) 1 and 2 clearly require marking of Parts and Appliances with 'name, trademark, or symbol identifying the Manufacturer' and 'Part number', as defined in the applicable Design Data.

According to the GM the Design Approval Holder shall identify in all its Design (TC, STC, ETSO, Repair, Change) approved after 28 December 2009, how the Manufacturer has to mark subject Parts and Appliances in accordance with 21A.804(a) 1; which can be limited to identifying a marking field and the method, without prescribing the actual text or symbols.

21.A.804(a) 3 requires additionally marking with the letters 'EPA' of all parts produced (manufactured) in accordance with data 'not belonging to the TC holder of the related product'.

Each interchangeable or removable Part or Appliance that is manufactured in accordance with a design issued by the Design Organisation, shall be permanently and legibly marked according to 21.A.804. The EPA marking was introduced in 2004; this was done to clearly identify any 'not original' Part, (which means any Part or Appliance not designed by the TC- or ETSO- Approval Holder), as a trigger for Maintenance Organisations and Accident or Incident investigators, in the light of Continuing

Airworthiness. The intention was certainly not to require adding of the letters 'EPA' to mark repairs. In this context, EPA marking only applies to the new designed and manufactured parts to be incorporated in the repair. Especially where repairs have an impact on interchangeability, identification of incorporated new Parts is very important, and DO Procedures should address this item. Note that for parts referred to in 21.A.307(b), as amended with (EU)2021/699 (applicable from 18.05.2022), the EPA marking is not required as stated in 21.A.804(a)(3).

The only accepted exception with regard to Marking (including EPA), is defined in 21.A.804(b). This subparagraph offers the possibility to not physically mark the Part of Appliance, when it is too small or when marking hereof is otherwise impractical, but only after "Agency agreement". This wording allows an Applicant/Holder of a Design and the Agency to further define in detail how this 'agreement' can be obtained and will be formalised. DOATL should however ensure that the DOA Applicant/Holder reflects this approach in its DO Handbook or Procedures, requiring at least a justification of the reason for not marking physically, and details of the alternative way chosen for the identification, in accordance with 21A.804(b), to know on the authorised release document accompanying the Part or Appliance, or on its container.

Last updated:

25/11/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/20095>

Should parts fabricated under a maintenance approval (Part 145) be marked with an EPA (European Part Approval) marking in accordance with Part 21A.804(a)(3)?

Answer

A Part 145 approved organisation can only fabricate parts for its own use in accordance with approved design data (145.A.42(cb) (iii)). If that data comes from the Type Certificate holder; 21A.804(a)(3) would not be applicable and those parts will not need EPA marking. If the data comes from a Supplemental Type Certificate holder, minor change approval holder or repair approval holder, the parts will have to be marked as prescribed in the applicable data which should include an EPA marking since 28/3/2004 (*).

(*) – As from 18.09.2022, parts covered by 21.A.307(b) does need to be accompanied by an EASA Form 1 to be eligible for installation and therefore their manufacturers do not require to hold a POA or produce the parts under Subpart F of Part-21.

Last updated:

25/11/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19010>

How can I find one particular AMC-20 in the published AMC-20 amendments?

Answer

Since its amendment 18, all AMC-20 items are included in the latest published AMC-20 amendment.

In addition, Subpart B of AMC-20 includes a list of the different AMC-20 items and indication of which amendment of AMC-20 introduced or modified each AMC-20 item.

Please also consult the [Easy Access Rules for AMC-20](#).

Last updated:

25/11/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/48205>

Regulation (EU) 2021/699 introduced point 21.A.101(h) that refers, among others, to point 26.320 of Regulation (EU) 2015/640 but this point is not present in the said regulation. Could you please clarify? (IA)

Answer

Point 26.320 indeed does not exist. Point 21.A.101(h) will be corrected at the next opportunity to delete this reference.

Last updated:

25/11/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/127778>

What is the mandate of the Agency for Environmental issues? What does the Agency concretely do?

Answer

The Agency's environmental mandate and standards are described in the [smart environmental standards page](#).

Last updated:

25/11/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19011>

What is the definition of "Critical parts"?

Answer

The term "critical part" or "critical component" is used in various EASA requirements, certification specifications and also in the EU-US bilateral, however it is not always defined. A general definition does not exist because it depends upon the context in which the term is used.

There are currently basically three different definitions:

- **for rotorcraft:**

CS 27-29-VLR.602(a): A critical part is a part, the failure of which could have a catastrophic effect upon the rotorcraft, and for which critical characteristics have been identified which must be controlled to ensure the required level of integrity.

- **for engines, propellers and APUs:**

CS-E.510(c): It is recognised that the probability of Primary Failures of certain single elements cannot be sensibly estimated in numerical terms. If the Failure of such elements is likely to result in Hazardous Engine Effects, reliance must be placed on meeting the prescribed integrity specifications of CS-E 515 (Engine critical parts) in order to support the objective of an Extremely Remote probability of Failure (similar for CS-P.150(c) and CS-P.160 and also for CS-APU.210(c) and CS-APU.150)

- **in the EU-US bilateral:**

A "Critical component" means a part identified as critical by the design approval holder during the product type validation process, or otherwise by the exporting authority. Typically, such components include parts for which a replacement time, inspection interval, or related procedure is specified in the Airworthiness Limitations section or certification maintenance requirements of the manufacturer's maintenance manual or Instructions for Continued Airworthiness.

Each of the above definitions should be used only within their own context and for their own purpose (i.e. the definition of the

bilateral is only relevant for the automatic acceptance of PMA parts and repair design from the US). Where the term "critical part" is not defined, the dictionary meaning of "critical" should be used (i.e. crucial, decisive, important, etc.).

For the application of point Part 21.A.805 of Annex I (Part 21) of Regulation (EU) 748/2012, critical parts are those identified as such by the design approval holder, which for rotorcraft, engines, propellers and APUs as a minimum should be those using the definitions of the relevant CS.

Last updated:

24/11/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19013>

Can "Field Loadable Software" be delivered with an EASA Form 1 and is an EASA Form 1 required for installation?

Answer

First of all it should be clear that the definition of "parts and appliances" (Refer to articles 3 and 140 of the Basic Regulation) includes software. This is software considered as an element of the aircraft as defined in the aircraft's type design. The rest of this response only refers to this type of software.

Secondly, "Subpart K - Parts and appliances" from Part-21 addressing installation, approval and release is applicable to this software and therefore:

1. this software must be part of the design data; and
2. the installation of this software in a type-certified aircraft is only accepted when it is accompanied by an EASA Form 1 and properly marked; and
3. the installation is approved. (Refer to 21A.303).

In order to achieve 1) and 2), the organisation that manufactures and releases the software must meet the requirements of Subpart F or G from Part-21. This means in particular that the software must be part of the scope of that production organisation and there must be a link between the design organisation and the production organisation.

The conclusion for Field Loadable Software is therefore that this software can be delivered with an EASA Form 1 when:

- it is part of design data for which approval has been applied or granted; and.
- it is produced by, and within the scope of a production organisation that meets the requirements of Subpart F or G.

Marking of this Field Loadable Software must be in accordance with Subpart Q of Part-21. For practical reasons the marking could be on the software "container" (e.g. the CD carrying the software).

Notwithstanding the above, paragraph 21.A.307(b) (as amended by EU 2021/699, in force in May 2022) alleviates certain parts from the need of being accompanied with an EASA Form 1 to be eligible for installation.

Last updated:

25/11/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19012>

From 18 May 2022, a new requirement 21.A.307 becomes applicable (refer to Regulation (EU) 2021/699). This means that certain new parts do not require an EASA Form 1 for installation during maintenance. What are the implications of these regulatory changes, especially for General Aviation? Are 'standard parts' and 'owner-accepted-parts (former 21.A.307(c)-parts') impacted?

Answer

In essence, two new categories of new parts will be permitted to be installed during maintenance of European registered aircraft

without the parts being accompanied with an EASA Form 1, but with an alternative document instead:

- parts with negligible safety effect as identified by the holder of the design approval (according to 21.A.307(b)3);
- parts with negligible safety effect as identified by EASA in CS-STAN for standard changes/repairs (according to 21.A.307(b)4)

This will permit fabrication of the above parts by organisations which are not approved as production organisations (POA), which was considered too stringent for the manufacturing of parts having negligible safety impact in case of non-conformities.

Note that already for years, and after the new regulatory change will become applicable, 'standard parts' (parts i.a.w. 21.A.307(b)1) and 'owner-accepted-parts' (parts i.a.w. 21.A.307(b)2) are not required to be accompanied with an EASA Form 1 when they fulfil certain conditions.

For all the above-mentioned parts, as an alternative to the EASA Form 1, the rule requires a manufactured-issued document accompanying the part (for instance a certificate of conformity) to properly identify the part and trace it to the original manufacturer (refer to the new 21.A.307(c) for details). In respect of 'standard parts', this requirement is fulfilled with a 'dated delivery-note' from the manufacturer stating the name and the part-number (and the parts being engraved with that number). For parts obtained through a part's dealer, the dealer can add a scanned copy of the dated delivery note (or equivalent) from the manufacturer on the shipment of the parts. This also applies to 'owner-accepted-parts'.

Finally, note that the regulatory amendment excludes the need for 'EPA' marking (see new point 21.A.804(a)3) for all the above-mentioned parts, and that the requirements applicable for the maintenance of these parts are also alleviated as established in M.A.502 (d) and (e) and ML.A.502 (a) and (c) of regulation (EU) 2021/700.

Last updated:

28/03/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136280>

Regulations (EU) 2022/201 and 2022/203 introduce new requirements to Part 21 such as SMS, Occurrence Reporting, AltMoC. What is the view of EASA on the transition of production organisations to these requirements?

Answer

Regulations (EU) 2022/201 and 2022/203 amend Regulation (EU) No 748/2012 and introduce new requirements for Part 21 production organisations, which apply from 07 March 2023.

[This guide](#) offers the view of EASA on the transition of Part 21 production organisations to the new requirements, including SMS, based on Articles 9(5) and 9(6) of Regulation (EU) No 748/2012, as amended by Regulation (EU) 2022/203 and corrected by Regulation (EU) 2022/1253.

This is not binding material.

Last updated:

23/02/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/137623>

Additional Airworthiness specifications

Are the repairs / alterations / changes, that are validated under the FAA PART 26 rule, automatically acceptable under the new EASA AASR rule?

Answer

The damage tolerance (DT) data that has been approved by the FAA can be used to demonstrate compliance with Part-26 where

the requirements are equivalent. The means to accept that data and approve it or recognize it as approved data for use by EU operators is subject to specific considerations, therefore it should be discussed with EASA as part of the compliance plan that STC holders have to submit to EASA in accordance with point 26.331 of Part-26. Note that according to point 26.333, DT data already approved by EASA for STCs issued on or after 1st September 2003 does not need to be submitted for approval if it is confirmed to be complete by the STCH in the compliance plan.

Last updated:

21/05/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/127763>

Are the REG's for example on a Boeing model (that meets the FAA ASSR / PART 26 requirements) accepted by EASA? If so, automatically? Do the TCH's individually have to apply for the review and approval of the REG?

Answer

There is no automatic acceptance of REGs developed to meet the FAA ASSR requirements.

As a result, the TCH has to apply to EASA for the review and approval of its REGs. However, EASA expects that significant credit for the existing content will be given. Furthermore, this subject might be covered by future revisions of the technical implementation procedures TIPs. The specific issue with REGs is that because of the elapsed time between the introduction of the requirement in the US and the introduction of the requirement in the EU, these REGs may not have a completely appropriate or achievable timeline for the aircraft surveys. Although some operators in Europe may have implemented REGs in accordance with Part-M and AMC 20-20, there was no explicit mandate for REGs to be followed in Europe until Part-26 amendment introducing ageing aircraft structures rule. In some cases, the point at which surveys would need to be done according to some REGs has already been reached and therefore those REGs need to be revised. This revision shall also make it clear to operators that the REG can be used in Europe and it's approved by EASA. Once TCHs comply with the applicable parts of Part-26, EASA will revise the TCDS to state this.

Last updated:

21/05/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/127764>

Point 26.331: Shall a compliance plan be submitted to EASA by STC holders that do not hold structures in their DOA Scope of Work; and only owns STCs that are cabin related and do not introduce fatigue-critical modified structure (FCMS)?

Answer

If the STC does not affect the Fatigue Critical Baseline Structure (FCBS) and does not introduce the Fatigue Critical Modified Structure (FCMS), the STCH would not be affected by ageing aircraft requirements introduced in Part-26. However, it should be considered that sometimes interior changes may affect the FCBS, for instance introduction of a galley, or of a large portable water tank, that does not use existing TCH or otherwise approved attachment points for which the allowable loads are known.

Last updated:

21/05/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/127765>

As STC Holders how can we obtain the list of FCBS?

Answer

The TCH's are bound to make the FCBS list available. That may come with some arrangement being required, but typically we see the list of FCBS included in the structural repair manuals (SRMs). Unless a database with the necessary information is already available, or can be established conservatively by the STC holder, they should approach the TCH directly to obtain these info. The Agency will approve TCH FCBS lists, however the lists that have been produced to show compliance with CFR 14 Part 26 may already be available. In this case unless the TCH wishes to change the content due to specific reasons, EASA is not seeking to introduce changes to those lists and the EASA approval is expected to be straightforward.

Last updated:

21/05/2021

Link:
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/127766>
When not sure if FCBS is affected by an STC, is there any Compliance Plan required?**Answer**

There is a time limit for the submittal of the Compliance Plan to EASA, so if an STC holder can't establish easily that an STC has no impact on Fatigue Critical Structure then a conservative approach should be implemented. This means that the subject STC will be provisionally included in the compliance plan and additional information on how to deal with it will be provided. If an STC holder is sure that there are no STCs affecting the FCBS, then there's no need to submit a compliance plan.

Last updated:

21/05/2021

Link:
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/127767>
An EASA approved STC is applied to aircraft which are nowadays operated in the US under FAA regulations. Does the F&DT still need to be performed? Or could we wait until an actual operator contacts us?**Answer**

The need to act depends on the date of issuance of the STC approval, see points 26.333 and 26.334. For STCs issued on or after September 1, 2003 the STC holder must perform and submit DTE unless it has already been completed and approved. For STCs issued prior to 1st Sept 2003, the STC holder can wait for an operator request. STC holders do not need to respond to operator requests under this regulation if the operator is not subject to point 26.370(a)(ii), however, the STC holder may be subject to foreign authority requirements as a holder of an STC approved by a non-EU state.

Last updated:

21/05/2021

Link:
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/127769>
Will Appendix 1 Table A.1 be updated to list all aircraft who successfully apply for exceptions per 26.300 via their compliance plans?**Answer**

No. EASA recommends that TCHs make such information available. EASA will consider if other means of increasing awareness are necessary.

Last updated:

21/05/2021

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/127770>

There are many structural repairs manual (SRM) repairs to fatigue critical structure (FCS) however the SRM does not define the classification of the repair per 21A91/21.435. How does an operator know the repair classification if it has not been specified per SRM?

Answer

If the reinforcing repair and associated ICA is implemented in accordance with the SRM approved data at the time of the repair the CAMO should check whether that data is still valid according to the latest SRM and TCH REGs and if it is not clear as to what action to take then the CAMO should contact the TCH to establish whether new or revised DTI are required. All reinforcing repairs to FCS performed in accordance with the SRM should be reviewed for completeness and applicability of DTI as necessary in accordance with the TCH REGs, SRM or other applicable data. If the reinforcing repair and associated ICA is implemented in accordance with the SRM approved data at the time of the repair the CAMO should check whether that data is still valid according to the latest SRM and TCH REGs and if it is not clear as to what action to take then the CAMO should contact the TCH to establish whether new or revised DTI are required. All reinforcing repairs to FCS performed in accordance with the SRM should be reviewed for completeness and applicability of DTI as necessary in accordance with the TCH REGs, SRM or other applicable data.

Last updated:

21/05/2021

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/127771>

26.370(a) (ii): where an operator's fleet consists of a/c certificated after 2009 and therefore has no REG - there will be no "REG" survey compliance threshold for repairs. When does one therefore plan to review the DTI?

Answer

The TCH repairs and associated DTI for new aircraft types first certificated after January 11, 2008 may be assumed to be compliant with the applicable damage tolerant certification basis and therefore Part-26. A records review should normally be sufficient on such a new aircraft to identify if there are third party reinforcing repairs to FCS and establish if those repairs have been approved appropriately and provided with DTI where necessary. Ultimately, for such aircraft, and notwithstanding Part-26, the need to ensure compliance with the applicable certification basis is a primary consideration and it is therefore recommended that the records review should be conducted and any missing DTI incorporated in the AMP as soon as possible. The allowances for evaluating repairs to older aircraft provided by the guidance of AMC 20-20A for development of the TCH REGs are not envisaged to be necessary or utilized for these newer aircraft.

Last updated:

21/05/2021

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/127772>

Will rework repairs (blend out, trim-outs, etc.) be on a list of repairs that require DTE?

Answer

All repairs should be DT from now on, e.g. in the SRM, all the inspection data will be fully DT compliant. However, you won't be

expected to evaluate existing blend outs, trim-outs, etc.. The plan for addressing the existing repairs only needs to address what we call reinforcing repairs, where a strap or reinforcing doubler or similar part is added. From now on you will always get DT data from the DAHs that is DT compliant.

Last updated:

21/05/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/127773>

Is it our correct interpretation of 26.370 g(5) that a physical survey for repairs for aircraft certified as per CS 25.571 (Damage Tolerance) is not a must as long as repair records for the aircraft are considered complete by the CAMO and the requirements per TC REG are complied with for any known repair?

Answer

Yes, that is correct, it's not a must as long as repair records are considered complete by the CAMO. It is recommended in some cases, particularly for older aircraft, because the records are not always as good as expected. Confidence in records will increase with the newer aircraft in general terms, with less repairs and with adherence to the stronger evolving requirements for records and data management.

Last updated:

21/05/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/127774>

Who needs to evaluate a change / repair in case the original design organization for the change / repair no longer exists?

Answer

In this case the operator needs to find an appropriately qualified third party to perform the DTE and develop DTI. An approved design organization could take that evaluation on.

Last updated:

21/05/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/127775>

Typically a DTI has a threshold and interval, how should the operator establish that start time (to calculate the 1st due inspection) if an unrecorded Mod/repair was found during the survey, and not knowing the cycles/landing at Incorp of the Mod/repair? Is that covered by the Reg?

Answer

There is guidance on this in AMC 20-20A, for a repair that may have exceeded the threshold. One can make the conservative assumption that repairs were implemented soon after the aeroplane went into service, however, the repair may have exceeded the formal threshold, so the AMC provides generically agreed grace periods. These periods, typically 12 – 24 months will be specified by the TCH in the REGs and were agreed some time ago and should be followed by operators unless a specific concern arises. AMC 20-20A provides also guidance regarding the way to handle inspections for rotatable parts.

Last updated:

21/05/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/127776>

Regulation (EU) 2021/699 introduced point 21.A.101(h) that refers, among others, to point 26.320 of Regulation (EU) 2015/640 but this point is not present in the said regulation. Could you please clarify?

Answer

The reference to point 26.320 is an oversight and it will be deleted at the first opportunity.

Last updated:

21/05/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/127777>

Basic Regulation

What does the EASA Basic Regulation apply to? How many extensions of the scope have there been?

Answer

The initial EASA Basic Regulation - Regulation (EC) No 1592/2002 of 15 July 2002 – included airworthiness and environmental protection of products, parts and appliances in the scope of European Union competence. It made the Agency responsible for the airworthiness and environmental certification of all aeronautical products, parts, and appliances designed, manufactured, maintained or used by persons under the regulatory oversight of EU Member States. Furthermore, the Agency was put in charge of the oversight of EU organisations involved in the design of aeronautical products, parts and appliances as well as of non-EU organisations involved in the manufacture or maintenance of such products. In these domains the Agency took over the certification tasks that were under the responsibility of Member States.

Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 February 2008 extended the scope of Union competence to air operations, flight crew licenses and aircraft used by third country operators into, within or out of the Community. It also gave the Agency additional operational responsibilities. In the field of flight crew licensing, the Agency was made responsible for the approval and oversight of pilot training organisations and aero-medical centers located outside the territory of the Community; the certification of flight simulation training devices used by the training organisations it certifies, or located outside the territory of the Community, or located in the Community territory, if the member State concerned so requests. In the field of operations, the Agency was given the power to determine corrective actions and disseminate information to react without undue delay to a problem affecting the safety of air operations. Regarding third country operators, the Agency is competent for the authorisation and oversight of commercial operators; for the oversight of non-commercial operators, when they need to declare their activities; and for the authorisation of third country aircraft when they or their crews do not comply with ICAO Standards.

The scope of EU law and the Agency' responsibilities were further extended by Regulation (EC) No 1108/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009. The provisions of the Regulation are the basis for precise, uniform and binding rules for aerodrome operations and operators, air traffic management and air navigation service provision. With the extension to ATM/ANS, the Agency was empowered to take the necessary measures related to certification and oversight of Pan-European and third country ATM/ANS organisations, as well as for the air traffic controllers' training organisations located outside the territory of the Community.

The entry into force of Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 of the European Parliament and of the Council on 11 of September 2018 consolidated the scope of European Union competence to cover the full spectrum of the aviation landscape and reinforce the European aviation system as a whole.

The Basic Regulation now applies to all unmanned aircraft irrespective of their operating mass. The only exception are certain small tethered aircraft in Annex I of the Basic Regulation which will remain under national competence.

The Basic Regulation was also extended to ground handling services.

The Basic Regulation also explicitly includes the design of airspace structures – which is not considered as a service but a specific Member State function.

The Basic Regulation continues not to apply to aircraft while carrying out military, customs, police, search and rescue, firefighting, border control, coastguard or similar activities or services, nor to several aircraft mentioned in Annex I to the Basic Regulation.

However, a novelty of the new Basic Regulation is the introduction of the possibility for changes in scope due to the operation of several opt-in and opt-out possibilities.

Last updated:

23/01/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/70133>

What is the scope of the Basic Regulation regarding aerodromes foreseen under Article 2(1)(e)?

Answer

The definition of which aerodromes are included is slightly changed in relation to the previous regulation. The requirements for aerodromes to be open to public use and serve commercial air transport remain the same. But the remaining criteria have slightly changed.

The new Basic Regulation applies to the design, maintenance and operations of aerodromes - and the safety related aerodrome equipment used thereon – that:

- are open to public use;
- serve commercial air transport; and:
- have a paved instrument runway of 800 m or more, or exclusively serve helicopters using instrument approach and departure procedures.

Last updated:

23/01/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/70134>

What are Opt-ins and Opt-outs?

Answer

Opt-in and Opt-out are ways to refer to certain provisions in the new Basic Regulation (NBR) that allow for flexibility in its scope. An Opt-in refers to a situation where a product or activity there would normally be excluded becomes subject to the scope of the Regulation; the opposite case is referred to as an opt-out.

The new Basic Regulation provides for 2 Opt-in and 2 Opt-out possibilities.

- Opt-in for state operations/aircraft (article 2(6) NBR).
- This opt-in allows Member States (MS) to decide to apply EASA rules to activities that are normally excluded by article 2(3)(a) NBR – military, customs, police, search and rescue, firefighting, border control, coastguard or similar activities or services.
- Opt-in for Annex II aircraft (article 2(4) NBR).
- This opt-in allows a design organization to choose to have the design, production and maintenance of a new product to be subject to EASA rules, when that product would normally be excluded from the scope of the NBR through article 2(3)(d).
- Opt-out for light aircraft (article 2(8) NBR).
- This opt-out allows MS to decide to exclude certain manned light aircraft from the scope of the EASA system, making them subject to their national rules. The opt-out will not create obligations for other MS.
- Opt-out for 'small' aerodromes (article 2(7) NBR).

This opt-out allows MS to decide to exempt the design, maintenance and operations of certain aerodromes from the EASA rules,

when that aerodrome handles no more than 10 000 commercial air transport passengers and 850 cargo operations per year.

Last updated:

23/01/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/70135>

Does the opt-in possibility for Annex I aircraft referred to in Article 2(4) apply also to air operations and air crew licensing?

Answer

The opt-in in Article 2(4) does not cover air operations and air crew, but only design, production and maintenance of the aircraft concerned. So for aircraft to which this opt-in applies, the Basic Regulation will apply to airworthiness (design, production, maintenance), but for the air operations and licensing areas the aircraft will remain excluded from the scope of the Regulation, meaning that national rules will apply. So the situation would be as under the initial Basic Regulation (Regulation (EC) 1592/2002), where the rules were harmonised in the airworthiness field but air operations and air crew licensing remained under the national competence (without mutual recognition).

Last updated:

23/01/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/70136>

What is the opt-in for state operations/ aircraft? What is the opt-in for military aircraft?

Answer

One of novelties introduced by the new Basic Regulation is the possibility for member States to decide to apply the Basic Regulation to aircraft performing State activities (military, police, coast guard, firefighting, search and rescue and other similar operations and services), which would normally be subject to national rules.

The main advantage of the opt-in is that once the aircraft are in the EASA system, they would benefit from mutual recognition of certificates, and therefore move more freely within the EU, enjoy international recognition, and increase their market value.

In relation to this opt-in, the important elements to highlight are its voluntary and modular nature - the decision to apply the BR, and the extent to which it is applied remains in the hands of the Member States. This means that the opt-in does not need to extend to the full EASA system (from airworthiness, maintenance and production to OPS and licensing) nor to the full range of State operations under the responsibility of the Member States:

- A Member State may decide to opt-in for police operations, but not for search and rescue;
- Equally, the Member States may decide to opt-in for a certain category/type of aircraft and not for others (eg, opt-in for rotorcraft but not for fixed wing);
- Finally, a Member State may decide to opt-in for one area of the EASA system and not for others (e.g. opt-in for the airworthiness of the aircraft but not for the operations).

It is important to highlight in relation to modular opt-ins (for instance restricted to airworthiness or OPS/licensing) that within each area the opt-in has to be complete – it is not possible to opt-in for initial airworthiness but not for the continued airworthiness/maintenance of the aircraft, for example. Another important element to highlight is that in certain cases there will be the need for specific measures to address risks created by the disconnection from the total system approach – e.g. if a Member State opts-in for the airworthiness/maintenance but not for the operations, appropriate measures need to be put in place to ensure the continued airworthiness of the aircraft.

Due to this modularity, each opt-in case will be different from the next, and requires an individual approach.

The Basic Regulation establishes only one condition for the opt-in, which is that the provisions covered by the opt-in can be effectively applied. The formalities needed to implement the opt-in are simple:

- The Member State needs to issue a decision; from the date of that decision, the opt-in applies immediately;
- The Member State then notifies this decision to the Commission and the Agency, together with relevant information;
- The Commission, after consulting the Agency, establishes whether the condition for the opt-in is fulfilled. If it is not, then the Commission issues a decision. Once notified, the Member State needs to modify or revoke its decision.

Last updated:

29/01/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/70137>

In the context of the exclusion of some operations from the scope of the Basic Regulation - such as military, police, coast guard and search and rescue operations - how to interpret the sentence in Article 2(3)(a) “similar activities or services under the control and responsibility of a Member State, undertaken in the public interest by or on behalf of a body vested with the powers of a public authority”?

Answer

The purpose of this sentence is to extend the exclusion of the application of the Basic Regulation to other type of operations not specially mentioned in Article 2(6), but that share some of the same characteristics. Looking at the operations that are specifically mentioned (military, coast guard, search and rescue, etc), they have in common the fact that they are performed in the service of public interest – which may sometimes require the operators to assume different levels of risk than those foreseen in the Basic regulation for normal civil operations.

The Basic Regulation clarifies that such activities and services should be carried out “**under the control and responsibility of Member State and undertaken in the public interest by or on behalf of a body vested with public authority powers** (Article 2(3)(a)). The Regulation does not further define the terms “under the control and responsibility of MS and “undertaken in the public interest” – this leaves the responsibility for determining whether a certain activity falls within the scope of the Basic Regulation, in the hands of the Member States, as part of their general duty to implement EU Law. The Agency will monitor the exercise of this responsibility by the Member States as part of its standardisation responsibilities under the Basic Regulation. In our view the different wording only clarifies already existing practice and should not change substantially the approach towards state services/activities.

Last updated:

23/01/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/70138>

What are the differences between an implementing act and a delegated act? Have any delegated acts been adopted?

Answer

The Lisbon Treaty makes a distinction between two sets of Commission implementing rules – implementing acts (IA) and delegated acts (DA). Delegated and implementing acts are subject to different procedures for their adoption. More information on these two types of act can be found in the European Commission's website (https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/law-making-process/adopting-eu-law/implementing-and-delegated-acts_en#documents).

It is also important to highlight that this difference in procedure for the adoption of DA and IA at Commission level does not affect the EASA rulemaking procedure, which will remain the same regardless of the type of act that will in the end be adopted.

Last updated:

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/70139>**What will happen with the exemptions granted by Member States under Regulation (EC) 216/2008 Article 4(3b)?****Answer**

Exemptions granted under Regulations 216/2008 **will remain valid** according to article 2(7) and supported by recital 8.

The Basic Regulation requires Member States to notify the Commission and the Agency the exemptions previously granted under Article 4(3b) of Regulation 216/2008 to ensure transparency and legal certainty – this is merely informative, no additional assessment against the requirements of the new BR is required.

Under Regulation 2019/1139 Member States can continue to exempt certain aerodromes from the scope of the Regulation, however now Member States must follow stricter requirements – in order to grant an exemption, they need to ensure that the exemption does not endanger compliance with the essential requirements.

Last updated:

23/01/2019

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/70140>**Which kind of measures can the Commission apply against the National aviation authorities who do not comply with their obligations deriving from Regulation (EU) No 2018/1139 and of the delegated and implementing acts?****Answer**

The implementation of the Basic Regulation and its implementing rules by Member States is subject to the European Union oversight. According to Article 85 of the Basic Regulation - Monitoring of Member States - the Agency shall assist the Commission in monitoring such implementation by conducting standardisation inspections and monitoring activities. Upon the standardisation inspection the Agency establishes an inspection report where it addresses findings identified during the inspection and which will be sent to the Member State concerned and to the Commission. In cases of non-compliance, the Commission may initiate an infringement procedure.

Additionally, in accordance with Article 67, the Commission, on its own initiative or at the request of a Member State or the Agency, may initiate a comitology procedure to decide whether a certificate issued or declaration made in accordance with the Basic Regulation or of delegated and implementing acts adopted on the basis thereof, effectively complies with them. In case of non-compliance, the Commission shall require, based on a recommendation of EASA, the Member State responsible of the oversight of a certificate to take appropriate corrective action, such as limitation or suspension of that certificate. Moreover, once the Commission issues such a decision, the obligation of mutual recognition of certificates ceases to apply to the other Member States. Once the Commission has sufficient evidence that appropriate corrective action has been taken, it will decide that mutual recognition shall be restored.

The oversight support mechanism in Article 66 is a new mechanism foreseen in the Basic Regulation meant to deal with situations where the Member State has shown a serious and persisting failure in complying with the safety provisions; in other words, it is a tool to react to immediate safety concerns. Article 66 of the Basic Regulation provides that in certain cases and only when the conditions described in the article the Commission can request the Member State concerned and EASA to establish jointly a temporary technical assistance programme, where the Agency would help the Member State to restore the acceptable level of safety. In accordance to Article 66 (2), during the oversight support programme, the Member State and the Agency would work together and the operations in the affected Member State can continue while the deficiencies are corrected, hence no negative impact to the aviation industry in the concerned Member State.

It is also important to note, that differently to Articles 64 and 65 of the new Basic Regulation, the support mechanism does not result in reallocation of responsibilities for the tasks related to certification, oversight and enforcement. This means that even during the oversight support programme, the Member State concerned remains responsible for its tasks, Article 66 (2).

While the Commission has a power to request that the Member State concerned and EASA establish an oversight support programme and the Member State concerned should make all possible efforts to restore its ability to perform its tasks, the article also provides a Member State a possibility to step out from the programme. If the Member State concerned recognises that the programme cannot be successfully implemented as planned, it should inform the Commission, and either reallocate responsibility for the certification, oversight and enforcement tasks to which the deficiencies pertain to the Agency or another Member State, or take other measures to resolve the deficiencies (Article 66(4)).

Last updated:

23/01/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/70141>

What is the 'Basic Regulation'?

Answer

The 'Basic Regulation' is Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 July 2018 on common rules in the field of civil aviation and establishing a European Union Aviation Safety Agency, and amending Regulations (EC) No 2111/2005, (EC) No 1008/2008, (EU) No 996/2010, (EU) No 376/2014 and Directives 2014/30/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council, and repealing Regulations (EC) No 552/2004 and (EC) No 216/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council and Council Regulation (EEC) No 3922/91.

Under the EU legal order, the Basic Regulation has general application. It is binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States. The main objective of the Basic Regulation is to “establish and maintain a high uniform level of civil aviation safety in the Union” — Article 1(1).

The Basic Regulation sets the legal basis for the creation of EASA, defines EASA's competences and establishes the scope of common aviation safety requirements. For that purpose, the Basic Regulation confers on the European Commission the power to adopt implementing and delegated acts which detail how to comply with the essential requirements of the Basic Regulation and regulate the subject matters included in its scope, in particular airworthiness, aircrew licensing, environmental compatibility related to products aircraft operations including third-country operators, ATM/ANS including air traffic controllers licensing, aerodromes and ground handling, and unmanned aircraft.

The Agency assists the Commission in the preparation of proposals for amendments to the Basic Regulation and of detailed delegated and implementing acts (Article 76). The documents that the Agency submits to the Commission for those purposes take the form of opinions, which are published on the EASA website.

Further [FAQs on the Basic Regulation](#)

Last updated:

07/03/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19107>

Under which provisions of the EASA Basic Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2018/1139) is a reallocation of responsibility between a Member State (MS) and EASA possible?

Answer

Two articles allows such reallocation of responsibility:

- Article 64: Reallocation upon request of MS, and

- Article 65: Reallocation upon request of organisations operating in more than one MS.

Last updated:

06/07/2022

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136768>**Where can I find additional information and explanations on the reallocation of responsibility pursuant to Article 64 or Article 65 of EASA Basic Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2018/1139)?****Answer**

Additional information on the applicability of these Articles as well as detailed explanations of the processes to be followed should be requested to the following email: aoc [at] easa.europa.eu

Last updated:

06/07/2022

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136769>**Which approvals can benefit from Article 64 and Article 65 of EASA Basic Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2018/1139)?****Answer**

Approvals issued by Member States such as Continuous Airworthiness Maintenance Organisations (CAMO), Air Operator Certificates (AOC) and Approved Training Organisations (ATO) may be subject to such a reallocation of responsibilities.

Last updated:

06/07/2022

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136770>**Are the Article 64 and Article 65 of EASA Basic Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2018/1139) available for initial issuance or for existing approvals?****Answer**

The provisions of Article 64 and Article 65 are available both for initial approvals and for already existing approvals.

Last updated:

06/07/2022

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136771>

ATCO Licensing

Should an STDI endorsement be issued for an OJTI when the person has not successfully completed an OJTI training course, but has successfully completed a training course for the STDI endorsement?**Answer**

The competences to be gained at the end of the practical instructional techniques course for the OJTI or STDI endorsement are the same (see AMC2 ATCO.D.090(a)(1)), but there may be differences in the assessment (see AMC1 ATCO.D.090(a)(3)) and there may also be natural differences between the courses themselves based on the applicants they are addressing.

Last updated:

29/06/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19537>

Can a Member State accept an ATCO license issued in accordance with the laws of a third country?

Answer

In accordance with Article 68 of Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 (Basic Regulation) national competent authorities may accept certificates issued in accordance with laws of a third country only where such possibility is provided for in: (a) international agreement concerning recognition of certificates concluded between the Union and a third country, (b) a delegated act adopted by the Commission, or (c) in absence of the recognition agreement concluded by the EU and of the relevant delegated acts, also on the basis of an international agreement concluded by a Member State with a third country before the entry into force of the former EASA basic regulation and notified to the Commission.

Last updated:

22/02/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21805>

Should an STDI endorsement be issued for an OJTI when the medical certificate has been withdrawn?

Answer

Yes, provided that the ATCO fulfils the requirements set out in ATCO.C.035 'Application for STDI endorsement', or ATCO.C.040 'Validity of STDI endorsement'.

Last updated:

29/06/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19536>

Why is there a difference in the requirements on the responsibility for undertaking assessment of previous competence in ATCO.B.010(b) compared with ATCO.B.001(d) and ATCO.B.005(e) and how should the difference be interpreted? Some say that the assessment could be conducted by a unit training organisation, while others are of the opinion that the assessment and if needed, additional rating training is to be done by an initial training organisation.

Answer

The purpose of not referring to initial training organisations in ATCO.B.010(b) is to leave some flexibility and to allow the possibility also for a unit training organisation to perform the assessment. Recognising that in most cases an initial training organisation would be in best position to perform the assessment of previous competence, it needs to be taken into consideration that training for rating endorsements is often conducted by unit training organisations. As the privileges of the rating endorsements are associated with the rating in question, the unit training organisation could also be suited to evaluate the previous competence. In any case, in accordance with AMC1 ATCO.B.010(b) the assessment should be based on the requirements set out in Part ATCO, subpart D, Sections 2 (initial training requirements).

Having considered the above mentioned, the competent authority should evaluate, which training organisation under its

supervision is eligible to perform the assessment of previous competence taking into account amongst others the requirements of AMC1 ATCO.B.010(b).

The result of the assessment of previous competence may evidence that there is a need for a training 'course' to recuperate an adequate level of skills to enable the applicant starting unit training. In this case, it is up to the Training Organisation performing the assessment to decide what the training needs are depending on the results of the assessment of previous competence. This may also include Initial Training, if the gaps identified so require.

Last updated:

21/12/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21806>

Do STDI instructors need a valid English language endorsement in their licences to obtain and to exercise their privileges?

Answer

The language endorsement requirement concerns also STDIs. The rationale is that an ATCO licence holder shall not exercise the privileges of the licences unless he/she has a valid language proficiency endorsement and exercising the privilege of the STDI endorsement is seen as exercising the privileges of the licence.

Last updated:

21/12/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21807>

Regulation 805/2011 requires one or more rating endorsements, including TCL and OCN, to be added to an ACS rating. However, Regulation 2015/340 does not appear to allow for both the TCL and OCN ratings to be added to an ACS rating at the same time.

Answer

EASA acknowledges that both TCL and OCN rating endorsements could be associated to the ACS rating at the same time. As this amendment will require a change to the IR, EASA will address it with its next Opinion to EC resulting from rulemaking activities on 'Maintaining of ATCO IR/AMC/GM'.

Last updated:

21/12/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21808>

If an assessors is assessed medically unfit, is he/she is allowed to perform or conduct assessments?

Answer

EASA acknowledges that assessors are only required to possess a valid medical certificate, when they exercise the privileges of the assessor endorsement as described in ATCO.C.045(b)(3) and (4), i.e. performing assessments leading to the issue, revalidation and renewal of unit endorsements. He/she could still carry out assessments as in the cases specified in ATCO.C.045 (b)(1), (2) and (5), i.e. assessment related to initial training and to the issue of OJT/STDI and assessor endorsements (provided that he/she has the required experience).

Furthermore, in reference to the introductory part of Appendix 1 to Annex II 'Format for licence - AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLER

LICENCE', paragraph (b) that states "The licence shall be accompanied by a valid medical certificate, except when only STD1 privileges are exercised", EASA acknowledges that it needs to be aligned, which privileges require the existence of a valid medical certificate and it will be addressed with EASA next Opinion to EC resulting from rulemaking activities on 'Maintaining of ATCO IR/AMC/GM'.

Last updated:

21/12/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21811>

What should be assessed and/or examined in relation to conversion training? When are the assessments/examinations to take place and who can conduct the assessments?

Answer

The conversion training courses shall include the determination of the examination and/or assessment methods. The examination and/or assessment should take place during the conversion training course or at least before the ATCOs exercise the privileges of their licences in the changed operational environment. Examinations and assessments should be conducted by appropriately qualified personnel having detailed knowledge of the training objectives and the subjects, topics and subtopics being examined or assessed.

Last updated:

21/12/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21813>

Should an STD1 endorsement be issued for an OJTI who is no longer competent? In such case, is there a possibility for a temporary issue of the STD1 endorsement or can the OJTI endorsement be retained on the licence if it is anticipated that the OJTI would regain competency?

Answer

ATCO.C.010 states that the OJTI endorsement entitles the person to also exercise the privileges of an STD1 endorsement (that is, to provide practical training on Synthetic Training Devices (STDs)). Thus, there is no need to introduce both endorsements simultaneously into the licence during the validity of the OJTI endorsement. Once the OJTI endorsement cannot be exercised, it can be exchanged into an STD1 endorsement, for which the validity date shall correspond to the validity date of the original OJTI endorsement, until its next revalidation.

Last updated:

29/06/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19535>

What should be assessed and/or examined in relation to refresher training? When are the assessments/examinations to take place and who can conduct the assessments?

Answer

ATCO.B.025(a)(5) and (7) require the air navigation service provider as part of the UCS to define processes for assessing competence, including assessment of the refresher training subjects according to ATCO.D.080(b) and to define the processes to identify the topics, subtopics and training methods for continuation training (including refresher training).

ATCO.D.080(c) stipulates that when subjects of refresher training refresh the skills of ATCOs, performance objectives have to be

established and included in the training syllabus.

In this context, GM1 ATCO.D.080 further clarifies that 'refresher training subjects may include rarely used procedures and practices, such as seasonally dependent procedures, trends and observations from occurrence reports and results from normal operation surveys'. Consequently, the use of STD or other simulated environments in this case would allow for the assessment of these procedures and practices, at any time and with the desired effect.

In accordance with AMC1 ATCO.B.025(a)(5);(6), subjects taught during refresher training, such as standard practices and procedures, abnormal and emergency situations and human factors, should be assessed on STD or in other simulated environments and/or examined. This is because it might not be possible to observe the skills related to all refresher training subjects (e.g. those related to seasonally dependent procedures) during the regular assessment.

Assessments are required on subjects that are of practical nature, while other subjects should be examined. When defining the need for assessment and/or examination, attention should be paid on the training objectives (what is the required performance/taxonomy level) and the processes and method for assessment/examination.

It is left to the Training Organisation, in coordination with the Air Navigation Service Provider, to decide and to arrange for the assessment of refresher training subjects in the context of the 'regular' assessment purposed for the revalidation of the unit endorsement. In this case, a clear link between the refresher training subjects and the performance objectives of the assessment needs to be established.

If the assessment of refresher training subjects is taking place during the assessment leading to the revalidation of the unit endorsement, the person conducting the assessment shall be a holder of an assessor endorsement. Should the assessment take place during the refresher training course, the assessments should be conducted by appropriately qualified personnel having detailed knowledge of the training objectives and the subjects, topics and subtopics being examined or assessed. It could be either assessors or e.g. human factors specialists.

In case that the Training Organisation certified for refresher training does not hold a certificate for ATC provision, the processes for assessment and examination should be addressed in the specific agreement concluded between the Training Organisation and the an ANSP.

Last updated:

21/12/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21812>

How should the pages and the information in Item XIIa 'Rating and endorsements with expiry date' be arranged within the ATCO licence format?

Answer

Item XIIa 'Ratings and endorsements with expiry dates' could be arranged in two ways:

- either by 1 table in landscape orientation – using 2 pages of 1/8 A4 (e.g. Pages 5 and 6); or
- by 2 tables in portrait orientation – each of them rotated with the respective heading (e.g. Pages 5 and 6).

Last updated:

25/07/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21166>

How should ratings and rating endorsements be linked together in the proposed licence format? There are two rating endorsements (Terminal Control (TCL) and Oceanic Control (OCN)) that can be attached either to the Approach Control Surveillance (APS) or the Area Control Surveillance (ACS) rating. The licence template establishes in point IX a place for ratings and another one for rating endorsements, with no link between these two. The question is how to differentiate between the two: to which rating

(APS or ACS) corresponds each one of those rating endorsements (TCL or OCN)? Is it necessary at all to make the distinction?

Answer

The 'pairing' of the current rating(s) and rating endorsement(s) is visible in point XIIa, which lists the ratings and rating endorsements according to the unit endorsements. Apart from that, there is no need to distinguish further.

Last updated:

15/06/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19514>

ATCOs who already hold a licence with an on-the-job training instructor (OJTI) endorsement according to Regulation (EU) No 805/2011, could they have their licence replaced to include the synthetic training device instructor (STDI) endorsement, with the same expiry dates?

Answer

ATCO.C.010 states that the OJTI endorsement entitles the person to also exercise the privileges of an STDI endorsement (that is, to provide practical training on Synthetic Training Devices (STDs)). Thus, there is no need to introduce both endorsements simultaneously into the same licence, until the OJTI is valid. Once the OJTI endorsement cannot be exercised anymore, it can be exchanged into an STDI endorsement whose validity date shall correspond to the validity date of the original OJTI endorsement, until its next revalidation.

Last updated:

15/06/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19516>

Is the same 'practical instructional techniques course' valid for obtaining/revalidating the OJTI/STDI licence endorsements?

Answer

The competences to be gained at the end of the practical instructional techniques course for the OJTI or STDI endorsement are the same (see AMC2 ATCO.D.090(a)(1)), but there may be differences in the assessment (see AMC1 ATCO.D.090(a)(3)) and there may also be natural differences between the courses themselves based on the applicants they are addressing.

Last updated:

15/06/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19517>

How to deal with practical instructors employed at an initial training centre who no longer hold a medical certificate?

Answer

If the practical instructor was holding an OJTI endorsement, it can be exchanged for an STDI endorsement. If the practical instructor was holding an STDI endorsement though, there is no need for exchange.

Last updated:

15/06/2015

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19518>**How to issue a licence with STDI privileges for applicants not holding a licence and associated ratings issued in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 805/2011?****Answer**

If the ratings are issued in accordance with Directive 2006/23/EC, they are 'grandfathered'. Thus, a licence with an STDI endorsement could be issued to applicants who fulfil the provisions of ATCO.C.035. In order to exercise the privileges of the STDI endorsement, the holder has to demonstrate compliance with ATCO.C.030(b) including demonstrated knowledge of current operational practices.

If the ratings are issued earlier than the Directive, the competent authority would need to assess the equivalence between the old (ICAO?) ratings and the current ones. In the case where the applicant has not held a licence (because there were no licences in the Member State in question), the applicant would need to provide evidence for the working experience in the ATC domain in question and related training records to the competent authority, which would need to evaluate whether the applicant fulfils the requirements of ATCO.C.035.

Last updated:

15/06/2015

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19519>**Is there a requirement for an ATCO who holds an ACS rating to also hold an ACP rating?****Answer**

No, there is no such explicit requirement in the Regulation. This depends on the service provided. If Air Traffic Control (ATC) is only provided with the use of surveillance equipment, there is no need for the ATCO to also hold the procedural rating, e.g. for applying vertical separation in emergency situations, this should be part of the ACS training. If the contingency plans also include procedures for service continuity by means of providing (limited) procedural ATC, a procedural rating should be required. It also needs to be taken into account what applies for the maintenance and revalidation of the unit endorsement.

Last updated:

15/06/2015

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19520>

It was explained at the ATCO Regulation Workshop in March 2015 that in the event of surveillance failure which results in having to switch to a procedural environment, once the failure is contained and the environment made safe, the provision of any further service would require an Approach Control Procedural (APP) or an Area Control Procedural (ACP) rating. What about if the unit or sector, operated in a rigid environment of 1 departure every 10 minutes, is to be handed over to a surveillance unit/sector and with no other traffic involved, would this be considered a requirement for the procedural rating?

Answer

As a rule of thumb, the provision of procedural ATC requires a procedural rating. It should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis,

e.g. whether procedural separation/clearances/procedures would be used.

Last updated:

15/06/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19521>

The removal of the age limit from an ATCO licence is a difference against the ICAO Standards And Recommended Practices (SARPs). Are Member States required to file a difference to ICAO or has EASA already notified ICAO on behalf of Member States?

Answer

Filing of differences falls within the competence of the Member States, since EASA (or the EU) is not an ICAO member. EASA, however, prepares the Compliance Checklist for ICAO Annex 1 in relation to Regulation (EU) 2015/340, which will be communicated to the Member States via the network of the European National Continuous Monitoring Coordinators.

Last updated:

15/06/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19522>

Initial Training Centre Assessors will be granted 'grandfather rights', according to Regulation (EU) 2015/340, with regard to the assessor endorsement. Shall this assessor privilege be endorsed on their licence?

Answer

Such privileges are not automatically 'grandfathered'. It is up to the evaluation of the Member State how to convert the privileges of personnel acting as examiners or assessors for initial training (according to Regulation (EU) No 805/2011) into an assessor endorsement (according to Regulation (EU) 2015/340). Based on that evaluation, Member States may establish conversion requirements for this personnel in order to be issued with an assessor endorsement. The conversion shall be performed in accordance with the opt-out derogations.

Last updated:

15/06/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19523>

Appendix 1 of Annex 2 is quite prescriptive as regards the content of the licence. It indicates that each page of the licence shall be one-eighth A4 (first quality paper). Do we need to identify all the pages with numbers and do they all belong to the same piece of paper? For the optional item V (holder's address), should we decide not to ask for it, can we delete line V from the licence?

Answer

The licence should ideally be one piece of paper of six pages (including the list of abbreviations). In this case, there is no need to identify the pages with numbers as the identification is done by the numbers of the columns (items). If the licence is printed on separate pages, the licence number and the date of issue, as well as page numbers, should be printed on each page. Item V (holder's address) can be left empty, or it can be omitted from the licence, while still maintaining the layout of page 2.

Last updated:

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19524>

Is it acceptable to have a licence with electronic elements, with the possibility for the ATCO to get the data via the Internet or by connecting the licence to a computer? Is a credit card format acceptable? If yes, can we have on the recto of the card the elements of page one, and on the verso the items of page 2? Is it compulsory to have all the permanent items displayed on the plastic card? Are there any EASA requirements for the font type and size, as well as the size of the card? For the signature of the holder, is it acceptable to use the signature on the application form and duplicate it on the licence (credit card format)?

Answer

The licence format, as set out in Regulation (EU) 2015/340, is developed in line with the specifications for personnel licences as required by ICAO Annex 1, and its purpose is to facilitate the recognition of licences at EU level. The means used to display the required information is left to the competent authorities. It should be either first quality paper and/or other suitable material, including plastic cards, which prevent or readily show any alterations or erasures. Any entries to or deletions from the form should be clearly authorised by the competent authority. The size of each page shall be one-eighth A4. There are no EASA requirements for the font type and size. Both the permanent and variable items shall be displayed on or as part of the licence. Only the variable items may appear on a separate or detachable part of the main form. The signature of the holder (as 'permanent' item) should appear on the 'main part' of the licence.

Last updated:

15/06/2015

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19525>

What does 'national licence endorsement' mean in GM1 ATCO.AR.D.001(c)?

Answer

Following Standardisation feedback, the Guidance Material in question has been introduced with the aim of allowing competent authorities to enter any additional licensing information deemed necessary, such as national licence endorsements and/or Radio-Telephony (R/T) licences. National licence endorsements may be issued for various reasons. They may convey additional information, according to national needs, but they are not subject to recognition at EU level. Such national licence endorsements may not limit or extend the privileges granted by the licence itself. It is important to note that they are not to be mistaken with national rating endorsements, which cannot be maintained according to Regulation (EU) 2015/340.

Last updated:

15/06/2015

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19526>

In case we have specimen of the new licences before issuing them, would EASA be in the position to verify whether they comply with the new requirements?

Answer

EASA would naturally advise competent authorities via various forms and fora on the implementation of the new requirements. However, the advance verification of licences not yet issued would not be in line with the shared competences in this domain and

wouldn't be compatible with the Agency's task to conduct the standardisation inspections neither.

Last updated:

15/06/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19527>

What are the assessor prerequisites for assessing applicant OJTIs and applicant assessors?

Answer

In order to assess for the purpose of the practical instructional techniques course for OJTIs/STDIs, the person shall hold an assessor endorsement and shall have 3 years' OJT/STDI experience. This means that only persons who have held at least an ATCO licence can perform such assessments. Currency is not a requirement. This is to ensure that the person in question is capable of maintaining safety during the assessment and capable of fully assessing the skills that are needed for the future OJT in relation to maintaining safety. The human factor expert in the example may be the most appropriate person to deliver the course, but is not trained for assessing their applicants in the operational context and to verify the safety element to be possessed by the future OJT.

Last updated:

15/06/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19528>

ATCO.A.010 'Exchange of licence' — Is this procedure valid also for the medical certificate?

Answer

No, there is no need to exchange the medical certificate. Medical certificates issued by any certified aero-medical examiner (AME)/ aero-medical centre (AeMC) are mutually recognised. Please, refer to GM1 ATCO.A.010 'Recognition of licences and certificates'.

Last updated:

15/06/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19529>

ATCO.AR.D.001(a)(2) ...authorisation for assessors... — Does this mean that the competent authority shall specifically approve the assessors who will renew and revalidate unit endorsements?

Answer

It is up to the competent authority to decide whether they want to delegate this task to (certain) assessors. If they do, a procedure has to be established and the assessors have to be specifically authorised for the task.

Last updated:

15/06/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19530>

Radio-telephony — I cannot find any provisions in Regulation (EU) 2015/340 requiring ATCOs to hold a radio-telephony certificate in order to be able to provide Air Traffic Services (ATS). There is also

nothing on this in the licence form.

Answer

There are no requirements in Regulation (EU) 2015/340 for a radio-telephony licence. These requirements stem from the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) and are dealt with at national level. However, in accordance with GM1 ATCO.AR.D.001(c), there is the possibility for the competent authority to include the radio-telephony licence in point XIII of the licence format, if they so wish.

Last updated:

15/06/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19531>

It is still unclear whether training for a rating endorsement is initial training or unit training. Is it up to the competent authority to decide? If training for a rating endorsement is considered to be initial training, does the ATS unit providing the training need to be certified for initial training?

Answer

Training for rating endorsements can be both initial training and unit training (see ATCO.D.005(a)(1) and (2)). It is up to the training organisation to define the training and include it either in the initial training plan or as part of a unit endorsement course, both of which have to be approved by the competent authority. If the training for a rating endorsement is provided by an ATS unit as part of a unit endorsement course, the ATS unit (Air Navigation Service Provider (ANSP)) has to be certified in order to provide training relevant to the rating endorsement in question. The type of training and the rating endorsement, for which the training is provided, shall be indicated to the competent authority when applying for the training organisation certificate (see ATCO.OR.B.001(c)(5)) and shall also be marked on the training organisation's certificate according to the template provided in Appendix 2 of Annex II.

Last updated:

15/06/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19532>

ATCO.D.015(f) 'Initial training plan' - What does this paragraph mean?

Answer

As the provision ATCO.D.010(b), referenced in ATCO.D.015(f), explicitly refers to 'training for an additional rating', the initial training plan shall include the description of a process to permit an applicant who has successfully completed initial training (therefore holding a student ATCO licence or an ATCO licence) to join an initial training course only for the rating training course therein, to achieve one or more additional ratings. This provision is relevant in particular in the case of integrated initial training courses, which are established in accordance with ATCO.D.020(a) and (b).

Last updated:

15/06/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19533>

Is it possible for ANSPs to provide training (e.g. transitional, pre-OJT, OJT, and continuation training) when having 'training' marked on its ANSP certificate without being certified as an ATCO training organisation?

Answer

With the new ATCO Regulation (EU) 2015/340 and the introduction of the ATCO TO certificate template, the possibility according to Article 27(3) of Regulation (EU) No 805/2011 stating that 'The certificate may be issued for each type of training or in combination with other air navigation services, whereby the type of training and the type of air navigation service shall be certified as a package of services' is not anymore valid.

Furthermore, it is important to note that according to Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) 2015/340 the certificates for air traffic controller training organisations shall be replaced with certificates complying with the format laid down in Appendix 2 of Annex II to said Regulation, and for the new applicants according to ATCO.AR.E.001(b), if the applicant training organisation fulfils the applicable requirements, the competent authority shall issue a certificate using the format established in Appendix 2 of Annex II.

Last updated:

15/06/2015

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19534>

When a total number of minimum hours to exercising the privileges of unit endorsement is established e.g. 150 in accordance with ATCO.B.025(a)(3), would it be sufficient for an OJTI to exercise his/hers privilege for 75 hours and the remaining 75 as OJTI?

Answer

Yes, it would be acceptable. The intent of the rule is to ensure that the OJTIs exercise the privileges of the licence 'on their own' and do not maintain the privileges just by instructing.

Last updated:

21/12/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21809>

How would it be possible to obtain information about Alternative Means of Compliance (AltMoCs) to the requirements of Regulation 2015/340 used by other Member States?

Answer

States are obliged to inform EASA only if they adopt AltMoCs, those will then be treated according to the procedure set out in the rule.

To support Member States in the uniform application of the provision in question, EASA has created a webpage on its website to include [information on AMC and AltMoCs](#), including a form to be used to notify the Agency.

Said website clearly disclaimed that EASA maintains this list of AltMoCs notified to it by the competent authorities of the Member States ('CAs') for purely information purposes, at the request of the CAs. The content may be subject to changes at any time without prior notice. This material is amongst others not professional advice, or any form of assessment, judgement or acceptance by EASA.

Last updated:

21/12/2016

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/21810>

Air Traffic Management (ATM) / Air Navigation Services (ANS)

ATM Basics

Where can I find Regulations, IRs, AMCs and GMs concerning ATM?

Answer

Regulations concerning ATM can always be found at EASA Website under the following link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/regulations#regulations-atmans---air-traffic-managementair-navigation-services>

Last updated:

26/03/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45941>

Is there a consolidated version of Regulation (EU) 2017/373?

Answer

Yes. The consolidated version (Easy Access Rules for Air Traffic Management/Air Navigation Services (ATM/ANS)) can be found under the following link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/document-library/general-publications/easy-access-rules-air-traffic-managementair-navigation>

Last updated:

26/03/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45942>

What is the status of documents published during the EASA Rulemaking process such as Notice of Proposed Amendment (NPA) or Comment Response Document (CRD)? Can they be used if there is no EASA rule available?

Answer

NPAs and CRDs are part of the Agency's rulemaking process to inform and consult stakeholders about possible rule changes or newly developed rules. The proposed rules, (provided in an NPA), are obviously not binding and still subject to change, either during the EASA rulemaking process or the Commission's comitology process. While a NPA and CRD may give a broad indication on how the future rule could look like, the Agency generally does not recommend using them before the final rules are published.

Last updated:

26/03/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45943>

What is the 'Cover Regulation'?

Answer

Reference: Regulation (EU) No 2017/373

The Cover Regulation includes the first 10 articles of the referenced Regulation, which:

- explain the principles and considerations of the legislator when adopting the regulation (the 'whereas' clauses);
- define the regulation's objective and scope including to whom/what the regulation and its annexes apply;

- establish the applicability and enter into force dates, including any grandfathering and transition measures for the adaptation to the new rules.

Last updated:

26/03/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45944>**What do 'enter into force' and 'applicability' mean in the Cover Regulation?****Answer***Reference: Regulation (EU) No 2017/373*

When Regulations are published in the Official Journal of the European Union they invariably include several dates. The **date of entry into force** is usually expressed as the 20th day following publication of the Regulation in the Official Journal of the European Union. It means that the EU rules have been adopted and published - thus producing legal effects - but are not necessarily mandatory on the date of entry into force. The date when they become mandatory is the **date of applicability**.


The *Regulation (EU) No 2017/373* entered into force on 21 March 2017 and the dates of applicability are specified in Article 10.

Last updated:

26/03/2018

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45945>**ATM/ANS Specifics****Which ATM/ANS providers fall under the EASA Basic Regulation and its implementing rules?****Answer**

The services included in the definition of ATM/ANS are schematically represented in the picture below.



Last updated:

26/03/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45949>

What are the main regulations governing ATM/ANS?

Answer

The main regulations governing ATM/ANS are the Basic Regulation 2018/1139 and the **Single European Sky** framework package, consisting of:

- *Regulation (EC) No 549/2004* of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 March 2004 laying down the framework for the creation of the single European sky (the framework Regulation);
- *Regulation (EC) No 550/2004* of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 March 2004 on the provision of air navigation services in the single European sky (the service provision Regulation);
- *Regulation (EC) No 551/2004* of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 March 2004 on the organisation and use of the airspace in the single European sky (the airspace Regulation); and
- *Regulation (EC) No 552/2004* of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 March 2004 on the interoperability of the European Air Traffic Management network (the interoperability Regulation).
 - Amended by Regulation (EC) No 1070/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 amending Regulations (EC) No 549/2004, (EC) No 550/2004, (EC) No 551/2004 and (EC) No 552/2004 in order to improve the performance and sustainability of the European aviation system.

It shall be noted that COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) 2017/373 of 1 March 2017 laying down common requirements for providers of air traffic management/air navigation services and other air traffic management network functions and their oversight is an implementing rule to both SES Regulations and EASA Basic Regulation.

COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) No 1035/2011 of 17 October 2011 laying down common requirements for the provision of air navigation services; and

COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) No 1034/2011 of 17 October 2011 on safety oversight in air traffic management and air navigation services;

Note: Implementing Regulations (EU) No 1034/2011 and (EU) No 1035/2011 will be repealed as from 2nd January 2020 (Applicability Date of Regulation (EU) 2017/373).

Last updated:

30/04/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45950>

What is the difference between ATM and ATC?

Answer

According to Definitions in Article 2(1) and (10) of Regulation (EC) No 549/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 March 2004 laying down the framework for the creation of the single European sky.

‘**Air traffic control (ATC) service**’ means a service provided for the purpose of:

- (a) preventing collisions: — between aircraft, and — in the manoeuvring area between aircraft and obstructions; and
- (b) expediting and maintaining an orderly flow of air traffic;

‘**Air traffic management (ATM)**’ means the aggregation of the airborne and ground-based functions (air traffic services, airspace management and air traffic flow management) required to ensure the safe and efficient movement of aircraft during all phases of operations;

Last updated:

26/03/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45953>

Is ATM/ANS personnel covered by Regulation (EU) 2017/373?

Answer

ATSEP – Air Traffic Safety Electronics Personnel are covered. Those can be found in Annex XIII – Part – PERS of Regulation (EU) 2017/373.

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/regulations#regulations—atmans——air—traffic—managementair—navigation—services>

However, there is a general requirement in Annex III of *Regulation (EU) 2017/373*:

ATM/ANS.OR.B.005 Management system

A service provider shall implement and maintain a management system that includes:

(...)

- (a)(6) a process to ensure that the personnel of the service provider are trained and competent to perform their duties in a safe, efficient, continuous and sustainable manner. In this context, the service provider shall establish policies for the recruitments and training of its personnel;

Last updated:

26/03/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45954>

Who is the ATM/ANS Competent Authority in my country?

Answer

The competent authority responsible for the issuing of certificates to service providers, for the acknowledgment of receipts of declarations made by providers of flight information services where relevant, and for the oversight and enforcement in respect of service providers shall be the **national supervisory authority**.

Last updated:

26/03/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45955>

Who is the competent authority for ATM/ANS Pan-European services?

Answer

According to Article 2 (Definitions) of *Regulation (EU) 2017/373*:

‘Pan-European service’ means an activity which is designed and established for users within most or all Member States and which may also extend beyond the airspace of the territory to which the Treaty applies.

The competent authority with regard to Pan-European services (e.g. DAT providers, the Network Manager, etc.) shall be the Agency (EASA) as defined in Article 4(1) of *Regulation (EU) 2017/373*.

Last updated:

26/03/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45956>

What are Air Navigation Services (ANS) according to EASA?

Answer

"Air Navigation Services" means air traffic services; communication, navigation and surveillance services; meteorological services for air navigation; and aeronautical information services. (Article 2(4) of *Regulation (EC) No 549/2004* of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 March 2004 laying down the framework for the creation of the single European sky.)

Last updated:

26/03/2018

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/45957>

AIS

SERA.3145 'Prohibited areas and restricted areas' of the standardised European rules of the air introduces a prohibition on the operation of aircraft in prohibited and restricted areas, '... the particulars of which have been duly published ...'. When is a prohibited or a restricted area considered as duly published?

Answer

Regulation (EU) 2017/373 defines the structure and the content of a State's AIP, and also defines the terms 'prohibited area' and 'restricted area'. Relevant information concerning such areas is required by Regulation (EU) 2017/373 to be published in the AIP, under section '*ENR 5.1 Prohibited, restricted and danger area*' and depicted in the relevant aeronautical charts, for the aviation community to be aware of the existence of such areas due to their operational significance.

This requirement for the publication of such areas in the AIP applies even if such regulatory acts are also published through other means (e.g., government gazette) within a State, as part of its legal or administrative system.

Last updated:

11/09/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/138505>

Can the operation of aircraft in certain areas be prohibited or restricted for environmental reasons?

Answer

A restricted or prohibited area may also be established by a State due to underlying environmental reasons. However, irrespective of the objective that the establishment of such a restriction or prohibitions serves, information about restricted or prohibited areas needs to be published in the State's AIP, under section '*ENR 5.1 Prohibited, restricted and danger areas*', as per the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2017/373 and depicted in the relevant aeronautical charts.

Last updated:

11/09/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/138519>

Is the publication of information under AIP section '*ENR 5.6 Bird migration and areas with sensitive fauna*' sufficient to consider that the particulars of a prohibited and restricted area have been 'duly published', in accordance with SERA.3145 'Prohibited areas and restricted areas'?

Answer

AIP section '*ENR 5.6 Bird migration and areas with sensitive fauna*', foreseen in Regulation (EU) 2017/373, is used for the provision of the following information: '*Description, supplemented by charts where practicable, of movements of birds associated with migration, including migration routes and permanent resting areas and areas with sensitive fauna*'.

The same EU Regulation foresees the publication of prohibited and restricted areas in the AIP, under a specific AIP section (*ENR 5.1 Prohibited, restricted and danger areas*) and depiction of relevant information in the relevant aeronautical charts.

Thus, the mere publication of information under '*ENR 5.6 Bird migration and areas with sensitive fauna*' is not sufficient to consider that information on a prohibited or restricted area has been '*duly published*', in accordance with SERA.3145 'Prohibited areas and restricted areas'. As long as an area is classified as restricted or prohibited, in accordance with the respective definitions in Regulation (EU) 2017/373, the respective information needs to be published in the relevant section (ENR 5.1) of the AIP addressing prohibited, restricted and danger areas and depicted in the relevant aeronautical charts.

Last updated:

11/09/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/138534>

DAT

Is a DAT certificate issued per organisation or per office?

Answer

An organisation (= a legal entity) is certified, while the scope of services, for which that organisation/legal entity is entitled to provide services, are listed in the attachment to the service provider's certificate and there can be multiple offices/locations per organisation. On the other hand, the principle location of the company will be printed onto the EASA certificate, while any additional locations will be listed into the application form as well as in the company's exposition.

Last updated:

25/04/2019

Link:
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/96110>

When the ISO certificate cover only one of the office and the processes are the same, how it could be used as AMC?

Answer

An ISO 9001 or EN 9100 certificate, issued by an appropriately accredited organisation, could be used as acceptable means of compliance (AMC) for the relevant management system requirements (i.e. quality management elements). In this context, it should be noted that the subject organisation should accept the disclosure of the documentation related to the certification to EASA as the competent authority. On the other hand, the ISO 9001/EN 9100 certificate covers only the quality management elements of the management system, while the other elements as stipulated in the rule that are not covered by ISO/EN certificate should be subject to oversight by the competent authority, such as e.g. adequacy of the processes and procedures.

Last updated:

25/04/2019

Link:
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/96111>

What kind of data providers need to be certified in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2017/373?

Answer

DAT provider that processes aeronautical data and provides an aeronautical database for use on certified aircraft application/equipment having a safety effect should be certified. Systems permanently installed, especially in the cockpit, would fall in general into the scope of the regulation.

In another words, databases for which the DAT provider is not required to be certified in accordance with the referenced Regulation include but are not limited to databases provided and/or used by the operator of the aircraft that are monitored under the operator's responsibility and not loaded into certified aircraft applications (e.g. airport moving map used in electronic flight bags (EFBs), take-off and landing performance used in EFBs). Databases that are approved as part of the type design of the aircraft or engine (e.g. engine power settings (take-off, climb, maximum continuous thrust (MCT), and cruise) and aircraft performance data (e.g. take-off distance, V speeds)) do not fall under the scope of certification.

For further details refer to AMC1 DAT.OR.100 Aeronautical data and information and GM1 DAT.OR.100 Aeronautical data and information.

Last updated:

25/04/2019

Link:
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/96112>

How does the application process look like and what would be the price quote and time schedule?

Answer

The application process is defined by following steps:

- Future DAT provider makes an application, using the available [DAT provider application forms](#)
- The application should include some company documentation (Organisation Exposition and a copy of the national Companies register / Certificate of Incorporation)
- An eligibility check will be done by EASA before proceeding with the next steps.
- Charges will differ between the organisations (depending on the organisation scope of work, number of location etc.) as the fee is calculated based on hours spent on certification. The application form for certification includes the possibility for the organisation to request a quote. If this is option is selected, EASA will send the corresponding quote after assessing the information delivered together with the documentation. No certification activity is started until the organisation accepts the quote.
- Once the quote is accepted, a Kick-Off Meeting between EASA and the organisation is organised in order to launch formally the activity. Certification tasks will start at that meeting.
- The duration of the assessment depends on the type of services and the compliance status of the organisation. Typically, as a minimum, an on-site audit is organised although it can be extended depending on the organisation structure (e.g. number of operational sites).

More information can be found on the following links:

[ATM/ANS approvals and ATCO training organisation approvals](#)

And here:

[Application for ATM/ANS Service Provider Organisation Approval](#)

Last updated:

25/04/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/96113>

Is it possible to extend the DAT certificate from the initial scope?**Answer**

It is always possible to extend a Type 1/Type 2 DAT-provider certificate to include other services through an organisation change and the corresponding assessment activities by the certification team.

Last updated:

25/04/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/96114>

Is there a consolidated list of EASA certified DAT providers?**Answer**

You can find up-to-date list of certified service providers (including DAT providers) here: [List of approved ATM/ANS organisations](#).

Last updated:

25/04/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/96115>

I have a DAT provider certificate (or equivalent) issued by another authority. Is it possible for EASA to recognise it

and/or accept it?

Answer

“Equivalent” to an EASA certified Type 1 or Type 2 DAT provider are defined in any Aviation Safety Agreement between the European Union (EU) and a third country, including any Technical Implementation Procedures (TIP), or any Working Arrangements (WA) between EASA and the competent authority of a third country. Up to date information regarding the status of such agreements can be found on our website '[International Cooperation Overview](#)'.

Last updated:

25/04/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/96116>

How can I obtain approval against EUROCAE ED-76(A)/RTCA DO-200A(B)?

Answer

It should be noted that the DAT certification attests that the databases produced by an organisation can be used by aircraft operators and that they have put in place an appropriate system for the control of the processing of data. In this context, it should be clearly pointed out that the DAT provider that we are addressing, processes aeronautical data and provides an aeronautical database for use on certified aircraft application/equipment (e.g. FMS) having a safety effect. Furthermore, it is important to be noted that the data as such is not subject to certification, but the organisation is subject to certification that demonstrates its capability to produce the subject databases.

More concretely, EUROCAE ED-76(A)/RTCA DO-200A(B) is only one of the means to demonstrate compliance to some of the requirements laid down in the binding act, i.e. Regulation (EU) 2017/373. For the rest of the requirements, the DAT provider needs to demonstrate compliance with the applicable requirements resulting in the issuance of a certificate attesting such compliance.

Last updated:

25/04/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/96117>

At what frequency should terrain and obstacle databases be updated?

Answer

Terrain and obstacles databases are not subject to major/planned changes, therefore, the principles and criteria applied in the maintenance of terrain and obstacle database should be specified in the DQR, including the frequency with which data products are updated. Depending on the intended use, the data/databases may be derived from the States published data (e.g. AIP) or from other sources (e.g. data services (DAT) providers). The data/databases may be updated based on the availability thereof, new sources that allow to improve their quality (e.g. accuracy or resolution), correction of detected errors, etc.

Please note that DAT providers are subject to Regulation (EU) 2017/373 (refer DAT.OR.100 and associated AMC/GM). In this context, when the databases (including terrain and obstacles) are used on certified aircraft application/equipment, (that support the flight operation where incorrect data leads to failures having at least minor or higher failure effect, excluding those databases approved as part of the type design of the aircraft) they should be produced and released by certified DAT providers.

In conclusion, the EU law does not address the frequency of terrain and obstacle database updates.

Last updated:

25/04/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/96120>

What are the applicable regulations and requirements for obtaining DAT provider approval?

Answer

Regulation (EU) 2017/373 that requires DAT provider's certification from 1 January 2019.

This regulation is accessible here: [Regulation \(EU\) 2017/373](#)

To support the implementation of said Regulation, please note the associated AMC/GM issued with EASA [ED Decision 2017/001/R](#).

The listed regulatory materials are consolidated in Easy Access Rules for Air Traffic Management/Air Navigation Services: [Easy Access Rules for ATM/ANS](#). These consolidated, up-to-date rules are displayed in an easy-to-read format with advanced navigation features through links and bookmarks and are for free download from the EASA website. The document contains the applicable rules for the providers of Air Traffic Management/Air Navigation Services and other Air Traffic Management network functions, incl. DAT providers. It covers Regulation (EU) 2017/373 and all its annexes (together with the related AMC and GM).

Furthermore, in order to assist stakeholders to prepare for the implementation, EASA organised a workshop focusing on the new requirements and aiming to familiarise with the use of Acceptable Means of Compliance and Guidance Material, being established by the Agency. The presentations provided during this Workshop can be found on the page for the event: '[1st EASA Workshop for DAT providers](#)'.

Last updated:

25/04/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/96121>

Is it possible for a legal entity to define two independent organizations, each dealing with specific Database with separate management processes?

Answer

Usually an organisation (= a legal entity) is certified, while the scope of services, for which that organisation/legal entity is entitled to provide services are listed in the attachment to the service provider's certificate. However, it is up to the organisation in question to organise its application(s) and the demonstration of compliance for the various services. It should be noted that the potential parallel applications would result in parallel certification and subsequently continuous oversight processes.

Last updated:

25/04/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/96123>

In case of tailored data, is it possible to release Test database upon request of the end user and is statement of conformity required for such database?

Answer

The change compare to the current LoA scheme is that the tailored data processing (from data origination and/or receiving till its release, incl. signing of the statement of conformity by DAT provider(s)) becomes subject to process verification and oversight by the DAT providers' competent authority, i.e. by EASA.

More concretely, if a DAT provider is requested to:

- a) Release a tailored Data as part of a Navigation DB, a statement of conformity is required;
- b) Release a DB containing tailored Data only, a statement of conformity is required;

c) Release a tailored Data as part of a test Navigation DB, no statement of conformity is required, only at a discretion of a DAT provider

Last updated:

25/04/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/96124>

Does the certification of DAT providers require renewal of the EASA certification or is it a one-off procedure? Following EASA certification, who will audit/monitor DAT providers?

Answer

EASA is the competent authority for the DAT providers. Following the certification process, upon receiving an application for the issuance of a certificate to a DAT provider, EASA needs to verify the DAT provider's compliance with the applicable requirements of Regulation (EU) 2017/373. In this context, EASA may require any audits, inspections or assessments it finds necessary before issuing the certificate. The certificate shall be issued for an unlimited duration. The privileges of the activities that the DAT provider is approved to conduct are specified in the service provision conditions attached to the certificate.

In accordance with ATM/ANS.OR.A.025, DAT provider's certificate shall remain valid subject to:

(1) the DAT provider remaining in compliance with the applicable requirements of Regulation (EU) 2017/373, including those concerning facilitating and cooperating for the purposes of the exercise of the powers of the competent authorities and those concerning the handling of findings as specified in points ATM/ANS.OR.A.050 and ATM/ANS.OR.A.055 respectively;

(2) the certificate not having been surrendered, suspended or revoked.

Having mentioned this, it could be concluded that EASA is the competent authority for the oversight of DAT providers in addition to its duties for the issuing of respective DAT providers' certificates.

Last updated:

25/04/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/96125>

Are VFR flight planning and navigation software under the scope Regulation (EU) 2017/373?

Answer

The provision of data services (= production of databases for certified a/c application/equipment by the DAT providers that would be subject to certification) has been extended from navigation databases (i.e. the current LoA holders' activities) to aeronautical databases' activities. To better illustrate the meaning of the DAT provider's scope of activities (DAT.OR.100), GM1 DAT.OR.100 Aeronautical data and information provides examples of databases provided by certified DAT providers.

In reference to the VFR Databases, GM1 DAT.OR.100(b)(3) is regarding applications/equipment installed on aircraft certified exclusively for VFR operations. In this context, only those databases used for primary navigation to meet the airspace usage requirements (for example, operations in the airspace where Precision Area Navigation (P-RNAV) is required) would be in the scope of the new DAT requirements.

More concretely, any VFR flight-planning software should be out of the scope of the products provided by certified DAT providers. In addition, as illustrated in GM1 DAT.OR.100, paragraph (b), the organisations putting these products in the market would not be required to be certified in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2017/373. However, it should be clarified that if the mentioned databases were to be fed/used on certified a/c application/equipment (exempted VFR cases addressed above), then the DAT providers would be subject to certification. To illustrate with an example, the airport moving map could be used a non-certified EFB application under operator responsibility, or could be fed into a certified aircraft application (covered by TC/STCs). Consequently, the latter case will fall into the regulation's scope.

Last updated:

25/04/2019

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/96126>

Does any software application used inside an EFB, which is not part of the certified aircraft configuration, require certified DAT?

Answer

Any software applications not loaded into certified aircraft applications, e.g. used inside an EFB do not require to be provided by certified DAT providers.

Last updated:

25/04/2019

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/96127>

When flying VFR, what kind of databases fall under scope of Regulation (EU) 2017/373 and which ones are excluded?

Answer

For specific flight into designated airspace or the use of specific procedures like SID, STAR, LPV approach, RNAV 1, there are minimum equipment requirements where a database is used to describe the flight path. Those need to be provided by a certified DAT provider.

However, there could be another scenario where the GPS is not used as primary navigation, e.g. in a pure VFR environment. Consequently, the database fed into the GPS could be provided by 'non-certified' DAT provider. In this latter case, the GPS database is excluded. The intention was to allow the use of tools in support of the VFR only certified aircraft while demanding oversight for databases used for mandatory navigation functions.

Last updated:

25/04/2019

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/96128>

Which changes require prior approval and which changes do not require prior approval?

Answer

Competent authority may grant a privilege to service provider(s) to implement changes to its management system and/or safety management system without prior approval. ATM/ANS.AR.C.025 regulates the competent authority to approve a procedure defining the scope of changes that do not require prior approval and description how such changes will be notified and managed). The mirroring requirements for the service providers are laid down in ATM/ANS.OR.A.040, especially in (b) and for further details please consult AMC2 ATM/ANS.OR.A.040(b) 'PROCEDURE FOR CHANGES NOT REQUIRING PRIOR APPROVAL' and GM1 ATM/ANS.OR.A.040(b). The procedure has to be defined by the service provider(s) and approved by the competent authority. The competent authority should evaluate depending on the maturity and reliability of the service provider, what kind of changes could be included this procedure. Changes that should always require prior approval are e.g. changes to the scope of services, significant change to the operational environment, etc. Changes that the competent authority could allow service provider to implement without prior approval are e.g. nominated personnel/post holders, QMS revisions, etc.

Last updated:

17/01/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/96122>

Air Traffic Management / Air Navigation Services (ATM/ANS) ground equipment

Application for DPO

Our product will require certification under the new framework and our company would like to become an approved Design or Production Organisation. COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) 2023/1769 includes DPO.OR.A.010 which states: "An application for a design or production organisation approval shall be made in a form and manner established by the Agency". Where can I find these forms, and how does the application process work in practice?

Answer

The "Application for Design or Production Organisation (DPO) Approval" is now available on the EASA Application Services website. Organisations that are interested to become an approved DPO can find the new form (FO.AOA.00085) on the [Application forms website](#). Detailed instructions to help applicants fill in the form are embedded at the bottom of the form itself. Additional information related to DPO and other ATM/ANS topics can be found on the [EASA ATM website](#).

As always, any queries related to the approval of an ATM/ANS Organisation, ATCO Training Organisation, or Design or Production Organisation (DPO) can be sent to: [AtmAnsOrg \[at\] easa.europa.eu](mailto:AtmAnsOrg@easa.europa.eu).

The process of becoming an approved DPO begins when an organization submits an application. Once an application is received and accepted, an EASA project team will be created and assigned to the project. It is also possible to schedule a "pre-application" meeting with EASA to clarify specific points before an application is formally submitted. However, please be aware that your project schedule may need to accommodate delays that result from scheduling constraints.

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139153>

If a manufacturing company has several subsidiaries in several countries, is a DPO certificate expected for each of the subsidiaries or would there be a way to get an overall for the entire company?

Answer

Any natural or legal person who has demonstrated, or is set to demonstrate, their capability to design or produce ATM/ANS equipment, may apply for a design or production organisation approval under the conditions laid down in EU IR 2023/1769.

In this context, if the legal entity has formalized control over other legal entities (i.e., subsidiaries), then these subsidiaries can be covered by the DPO approval. For example, if the legal corporate entity (aka the "parent company") submits an application as DPO, then it can choose to include subsidiary organisations under Section 2.3 "Additional Locations" on the DPO application form.

However, be aware that this is not simply a matter of legal definition on paper. The DPO applicant must demonstrate that all subsidiaries are also meeting the requirements needed for DPO approval (e.g., competencies, procedures, etc).

In accordance with ATM/ANS.EQMT.CERT.005 on Eligibility, any natural or legal person who has demonstrated, or is in the process of demonstrating (i.e. is an applicant), their design capability in accordance with point ATM/ANS.EQMT.CERT.010, may apply for the issuance of an ATM/ANS equipment certificate.

A DPO needs an organisation approval at latest by September 2028, but it could already apply now. Formally speaking, the certification process of an ATM/ANS equipment could be launched during the DPO approval process. However, it should be

noted that the certificate of ATM/ANS equipment could be issued by EASA only after the DPO is approved. The same applies for an ATM/ANS equipment declaration of design compliance; the DPO could issue the declaration but only after the DPO approval is completed and issued.

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139154>

Which cost can be expected to perform a DPO approval? (external cost, e.g. to be paid to EASA)

Answer

An estimate of workload connected with the approval procedure is provided by EASA as part of the quotation that may be requested in the application. As DPO is an entirely new domain for the Agency, these activities in accordance with the principles in the F&C regulation will be charged on an hourly rate basis. This is stated under Chapter IV, Article 21, Subparagraph 2 (page 10 of Regulation 2019/2153):

“The hourly rates set out in Part II of the Annex shall apply as of the entry into force of this Regulation to any tasks ongoing at the entry into force of this Regulation and for which fees or charges are calculated on an hourly basis.”

The level of effort depends on a number of specific factors linked to the organization itself and the type of equipment under consideration, so the assessment is done based on the documentation and exposition of activities accompanying the application. This is why EASA only provides detailed estimates in conjunction with a submitted application. The following provides additional detail:

- An applicant is entitled to request a financial quotation, and the Agency will provide the quotation before starting the investigation. This ensures that the DPO applicant has all the financial elements to make a business decision. An applicant can request a financial estimate (including working hours) via point 8 of the Application form. After submitting the application, EASA will reply with a quotation of estimated cost. Invoicing will be done based on the actual effort.
- The production of the estimate should not last more than a few working days, in parallel to the assessment of technical and administrative eligibility of the application, and the information is provided to the applicant. Procedurally, there is a maximum period of 90 days for the applicant to evaluate the quote and accept it.
- If the applicant would decide not to accept the quotation, there would be no fees/charges incurred. The investigation would start once the quotation is accepted.
- It is also important to be aware that an approved DPO organisation will incur additional costs under the EASA oversight activity. This oversight activity will also be invoiced for hours worked and travel costs.

If an organization has other questions linked to filling out the DPO application forms or about the logic applied to the initial investigation in order to better prepare the approach, it is possible to schedule a “pre-application” meeting with EASA to clarify specific points before an application is formally submitted.

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139155>

In order to apply for EASA acceptance of a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approval, does our company have to be an EASA-approved design or production organisation (DPO) beforehand?

Answer

The current EU-USA Bilateral Agreement and the EASA-FAA Technical Implementation Procedures (TIP) do not address ATM/ANS ground equipment conformity assessment and ATM/ANS design or production organisation approval.

In accordance with ATM/ANS.EQMT.CERT.005 'Eligibility', any natural or legal person who has demonstrated, or is in the

process of demonstrating (i.e. is an applicant), their design capability in accordance with point ATM/ANS.EQMT.CERT.010, may apply for the issuance of an ATM/ANS equipment certificate. This includes non-EU (e.g., US) stakeholders.

Last updated:

04/04/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139156>

In order to perform maintenance and provide support of equipment produced by our company and that is already deployed in Europe, does our company need to be an approved design or production organisation (DPO)?

Answer

Responsibilities in relation to 'routine maintenance' are in the sphere of the ATM/ANS provider's responsibilities as prescribed under Regulation (EU) 2017/373, and are performed following the instructions/manuals provided by the design and production organisation of the equipment.

Therefore, there is no need to become an approved DPO in order to perform the maintenance.

In contrast, a change to already deployed equipment must be performed in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2023/1768. During the transition period, the air navigation service provider (ANSP) may change the equipment using a 'Statement of Compliance'. However, after the transition period, the implementation of changes for equipment subject to Article 4 or 5 will require an approved DPO.

Last updated:

04/04/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139157>

What about home-made ANSP equipments? Does the ANSP need to be accredited as a DPO?

Answer

It depends on the criticality and the categories. For example, Air/Ground communication is certified equipment, so it needs to be certified. If it involves AIS or MET, then there are two possibilities: a Statement of Compliance can be issued by the ANSP, or the ANSP can contract this to an approved DPO.

Last updated:

04/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139162>

If an ANSP designs and builds an integrated system, e.g. integrating software from various suppliers onto a data centre infrastructure (noting this may involve "DPO" activities, and some specifications can only be fully implemented/verified at this level) is the ANSP expected to certify as a DPO?

Answer

In those cases, yes, the ANSP has to be certified as an approved DPO to have those privileges.

Last updated:

04/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139163>

Classification or notification of changes

Major and minor changes (Major/Minor changes) - the description of what is a major and what is a minor change (for major changes, the need to issue an SoC/Declaration/Certificate) is defined in general terms in the regulatory proposals. There was no consensus on the interpretation at the EASA webinar. It is necessary to define the criteria for including the change in the big/small category

Answer

The definition of major/minor changes are provided at the AMC/GM level. Further details on the delineation between minor and major changes will be clarified in the forthcoming set of AMC/GM associated to Regulation (EU) 2023/1769 and apply regardless of when the system was deployed/implemented.

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139159>

The new regulation does not require a notification and documentation of a small change - in cases where the SoC is not changed. A different approach compared to today's DoVs, which cover the entire life cycle of a component/equipment - for small changes, a TF change is made. Will this create a problem at the end of the transition period? – TF will not be updated and SoCs will only have some changes

Answer

The details for the notification and management (incl. documentation) of minor changes are illustrated at AMC/GM level.

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139160>

What should an air navigation service provider (ANSP) expect to receive from a design or production organisation (DPO) for minor changes that are not notifiable to EASA and do not result in an update to the certification, and is the ANSP still expected to notify these minor updates as changes to the functional system?

Answer

The DPO is eligible to design and implement minor changes to its CERT/DECL equipment, but has to notify these changes to EASA in any case.

The DPO is required to communicate to the ANSP any update to the technical manuals and maintenance instructions of the equipment.

The ANSP is responsible to notify a change to the functional system in accordance with the change management procedure approved by the competent authority, which may or may not require prior approval.

Last updated:

04/04/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139609>

Acceptance of approvals issued by third countries

Some of the equipment produced by our company has a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approval and some

equipment does not. For the FAA-approved equipment, can you confirm that our company can apply to have the FAA certification accepted by EASA?

Answer

It is acknowledged that there is an EU-USA agreement on cooperation in the regulation of civil aviation safety (i.e. via a Bilateral Aviation Safety Agreement (BASA)). However, there currently are no Technical Implementation Procedures (TIP) for ATM/ANS equipment in place to allow direct acceptance/recognition of FAA approvals/certificates.

Last updated:

04/04/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139165>

Categorisation of systems or equipment

We are still not sure, in which category some specific equipment falls and thus we would appreciate a more detailed allocation oversight of specific systems to categories (e.g. electr. flight strips; network equipment, Server HW, virtualisation and operating systems, used for all kinds of systems).

Answer

First step is to assess the scope of the equipment and which function it supports. This assessment will determine the category to which it belongs.

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139167>

Division of today's EATMN components into CA categories. For some existing systems, the categorization is debatable (e.g. EFS). Does the new regulation require anything similar as so called "distribution of systems and constituents within the functional system"?

Answer

The new regulatory framework clearly defined the ATM/ANS equipment subject to the various attestation methods – certification/declaration of design compliance and statement of compliance. The scope will be further illustrated at DS/AMC/GM level.

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139168>

Does a primary surveillance radar (PSR) being provided to the European Union require certification under Regulation (EU) 2023/1768? If so, are there any published detailed specifications (DSs) for PSRs?

Answer

No, the PSR that only performs the surveillance function does not require certification.

Since the PSR is used to provide surveillance data for the purpose of ensuring safe and interoperable air navigation, it is considered ATM/ANS equipment that falls under Article 5(1)(b) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2023/1768. Therefore, a PSR would require a declaration of design compliance (see also Annex III to Regulation (EU) 2023/1768) rather than

certification.

At the moment, DSs only contain general requirements for PSRs, but no specific technical requirements. However, DSs will follow regular updates in accordance with Rulemaking Task (RMT).0744.

Last updated:

04/04/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139169>

Does the European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) provides for the possibility of Air Traffic Management / Air Navigation Services (ATM/ANS) equipment supporting multiple functions, which falls into different categories and hence is subject to more than one attestation method?

Answer

EASA provides for the possibility of ATM/ANS equipment supporting multiple functions, which falls into different categories, and in such case, the attestation process for the highest-severity function would apply. For example, if one piece of equipment hosts two functions (one falling under certification and one under declaration), then the equipment would follow a certification process.

Last updated:

10/05/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139827>

Article 4 states that "equipment supporting air traffic control (ATC) services when enabling the separation of aircraft or the prevention of collisions" should undergo certification. And Article 6 specifies that system used for meteorological services (MET) should have a statement of compliance (SoC) that "...supports air traffic services, communication, navigation or surveillance services, airspace management, air traffic flow management, aeronautical information services or meteorological services." Is the weather system used in towers classified as a system that "prevents collisions" (with the ground) or as a MET system? Should the system provide the controller with the wrong mean sea level pressure (QNH) or misleading runway visual range (RVR), it could have an impact on the separation. We all remember the incident in Paris where the wrong QNH almost led to an accident. How should it be classified? For certification or SoC?

Answer

GM1 Article 4 Certification of ATM/ANS equipment; Article 5 Declaration of design compliance of the ATM/ANS equipment; Article 6 Statement of compliance of the [AMC & GM Regulation \(EU\) 2023/1768](#) at Issue 1 provides examples of which means of conformity assessment applies to various types of ATM/ANS equipment.

Item 8 of the table in GM1 notes that meteorological services (MET) typically fall under Article 6 "Statement of Compliance".

Last updated:

13/08/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140275>

Regarding ED Decision 2023/015/R, Annex I (DS-GE.CER/DEC), in Part 3 – ATM/ANS Equipment Subject to Design Conformity Declaration, Subpart C – Surveillance (SUR), Section 1 – General, point DS GE.DEC.MSS.101 "Scope", three types of technology are listed: (a) Mode S; (b) ADS-B; (c) WAM. Does this refer to a classification of ground equipment? Or does it refer to which technologies/functionalities are applicable to each ground equipment? For example, if a multilateration system utilising Mode S is available, which standards would apply? Would the standards listed in Section 4 – Wide Area Multilateration be applicable? Or are the standards listed in Section 2 – Mode S ground station

(MSS) also applicable?**Answer**

The three technologies listed under **Part 3, Subpart C, Section 1** should be understood as falling under Article 5, subparagraph 1, of Regulation (EU) 2023/1768. Article 5 applies to equipment that "...generates, receives, and transmits data and/or signals in space for the purpose of ensuring safe and interoperable air navigation...". Therefore, the three technologies require a **declaration of design compliance** in order to be integrated by an air traffic management (ATM)/ air navigation services (ANS) provider in their functional system.

Section 1 – GENERAL is applicable to all equipment falling under Subpart C (i.e. Mode S, ADS-B, and WAM). In the case of a multilateration system utilising Mode S, Section 2 and Section 4 would be applicable.

However, Section 4 of DS-GE.CER/DEC at Issue 1 does not contain any requirements at this time. Since DS-GE.CER/DEC does not impose specific standards that must be included in the declaration, the applicant may select an appropriate standard. The same would be true for equipment that is not listed under Section 1 – GENERAL.

Note: EASA has planned Rulemaking Task RMT.0744 to prepare **Issue 2 of DS-GE.CER/DEC**, which will add requirements to Section 4. At this stage, EASA cannot specify which standard might be applicable.

Last updated:

13/08/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140276>

Is the video wall included in the attestation process, and if so, under what level of attestation?**Answer**

To determine the appropriate attestation category (i.e., certification, declaration, statement of compliance), one needs to define the intended function of the equipment and the tasks that are expected to be performed with it. For example:

- If the intended function is to provide a means for controllers to inform aircraft about environmental conditions on the runway surface or general information on traffic (e.g. FIS), then one can reasonably conclude that the appropriate attestation is Article 6 (1) Statement of Compliance.
- If the intended function is to provide a means for controllers to visually observe the manoeuvring area in order to enable separation and prevent collisions, then the appropriate attestation is Article 4 Certification.

In cases where equipment fulfils more than one intended function/task, the DPO should select the attestation level that corresponds to the most critical function/task. For example, if the equipment provides both intended functions/tasks described above, then Article 4 Certification would be the most appropriate attestation.

Performance specifications and minimum requirements (i.e., MOPS and MASPS) for many aspects of Remote Tower installations (e.g., image quality, integrity, latency) are not yet available and/or harmonized in industry standards or the EASA detailed specifications. In the absence of such materials, the DPO should use engineering judgement to identify/define and justify performance objectives and technical specifications. These should be proposed to EASA or the National Competent Authority for review and acceptance.

Last updated:

20/03/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/141756>

Categorisation of software

For surveillance (SUR) equipment, e.g. ADS-B station, there is also processing equipment (including software) for at

least converting the received signal to ASTERIX. Does this mean that this equipment will always be subject to certification by EASA?

Answer

The key criteria for the equipment is the intended function that the equipment supports. Software (SW) per se is not always subject to certification but the function the SW supports. If the intended supported function is not subject to certification, then the SW is not required to undergo the certification process. In the example, an ADS-B station will support the SUR function, and thus, as per Article 5 of Regulation (EU) 2023/1768, the equipment (including the associated SW) will be subject to a declaration by a design or production organisation (DPO).

Last updated:

04/04/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139612>

GM1 GE.GEN.003 'Software': It is stated that firmware is considered as software. Is this also the case for libraries, operating systems, enterprise service bus (in service-oriented architecture (SOA)), security software, and all software used for virtualisation (e.g. VMware)?

Answer

Yes, if those are part of the equipment definition that is subject to the certification/declaration process.

Last updated:

04/04/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139613>

Commercial off the shelf (COTS) systems or equipment

Is it correct to assume that COTS IT/network elements (e.g. servers, routers, switches) do not have the need for certification or declaration, if they are not part of the equipment subject to certification/declaration? E.g. certified software is delivered by DPO, which can be run on any platform/network at the ANSP, which is not certified but fulfils the specifications provided by the DPO.

Answer

Boundaries of the system / constituent are defined by the DPO. As such, COTS IT equipment can be well outside of the system subject to certification / declaration. Such system can be composed of SW only.

When a certain equipment requires underlying/supporting infrastructure (e.g. IT, network, cloud), the characteristics and requirements for this infrastructure are to be defined by the DPO and provided to the ANSP with the installation and operation instructions and any other integration requirements. The underlying infrastructure does not necessitate to be part of the equipment design and therefore does not necessarily form part of the certification envelope.

Last updated:

04/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139171>

Cloud-based architectures

How the case of an ANSP cloud based architecture and a SW application produced by a DPO which is subject to

certification or declaration will be handled ?**Answer**

The ANSP has to demonstrate to meet the functional requirements and the interface requirements. If the system is cloud based, then it is possible that the information security aspects may require specific scrutiny. However, the requirements are not dictating any specific architecture or HW/SW.

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139173>
Development Assurance for Software or Hardware

Who is going to define software / software assurance level (SWAL) requirements for a particular ATM/ANS system? EASA, ANSP, ...?

Answer

The design or production organisation (DPO) should anticipate the SWAL that is expected by the air navigation service provider (ANSP). This SWAL needs to be incorporated into the DPO's software development process of the equipment. The EASA attestation is granted according to that SWAL. It is the responsibility of the DPO to declare the SWAL that will be followed for the development of the equipment. This needs to be documented by the DPO in the certification programme.

The ANSP has the responsibility to select equipment in accordance with the safety assessment and the SWAL requirement for the functional system.

Last updated:

04/04/2024

Link:
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139175>

Did I understand correctly that the software assurance level (SWAL) assignment and stating that the equipment is safe for use is moved to design or production organisations (DPOs)? I got that impression from previous sessions and disagree since safety (as security) depends on the operational usage of the equipment. What is your opinion?

Answer

See answer to FAQ [Who is going to define softwares / software assurance level \(SWAL\) requirements for a particular ATM/ANS system? EASA, ANSP, ...?](https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139173).

Last updated:

04/04/2024

Link:
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139176>

If the software design assurance level (SW DAL) of equipment depends on ATM functions of the air navigation service provider (ANSP), how do you guarantee that certified/declared equipment will be available with such an expected level? Aren't we creating a chicken-and-egg issue?

Answer

This is similar to the case of safety objectives; the market will tend to provide products that are demanded by the ANSPs. A

design or production organisation (DPO) will develop products per their anticipated selected software assurance level (SWAL). The ANSP will select the equipment that meet the required SWAL to meet their safety objectives of the functional system.

See also answer to FAQ [‘Who is going to define software/SWAL requirements for a particular ATM/ANS system? EASA, ANSP, ...?’](#).

Last updated:

04/04/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139177>

ED-153 considers that the air navigation service provider (ANSP) shall allocate the software assurance level (SWAL). Which standard support that the DPO shall allocate the SWAL? As in a previous comment, ANSP should allocate the SWAL and DPO should evidence. Why the change? (in a previous question, the answer was that the DPO allocate the SWAL)

Answer

See answer to FAQ [‘Who is going to define software/SWAL requirements for a particular ATM/ANS system? EASA, ANSP, ...?’](#).

Last updated:

04/04/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139614>

Non-compliance

The implementation of a change from the awarding of a public contract to the introduction into operation is a long-term process, during which the following situations may occur (we are considering the transition period): - Issuance of the specification for the given device during implementation - Failure to certify the supplier by the end of the transition period - Reluctance of the contracted supplier to certify. We consider it appropriate to agree with the procedure of the provider/regulator for these cases. Does EASA work on something as a guidelines in this matter?

Answer

The new regulatory framework consisting of 5 regulations has been published on 15 September 2023 and will be applicable as from beginning of October 2023. Any DS/AMC/GM will be associated to facilitate the implementation of the ATM/ANS ground equipment conformity assessment. If a regulated party is not in a position to apply any of the requirements, the *Flexibility* provisions under Article 71 of EASA BR could be applied for a certain period of time.

Last updated:

04/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139179>

For a system subject to SoC: If there is a documented non-compliance with some detailed specification, does that automatically mean, it must not be put into operation, or can it be put into operation based on some evaluation criteria? If yes, which are these criteria?

Answer

Considering that the detailed specifications are “soft law”, deviations to the detailed specifications (i.e., non-compliances) can be declared within the statement of compliance. Please refer to the associated AMC/GM Article 6 of the Delegated Act.

Last updated:

04/01/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139193>**Partnership Agreements****What is the process to follow for an NSA to support EASA in its activity?****Answer**

There will be need for coordination and information exchange between EASA and NSAs. If the question is about possible contribution of NSA into EASA assessments, then it is reminded that partnership agreements are possible. EASA intends to make use of that instrument, to get support from NSAs when needed.

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139181>**Registry of certificates, statements of compliance, defects**

Does EASA plan to publish an EU-open database recording: a. Certified DPO with the details of the certificates (validity, etc.), b. Certified GE with the details of the certificates, c. Issued SoC by ANSP or DPO, d. Known defects on certified and declared GE?

Answer

Some of the elements of the list will be included in EASA registry that is going to be created. For elements A and B, EASA needs to consider which info could be public. EASA does not anticipate the need for C at the moment. For d. the information will be made available to interested parties, for example, for occurrence reporting. This needs to be assessed internally, but at the moment EASA does not anticipate making this available for public information.

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139183>**Scope/Applicability**

We assume that only those systems are subject to Certification/Declaration/SoC, where applicable specific Detailed Specifications have been issued. Is this assumption correct?

Answer

In fact, systems that require attestation are defined in Articles 4, 5 and 6 of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2023/1768. All these systems have to fulfil at least the general requirements contained in the detailed specifications. Additionally, systems will have to comply to specific detailed specifications in case they are available.

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139185>

We assume that Electronic Flight Strips are not subject to certification (EFS does not fall into 3b, as EFS does not provide separation of aircraft or prevention of collision, it is not 3a either, there it must be 3c). Please confirm.

Answer

EFS falls in the scope of the ATC equipment that supports ATCO's in providing separation.

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139186>

What parts of the system need to be certified/how can we define the equipment/constituent that needs to be certified. E.g. Flight strips System with several servers, operating system and virtualisation, switches, operating position equipment plus some software components. Can the DPO only certify the software, with definition of hardware requirements and the customer (or we) purchases any COTS HW, which fulfills these requirements?

Answer

It is a decision of the DPO to set the boundaries of the equipment that they wish to certify/declare.

COTS HW is not automatically excluded because it is COTS. However, if COTS HW is part of the supporting infrastructure, then it may fall out of the product boundaries.

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139187>

Is the following requirement applicable for all ATM/ANS Equipment in "PART 2 — ATM/ANS equipment subject to certification / Subpart A — Air traffic services: "DS GE.CER.ATS.110 ATS recording ATM/ANS equipment specified in this Subpart is to provide recording and replay capability of technical and operational data, and system status."?

Answer

Yes, it is applicable for all in Part 2.

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139188>

DoV refers to the systems structured according to support of the functions and services provided within the functional system defined by the respective ANSP, while SoC refers to components/equipment. DoV also covers the integration process within ANSP, while a SoC is at the level of today's DSU, DoC. Is this assumption correct?

Answer

Not exactly. E.g. point 3 of Annex VIII (Essential requirements) of EASA Basic Regulation also refers to "The systems and procedures shall include in particular those required to support the following functions and services (...)". Thus, the principle is the same. As regards the integration, it remains as today the ATM/ANS provider's responsibilities as only the ANSP has the global picture of the complete functional systems and how it will behave or continue to behave after the integration.

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139189>

The DoV is also documenting the integration of components/devices into the provider's systems within its FS, the new regulatory framework does not cover this integration - the SoC issuing process ends before the device is integrated into the FS, the integration is done as a change to FS. Is this assumption correct?

Answer

Yes, the integration should be assessed as part of the change to the functional system.

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139190>

In Part 3, Subpart C, what about PSR and SMR?

Answer

They will be introduced in due course, at further updates, as EASA moves forward. Hopefully, before the transition period expires.

Last updated:

04/01/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139205>

Could you please elaborate a bit more on the Statements of Compliance (SoCs) in case there are no detailed specifications DSs? If there are no DSs, then no SoC is required, right? Otherwise, any single and simple system would need a SoC?

Answer

Equipment that falls under Article 6 of Regulation (EU) 2023/1768 is subject to compliance with the DSs in DS-GE.SoC. The attestation of compliance must be made through an SoC.

DSs contain general requirements that must be complied with (Subpart A 'General' in DS-GE.SoC), even when there are no lower-level specific requirements in the DSs. Therefore, an SoC is required when the equipment falls under Article 6, even when there are no specific DSs.

Last updated:

04/04/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139206>

From your explanations, we infer that if we need to put into service a system but there are no DSs, then we only need to comply with the GENERAL part of the DSs: Is this interpretation right?

Answer

That is correct.

Last updated:

04/01/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139207>

If a detailed specification (DS) does not exist for certain hardware (HW) or software (SW), e.g. the application that provides to air traffic controllers (ATCO) the radar availability chart on the auxiliary display, is it subject to this regulatory package? I would say neither CERT, DECL nor SoC are applicable in this case? Only change management should be applied?

Answer

It is not the lack of lower-level specific requirements in a DS that determines if certain equipment is subject to CERT/DECL/SoC, but rather Articles 4, 5, and 6 of Regulation (EU) 2023/1768.

Articles 4, 5 and 6 address what is included at each category. Therefore, equipment supporting air traffic control (ATC) service provision will be subject to compliance with the DSs.

It is important to note that DSs always contain general requirements that must be complied with, even when there are no lower-level specific requirements in the DS.

Last updated:

04/04/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139610>

Where is compliance with the essential requirements documented in the first place?

Answer

Compliance with the essential requirements is demonstrated when the equipment demonstrates compliance with the detailed specifications (DSs) applicable to the equipment category. There is no requirement on where compliance with the essential requirements is explicitly recorded.

Last updated:

10/05/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139825>

What parts/functions/constituents of a remote tower system will be subject to conformity assessment?

Answer

[Regulation \(EU\) 2023/1768](#) defines the categories of equipment that are subject to the conformity assessment process. Please see Article 4 (for equipment subject to certification), Article 5 (for equipment subject to a declaration) and Article 6 (for equipment subject to a statement of compliance). The regulation applies equally to equipment used within a remote tower system or a conventional tower system.

Last updated:

10/05/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139826>

Does the conformity assessment framework for ATM/ANS ground equipment, including Commission Implementing

Regulation (EU) 2023/1771, apply to flight procedure design (FPD) providers?

Answer

ATM/ANS equipment used in support of FPD services is out of the scope of [Regulation \(EU\) 2023/1768](#). Articles 4, 5, and 6 of that Regulation determine what ATM/ANS equipment is subject to conformity assessment. Equipment supporting FPD, data services (DAT) and other network functions (other than air traffic flow management (ATFM)) is not listed, and thus **FPD is not within the scope of Regulation (EU) 2023/1768**.

However, FPD organisations **are** within the scope of [Regulation \(EU\) 2017/373](#). This includes the latest amendment to Regulation (EU) 2017/373, i.e. [Regulation \(EU\) 2032/1771](#). This amendment applies to FPD in its entirety. Indeed, GM1 ATM/ANS.OR.A.045(g)(4) to Regulation (EU) 2017/373 is intended to explain this aspect. In short, point ATM/ANS.OR.A.045(g) applies to FPD, in particular its point 4, because this equipment does not fall within points 1, 2, or 3.

In summary, for equipment used in the provision of FPD services, the Conformity Assessment Regulation (i.e. Regulation (EU) 2023/1768) **does not apply**. However, Regulation (EU) 2017/373, as amended by Regulation (EU) 2023/1771, **does apply**.

Last updated:

10/05/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139828>

Does a military surveillance station fall under the equipment of Regulation (EU) 2023/1768 if an air navigation service provider (ANSP) chooses to make use of the surveillance data for Air Traffic Management / Air Navigation Services (ATM/ANS) provision?

Answer

No. However, military services or equipment used for civilian purposes by an ANSP are not fully excluded from the scope of the Regulation.

Article 2 of the Basic Regulation ([Regulation \(EU\) 2018/1139](#)) excludes from its scope ATM/ANS systems and constituents provided or made available by the military. However, in accordance with Article 2(5)(b) of the Basic Regulation, Member States shall ensure that those military ATM/ANS or equipment offer a level of safety and interoperability with civil systems that is as effective as that resulting from the application of the essential requirements that are laid out in the Basic Regulation.

In other words, the military service or equipment provider is not bound by the implementing rules (i.e. Regulations (EU) [2023/1768](#) and [2023/1769](#)) and is not required to apply the requirements defined in Regulation (EU) 2023/1768. However, Member States are required to demonstrate that military ATM/ANS or equipment provides a level of safety and interoperability that is as effective as civil systems that are developed on the basis of Regulation (EU) 2023/1768. This is in addition to assessments performed by the ATM/ANS provider and any Service Level Agreement (SLA).

For example, this could be achieved by applying (and demonstrating compliance to) the requirements of Regulation (EU) 2023/1768. It could also be achieved by demonstrating that the standards and requirements used to develop the military ATM/ANS or equipment (e.g. military standards) are equivalent to the standards and requirements defined in Regulation (EU) 2023/1768. This demonstration that the equipment provides a level of safety and interoperability as effective as civil systems is to be made available, upon request, to any civil ANSP intending to make use of the military equipment in the provision of their services.

Finally, there is an obligation to EASA, when monitoring Member States' compliance with the Basic Regulation through the standardisation processes, to verify that the process/criteria used by Member States (to determine that military services or equipment are "as effective as" the systems and equipment produced under Regulation (EU) 2023/1768) are coherent and aligned, and achieve that objective.

Please see below for the relevant regulatory references.

Recital 9 of the Basic Regulation states:

“(9) Aerodromes that are controlled and operated by the military, as well as air traffic management and air navigation services (‘ATM/ANS’) that are provided or made available by the military, should be excluded from the scope of this Regulation. However, Member States should ensure, in accordance with their national law, that such aerodromes, when opened to the public, and such ATM/ANS when serving air traffic to which Regulation (EC) No 549/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council (1) applies, offer a level of safety and interoperability with civil systems that is as effective as that resulting from the application of the essential requirements for aerodromes and ATM/ANS set out in this Regulation.”

Article 2(3) 3 states:

“3. This Regulation shall not apply to ... (c) ATM/ANS, including systems and constituents, personnel and organisations, that are provided or made available by the military;”

Article 2(5) states:

“5. Without prejudice to national security and defence requirements, and Article 7(5) of Regulation (EC) No 550/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council (1), Member States shall ensure that:

(a) the facilities referred to in point (b) of the first subparagraph of paragraph 3 of this Article that are open to public use; and

(b) the ATM/ANS referred to in point (c) of the first subparagraph of paragraph 3 of this Article that are provided to air traffic to which Regulation (EC) No 549/2004 applies,

offer a level of safety and interoperability with civil systems that is as effective as that resulting from the application of the essential requirements set out in Annexes VII and VIII to this Regulation.”

Last updated:

10/05/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139829>

Means of compliance (MOC)

Should the ATM/ANS Equipment Release Form attach external documentation/evidence how the GE is compliant with the AMCs and DSs?

Answer

The release form is a declaration that what the manufacturer produced is in compliance with the applicable detailed specifications. There is no requirement or need for additional evidences.

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139192>

Conformity assessment during the transition period

We assume that all systems in operation before September 13 are grandfathered and only need SoC after major changes. Please confirm.

Answer

According to the transitional provisions, systems in operation before 5 October (entry into force date) holding EC declarations in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 552/2004 are deemed to have been issued with certificate, declaration, or statement of compliance.

In case of major change, there is a need to reissue the SoC.

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139195>

What happens with the equipment sold by a DPO during the transition period and installed by the ANSP but at the end of the transition period, the DPO is not certified by EASA?

Answer

During provisional period, it is possible to issue a statement of compliance (SoC). It becomes legacy equipment at the start of 2028. Therefore, legacy ATM/ANS GE issued with a SoC during this transition period (2023-2028) will be subject to evaluation by EASA and subject to certification/declaration. After 2028, this path will be closed.

Last updated:

04/01/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139197>

In the following scenario, an ANSP put into service a GE (i.e. ADS-B) with its SoC, in September 2028 the manufacturer is not approved as DPO. Should the ANSP deinstall it and deploy a GE from another DPO?

Answer

Between 2023 and 2028, attestation of equipment is achieved through a SoC. After 2028, there will be an EASA evaluation. If those equipment are installed, they will remain in operation. But if they need to be updated/modified, there will be a need to conduct certification/declaration.

Last updated:

04/01/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139198>

Does it mean that if during the transition period there is only one DPO but many manufactures, ANSPs are not forced to procure the equipment from that DPO? They can thus procure an equipment from non-DPO manufacturers till September 2028?

Answer

EASA confirms that during transition period, the main means for attestation will be the Statement of Compliance (SoC) by the ANSP.

To have a certificate of equipment, we need to have an approved DPO. However, during the transitional period, there may not be many approved DPOs. Therefore, the main means would be the SOC.

During the transition period (2023-2027) there will be a mixture of DPOs and equipment that is certified, and Statements of Compliance (SoC). If there is a certificate of conformity, then there is no need for the ATM/ANS provider to issue a SoC.

Last updated:

04/01/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139199>

For SoC and DoV, we assume that the issuance of existing DoVs will be simply replaced by the issuance of SoCs (at least within the transitional period until 2028, once the DoV or its part are to be change). Is this correct?

Answer

During the transition period (13 September 2028):

- ATM/ANS equipment subject to certification and ATM/ANS equipment subject to declaration of design compliance shall be deemed to have been issued with a certificate or declaration respectively in accordance with Article 4 or Article 5 on a provision basis, i.e. unless the Agency determine based on an assessment that such ATM/ANS equipment does not ensure a level of safety, security, performance and interoperability equivalent to that required by Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 and the new delegated act.
- ATM/ANS equipment which is subject to a statement of compliance, the EC declarations of verification (DoV) of systems that have been issued shall continue to be valid for an unlimited duration and shall be deemed to have a statement of compliance pursuant to Article 6 of the new delegated act.

Last updated:

04/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139201>

Implementation support to stakeholders

What is the EASA plan to ensure wide communication towards ATM GE providers and common understanding of the regulation framework?

Answer

EPAS 2023-2025 contains 3 new tasks, 2 for the regulatory activities (covering the detailed specifications, AMC and GM material), and also 1 task requiring implementation support to Stakeholders (National Supervisory Authorities). EASA is also thinking about additional ways that materials can be provided to any stakeholder to facilitate common understanding (e.g. Specific trainings and presentations, FAQs, etc).

Last updated:

03/01/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/139203>

Aerodromes (ADR)

Aerodromes

ADR.1 Which aerodromes fall under the EASA Basic Regulation and its implementing rules?

Answer

According to Art. 2.1 (e) of Regulation (EU) 2018/1139, the applicability of the Basic Regulation (BR) in the domain of aerodromes is as follows:

(e) the design, maintenance and operation of aerodromes, including the safety-related equipment used at those aerodromes, located in the territory to which the Treaties apply, which:

- (i) are open to public use;*
- (ii) serve commercial air transport; and*
- (iii) have a paved instrument runway of 800 metres or more, or exclusively serve helicopters using instrument approach or*

departure procedures;

According to Art. 2.7 of the BR, a Member State can decide to exempt the design, maintenance and operation of an aerodrome, and its safety-related equipment, where that aerodrome handles no more than 10,000 commercial air transport passengers per year and no more than 850 movements related to cargo operations per year. However, the Member State concerned must ensure that such exemption does not endanger compliance with the essential requirements for aerodromes that are detailed in the Annex VII of the BR.

Art. 2.7 details this exemption possibility even further and states that:

- When such exemption decision is taken for a specific aerodrome, the design, maintenance and operation of the aerodrome concerned and the safety-related equipment and ground handling services and AMS (apron management services) at that aerodrome shall no longer be regulated by this Regulation and by the delegated and implementing acts adopted on the basis thereof;
- When such an exemption decision was granted without meeting the traffic conditions, the Commission will address an Implementing act to the the Member State concerned to modify or revoke its exemption decision; and notify the Commission and the Agency thereof;
- The Member States need to also to notify to the Commission and the Agency all “old” such low traffic exemptions granted under Art. 4 (3b) of the revoked Regulation 216/2008 and examine their traffic figures annually. Where this examination demonstrates that, over three consecutive years, one of those aerodromes handles more than 10 000 commercial air transport passengers per year or more than 850 movements related to cargo operations per year, the Member State concerned shall revoke the exemption of that aerodrome.
- All such revocations need to be notified to the Commission and the Agency, and the Agency shall include all decisions by the Commission and the Member States in the repository, described under Art. 74 of the Basic Regulation.

A list of currently exempted aerodromes is found on EASA's website: [List of aerodromes falling in the scope of Regulation \(EU\) 2018/1139 \[Regulation \(EC\) No 216/2008\]](#). You can directly filter on screen and download the information.

A Member State shall use a dedicated platform (FlexTool) to provide needed information and upload associated documentation. For troubleshooting, the FlexTool Focal Point (FoP) for the country should contact exemptions [at] easa.europa.eu (exemptions[at]easa[dot]europa[dot]eu).

[Aerodrome traffic exemptions notification form](#) (EC) 216/2008 only applicable for Iceland, Liechtenstein & Norway.

Last updated:

31/07/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19499>

ADR.2 Is an extension of the applicability of the EASA rules towards smaller aerodromes planned?

Answer

As stated in Recital (7) of Regulation (EU) No 2018/1139, a “deepening of the scope” is not planned:

“It would not be appropriate to subject all aerodromes to common rules. Aerodromes which are not open to public use or aerodromes which do not serve commercial air transport or aerodromes without paved instrument runways of more than 800 metres and which do not exclusively serve helicopters using instrument approach or departure procedures should remain under the regulatory control of the Member States, without any obligation under this Regulation on other Member States to recognise such national arrangements.”

Last updated:

30/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19501>

ADR.3 What is the “Certification Basis” of an aerodrome?

Answer

The term “Certification Basis” (CB) is a key term in the area of oversight of aerodromes. According to Art. 34.1 (a) of the Basic Regulation (EU) No 2018/1139 a certificate is required for aerodromes in scope of the BR. The process of obtaining such an aerodrome certificate involves the establishment of the aerodrome’s CB to describe the infrastructure and equipment in terms of the regulatory requirements which they are meant to comply with. The concept of the CB gives also the necessary flexibility to take account of the non-uniform elements of the infrastructure at Europe’s airports. The CB concept does so by allowing local solutions to local issues of deviations from the European aerodrome certification specifications (CS). This CB document is proposed by the applicant (usually the aerodrome operator) and is finally decided on by the Competent Authority, the State entity designated to certify and oversee aerodromes.

The CB concept is enshrined in the Basic Regulation under Art. 34.5, where it is stipulated that the certification basis for an aerodrome shall consist of the following:

- *a) the applicable certification specifications related to the type of aerodromes;*
- *b) those provisions of the applicable certification specifications for which an equivalent level of safety has been accepted;*
- *c) the special detailed technical specifications necessary when the design features of a particular aerodrome or the experience in operation render any of the certification specifications referred to in point (a) of this paragraph inadequate or inappropriate to ensure conformity with the essential requirements referred to in Article 33.*

The CB can be a list of all the applicable Certification Specifications, which are relevant to the aerodrome infrastructure elements in question, ideally with an indication for each infrastructure element how each relevant and applicable CS is satisfied. For CS that are not met, an equivalent level of safety (ELOS) or special condition (SC) can be proposed. The CB would normally reference the documentation showing the compliance, the ELOS or the SC, as the case may be.

When the applicant has demonstrated that the aerodrome complies with the agreed CB as per ADR.OR.B.025 (in Annex II of Regulation (EU) No 139/ 2014), one condition for the issuance of the certificate would be met. The final aerodrome certificate shall be considered to include the aerodrome’s CB, and moreover any Deviation Acceptance and Action Documents (DAAD) based on Art.7 “Deviations from certification specifications” of Regulation (EU) No 139/2014, which may have been issued. (See also ADR.AR.C.035 (d) in Annex II of 139/2014).

Last updated:

30/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19502>

ADR.4 When establishing the certification basis of aerodrome, to what extent will the Competent Authority be allowed to take into account the differing environments and location of aerodromes?

Answer

There are altogether three important “flexibility tools” in the process of the certification of aerodrome infrastructure and design. Firstly, the establishment of an individual aerodrome Certification Basis (CB) includes the possible element of special conditions (SC), as described under ADR.AR.C.025 in annex II of Regulation (EC) No 139/2014. It gives the flexibility to the authority to allow deviations from the Agency’s Certification Specifications when the aerodrome is subject to topographical, physical or other limitations.

Secondly, the concept of the equivalent level of safety (ELOS), as described ADR.AR.C.020 (b) in Annex II of Regulation (EC) No 139/2014, may also allow for technological solutions or alternatives to be introduced into the CB instead of complying with the applicable certification specification(s). This is on condition that the authority allows for such an equivalent level of safety to be demonstrated (see also the Agency’s Guidance Material for ADR.AR.C.020).

Furthermore, the concept introduced by Art. 7 “Deviations from certification specifications” of Regulation (EC) No 139/2014 allow competent authorities to accept “legacy” deviations from the certification specifications until the end of 2024 for newly certified. Such “legacy” deviations have to pre-date the coming into force of the said Regulation (i.e. have existed before 6 March 2014) to continue as long as they cannot be captured with the aforementioned concepts, are safety assessed, mitigated and undergo regular reviews to establish their continued legitimacy. Such acceptances may be formalised in what is called a “Deviation Acceptance and Action Document” (DAAD).

Last updated:

30/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19503>

ADR.5 What is the Deviation Acceptance and Action Document (DAAD) described in Art. 7 of Regulation 139/2014?

Answer

The old and the new Basic Regulation (BR) tasked the Agency to provide solutions to measures at existing aerodromes, which Member States had already authorized on the basis of national law and which stem from notified deviations from Annex 14 filed by the Member States to International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). One of the tools that the Agency developed in order to meet this request is found in Art. 7 “Deviations from certification specifications” of the aerodrome implementing rules (Regulation (EU) No 139/2014). It says the following:

Article 7 Deviations from certification specifications

1) The Competent Authority may, until 31 December 2024, accept applications for a certificate including deviations from the certification specifications issued by the Agency, if the following conditions are met:

- a. the deviations do not qualify as an equivalent level of safety case under ADR.AR.C.020, nor qualify as a case of special condition under ADR.AR.C.025 of Annex II to this Regulation;*
- b. the deviations existed prior to the entry into force of this Regulation;*
- c. the essential requirements of Annex Va to Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 are respected by the deviations, supplemented by mitigating measures and corrective actions as appropriate;*
- d. a supporting safety assessment for each deviation has been completed.*

2) The Competent Authority shall compile the evidence supporting the fulfilment of the conditions referred to in paragraph 1 in a Deviation Acceptance and Action Document (DAAD). The DAAD shall be attached to the certificate. The Competent Authority shall specify the period of validity of the DAAD.

3) The aerodrome operator and the Competent Authority shall verify that the conditions referred to in paragraph 1 continue to be fulfilled.

This means that during the initial certification process all existing deviations at an aerodrome must undergo review. In a next step, all deviations which cannot be handled with the other flexibility tools provided (i.e. the Equivalent Level of Safety and Special Condition), and which pre-date 2014, can be accepted by the Competent Authority in a “Deviation Acceptance and Action Document” (DAAD), which would be attached to the certificate, but which does not form part of it.

Such a DAAD will have to describe the deviation, contain the outcomes of a safety assessment concerning the deviation and describe how the essential requirements of Annex VII of Regulation 2018/ 1139 are nevertheless respected by the deviation, when supplemented by mitigating measures and corrective actions as appropriate. It could also be that the Competent Authority includes an action plan for the removal of the deviation at some point in the future. Despite the issuance of a DAAD the deviation(s) should be regularly reviewed.

When a DAAD is issued, there is no pre-defined expiry date. While a “validity period” must be stated, it must not necessarily be a temporal period. It can also be a traffic volume threshold or in relation to a change in the traffic mix (aircraft type) or a condition whereby the rectification (the “fixing”) of a deviation is related to the next time when a piece of infrastructure is changed, renewed,

re-furbished or maintained. It is up to the authority to decide. However, after 2024 this possibility to issue a DAAD for newly certified aerodromes will no longer be possible for the CAAs as this is a transitional measure only.

Last updated:

30/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19504>

ADR.6 Is it planned to have two different certificates, one for the aerodrome operator and one for the aerodrome infrastructure?

Answer

Based on the Basic Regulation and as detailed in ADR.AR.C.035 "Issuance of Certificates" under paragraph (b) in Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 139/2014 both options are possible.

Last updated:

30/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19506>

ADR.7 What are the so called "standardisation inspections" by EASA of the competent authorities of the Member States?

Answer

As of 2018 (end of the conversion period), standardisation teams composed out of EASA officers and personnel of competent authorities qualified by EASA, started to conduct aerodrome standardisation inspections. Those standardisation inspections are based on Article 85 of the Basic Regulation and Regulation (EU) No 628/2013 describing the working methods of these standardisation inspections.

According to a risk-based programme for the Aerodromes domain all the Member States and their competent authorities will systematically receive an aerodromes standardisation inspection in order to assess the application of the aerodrome rules. In the context of such a standardisation visit one or more aerodromes in the Member State are visited to better understand the interactions between the authority and the aerodrome operator; and to understand how the certification process and oversight of the aerodromes by the authority is reflected on the aerodrome operators. However, EASA is not raising findings directly against the sampled aerodrome operator(s) and the addressee of the standardisation visit remains the Member State and its competent authority(ies).

Last updated:

30/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19508>

ADR.8 Safety Management System (SMS) for aerodrome operators: are the EASA rules regarding this area the same as those required by ICAO in Annex 19?

Answer

In line with ICAO Annex 19, the European rules for aerodromes require that aerodrome operators put into place and maintain a management system, which contains a system to manage safety (SMS). This reflects the need to integrate the various sub-systems used for the management of the different activities of an aerodrome organization (e.g. management of aeronautical data and related activities).

The relevant provisions on the management system of aerodrome operators may be found in the management requirements contained in Subpart D of Annex III of Regulation (EU) No 139/ 2014 (Part ADR.OR), as well as in the related acceptable means of compliance and guidance material. They reflect the Annex 19 requirements and will be updated in line with updates to Annex 19.

Last updated:

30/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19509>

ADR.9 What are alternative means of compliance (AltMOC)?

Answer

For all questions regarding alternative means of compliance please consult the following FAQ pages:[link](#)

Last updated:

30/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19512>

ADR.10 Has EASA published design requirements for heliports?

Answer

Yes, following the developments under RMT.0638, EASA published in May 2019 the ED Decision 2019/012/R issuing the Certification Specifications (CS) and Guidance Material (GM) for the design of surface-level VFR heliports located at aerodromes that fall under the scope of Regulation (EU) 2018/1139. These requirements are contained in CS-HPT-DSN: [Regulations ADR-Aerodromes](#)

Last updated:

29/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19510>

ADR.11 The Basic Regulation – BR (Regulation (EU) 2018/1139) contains provisions for the safety-related aerodrome equipment. Where can I find the rules?

Answer

In accordance with Article 35 of the BR, organisations involved in the design, production and maintenance of safety related aerodrome equipment used or intended for the use at aerodromes in the scope may have to either:

- (a) declare that the equipment complies with certain specifications; or
- (b) hold a certificate for such equipment.

Where the safety-related aerodrome equipment is not covered by either a declaration or a certificate, the aerodrome certificate required under Article 34 will also have to include this equipment.

Once the implementing rules will be adopted, EASA will act as Competent Authority responsible for the certification, oversight and enforcement in accordance with Article 62(2) with respect to the certificates and the declarations.

EASA and its stakeholders need to further assess and decide the optimum approach and concept, followed by the development of proposed rules and procedures. Therefore, the development of these requirements will be performed at a later stage, possibly after 2021. The type of regulatory action will be reflected in the European Plan for Aviation Safety (EPAS), which is consulted with

the stakeholders.

Last updated:

30/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19511>

ADR.12 Is it true that EASA will soon be publishing common rules for groundhandling providers and groundhandling services?

Answer

The new Basic Regulation ((EU) 2018/1139), under its articles 33 and 37, gives the Agency responsibility for the rulemaking for this area. Due to ground safety being also a significant safety issue showing up in safety data, the area has priority over other new responsibilities. The associated rulemaking task is RMT.0728. It was already kicked off in 2018 and is reflected in the EPAS of 2019. The involvement of the relevant stakeholders is, as always, taken very seriously by the Agency.

Last updated:

30/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/99723>

ADR.13 When will the rules for Apron Management Services (AMS) finally come out? Note: ICAO also calls such services Apron Control.

Answer

The requirements for Apron Management Services at aerodromes falling under the scope of Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 have been adopted with [Commission Delegated Regulation \(EU\) 2020/1234](#). The Regulation will apply as of 20 March 2022.

The relevant AMC and GM can be found in the updated [Easy Access to the Rules for Aerodromes](#).

EASA organized on the 23 November 2021 a webinar on Apron Management Services. The proceedings on the webinar can be found [here](#).

Last updated:

13/01/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/99724>

ADR.14 Is it correct that Europe has extended powers with respect to the protection of aerodrome surroundings and that this area will be regulated by Europe?

Answer

The Basic Regulation ((EU) 2018/1139) in its article 38 talks about the Member States' and aerodrome operators' obligations with respect to the protection of aerodrome surroundings and the possible European intervention in order to ensure the uniform application of these obligations.

Article 38 states that Member States must ensure that the aerodrome located in their territory are safeguarded against activities and developments in their surroundings, which may cause unacceptable risks to aircraft using the aerodrome. Examples for such activities would be for example those that attract wildlife, while development would be constructions, which represent obstacles in one of the different obstacle limitation surfaces.

The article then goes on to say, that aerodrome operators have the task to monitor the aerodrome surroundings for such activities

and developments which may cause risks to aviation in the surroundings of their aerodromes. They then need to take the necessary measures to mitigate those risks in as far as this lies in their control or otherwise bring the risk to the attention of the competent authority of the Member State where the aerodrome is located.

The Commission shall develop implementing acts to ensure the uniform application of the article on the basis of the principle laid out in Art. 4 of the Basic Regulation in order to achieve the objectives laid out in Art. 1, among which the establishment and maintenance of a high uniform level of civil aviation safety in the Union is the most prominent.

However, the development of this task will only start at some point after 2021, due to lack of resources and other priority tasks at this point in time.

Last updated:

27/06/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/99725>

ADR.15 Is there a transition period by which an aerodrome operator has to comply with new or changed certification specifications (CS) for aerodrome design?

Answer

In accordance with ADR.OR.B.50, the aerodrome operator, following an amendment of the certification specifications, must perform a review to identify any certification specifications, which are applicable to the aerodrome. If relevant, the aerodrome operator needs to initiate a change process in accordance with ADR.OR.B.040, propose an update of the certification basis and implement the necessary changes at the aerodrome.

The competent authority, for its part, shall process the application for changes in accordance with the steps prescribed in ADR.AR.C.040. During this process, a timeline to reach compliance with the new CS shall be prescribed by the competent authority, depending on, amongst other factors, the nature and the significance of the required change.

Last updated:

30/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/19513>

ADR.16 What is the underlying definition of “passengers” in the context of exemptions mentioned under Art. 2(7) of the EASA New Basic Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2018/1139)?

Answer

According to Article 2(7) of Regulation (EU) 2018/1139, a Member State may decide to issue an exemption from the provisions of this regulation and its implementing rules when the aerodrome in question handles no more than 10,000 commercial air transport passengers per year and no more than 850 movements related to cargo operations per year.

The exact term “commercial air transport passengers” is not defined in Regulation (EU) 2018/1139. However, in accordance with Article 3 (24) of the same regulation, commercial air transport is defined as an aircraft operation to transport passengers, cargo or mail for remuneration or other valuable consideration.

Passengers are practically all persons on board an aircraft, who are not crew members. This corresponds with the practice at Eurostat in its 2015 “Reference Manual on Air Transport Statistics”, where the following definition is given: “Air Passenger” any person, excluding on-duty members of the flight and cabin crews, who makes a journey by air. Infants in arms are included.”

Last updated:

30/05/2018

Link:

ADR.17 The EASA Basic Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 talks in its Art. 2 (1e) about aerodromes “open to public use”. Can you provide a definition about the meaning of this?**Answer**

The term “public use” is included in Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 as one of the elements for defining which aerodromes shall comply with this Regulation and consequently will need to be certified in accordance with the requirements and administrative procedures laid down in Commission Regulation (EU) No 139/2014.

In the context of aviation rules, an aerodrome open to public use means that it is generally accessible to use by the public, as opposed to being accessible only to one particular person (for example only the owner) or a restricted group of users.

The Agency’s interpretation of the term “open to public use”, is that an aerodrome (and heliport) which is open to public use is not necessarily open for all purposes. Its use may be limited to certain operations / types of users and a prior permission/approval may also be required for its use. In any case, a “uniform treatment” of the users of an aerodrome open to public use is always required. This would mean that for example also “PPR” (Prior Permission Required) aerodromes can be open to public use.

Ultimately, the Member States are responsible to ensure effective implementation of the relevant provisions of the Basic Regulation.

Last updated:

30/05/2019

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/99722>

ADR.18 When is EASA going to implement the new Aircraft Classification Rating – Pavement Classification Rating (ACR–PCR) method?**Answer**

In 2020, the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) adopted with Amendment 15 to its Annex 14, Volume I ‘Aerodromes — Aerodrome Design and Operations’, **a new method for expressing and calculating the bearing strength of a pavement, called the ACR-PCR**. A transition period of 4 years has been set by ICAO, and the new method will become applicable on 28 November 2024, replacing the current Aircraft Classification Number – Pavement Classification Number (ACN–PCN) method.

The applicability of the ACR-PCR method in the European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) Member States has been deferred to a later date, and there is currently ongoing work to transpose the new method in the European Union (EU) regulatory framework.

Following the questions received from stakeholders, EASA has prepared [guidance](#) to support them in their efforts to implement the new ACR-PCR method. The guidance:

- provides information on the steps and planned time frame for the transposition of the new method in the EU regulatory framework;
- presents recommended actions to the competent authorities, aerodrome operators, and aeronautical information services (AIS) providers to ensure compliance with the new method;
- details the two acceptable methods to determine the PCR values:
 - the technical evaluation method, which represents a study, or
 - ‘using the aircraft experience’ method, which represents a knowledge of the specific type and mass of aircraft being satisfactorily supported under regular use; and
- includes examples for the calculation of the ACR and PCR values.

Last updated:

01/10/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140472>

Rescue and Firefighting

Is it required to perform a 'Task and Resource Analysis' as referred to in ICAO Airport Service Manual (Doc 9137) and GM2 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2)?

Answer

Although the term 'Task and Resource Analysis' is used in GM2 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2), it should be considered as a generic term not linked to the ICAO Airport Service Manual, Part 1. Therefore, it is neither a certification requirement to conduct a Task and Resource analysis nor an obligation to follow the example in the ICAO documentation.

Regardless, the aerodrome operator is expected to demonstrate to the competent authority the adequacy of the staffing levels. For that, the aerodrome operator may choose any existing or established approach to determine the number of personnel (e.g. adapted from public firefighting services or structural firefighting).

However, the aerodrome operator is expected to develop a transparent approach to determine the minimum number of personnel and equipment for a credible scenario, which might be validated in further scenarios, in accordance with its published rescue and firefighting aerodrome level(s) of protection. In case of reduced aerodrome level of protection during anticipated periods (see AMC2 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2)(b)), an additional determination is required with a credible scenario in each of the published levels of protection.

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140161>

What considerations for determining the number of personnel are already given in the regulatory framework?

Answer

Although Regulation (EU) No 139/2014 does not contain specific considerations on the number of required rescue and firefighting services (RFFS) personnel, the existing EU regulatory framework contains different factors that may influence the number of RFFS personnel and should be taken into account. The following four key aspects affecting the number of personnel should be considered:

- **RFFS Level of Protection** (AMC2 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2));
- **Core Tasks** as indicated in the scope of RFFS (GM1 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(1));
- Comparison of **available and required resources** (AMC6 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2)); and
- **Human Performance** (AMC6 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2)).

However, the determination should always be guided by the question whether an aerodrome operator is confident with its tactics and the associated number of personnel.

GM1 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(1) specifies that the principal objective [...] is to **save lives** [...]. The rescue and firefighting service is provided **to create and maintain survivable conditions**, to **provide egress routes** [...] and **initiate the rescue of those occupants unable to make their escape without aid**. The rescue may [...] **use equipment and personnel other than those** assessed primarily for rescue and firefighting [...].

In determining the number of personnel required to provide for rescue and firefighting, a **Task and Resource Analysis** should be performed, taking into consideration the **types of aircraft** [...], the available [...] **vehicles and equipment** (consider: AMC3 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2)), and **other duties** required from RFFS personnel (GM2 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2)).

AMC6 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2) specifies that the aerodrome operator should ensure that:

- during flight operations [...] **sufficient trained personnel** is detailed and readily available to **ride** [...] **vehicles**, and to operate

the equipment [...];

- personnel is deployed [...] considering also the **use of hand lines, ladders, and other rescue equipment** normally associated with aircraft rescue and firefighting operations; [...] and
- any **other duties carried out** [...] do not compromise the response [...].

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140162>

How does the RFFS level of protection influence the minimum number of RFFS personnel?

Answer

The rescue and firefighting services (RFFS) level of protection reflects the size and capacity of aircraft normally using an aerodrome. Hence, it sets the overall frame when determining the number of RFFS personnel. When aligning the number of personnel, it could either reflect the largest aircraft usually scheduled at the aerodrome or the largest type of aircraft within the published RFFS aerodrome category. Furthermore, the number of personnel usually available at an aerodrome should be sufficient to man the available vehicles associated with the RFFS level of protection and operate the equipment deemed to be required by the aerodrome operator at its maximum capacity (c.f. AMC3 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2) and AMC6 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2)).

In addition to the RFFS level of protection, the potential existence of difficult environments at or near the aerodrome may impact the number of RFFS personnel, as a response to such areas is to be initiated and the effective deployment of rescue equipment for such areas is to be considered.

To determine the minimum number of RFFS personnel, the aerodrome operator should develop a credible scenario in accordance with its published RFFS level(s) of protection.

Possible factors taken into account		Example Scenario #1	Example Scenario #2
Flight Phase	Landing / Take-Off / Taxiing / On Stand	Landing	On Stand
Prior Alert	Yes / No	No	Yes
Number of Aircraft / Vehicles involved	Aircraft / Ground Service Equipment / Regular Vehicle	1 Aircraft	1 Aircraft
Type of Aircraft	According to Airport RFFS Category or Reference Aircraft	RFFS Aerodrome Category	(Reference) Aircraft Type
Number of Persons on Board	According to Airport RFFS Category or Reference Aircraft	Maximum Capacity of Reference Aircraft	Actual Capacity of Reference Aircraft
Passengers with Reduced Mobility	Yes / No	No	Yes
Quantity of Fuel on Board	Low (e.g., on arrival) / Full (e.g., on departure) / Unknown	Low	Unknown
Dangerous Goods	Yes / No / Types and Quantities	No	No
Location of Accident	Runway / Before or After Threshold / Taxiway / Aprons	Runway	Taxiway
Conditions at Location	Paved / Unpaved / Water or swampy Area	Paved	Unpaved
Weather Conditions	Optimal / Impacting ...	Optimal	Optimal
Aircraft Emergency State	Aircraft Accident / Full Emergency / Local Standby	Full Emergency	Aircraft Accident
Fuselage Integrity	OK / Damaged / In Several Parts	Damaged	OK
Access to Fuselage	Normal / Partial / Difficult	Partial	Normal
Emergency Evacuation	< 90 sec / < 5 min / Incomplete	< 5 min	Incomplete

External Emergency Services Arrival	< 10 min / X min / 30 min ...	< 30 min	25 min
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------	--------

Last updated:

17/07/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140188>

What are the core tasks that should be taken into account when determining the number of personnel for rescue and firefighting?

Answer

The determination of the number of personnel should define and prioritise tasks required to save lives as indicated in GM1 ADR.OPS.B.010 and could include:

1. Creating survivable conditions:

1. manning vehicles after the initial call;
2. responding to the accident scene;
3. assessing the accident; and
4. controlling external fires (mainly by foam tender's turrets).

2. Maintaining survivable conditions:

1. controlling external fires (supported by hand lines); and
2. monitoring the evacuation process.

3. Providing egress routes

1. assisting the evacuation; and
2. creating access to fuselage (e.g. with ladders, ground handling stairs or rescue stairs).

4. Initiating rescue of trapped occupants

1. Initiating the egress for occupants (e.g. ventilating or accessing the fuselage); and
2. transporting of trapped occupants out of the 'hot zone'.

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140163>

How do available resources at an aerodrome influence the number of RFFS personnel?

Answer

The aerodrome operator should not only consider the deployment of available vehicles and equipment but also and foremost their specifications and requirements, in order to deploy the vehicles and equipment effectively. The following technical factors may increase or decrease the number of rescue and firefighting services (RFFS) personnel:

1. **number, types, and seat capacity of vehicles** (cf. AMC3 ADR.OPS.B.010);
2. **number and type of potential rescue equipment** for a response to difficult environments at or adjacent to the aerodrome;
3. **technical configuration and state-of-the-art features** of vehicles and other rescue equipment available at the aerodrome; and
4. human or infrastructural capability of **effective deployment** of required rescue equipment.

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140164>

What role does human performance play in the determination of the number of personnel?**Answer**

Human factors and capabilities play a major role in the overall tactics, and have hence a major impact on the response to an incident. Therefore, the following may increase or decrease the number of personnel:

1. **training and proficiency of RFFS personnel** (e.g. voluntary, part-time, or full-time firefighters);
2. **tasks other than RFFS required by core RFFS personnel, resulting in fatigue** (e.g. domestic firefighting, ground handling, or aerodrome maintenance);
3. **responsibilities and tasks conducted by non-RFFS personnel** (e.g. cabin crew, security personnel, maintenance, or state authorities); and
4. **availability and response time of rescue staff other than the aerodrome's core RFFS personnel to support during an incident** (e.g. civil defence, medical services, or other external services).

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140165>

How could the total number of RFFS personnel be calculated based on an incident-related approach?**Answer**

If the transparent and documented approach to determine the number of RFFS personnel was based on a scenario, the results could be used to conclude the total number of RFFS personnel by considering the following:

1. **aerodrome infrastructure** (e.g. provision of additional capacities depending on the aerodrome specifics and to intervene at any point of the aerodrome by meeting the response time(s)); however, there is no need to duplicate each position or equipment in such case);
2. **planned absence** (e.g. recurrent training, annual leave, shift factor or shift schemes); and
3. **contingency arrangements to cover unplanned absence** (e.g. sick leave, unplanned events, vehicle breakdown (cf. GM4 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(e))).

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140166>

Is there any further supportive material that could be useful when determining the number of required RFFS personnel?**Answer**

Further guidance or considerations to determine the number of required RFFS personnel may be found in the following sources:

- [ACI World: Managing Rescue and Firefighting Services at Airports — Handbook](#)
- [ICAO: Airport Services Manual, Part 1 — Rescue and Firefighting \(Doc 9137\)](#)
- adapted procedures from structural firefighting or civil defense;
- contact or consultation with members of the working group for knowledge exchange; and
- any other international or national guidance material on the subject matter.

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140167>

AMC5 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2), point (a) refers to a response time not exceeding three minutes, and to an operational objective not exceeding two minutes. How should the operational objective be considered in relation to the response time?

Answer

The response time not exceeding three minutes should be considered as a time frame that should be met under optimum visibility and surface conditions.

The operational objective should be considered as a desired target under ideal conditions and understood “as low as reasonably possible and feasible” (considering saving lives as primary objective as well as relevant financial, organisational, technological, and human factors).

Getting as close as possible to the operational objective encompasses the set-up of a continuous improvement process (e.g. training, vehicle management, fire station(s) location and design, guidance, access roads, procedural amendment(s)).

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140168>

What should be understood as expeditiously as possible, should a response time be defined?

Answer

It is acknowledged that a response time should not be set to respond to an emergency in swampy or water areas, as it largely depends on varying local situations and environments. However, guidelines should be provided on the need for rescue entities to ensure timely response, taking into account:

- the local situation;
 - specific conditions regarding survivability (e.g. survival in cold water is approximately 10 minutes maximum); and
- the importance of providing adequate deployment of appropriate equipment in coordination among these entities.

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140169>

AMC5 ADR.OPS.B010(a)(2), point (a) refers to the time of the initial call to the rescue and firefighting services. How should the term ‘initial call’ be understood?

Answer

- ‘Initial call’ means the first sound of the siren in the fire station, the pager’s alarm or any other means of alert notified by air traffic services (ATS) or any other party [or person], indicating an aircraft incident to the rescue and firefighting services.
- Assessment of the response time should take into account the various significant milestones, and in particular any delay in communicating the incident’s location.

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140170>

AMC5 ADR.OPS.B010(a)(2), point (a) refers to the ‘position to apply foam’. How should the term ‘position to apply foam’ be understood?

Answer

As the capabilities of vehicles (e.g. moving and discharge or stop and discharge) and the procedures (e.g. one or two persons) in place at aerodromes vary widely, in such a context:

- To be in a ‘position to apply foam’ means the moment whenever the vehicle(s) is capable to effectively apply at least 50 % of the required discharge rate as per the reported incident’s category.
- The requirement may be considered to be fulfilled as soon as the vehicle(s) reach(es) a location where fire monitors of the vehicle(s) are within the range of where the incident occurred and is/are in a position to effectively apply the extinguishing agents at the specified discharge rate.
- The capabilities of vehicles and procedures in place should be taken into consideration when calculating the response time.

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140171>

AMC5 ADR.OPS.B010(a)(2), point (a) defines that the response time is subject to optimum visibility and surface conditions. What circumstances should be considered as optimum visibility and surface conditions?

Answer

‘Optimum visibility’ includes daytime and good visibility that is not being interfered by any environmental impacts impairing the driver’s view (e.g. precipitation such as rain, snow, or fog).

‘Optimum surface conditions’ means that the normal response route (i.e. the predefined route that is normally available unless there is a temporary maintenance) can be accessed without delay and is free of any:

- environmental contamination (e.g. no precipitation, water, ice, or snow); or
- unusual or unpredictable obstacles affecting safety and effective response time (e.g. foreign object debris (FOD), traffic obstructing RFFS routing, etc.).

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140172>

AMC5 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2), points (a) and (b) define that the response time should be achieved to any point of each operational runway and calculated to any part of the movement area. How many measurements/calculations should be conducted to meet the requirement of ‘any point’ or ‘any part’?

Answer

Usually, the response time should be achieved from the fire station(s) to the furthest point of the runway/s. However, if there are objective reasons why another point of the runway/s might be reached earlier or later (e.g. in case of more turns slowing down the vehicle speed), the response time should also be achieved to this point(s).

The same approach based on calculations should apply to any other parts of the movement area than the runway/s. However, as the complexity of the movement area might usually be more diverse, in many cases, more than one calculation might be considered.

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140173>

AMC5 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2), point (d) refers to guidance material that should be provided to meet the operational objective as nearly as possible in less than optimum visibility. To which response time(s) does that refer to?

Answer

AMC5 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2), point (d) aims to ensure an as quick as possible response to an incident and in less than optimum visibility, as orientation might be difficult. Hence, it refers to the response time of three minutes to any point of each operational runway/s, as per point (a) of the AMC, as well as to the response time to be calculated for any other part of the movement area, as per point (b) of the AMC.

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140174>

Should the term 'near' be understood as a distance of 1 000 meters, as identified in AMC1 ADR.OPS.B.005(b)?

Answer

The term 'near' used in AMC3 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2) should be understood as including at least the 1 000 m referred to in AMC1 ADR.OPS.B.005(b), up to the 8 km referred to in AMC2 ADR.OPS.B.005(b), considering the published approach and departure procedures and the preferential flight routes.

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140175>

How should the aerodrome operator deduct these areas?

Answer

AMC1 ADR.OPS.B.005 aims that the aerodrome operator should ensure that assessment of the approach and departure areas is carried out which includes also cases when the aerodrome is located near a water/swampy area, or other difficult environment, or a significant portion of the approach/departure operations takes over these areas.

Within the 1 000 m, these areas should be defined considering the 'obstacle limitation surfaces' calculated according to the figures of 'Divergence (each side)' in CS ADR-DSN.J.480, Table J-1. 'Dimensions and slopes of obstacle limitation surfaces — Approach runways', adopting a trapezoidal shape with a 15-% angle for an instrument runway or a 10-% angle for a non-instrument runway.

For a portion of approach or departure operations up to 8 km, these areas should be defined considering the protection envelopes of a published approach or departure procedure.

Last updated:

17/07/2024

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140189>

What width should be considered to define these areas?

Answer

AMC1 ADR.OPS.B.005 aims that the aerodrome operator should ensure that assessment of the approach and departure areas is carried out which includes also cases when the aerodrome is located near a water/swampy area, or other difficult environment, or a significant portion of the approach/departure operations takes over these areas.

These areas should be defined considering, whenever possible and depending on the type of approach or departure procedure, the width of the runway strip and the published procedures envelope.

Last updated:

17/07/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140190>

What should be understood as the largest aeroplane normally using the aerodrome?

Answer

Based on AMC2 ADR.OPS.B010(a)(2), the aerodrome operator should consider for providing the minimum of the RFF service, that it needs sufficient equipment taking into account the longest aircraft (or group of aircraft) and their fuselage width based on which the level of protection of the aerodrome has been defined.

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140177>

In case off water/swampy areas, what should be considered to ensure an effective or adequate response to an emergency at the distances mentioned in AMC1 ADR.OPS.B.005(b) and AMC2 ADR.OPS.B.005(b)?

Answer

With regard to the 1000-m area from the runway thresholds, the aerodrome operator is required to assess and ensure the intervention capability of dedicated aerodrome services. If needed, according to the local environment, and through the establishment of appropriate cooperation protocols taking due account of national or local legislation, the institutional set-up and entities mission statement, the intervention capability could be ensured by relevant support entities.

With regard to the 8-km grid map and its relevant areas concerning published flight procedures, the aerodrome operator, taking due account of the the national or local situation in terms of the institutional set-up of responsibility for managing and responding to an emergency, should conduct, with the support of relevant national or local entities, an assessment of the area to map entities available in case of an emergency, to identify intervention capability.

Such capability, with the aim to clarify how intervention would be implemented and the available means (i.e. responsibilities considering national or local legislation; type and quantity of equipment and personnel available; dispatch/activation time; other alternatives when response capacity is exhausted or in case there is no immediate response), should be documented and included in the National or Local Emergency Plans (GM1 ADR.OPS.B.005(a)), as well as in the Aerodrome Emergency Plan.

Such assessment should consider the safety management system requirement to coordinate the aerodrome emergency response plan. In that respect, coordination of the aerodrome emergency response plan with the emergency response plans of those organisations it must interface with during the provision of aerodrome services and with the relevant external organisations who have the responsibility to respond to an emergency occurring at an aerodrome or in its surroundings (ADR.OR.D.005) should be ensured.

The assessment of intervention capability should be periodically reviewed, tested, and discussed with all organisations that bear some responsibility in case of an emergency.

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140178>

What considerations for assessing difficult environments are already given in the EU regulatory framework?

Answer

Although the Regulation (EU) No 139/2014 does not contain specific considerations on the assessment of difficult environments at or near an aerodrome as the response to such areas, the existing EU regulatory framework contains aspects that could be used to assess difficult environments and plan the response to such areas in a transparent way:

1. **definition of the area's size** (e.g. AMC1 ADR.OPS.B.005(b), AMC2 ADR.OPS.B.005(b), GM1 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(1));
2. **availability of support within the area;**
3. **resource management** (e.g. GM3 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2), AMC3 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2); and
4. **verification.**

For more information, please refer to the following acceptable means of compliance (AMC) and guidance material (GM):

- GM1 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(1).
- AMC3 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2), which states that 'If the aerodrome is located near a **water/swampy area**, or **other difficult environment**, or a significant portion of the approach/departure operations takes over these areas, the aerodrome operator should **coordinate** the availability of suitable rescue equipment'.
- GM3 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2), which states that 'Special fire fighting equipment **may not be provided** for water areas; this does not prevent the **provision of such equipment if it would be of practical use**, such as when the areas concerned include reefs or islands. The objective should be to **plan and deploy** the necessary life-saving flotation equipment, as expeditiously as possible, in a number commensurate with the largest aeroplane normally using the aerodrome'.
- AMC1 ADR.OPS.B.005(b), which states that 'The aerodrome operator should ensure that an assessment of the approach and departure areas within 1000 m of the runway threshold is carried out to determine the options available for intervention'.
- AMC2 ADR.OPS.B.005(b), which states that 'A grid map of the aerodrome and its immediate surroundings, approximately at a distance of 8km from the centre of the aerodrome'.

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:


<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140179>

What area should be considered when assessing difficult environments?

Answer

The assessment of potential difficult environments at or near an aerodrome should consider the immediate surroundings of an aerodrome and the established standard flight procedures.

In accordance with point (b) of ADR.OPS.B.005, the assessment of the area at an aerodrome should consider the width of the runway strip and then follow the actual approach obstacle limitation surface up to a distance of 1 000 m beyond the runway's threshold (or, if there is no threshold, the runway end).



In accordance with point (e) of AMC2 ADR.OPS.B.005(b), the assessment near an aerodrome should consider significant portions underneath the standard approach and departure routes within a 8-km radius from the aerodrome reference point.



To determine the size of the area, please refer to the following:

- Table 1 of CS ADR-DSN.A.005 for the aerodrome reference code;
- CS ADR-DSN.A.002 for the runway;
- CS ADR-DSN.A.002 and CS ADR-DSN.B.160 for the runway strip; and
- CS ADR-DSN.A.002 and CS ADR-DSN.H.405 for the obstacle limitation surfaces.

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140180>

What response to difficult environments is expected by the aerodrome operator in those areas that are considered as difficult environments?

Answer

Within the 1 000 m area, the aerodrome operator should normally provide intervention capacities and respond to an incident (however, those responsibilities may be limited by local or national legislation defining other responsibilities). Therefore, the aerodrome operator should determine the options available for intervention based on the capacity of its dedicated means or the established intervention protocols with third-party entities in charge. Additionally, activation and engagement procedures in accordance with needs and capacities considering the actual environment should be established.

For other difficult environments within the 8-km radius from the aerodrome reference point, the responsibility to respond remains with the local authorities or entities in charge within the local legal framework of the district where the incident occurred. Although there is no response expected by the aerodrome operator, the aerodrome operator should actively participate in the coordination of resources. This should include:

- the mapping of further entities' location and intervention capacities considering the safety management system requirements; and
- the counselling other responsible entities located in the area in the establishment of protocols to allow for the effective organisation of resources for a rapid intervention.

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140181>

What resources could be considered when establishing intervention protocols?**Answer**

Resources that could be considered to respond to incidents in difficult environments do not need to be limited to aerodrome-owned or RFFS resources. They could rather include any type of aerodrome service that can offer or ensure acceptable level of safety within the defined areas. Other such resources include third-party arrangements with external partners or organisations that can support or facilitate any response, whenever necessary, through knowledge, personnel, or equipment.

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140182>

How could the presence of difficult environments and the response capabilities to difficult environments be verified?**Answer**

The presence of difficult environments should be reassessed upon infrastructural changes at or near the aerodrome. The intervention capabilities should be verified during training sessions, familiarisation with difficult environments, or exercises. Any [third-party arrangements](#) should be reviewed and updated periodically to ensure high-level of safety.

Last updated:

16/07/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140183>

Do firefighters need specific training when using fluorine-free foam?**Answer**

Considering the characteristics of Fluorine-Free Foams, it is recommended that aerodrome operators and RFFS identify and implement actions to familiarize firefighters with Fluorine-Free Foam properties and tactics. Special attention should be given to foam application conditions and on ensuring isolation from heat and flames to break the combustion chain reaction.

These actions may include information dissemination or various levels of training. It is advantageous to carry out training with live fire & foam drills, as real practice offers greater responsiveness and adequacy of procedures.

Last updated:

29/07/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142317>

Are European airports required to replace current foams (AFFF) with fluorine-free foams (F3)?**Answer**

At this stage, the replacement of AFFF foams with fluorine-free foams is not mandatory under the regulatory framework in the domain of civil aviation rules by EU-EASA and European current regulations.

However, due to European environmental regulation, the use of some AFFF is banned and considering future deadlines and the European objective of a complete ban of PFAS in firefighting foams, airports should proactively plan the

transition to fluorine-free foams.

The transition from AFFF foams to fluorine-free foams is driven by a phased ban - due to health and environmental concerns - on the production and use of certain fluorinated substances (PFAS) that are used in AFFF historically used by Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting Services at airports.

At this point, in accordance with the international Stockholm Convention, the European Regulation (EU) 2019/1021 "POPs" (Persistent Organic Pollutants) bans on production and use the fluorinated foams containing PFOS (since 2009 and PFOA (since 2020) with some exemptions until end of 2022 and July 2025 for operational uses, depending on if discharges of foamed water are collected.

Additionally, the European Regulation (EC) 1907/2006 "REACH" **bans the production and use of additional PFAS in firefighting foams, including PFHxA**, to be banned before April 10, 2026, for regular firefighting uses and **before October 10, 2029, for civil aviation firefighting** (including airports)

Additional bans on any PFAS in firefighting foams are currently under discussion in the EU, leading many foam manufacturers to plan for discontinuing all PFAS-containing products.

As a result, depending on their chemical composition, some AFFF foams are now already banned or will be in future years:

- "C8 foams", containing 'long-chain' (more than 8 carbons) PFAS, are banned since 01/2023 at airports, where collecting foamed water is not ensured.
- Most of "C6 foams" (more recent generation of AFFF) will be banned in UE, with a specific 5-year delay (10/2029) for ARFF operations at airports.

Last updated:

29/07/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142303>

What are the differences between AFFFs (Aqueous Film-Forming Foams) and the F3s (Fluorine-Free Foams)?

Answer

The main differences between the Aqueous Film-Forming Foams (AFFFs) and Fluorine-Free Foams (F3s) are chemical composition, firefighting performances and operational application methods.

AFFFs (Aqueous Film-Forming Foams) contain PFAS, that are responsible for these foams' ability to form an aqueous film which helps to quickly suppress fires and provides higher resistance to re-ignition, even when foam has been degraded due to time or weather conditions.

F3s (Fluorine-Free Foams) have in common to be designed to be free of intentional fluorinated chemicals. Without fluor surfactants and film forming abilities, **their firefighting efficiency mainly relies on the quality of the foam blanket applied in operation.**

Accordingly, level of performance highly depends on the initial **quality of the foam produced by nozzle**, the **quality of the foam blanket created by firefighters** and **maintaining this quality despite degradation by time, physical or weather conditions**

F3 Foam concentrate also presents various compositions, e.g. various physical properties, such as a different viscosity, that may impact quality of foam produced with firefighting equipment.

As a result, whatever the foam fire performance level, the compatibility with firefighting equipment and the training and operational tactics are more important criteria when using F3 than AFFF.

Last updated:

29/07/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142304>

What are the main challenges for transition to Fluorine-Free Foam?

Answer

As for any change of foam, ensuring that the selected foam has demonstrated an appropriate and expected level of performance is fundamental.

However, considering general characteristics of Fluorine Free Foams, and considering the various products, the main challenges are, for an aerodrome operator, to ensure, with selecting and testing arrangements that:

- Selected foam suits with existing RFFS vehicles i.e.;
- Proportioning system vs. Viscosity of foam concentrate;
- Monitors and nozzles characteristics vs. Minimum quality of foam;
- Firefighting tactics are adjusted to F3;
- Firefighters are familiarized with the new foam;
- Handling or storage conditions assessment at the airport;
- Review and improve arrangements and criteria for initial and periodic testing of foam or vehicles.

In addition, aerodrome operators must plan transition to F3 considering:

- If or how existing vehicles are available for a future exploitation with F3 depending on:
 - Compatibility between vehicles and F3;
 - Impact of residual contamination with PFAS and environmental regulation.
- Already planned new vehicles, as it is advisable to limit contamination with PFAS;
- Existing stockpiles of AFFF, as far as it is usable foam considering PFAS regulation.

Last updated:

29/07/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142305>

What are the standards about performance level of fluorine-free foams at airports?

Answer

Although it is not clearly specified in AMC4 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2), it is commonly considered that the minimum level of performance A, B or C expected for extinguishing foams refers to performance levels defined by ICAO in Annex 14 and to information about fire performance test described in ICAO Airport Services Manual (Doc 9137), Part 1 (Rescue and Fire Fighting Services), Chapter 8.

As of today, there is no specific testing protocol defined for Fluorine Free Foam in the Airport Services Manual.

The current protocol allows measuring the minimum application rate whatever the tested Foam (Aqueous Film Forming (AFFF) or Fluorine Free (F3)).

As for AFFF, Aerodrome operators should refer to these information and the Airport Services Manual when requiring a minimum level of performances.

Selecting arrangements should include additional information such as expected conditions of certification or qualification of foam (fire performance test, foam production acceptance test with vehicles) and considerations about specifications of RFFS vehicles in use.

Last updated:

29/07/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142308>

Does the use of F3s change the quantities of extinguishing agent (water & foam) required?

Answer

The quantities and flow rates required by the Aerodrome regulation have been determined according to the length and width of the aircraft to be protected, as well as the foam application rate, which depends on the performance level (A, B, or C) achieved by the foam used as the primary extinguishing agent.

At this stage, once the foam, whether F3s or AFFF, has demonstrated its performance level on kerosene Jet-A1, the required quantities will be the same, regardless of whether AFFF or F3 is used.

Last updated:

29/07/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142309>

Is it required to consider transition to F3s as a change that needs to be approved by Authority?**Answer**

A change of foam, even when changing from AFFF to F3, does not directly affect the RFFS level of protection to be ensured by the airport operator. As such, the change is not identified as one requiring prior approval by Competent Authority (see AMC1 ADR.00.B.040 (a);(b)).

However, using a new type of foam could have a potential impact on the efficiency and organization of RFFS due to the different performances or application procedures as well as the challenges of such transition on the capacity to maintain an appropriate operational level of protection.

Therefore, it would be advisable for an airport operator to consider initiating and documenting a safety assessment – potentially supported by testing – before transitioning from AFFF to F3.

Last updated:

29/07/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142310>

Does fluorine-free foam offer equivalent performance and effectiveness on hydrocarbon fires?**Answer**

Fluorine-free foams have generally demonstrated a different level of performance with regard to AFFF.

The lack of aqueous film-forming capability makes achieving initial fire suppression more difficult and affects resistance to re-ignition. This performance difference also depends on the type of flammable liquid or hydrocarbons to be extinguished.

However, many fluorine-free foams have demonstrated fire performance levels and effectiveness on kerosene that meet the minimum standards used to assess AFFF foams.

In practice, when using fluorine-free foam, **the ability to achieve quick, complete and lasting suppression largely depends on the firefighters' capacity to create and maintain a uniform foam blanket.**

In contrast, AFFF foams, with their aqueous film-forming properties, maintain better effectiveness even when the foam blanket is imperfect or degrades during the operation.

As a result, foam **application methods and firefighter training are to be considered as critical** when using fluorine-free foam than when using AFFF foam.

Last updated:

29/07/2025

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142311>**Can a Fluorine Free Foam be used in conjunction with AFFF (Aqueous Film-Forming Foam)?****Answer**

Due to their distinct chemical compositions, F3 and AFFF exhibit different mechanisms in fire suppression, particularly due to the lack of a floating aqueous film in F3.

AFFF and F3 concentrates must never be mixed into tank or mixing systems of vehicles.

However, using these two types of foam simultaneously from separate vehicles during an intervention, in the event of an aircraft accident, may not have any significant impact on the firefighting performance of the individual foams as far as respective application conditions are taken into account.

Moreover, it is suggested to minimize the duration of the period using both foams for transition purposes and to consult the manufacturers of the respective products for detailed technical guidance.

Last updated:

29/07/2025

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142313>**Do airports need to change their firefighting vehicles or systems to use Fluorine Free Foam?****Answer**

No, not necessarily. However, to ensure effectiveness of the new foam, the following aspects should be considered:

1. the compatibility of specifications of the intended foam concentrate with each firefighting vehicle and its firefighting systems;
2. sufficient cleaning of firefighting systems to avoid chemical interactions between previous foam (AFFF or F3) and new fluorine free foam.

Compatibility of F3s with vehicles depends on both the specifications of the vehicles and the on-board equipment, such as the foam proportioning system and nozzles, as well as the physical properties of the selected fluorine-free foam (e.g., viscosity or expansion rates), which could impact its performance with existing firefighting systems.

Depending on the chosen foam concentrate, **airports may need to adjust or replace foam proportioning systems or nozzles to ensure compatibility**. In some cases, if adjustments or replacements are not feasible, it may be necessary to **consider changing firefighting vehicles** or, if possible, selecting a foam product with more suitable physical properties.

Therefore, it is recommended (including by vehicles manufacturers) to check the compatibility of the vehicles with the intended product:

- Prior to the order and delivery of the product, through a verification of the declared specifications and consultation with the manufacturers (of the vehicle and of the foam). At this point, results obtained previously on similar vehicles can be useful and valuable;
- Then, before F3 is officially put into service, (in-site) measurements and tests, to ensure that foam production by the airport's RFF vehicle is of an acceptable and expected standard considering proportioning system, foam quality and jet range (see ICAO Airport Service Manual "§ 8.1.6 "Foam performance acceptance test").

Considering sufficient cleaning of vehicle and firefighting systems, as it was usually recommended for any change of AFFF, a simple water rinse of the entire system (from tank to external equipment) may be considered as sufficient to prevent chemical interactions between new F3 and previous used foam.

However, it should also be noted that additional cleaning or vehicle replacement may be necessary to meet environmental requirements, due to the potential residual contamination of firefighting equipment with PFAS.

Last updated:

29/07/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142314>

What are foam production performance tests?

Answer

Whatever is the fire performance level of a selected foam, according to ICAO fire testing protocols, foam production by the airport's RFFS vehicles should be acceptable, considering fire testing conditions and expected performance of foam according to the foam manufacturer.

Foam production performance tests are measurements conducted with the airport's ARFF vehicles to verify:

- Performances of the proportioning system of the vehicle;
- Quality of foam (expansion ratio and 25% drainage time) produced with turret monitor and all other foam-making devices;
- Jet range of the main monitor.

Results of these tests, compared with expected performances, help to assess the compatibility of foam and vehicles in the foam acceptance process. Initial results may be also used as reference for periodic in-service tests to ensure the ongoing performances of foam and foam production equipment. Considering that with Fluorine Free Foams, the quality of produced foam is more critical, performances of the main turret, in particular non-aspirated nozzle, should be assessed with care.

Last updated:

29/07/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142315>

Do intervention protocols need to be changed with the use of fluorine-free foam?

Answer

Considering differences between AFFF and F3s, which do not guarantee the production of an aqueous film on the burning or spilled liquid, aerodrome operators with their RFFS team should assess and review, in coordination with the foam manufacturer, whether their firefighting techniques and tactics are still appropriate or need to be adapted.

In particular:

- Foam application techniques;
- Consideration on adverse conditions impacting the quality of the foam blanket during operation;
- Monitoring and regeneration of foam blanket.

Furthermore, changes in intervention protocols should be taken into account in the Tasks and Resource Analysis as changes in techniques and tactics could affect the required number of firefighting personnel.

Last updated:

29/07/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142316>

What are the applicable safety regulatory requirements when changing foam?

Answer

ADR.OPS.B.010 requires that aerodrome operators ensure that adequate fire extinguishing agents are available. For this purpose, AMC4 ADR.OPS.B.010(a)(2) defines that:

- (b) The foam (used as principal extinguishing agent) is meeting a minimum level of performance A, B or C;
- (d) Minimum usable amounts of water are available for foam production (see table 1);
- (j) A reserve supply of foam concentrate (200%) is maintained on the aerodrome (...);
- (p) Arrangements are in place to manage extinguishing agents in terms of selection, storage, maintenance and testing.

As with any change of AFFF foam, the airport operator should ensure compliance with these provisions paying particular attention to those concerning the performance level.

In addition, it would be advisable to ensure that arrangements previously in place for selection, storage, maintenance and testing of AFFF are adapted to the characteristics and performance of new types of foam such as Fluorine-free foams, also with regard to the specifications of RFFS vehicles in use.

Last updated:

31/07/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142323>

Is on-site Fire performance testing necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of an extinguishing agent at an airport?

Answer

The legal provisions set in the Aerodrome regulation or in ICAO documents neither require nor recommend conducting on-site fire performance tests under airport condition (to be distinguished from on-site tests for verifying the compatibility of foam concentrate with the vehicles).

However, when selecting a foam concentrate, best practices should be adopted to ensure that the conditions under which the foam's performance was previously assessed (such as dosage, foam quality, and testing temperatures) match the conditions encountered at the airport or provide an acceptable level of performance.

If needed, especially when operating in temperatures that differ significantly from those experienced during the tests, it is recommended to consult the foam manufacturer for more information about the impact of temperatures on the foam performance.

Additional tests at a testing center may also be considered, or, ultimately, on-site tests if replicating the airport's specific conditions elsewhere proves too difficult.

Last updated:

31/07/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142324>

English Language Proficiency

Where can I find the requirements on language proficiency for vehicle drivers at EU aerodromes?

Answer

Regulation (EU) No 139/2014 on aerodromes requires that any person that intends to drive on the manoeuvring area of an aerodrome must demonstrate language proficiency at least at an operational level in the English language and any other language or languages used at the aerodrome for radio communication purposes with the air traffic services (ATS) unit at the

aerodrome.

The Regulation allows aerodrome operators to issue authorisations for driving on the manoeuvring area without the drivers having demonstrated language proficiency at an operational level until January 2026 as regards the English language, while language proficiency for any other language already applies as of 7 January 2023.

Regulation (EU) No 139/2014 can be accessed via the Official Publication of the European Union. It is also available on the EASA website as [Commission Regulation \(EU\) No 139/2014](#) and under [Easy Access Rules for Aerodromes](#), where you can also find a consolidated version of the Regulation along with the related Acceptable Means of Compliance and Guidance Material (points ADR.OPS.B.024 and ADR.OPS.B.029, including AMC & GM).

Last updated:

23/06/2025

Link:


<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142096>

Why did the European Union decide to require (English) language proficiency? What are the safety issues?

Answer

Runway incursions are one of the high-risk accident occurrence categories identified by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). Runway-safety-related accidents account for the majority of all accidents at global level. According to the [EASA Annual Safety Review 2024](#) (see graph below), collision on the runway represents the higher-risk category for commercial air transport (CAT) and non-commercial operations with complex aeroplanes (NCC).

See Annual Safety Review 2024:



Appendix 2 Figure 1 KRAs by aggregated ERCS score and number of risk-scored occurrences involving CAT complex aeroplanes and NCC aeroplanes

□

EASA's Notice of Proposed Amendment [NPA 2018-14](#), published on 17 December 2018, contains references to several occurrences and accidents where insufficient communications, misunderstandings or lack of understanding between the air traffic services (ATS), the aircraft taking off or landing, and the driver, contributed to the occurrence/accident. Examples of safety recommendations that were found to be relevant to the regulatory proposal in 2018 were included in NPA 2018-14.

In addition, the [Global Action Plan for the Prevention of Runway Incursions \(GAPRI\)](#), endorsed by all major aviation industry stakeholders, recommends developing a 'phased plan for all communications in the English language'.

Based upon safety recommendations and feedback from Member States and stakeholders, EASA and the European Commission identified a need to enhance the situational awareness between pilots, air traffic controllers (ATCOs), and vehicle drivers when

operating on the manoeuvring area, as a measure to prevent runway and taxiway incursions. Therefore, [Commission Regulation \(EU\) No 139/2014](#) (the 'Aerodromes Regulation'), as updated through [Regulation \(EU\) 2020/2148](#), requires that vehicle drivers intending to operate on the manoeuvring area must demonstrate language proficiency at least at an operational level (level 4) in the English language and any other language or languages used at the aerodrome for purposes of radio communication with the ATS unit at the aerodrome. The assessment criteria to assess the English language of an operational level are included in AMC1 ADR.OPS.B.029(b).

The Aerodromes Regulation allows Member States to derogate from the requirement to demonstrate English language proficiency, based on a safety assessment that can cover one or several aerodromes (for example low traffic, only national traffic, etc.). This derogation, which applies only to English language proficiency, is included in point (g) of ADR.OPS.B.029.

Last updated:

23/06/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142097>

When a Member State decides to derogate from the English Language Proficiency, does this require an approval by EASA or the European Union?

Answer

No, neither EASA nor the European Commission are involved in reviewing or approving the derogation or the underlying safety assessment. It is up to the Member State to decide if a derogation is appropriate for one or several aerodromes.

Last updated:

23/06/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142098>

Does Regulation (EU) No 139/2014 require a common frequency for vehicle drivers, air traffic control (ATC), and pilots, the so-called 'Triple One' concept?

Answer

No, [Commission Regulation \(EU\) No 139/2014](#) does not require a common frequency to be used by vehicle drivers, air traffic control (ATC), and pilots when operating on the runway. Even if the aerodrome continues to use a separate Ground/ATC frequency in the national language, English language proficiency can be considered beneficial as it can increase safety by improving situational awareness and by allowing vehicle drivers to understand safety-critical information provided in English.

Some airports in the European Union have found solutions where vehicle drivers can either listen to the ATC frequency at all times or only in certain high-risk scenarios (accessing the runway).

During an emergency situation, English language proficiency is considered beneficial for aviation safety. For more information on the safety benefits, please see [NPA 2018-14](#). For an overview of the different practices regarding frequencies and their use, please refer to a recent study commissioned by EASA on the [Triple One Concept Implementation](#).

Last updated:

23/06/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142099>

Will all communications on the manoeuvring area have to be conducted using the same communication channel that is used by air traffic controllers (ATCOs) and flight crews and in English language as of January 2026?

Answer

No, the rule does not mandate either the use of a common communication channel between air traffic controllers (ATCOs), flight crews, and vehicle drivers or the exclusive use of the English language on the manoeuvring area.

Last updated:

23/06/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142100>

What does English language proficiency mean in practice?

Answer

Language proficiency for vehicle drivers is the demonstration of their ability to:

- communicate effectively in voice-only and in face-to-face situations;
- communicate on common and work-related topics with accuracy and clarity;
- use appropriate communicative strategies to exchange messages and to recognise and resolve misunderstandings in a general or work-related context;
- handle successfully the linguistic challenges presented by a complication or unexpected turn of events that occurs within the context of a routine work situation or of a communicative task with which they are otherwise familiar; and
- use a dialect or accent that is intelligible to the aeronautical community.

Last updated:

23/06/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142101>

Why is there a deferred applicability of English language proficiency?

Answer

As the implementation of the language proficiency in the English language and any other language used at the aerodrome for communication with air traffic services (ATS) requires preparation, training, and qualification, a transition period has been granted at the time of the adoption of [Regulation \(EU\) 2020/2148](#) (6 years for the English language and 3 years for other languages).

Last updated:

23/06/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142102>

What is the meaning of operational Level 4 of English language proficiency?

Answer

The operational level 4 is described in the rating scale included in AMC1 ADR.OPS.B.029(b) 'Language proficiency'. It explains the different rating elements for all levels with regard to pronunciation, language structure, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, interaction, and should be used when assessing if a vehicle driver is proficient and at what level.

Last updated:

23/06/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142103>

Is there any guidance for language schools on language training curricula in the context of aviation?

Answer

Language proficiency requirements already apply to flight crews and air traffic controllers (ATCOs). Aerodromes are advised to contact their competent authority, approved training organisations (ATOs), and air navigation service providers (ANSPs) for further information concerning the implementation of language proficiency.

[Commission Regulation \(EU\) No 139/2014](#) is supported by numerous acceptable means of compliance (AMC) and guidance material (GM) with detailed information on how to conduct the training and the assessments (see also the [Easy Access Rules for Aerodromes](#)). The requirements are based on the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) language proficiency concept and are therefore familiar to aviation stakeholders.

Last updated:

23/06/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142104>

Why does Regulation (EU) No 139/2014 refer to the ICAO operational level 4 for English language proficiency, which has not been developed for aerodrome vehicle drivers, but flight crew and air traffic controllers (ATCOs)?

Answer

Flight crews, air traffic controllers (ATCOs), and aerodrome vehicle drivers are operating in the same environment; therefore, it is appropriate to require the same minimum level of language proficiency, which is level 4.

International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Document 9835 on language proficiency states in Section 2.3.4 that the recognition of possible (language) errors “*contributed to the construction of ICAO Operational Level 4 which is considered to be the minimum level acceptable to ensure safe operations*”. Since the role of the personnel in question (flight crew, ATCO, or aerodrome vehicle driver) is irrelevant to the possibility of making an error, it should be considered appropriate that ICAO’s Operational Level 4 is equally applicable to the aerodrome vehicle drivers as the minimum acceptable level. Indeed, even Level 3 of proficiency as described in AMC1 ADR.OPS.B.029(b) is insufficient to prevent impaired communication caused by errors in comprehending the meaning, which may result in failure to understand a situational complication or an unexpected turn of events.

Last updated:

23/06/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142105>

What is the difference between assessment/proof of English language proficiency and assessment/proof of national language proficiency?

Answer

The same method and criteria described in AMC1 ADR.OPS.B.029(b) apply to both English language proficiency assessments and assessments of the national language. AMC1 ADR.OPS.B.029(b) describes the rating scale in a table format, indicating the language proficiency levels and the criteria for each level that should be used for the assessment. The proficiency levels and criteria are in line with the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO).

Last updated:

23/06/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142106>

How can the aerodrome perform an assessment of language proficiency?**Answer**

AMC2 ADR.OPS.B.029(e) contains the assessment method. The assessment should comprise the following three elements:

1. listening: assessment of comprehension;
2. speaking: assessment of pronunciation, fluency, structure, and vocabulary; and
3. interaction.

To assess proficiency in listening and speaking, the aerodrome operator should ensure that the method assesses the ability to switch between aviation phraseology and plain language.

Last updated:

23/06/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142107>

Reassessment of language proficiency**Answer**

Language proficiency, irrespective of the language, needs to be reassessed every 4 years if the proficiency level that is demonstrated is operational (Level 4) and every 6 years for the extended level (Level 5). Persons that have demonstrated expert level (Level 6) do not need to be reassessed. See also point ADR.OPS.B.029(d).

Last updated:

23/06/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142108>

Why does the language proficiency requirement apply to the manoeuvring area, which includes taxiways, and not only to the runway?**Answer**

The manoeuvring area is a controlled area, and persons operating there need to have the same understanding of the instructions given. By limiting the language proficiency requirement only to persons that drive on the runways, the risk of a runway incursion is increased, since persons who do not meet the language proficiency requirements may operate very close to an active runway.

Last updated:

23/06/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142109>

Is there a definition of the manoeuvring area?**Answer**

Yes, Annex I to [Commission Regulation \(EU\) No 139/2014](#) contains a definition of the manoeuvring area: '*manoeuvring area*' means that part of an aerodrome to be used for the take-off, landing and taxiing of aircraft, excluding aprons.

Last updated:

23/06/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142110>

National Language Proficiency

Which persons could be considered as “qualified” to perform the language proficiency assessments for the national language?

Answer

The qualifications of the persons that can be considered as suitable to perform language assessments are described in AMC3 ADR.OPS.B.029(e), where it is stated that assessors should be either aviation specialists or language specialists with additional aviation-related training.

Last updated:

27/06/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142138>

Can a certificate for the successful completion of the minimum level of education (school diploma) in each country be considered as equivalent to the assessment of the national language(s) proficiency?

Answer

Demonstration of language proficiency is not only a knowledge of the language, but the ability to meet the requirements in point ADR.OPS.B.029(b). Therefore, a school diploma (or equivalent) cannot substitute an assessment. In any case, the absence of a school diploma (or equivalent) cannot exclude persons from the assessment of national language proficiency.

Last updated:

27/06/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142139>

Can language proficiency assessments be conducted by the aerodrome operators themselves?

Answer

Yes, the language proficiency assessment can be conducted by the aerodrome operator; the aerodrome operator takes this decision.

Last updated:

27/06/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142140>

Where can guidelines be found for the provision of internal training and examination concerning language proficiency assessments?

Answer

The following International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) documents contain useful material for the training and examination regarding the language proficiency assessments:

- ICAO Doc 9835 *Manual on the Implementation of ICAO Language Proficiency Requirements*,

- ICAO Doc 10197 *Test Design Guidelines: Handbook on the Design of Tests for the ICAO Language Proficiency Requirements* and
- ICAO EUR Doc 046 *Guidance on the Harmonized Implementation of Language Proficiency Requirements and its Oversight*

Last updated:

27/06/2025

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/142141>

Drones (UAS)

Provisions applicable to both 'open' and 'specific' category

Regulations on UAS (drone) explained

What are the applicability dates under EU regulation 2019/947 and 2019/945?

Answer

Due to the COVID-19 crisis, the applicability date of EU Regulation 2019/947 has been delayed from 1 July 2020 to **31 December 2020**, meaning:

- as of 31 December 2020, registration of drone operators and certified drones becomes mandatory;
- as of 31 December 2020, operations in the 'specific' category may be conducted after authorisation has been given by the National Aviation Authority;
- between 31 December 2020 and 1 January 2023, drone users operating drones without class identification label can continue to operate in the limited category under Article 22 of EU Regulation 2019/947 (see FAQ #x for additional information);
- as of January 2022, national authorisations, certificates, and declarations must be fully converted to the new EU System;
- from 1 January 2022, EASA Member States must make available information on geographical zones for geo-awareness in a digital format harmonised between the EU countries;
- as of January 2023, all operations in the 'open' category and all drone operators must fully comply with [EU Regulation 2019/947 and EU Regulation 2019/945](#).

Last updated:

13/10/2020


Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116446>

Who is a drone operator

Answer

UAS Operator



A drone operator is any person, whether natural or an organisation, **who owns the drone(s) or rents the drone**. You can be both a drone operator and a remote pilot if you are also the person who actually flies the drone. However, you could be the remote pilot without being a drone operator, if, for example, you are a pilot working for a company which provides services with drones. In that case, the company is the drone operator and you are the remote pilot.

If you bought a drone to fly it in your leisure time, you are both the drone operator and remote pilot.

If you bought a drone to give away as a gift, the person who will receive the gift and then fly the drone will be the drone operator and the remote pilot.

Last updated:

14/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116447>

Types of drone the Regulation refers to

Answer

'Unmanned Aircraft' means any aircraft operating or designed to operate autonomously or to be piloted remotely without a pilot on board;



Aerial Work



Urban air mobility



Leisure flights, including with model aircraft



International IFR flights

This definition includes all types of aircraft without a pilot on board, including radio-controlled flying models (powered fixed wing, helicopters, gliders) whether they have an on-board camera or not.

The Regulations use the term UAS, unmanned aircraft system, to refer to a drone, its system and all the other equipment used to control and operate it, such as the command unit, the possible catapult to launch it and others.

RPAS (Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems) is a subcategory of UAS, which includes both RPAS and fully autonomous UAS. Fully autonomous UAS fly completely by themselves without the need for any pilot intervention.

Regulatory reference: paragraph 30 of Article 3 of Regulation (EU) 1139/2018 / Article 2(1) of EU regulation 2019/947 and article 3(3) of EU regulation 2019/945

Last updated:

14/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116448>

When is a drone considered to be a toy?

Answer

A drone is considered as a toy when it could be attractive to a child. More precisely, products designed or intended whether or not exclusively, for use in play by children under 14 years of age should be considered as a toy and comply with the Directive 2009/48/EC on the safety of toys. The compliance of a drone with that directive is declared in the corresponding EU declaration of conformity. In case of doubts, the fact that a product should be considered as a toy is assessed by market surveillance authorities based on a number of characteristics related to the attractiveness of the product for kids, accessibility, etc.

However, manufacturers may clearly exclude their product from the application of the Directive on the safety of toys (when a confusion is possible) by indicating clearly a minimum age > 13 years on their product (packaging, manual etc.) (e.g; "not for use under 14 years").

Regulatory reference: Article 2 of Directive 2009/48/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 June 2009 on the

safety of toys.

Last updated:

07/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119218>

What is the difference between autonomous and automatic drone?

Answer

An **autonomous** drone is able to conduct a safe flight without the intervention of a pilot. It does so with the help of artificial intelligence, enabling it to cope with all kinds of unforeseen and unpredictable emergency situations.

This is different from **automatic** operations, where the drone flies pre-determined routes defined by the drone operator before starting the flight. For this type of drone, it is essential for the remote pilot to take control of the drone to intervene in unforeseen events for which the drone has not been programmed.

While **automatic** drones are allowed in all **categories**, **autonomous** drones are not allowed in the 'open' category.

Autonomous drones need a level of verification of compliance with the technical requirements that is not compatible with the system put in place for the 'open' category. Autonomous operations are, instead, allowed in the 'specific' category, where the Regulation includes a tool flexible enough to verify requirements with the appropriate level of robustness.

Autonomous operations are also allowed in the 'certified' category.

Last updated:

14/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116449>

Who is an 'uninvolved person'?

Answer

'An uninvolved person is a person who is not participating in the UAS operation or who is not aware of the instructions and safety precautions given by the UAS (drone) operator'.

A person is considered involved if he/she decides to be a part of the operation, understands the risk and is able to check the position of the drone while it is flying.

Therefore, in order to be considered 'involved' in the operation, a person needs to:

- give consent to be a part of the operation (e.g. consent to be overflown by the drone); the consent needs to be explicit;
- receive from the drone operator/remote pilot instructions and safety precautions to be applied in case of an emergency situation; and
- not be busy with any other activities that would make the person unable to check the position of the drone and, in case of an incident, take action to avoid being hit.

Writing on a ticket that a drone will be used during an event is not considered sufficient, since the drone operator needs to receive individual explicit consent and make sure people understand the risk and the procedures to be taken in case of an emergency.

During the operation, it is expected that involved persons will follow the trajectory of the drone and be ready to take action to protect themselves in case the drone behaves unexpectedly. If, during the UAS operation, people are busy working or watching something that is not compatible with monitoring the trajectory of the drone, than they cannot be considered to be involved.

Examples of uninvolved people:

- spectators gathered for sport activities, concerts or other mass events;
- people in a beach or in a park, or walking on the streets.

An uninvolved person is not only a person who is directly exposed to a drone, but could also be a person who is in a bus, car, etc., and who is indirectly exposed. For example, if a drone is flying over a car, its driver should be considered to be an 'uninvolved person'. The reason is that a drone flying close to a car (even if it does not impact it) could possibly distract its driver and therefore cause a car accident.

Regulatory reference: GM1 Article 2(18) Definitions, ED Decision 2019/021/R.

Last updated:

13/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116453>

What is an 'assembly of people'?

Answer

An assembly of people is a crowd of people. It is not defined by a specific number of people, but is related to the possibility for an individual to move around in order to avoid the consequences of a drone which is out of control. If a group of people are so densely packed that their possibility to freely escape or move away from the drone is limited, then it is considered to be an assembly of people.

Examples of assemblies of people are the people in:

- sport, cultural, religious or political events;
- beaches or parks on a sunny day;
- commercial streets during the opening hours of the shops; or
- ski resorts/tracks/lanes.

Regulatory reference: GM1 Article 2(3) Definitions, ED Decision 2019/021/R

Last updated:

13/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116553>

What is covered by the regulations?

Answer

These EU Regulations adopt a risk-based approach, and as such, do not distinguish between leisure or commercial activities. They take into account the weight and specifications of the drone and the operation it is intended to undertake.

The Regulations cater for drones sold on the market, meaning:

1. when operating in the 'open' category:

- i. those that will bear a class identification label (according to Regulation (EU) 2019/945) ranging from 0 to 6 from lighter to heavier models; or
- ii. those privately built; or
- iii. those placed on the market before 1 July 2022.

2. when operating in the 'specific' category, all drones falling under this category including those without a class identification label.

EU Regulation 2019/947 caters for most types of operation and their levels of risk. It does so through three categories of operations: the 'open', 'specific' and 'certified' categories.

Last updated:

30/07/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116445>

Is it possible for an EASA Member State (MS) to maintain its national drone regulation in parallel with the new European drone legislation?

Answer

No. The EU drone regulation is an act that became immediately applicable in all EU MSs since 31 December 2020 superseding national regulations and making them not applicable anymore. However the European drone regulations provide some flexibility for the MSs to develop acts to define certain aspects such as:

- Minimum age for remote pilot
- Conversion of certificates issued before the applicability of the EU regulation
- Authorisation of model club and associations
- Fines when breaching the regulation
- Use of geographical zones
- Insurance

The EASA MSs cannot develop any further regulations on drones on a topic that is already regulated by the European Drone regulation.

Last updated:

10/09/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/131132>

Are the UK issued certificates for unmanned aircraft system, including training of remote pilot, accepted in EU after December 31, 2020?

Answer

This FAQ is placed in [Brexit - Aircraft Operations](#)

Last updated:

27/07/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136864>

Registration requirements

Do I need to register my drone?

Answer

Unless they are certified, drones do not need to be registered, but **you, as drone operator/owner, must register yourself**. You do so with the National Aviation Authority **of the EU country you residence in**. (<https://www.easa.europa.eu/domains/civil-drones/naa>)

You register once, independently of how many drones you have operating in the 'open' or the 'specific' category. Your registration will be valid for a period defined by your National Aviation Authority, after which you need to renew it.

However, you **do not need to register yourself** if your drone(s):

1. weighs less than 250g and has no camera or other sensor able to detect personal data; or
2. even with a camera or other sensor, weighs less than 250g, but is a toy (this means that its documentation shows that it complies with 'toy' Directive 2009/48/EC);

A drone is certified when it has a certificate of airworthiness (or a restricted certificate of airworthiness) issued by the National Aviation Authority. In this case, it requires a registration. A certified drone is needed only when the risk of the operation requires it. So certification is never needed for drones operated in the 'open' category.

Relevant regulation: article 21 of EU regulation 2019/947.

Last updated:

10/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116454>

What happens once I register?

Answer

Once registered, you receive a '**drone operator registration number**' that needs to be **displayed** with a sticker **on all the drones you own, including those privately built**. You must also, **upload it** into the 'Drone's **remote identification system**'.

Regulatory reference: article 14 EU regulation 2019/947.

Last updated:

10/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116455>

Will my registration as drone operator be recognised throughout Europe?

Answer

Yes, you as drone operator, will receive a unique registration number and this will be valid in all other EASA member State. You cannot register twice.

Regulatory reference: article 14 of EU regulation 2019/947.

Last updated:

14/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116456>

I fly model aircraft

How can I fly my model?

Answer

Model flyers have the following options to conduct their operations:

- (a) (a) They may operate as members of a model club or association that has received from the competent authority an authorisation, as defined in Article 16 of the UAS Regulation. In this case, they should comply with the procedures of the model club or association in accordance with the authorisation. The authorisation will define all the conditions to operate, and may

deviate from the Regulation (for example it may allow operations with drones exceeding 25 kg, or flying higher than 120 m etc).

Member States may enable model aircraft clubs and associations to register their members in the registration systems established in accordance with Article 14 on their behalf. If this is not the case, the members of model aircraft clubs and associations shall register themselves in accordance with Article 14.

(b) (b) If a person does not want to become a member of a club or association, they may use the special geographical zones defined by EASA Member States, in accordance with Article 15(2) of the UAS Regulation, where drones and model aircraft are exempted from certain technical requirements, and/or where the operational limitations are extended, including the mass or height limitations.

(c) Lastly, models may be operated in subcategory A3. Please refer to the FAQ

Regulatory reference: Art. 16 of EU regulation 2019/947.

Last updated:

10/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116521>

Once in the air

Can I fly my drone anywhere I want to?

Answer

Flexibility for Member States

Geographical zones defined by Member States



Geo-awareness on drones to support remote pilots

Each EASA Member State will determine drone geographical zones,

which are areas where drones may not fly (e.g. national parks, city centres or near airports) or may fly only under certain conditions, or where they need a flight authorisation. Therefore, it is important for you to consult your National Aviation Authority to check where you can and cannot fly your drone.

These geographical zones apply to all categories.

In addition, you are not allowed to fly a drone close to or inside an area where there is an ongoing emergency response.

See the links to National Aviation Authorities at:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/domains/civil-drones/naa>

Regulatory reference: Article 15 and UAS.OPEN.060 (4) of EU regulation 2019/947.

Last updated:

10/10/2020

Link:


<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116463>

Can I fly over people?

Answer

Generally when you operate in the 'open' category, you are not allowed to fly over uninvolved people, unless you have a privately built drone with a weight below 250 g or a drone purchased on the market with a class identification label 0 or 1 mark. In any case, try to minimise the time during which you fly over people.

If you have a drone with a CE class 2 mark, under subcategory A2, as a general rule, keep the UA at a lateral distance from any uninvolved person that is not less than the height at which the drone is flying (this is the '1:1 rule', i.e. if the UA is flying at a height of 40 m, the distance from any uninvolved person should be at least 40 m), and never fly closer than 30 metres horizontally from any uninvolved person. If your drone is equipped with a low-speed mode function and this is active, you can fly as close as 5 metres from uninvolved people.



Distance from uninvolved people in the case of flying with a class C2 drone

In all other cases (drones with class identification label 3, 4, 5 or 6 marks or privately built and heavier than 250 g), you need to ensure that no uninvolved people are present within the range of the operation.

Regulatory reference: article 4 (1) (c) and UAS.OPEN.040 of EU regulation 2019/947.

Last updated:

14/10/2020

Link:


<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116464>

How high can I fly my drone?

Answer

Your maximum flight height is generally 120 m from the earth's surface. Please check whether the National Aviation Authority imposes a geographical zone with a lower limit in the area where you fly. If you need to fly over an obstacle taller than 120 m, you are allowed to fly up to 15 metres above the height of the obstacle, but only if there is an explicit request from the owner of the obstacle (e.g. a contract with the owner to perform an inspection). In such a case, you may fly within a horizontal distance of 50 metres from the obstacle.

When you are operating in hilly environments, the height of the drone above the surface of the earth should be within the grey zone in the picture below: you need to keep the drone within 120 m of the closest point of the terrain. This means that there may be conditions such as on top of a hill where even if you keep your drone 120 m from the side of the hill, you are actually flying at a distance higher than 120 m above the bottom of the valley. So as long as you keep your drone within 120 m of the shoulder of the hill (as in the grey area in the picture below), your flight is legal.



Regulatory reference: UAS.OPEN.010 (2) (3) Annex Part A of EU Regulation 2019/947

Last updated:

13/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116465>

Geographical zones (where I can fly)

How do I know if can fly in a location?

Answer

All states are required to publish maps identifying geographical zones where all drone flights are forbidden or where you need to have a flight authorisation before starting the operation. In most of state, apps for mobile phones are available to easily identify where you can fly. Please check the website of your NAA (<https://www.easa.europa.eu/domains/civil-drones/naa>).

Flight authorisations are different from the operational authorisation required for the specific category. A flight authorisation is applicable to all operations in 'open' or 'specific' category and is issued by the authority/entity identified in the maps by the state. For example a state may want to restrict the flights over a natural park or a riskier area such as industrial area or over a prison etc. The state may then publish a geographical zone requiring that all drone operations conducted in these zones must have a flight authorisation issued by the authority managing the area (e.g the park authority or the owner of the industry etc..).

Other types of geographical zones are those where one or more of the limitation of the open category are alleviated. For examples area where the state may authorise all drones to operate up to a height more than 120m or with drones heavier than 25kg or in BVLOS etc., without the need for an authorisation or a declaration. This may be very useful to fly model aircraft for example.

Make sure you check the geographical zones before starting the operation and you always respect them.

Regulatory reference Article 15 of EU Regulation 2019/947

Last updated:

10/09/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/131131>

Other requirements

Is there a minimum age to fly a drone?

Answer

The general rule mandates that the minimum age for remote pilots of drones in the 'open' and 'specific' categories is 16 years old. However, there are exceptions. There is no minimum age for remote-pilot requirements:

1. for flying in Subcategory A1 with a Class 0 drone;
2. for flying with a privately-built drone weighing below 250 g; or
3. for flying under the direct supervision of a remote pilot that has met the competency requirements — see the following link for more details on training: [Open Category - Low Risk - Civil Drones | EASA \(europa.eu\)](https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116466).

Last updated:

08/05/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116466>

Do I need insurance?**Answer**

You, as drone operator, are always required to have an insurance for your drone if you are using a drone with a weight above 20kg. However most of EASA Member States mandate a third party insurance also if you are operating a lighter drone. So please consult the national regulation.

Regulatory reference: Article 14 (2) (d) of EU regulation 2019/947.

Last updated:

14/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116469>

Are there any Brexit related regulations?**Answer**

For Brexit related questions please consult our [Brexit FAQs under Aircraft Operations](#).

Last updated:

20/01/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/123802>

Open category**Understanding the 'open' category****How do I determine I fall under the 'open' category?****Answer**

A drone can be operated in the "Open" category when it:

- bears one of the class identification labels 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4; or
- is privately built and its weight is less than 25 kg; or
- it is placed on the market before 31 December 2023 and bears no class identification label as mentioned above;
- will not be operated directly over people, unless it bears a class identification label or is lighter than 250 g. (Please refer to

subcategories of operations: A1, A2 and A3 to find out where you can fly with your drone);

- will be maintained in visual line of sight (VLOS) or the remote pilot will be assisted by a UA observer;
- is flown at a height of no more than 120 metres;
- will not carry any dangerous goods and will not drop any material.

Regulatory reference: Article 4 and article 20 of EU Regulation 2019/947; Annex part A and Article 5(1) of EU Regulation 2019/947, Part1 to 5 Annex of EU regulation 2019/945.

Last updated:

01/02/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116450>

I fall under the 'open' category, how do I determine which subcategory I can fly under?

Answer

The Subcategory is determined either by:

- the label showing the class identification label (0, 1, 2, 3 or 4), affixed to your drone; or
- the weight of your drone, for a privately built drone or for a drone without class identification label (called legacy drones);

Caveat: in order to facilitate the transition, drones without class identification labels may fly until 1st of January 2023 according to the requirements defined in article 22 of EU regulation 2019/947 (please refer to [FAQ on flying without CE Class Markings](#) for additional information).

Applying the instructions above, please refer to the table below to determine the subcategory you must fly under. For instance, drones with CE class 2 marks canmarks can be only be flown under subcategory A2 (close to people) or A3 (far from people).

'Open' - Subcategory	class identification label type of drone
A1 Urban areas but not over crowds or outside of urban areas	class identification label 0, 1
	Privately built drone with MTOM < 250 g and Speed < 19 m/s
	Drone without class identification label with MTOM < 250 g incl. fuel and payload. As of 1 January 2023
A2 Urban areas keeping at least 5 m (or 30 m depending on the features of your drone) from people, or outside of urban areas	2
A3 Outside of urban areas	class identification label 2, 3, 4
	Privately built drone with MTOM < 25 kg Speed < 19 m/s
	Drone without class identification label with MTOM < 25 kg incl. fuel and payload. As of 1 January 2023

Please consider that your state may publish geographical zones that may restrict the use of your drone.

Last updated:

10/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116451>

I bought a DJI Mini (weight 249g) how can I operate it?

Answer

DJI Mini is a drone with a weight of 249g, has a camera and it is not a toy (meaning that it does not comply with the toy directive). Therefore, the following actions have to be taken in order to comply with Regulation (EU) 2019/947:

- As a drone operator/owner, you must register yourself with the [National Aviation Authority \(NAA\) of the Member State you reside in](#).
- Once registered, you receive a 'drone operator registration number' that needs to be displayed with a sticker on all the drones you own, including those privately built. You must also upload it into the 'Drone's remote identification system', If the drone has this function;
- When operating the drone, always comply with the [A1 sub-category requirements](#).

A remote pilot training certificate is not needed to operate a drone of this kind, however is highly recommended to conduct the A1/A3 online training. Moreover, most of EASA Member States mandate a third party insurance. Please consult the national regulation for further information about the insurance for drones. For further inquiries related to the operations in the A1 sub-category and in the Open category in general, please consult [our related FAQs](#)

Last updated:

27/07/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136863>

Requirements under the 'open' category


What are the requirements under the subcategories of the 'open' category?

Answer

According to the class identification label of the drone or the weight, in the case of privately built drones, they can be operated in different conditions as described below:


Drones bearing a CE class 0 mark or that are privately built and weigh up to 250 g can fly in subcategory A1, which means almost everywhere, except over assemblies of people, or areas that the state has forbidden by imposing a restriction on the flight of drones (please consult the website of your National Aviation Authority. See <https://www.easa.europa.eu/domains/civil-drones/naa>).

Open category - Subcategory A1



Drones bearing a class identification label 1 can also be operated in subcategory A1 with the difference that you are required to minimise flying over uninvolved people.

Open category - Subcategory A1




- CE  MTOM<900g
- **No fly over assembly of people**
 - reasonably expect that no uninvolved person is overflowed. In case of unexpected overfly over uninvolved persons, the remote pilot shall reduce as much as possible the time during which the unmanned aircraft overflies those persons

Drones bearing a class identification label 2 can be operated in subcategory A2, which means in urban environments, however, you are required to keep a safe distance from any uninvolved people. As a rule, this minimum distance should be equal to the height at which the drone is flying (e.g. if you are flying at a height of 30 m, make sure that the closest uninvolved person is at least 30 m from the position where the drone would vertically fall in the event of an incident). In any case, this distance must never be less than 5 m. In addition, you can also fly in the conditions defined for subcategory A3. Finally, you must avoid flying in areas that the state has forbidden by imposing a restriction on the flight of drones.

(Please consult the website of your National Aviation Authority for additional information.

See <https://www.easa.europa.eu/domains/civil-drones/naa>).


Open category - Subcategory A2



- CE  MTOM<4kg
- **No fly over uninvolved people**
 - UAS at a horizontal distance of at least 30 metres from uninvolved persons, or up to a of 5 metres when low speed mode function is activated

Drones bearing a class identification label 3 or 4, or that are privately built and weigh up to 25 kg, can be operated in subcategory A3. That means that they can never be operated in urban environments that you need to keep the drone at least 150 m from residential, commercial or industrial areas, and to only operate in areas where no uninvolved people are present in the range where the drone can be operated. In any case, you must avoid flying in areas that the state has forbidden by imposing a restriction on the flight of drones (please consult the website of your National Aviation Authority for additional information, see <https://www.easa.europa.eu/domains/civil-drones/naa>)

Open category - Subcategory A3



For the full image of requirements and limitations applicable to different classes of drones and conducted operations, please refer to the tables below:

Table 1 — ‘Open’ category, applicable until 31 December 2023

WHAT TYPE OF DRONE CAN I FLY?					
Applicable until 01 of January 2014					
Operation		Drone Operator / pilot			
Max Take off mass	Subcategory	Operational restrictions	Drone Operator registration?	Remote pilot qualifications	Remote pilot minimum age
<250g 	A1 Not over assemblies of people (can also fly in subcategory A3)	Operational restrictions on the drone's use apply (follow the QR code below)	Yes No if toy or not fitted with camera/sensor 	Read user's manual	No minimum age (certain conditions apply)
<500g 			Yes	Check out the QR code below for the necessary qualifications to fly these drones	16
<2kg 	A2 Fly close to people (can also fly in subcategory A3)				
<25kg 	A3 Fly far from people				



#EASAdrones

together
4safety

For more details go to
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/domains/civil-drones-rpas>



Table 2 — ‘Open’ category, applicable from 1 January 2024

WHAT TYPE OF DRONE CAN I FLY?

Operation			Drone Operator / pilot							
C-Class	Max Take off mass	Subcategory	Operational restrictions	Drone Operator registration?	Remote pilot qualifications	Remote pilot minimum age				
Privately build	<250g 	A1 Not over assemblies of people (can also fly in subcategory A3)	Operational restrictions on the drone's use apply (follow the QR code below)	Yes No if toy or not fitted with camera/sensor 	Read user's manual	No minimum age (certain conditions apply)				
legacy < 250g										
C0										
C1	<500g 	A2 Fly close to people (can also fly in subcategory A3)		Yes	Check out the QR code below for the necessary qualifications to fly these drones	16				
C2	<2kg 									
C3	A3 Fly far from people									
C4										
Privately build										
Legacy drones (art 20)										



#EASAdrones

together
4safety

For more details go to
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/domains/civil-drones-rpas>





#EASAdrones

together
4safety

For more details go to
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/domains/civil-drones-rpas>



Last updated:

23/11/2023

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116452>

Training requirements in the 'open' category

Who issues the remote pilot competency certificate for the 'open' category and how long is it valid for?

Answer

For the 'open' category or standard scenarios, the National Aviation Authority is responsible for issuing the certificates. A certificate for Remote Pilot competency **is valid for 5 years**. If the revalidation is conducted before the certificate expires, the remote pilot may attend a seminar provided by the National Aviation Authority or by an entity recognised by it, otherwise competencies need to be re-demonstrated.

Regulatory reference: DRONE.OPEN.070 (1) of EU regulation 2019/947.

Last updated:

10/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116458>

Will the competency certificate for the 'open' category be recognised throughout Europe?

Answer

Yes, training conducted in one EASA member state will be recognised in all others.

Last updated:

13/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116459>

Which training I need to fly my drone in the open category?

Answer

The type of training required depends on the type of drone you use.

A transitional period **until December 31, 2023** applies, and each EASA Member State may define the appropriate remote pilot training requirements according to **the following table**:

WHAT TYPE OF DRONE CAN I FLY?					
Applicable until 01 of January 2014					
Operation		Drone Operator / pilot			
Max Take off mass	Subcategory	Operational restrictions	Drone Operator registration?	Remote pilot qualifications	Remote pilot minimum age
<250g 	A1 Not over assemblies of people (can also fly in subcategory A3)	Operational restrictions on the drone's use apply (follow the QR code below)	Yes No if toy or not fitted with camera/sensor 	Read user's manual	No minimum age (certain conditions apply)
<500g 			Yes	Check out the QR code below for the necessary qualifications to fly these drones	16
<2kg 	A2 Fly close to people (can also fly in subcategory A3)				
<25kg 	A3 Fly far from people				
		#EASAdrones		together 4safety	
		For more details go to https://www.easa.europa.eu/domains/civil-drones-rpas			

Remote pilot training as from 1 January 2024

The training requirements applicable as from January 1, 2024 are described below. However, most of the EASA Member States already offer the training listed below. In this way, you can already today receive a certificate according to the EU regulation. So, if you receive from an NAA of an EASA Member State one of the certificate of training with the EASA logo as shown below, you may already use it to operate your drone in the 'open' category in all EASA Member States. The training and exams can be conducted in an EASA Member State of your choice.

WHAT TYPE OF DRONE CAN I FLY?

Operation			Drone Operator / pilot			
C-Class	Max Take off mass	Subcategory	Operational restrictions	Drone Operator registration?	Remote pilot qualifications	Remote pilot minimum age
Privately build	<250g 	A1 Not over assemblies of people (can also fly in subcategory A3)	Operational restrictions on the drone's use apply (follow the QR code below)	Yes No if toy or not fitted with camera/sensor 	Read user's manual	No minimum age (certain conditions apply)
legacy < 250g						
C0						
C1	<900g 			Yes	Check out the QR code below for the necessary qualifications to fly these drones	16
C2	<4kg 	A2 Fly close to people (can also fly in subcategory A3)				
C3	<25kg 	A3 Fly far from people				
C4						
Privately build						
Legacy drones (art 20)						



#EASAdrones

together
4safety

For more details go to
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/domains/civil-drones-rpas>





#EASAdrones

together
4safetyFor more details go to
<https://www.easa.europa.eu/domains/civil-drones-rpas>

Please pay attention: we are made aware that some illegal websites are selling fake certificates of training. Please trust only the providers of training and exams that are listed in a NAA website!

How to operate drones in the open category from 01/01/2024 (These provisions already apply to drones with C-class marks)

- Privately built and drones placed on the market before 01/01/2024 (under 250 gramm)

Subcategory	A1 (can also fly in subcategory A3)
Operational restrictions	- May fly over uninvolved people (should be avoided when possible) - No flight over assemblies of people
Drone operator registration	No, unless camera / sensor on board and a drone is not a toy
Remote pilot competence	No training required
Remote pilot minimum age	No minimum age

- C0 (under 250 gramm)

Subcategory	A1 (can also fly in subcategory A3)
Operational restrictions	- No flight over assemblies of people; - Maintain flight altitude below 120m above ground level.
Drone operator registration	No, unless camera / sensor on board and a drone is not a toy
Remote pilot competence	Read carefully the user manual
Remote pilot minimum age	16*, no minimum age if drone is a toy

- C1 (under 900 gramm)

Subcategory	A1 (can also fly in subcategory A3)

Operational restrictions	◦ No flight expected over uninvolved people (if it happens, overflight should be minimised); ◦ No flight over assemblies of people; ◦ Maintain flight altitude below 120m above ground level.
Drone operator registration	Yes
Remote pilot competence	◦ Read carefully the user manual ◦ Obtain a 'Proof of completion for online training' for A1/A3 'open' subcategory by: ▪ Completing the online training ▪ Passing the online theoretical exam
Remote pilot minimum age	16*

• [C2 \(under 4 kg\)](#)

Subcategory	A2 (can also fly in subcategory A3)
Operational restrictions	◦ Must not overfly uninvolved people; ◦ Maintain a horizontal distance of 30 m from uninvolved people (can be reduced to 5 m if the low-speed function is activated); ◦ Maintain flight altitude below 120m above ground level.
Drone operator registration	Yes
Remote pilot competence	◦ Read carefully the user manual ◦ Obtain a 'Remote pilot certificate of competency' for A2 'open' subcategory by: ▪ Having a 'Proof of completion for online training' for A1/A3 'open' subcategory ▪ Conducting and declare a practical self- training ▪ Passing an additional theoretical exam at the NAA or proctored online
Remote pilot minimum age	16*

• [C3 \(under 25 kg\)](#)

Subcategory	A3
Operational restrictions	◦ Must not overfly uninvolved people; ◦ Maintain a horizontal distance of 150 m from uninvolved people and urban areas; ◦ Maintain flight altitude below 120m above ground level.
Drone operator registration	Yes
Remote pilot competence	◦ Read carefully the user manual ◦ Obtain a 'Proof of completion for online training' for A1/A3 'open' subcategory by: ▪ Completing the online training ▪ Passing the online theoretical exam
Remote pilot minimum age	16*

• [C4 \(under 25 kg\)](#)

Subcategory	A3
Operational restrictions	◦ Must not overfly uninvolved people; ◦ Maintain a horizontal distance of 150 m from uninvolved people and urban areas; ◦ Maintain flight altitude below 120m above ground level.
Drone operator registration	Yes

Remote pilot competence	◦ Read carefully the user manual ◦ Obtain a 'Proof of completion for online training' for A1/A3 'open' subcategory by: ▪ Completing the online training ▪ Passing the online theoretical exam
Remote pilot minimum age	16*


- [Privately built and drones placed on the market before 01/01/2024 \(under 25 kg\)](#)

Subcategory	A3
Operational restrictions	◦ Must not overfly uninformed people; ◦ Maintain a horizontal distance of 150 m from uninformed people and urban areas; ◦ Maintain flight altitude below 120m above ground level.
Drone operator registration	Yes
Remote pilot competence	◦ Read carefully the user manual ◦ Obtain a 'Proof of completion for online training' for A1/A3 'open' subcategory by: ▪ Completing the online training ▪ Passing the online theoretical exam
Remote pilot minimum age	16*

Note that an NAA may designate an entity that may conduct the online training and provide the online exam or the exam for the A2 subcategory. Please refer to the NAA's website for additional information.

Summary

'Open' category: remote pilot competency



Last updated:

21/02/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116457>

Operational authorisation requirements 'open' category

Do I need to obtain an authorisation before flying my drone? ('open' category)

Answer

No prior authorisation is needed for operations in the **'open' category**.

Last updated:

13/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116460>

Responsibilities for drone operators and remote pilots in the 'open' category

What are my responsibilities as a drone operator in the 'open' category?

Answer

As a drone operator flying in the 'open' category, you **must**:

- ensure that the drone displays the drone operator registration number (e.g. with a sticker) and the same number is uploaded into the remote identification;
- develop operational procedures (written procedures are required when the drone operator employs more than one remote pilot, otherwise it is enough that the remote pilot follows the procedures defined by the manufacturer in the user's manual);
- ensure that there is no radio interference that may affect the command and control link of the drone;
- designate a remote pilot for each operation; it is important that it is clear who is the person responsible for each flight;
- ensure that the remote pilot and the personnel supporting the operation of the drone are familiar with the user's manual and with the drone operator's procedures, have appropriate competency, and are provided with the relevant information concerning any geographical zones published by the MS;
- ensure that the maps in the geo-awareness system of the drone are up to date, unless you are flying in a geographical zone where geo-awareness is not required;
- ensure that, unless you are using a privately built drone, it has a declaration in conformity to the CE class mark and its class label (0 to 4) is affixed to the aircraft; and
- ensure that the persons involved in the operation of the drone is aware of the risks involved in operations under subcategories A2 and A3.

Regulatory reference: UAS.OPEN.050 under Annex 1 and art.19 (2)

Last updated:

14/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116467>

What are my responsibilities as a remote pilot in the 'open' category?

Answer

As a remote pilot you **must**:

Before the flight:

- complete the training and examination required for the type of operation you will be involved in;
- have relevant up-to-date information about any geographical zones published by the National Aviation Authority;
- check for obstacles and the presence of people not involved in the operation of the drone (unless operating in the A1 subcategory with a privately built drone or a drone with a CE class 0 mark);
- check that the drone is fit for flight and the operation it will undertake;
- check that the remote control works properly (if applicable); and
- ensure that the weight of the drone is within the limit of the category or subcategory of the intended operation.

During the flight in the 'open' category, you must:

- not operate the drone when you are unfit either due to the consumption of psychoactive/ hallucinogenic substances or alcohol, or unfit due to sickness;
- keep the drone at a distance such that you can clearly see it; you may use a UA observer to scan the airspace when you want to fly in first person view. UA observers must be located alongside you such that they can immediately communicate in case they see an obstacle and give you instructions such as to immediately land the drone.
- if you or the UA observer see a manned aircraft, give way to it, and make sure you are far away from it. If you have any doubt

about the operation, you should land the drone immediately.

- comply with the limitation of the geographical zones;
- operate the drone according to the manufacturer's user manual;
- comply with the operator's procedure; and
- do not operate where an emergency response service is ongoing (e.g. in the case of an accident, keep away from that location since an emergency helicopter may be required to be used);

Regulatory reference: UAS.OPEN.060 under Annex part A EU regulation 2019/947.

Last updated:

13/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116468>

When I buy a drone to be operated in the open category or in standard scenario (STS) in the specific category, what should I do?

Answer

The operator is responsible for obtaining a reasonable confidence that the drone he/she is acquiring complies with requirements applicable to its C class 1 - 6 (ref: Annex of Delegated Regulation (EU) 2019/945).

In particular, the operator needs to ensure that:

- buying directly from outside the EU should be avoided as the UAS may not be intended for the EU market and may not comply with EU legislation.
- the drone bears the appropriate class label from 1 to 6 and it comes with a declaration of conformity showing compliance with the Drone Regulation (EU) 2019/945.
- when buying a second hand UAS, obtain reasonable confidence that the UAS has not been damaged or modified in a way that affect its initial compliance with the Drone Regulation (EU) 2019/945.
- the initial compliance of the UAS to the requirements of its C Class is maintained throughout its lifetime, in particular that the UAS is not damaged or modified in a way that could affect it.

Last updated:

25/04/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136384>

Drones without class identification label 'open' category

Under the 'open' category do I still need training, given that I was flying drones before the rules became applicable?

Answer

Any certificates of remote pilots' competency issued by national authorities will remain valid until 1 January 2022, after which your National Aviation Authority will have to convert your national certificate(s) to new one(s) that comply with this Regulation.

Whether or not you have to undergo more training after that date will depend on the conversion process that your National Aviation Authority decides to put in place.

As of 31 December 2020, if you do not have a national certificate for your remote pilot competency, you will have to undergo the required competency training as required for the 'open' category.

Regulatory reference: Article 21 and Annex part A (UAS.OPEN.020) and (UAS.OPEN.040) of EU regulation 2019/947.

Last updated:

14/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116509>

I fall under the 'open' category will I be able to fly my old drone after 31 December 2020 ?

Answer


Yes, from 31 December 2020 to 1 January 2024, you may fly your drone without class Identification label in the 'open' category under the following conditions:

- drones with less than 500 g MTOM cannot fly over people, and pilot competency is determined by your National Aviation Authority;
- drones with less than 2 kg MTOM can fly 50 metres or more (horizontally) from people and the pilot must undergo training equivalent to subcategory A2 (see the FAQ section on training);
- drones with less than 25 kg MTOM, can fly in areas free from people, 150 metres or more away from properties, and the pilot must undergo training equivalent to subcategory A3 (see the FAQ section on training).

After 1 January 2024, you can still fly your drone without class identification labels, however, only under the following subcategories of operation, for which you have to fully comply with:

- Subcategory A1 when the drone's maximum take-off weight (MTOM) is less than 250 g; or
- Subcategory A3 when the drone's maximum take-off weight is less than 25 kg.

You **will not need to apply any retrofit/sticker** to the drone in subcategories A1 or A3.



Regulatory reference: Article 20 and Annex part A of EU regulation 2019/947 and EU regulation 2019/945.

Last updated:

18/03/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116508>

Which are the maximum take-off mass requirements in the 'open' category for drones without class identification label?

Answer

As explained in the following article, [Drone Open Category - Applicable requirements to fly from the 1st of January 2024 | EASA](#) and according to the [EU Regulation 2019/947](#), from 1 January 2024, you can fly a drone without a class identification label if you operate in the open category in:

- **Subcategory A1:** if the drone has a maximum take-off mass of less than 250 g, including its payload;

- **Subcategory A3:** if the drone has a maximum take-off mass of less than 25 kg, including its fuel and payload.

Only for drones with a class mark, manufacturers have the responsibility for declaring the maximum take-off mass of the drone. This means that, when using a drone without a class identification label the maximum take-off mass is not available. In this case the remote pilot has the possibility to weight the drone before the flight and make sure it is within the above limits.

The information contained in this article is meant purely as a summary of the Drone Regulations. It has no legal effect and shall not be construed as the official guidance of the Agency in accordance with Article 76 of [Regulation \(EU\) 2018/1139](#). The Union's institutions and the Agency do not assume any liability for its contents. The authentic versions of the relevant acts, including their preambles, are those published in the Official Journal of the European Union and available in EUR-Lex.

Last updated:

30/10/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140559>

I am into drone racing and/or flying drones with goggles (FPV) 'open' category

As a drone racer, which category and subcategory of operation do I fall under?

Answer

Normally drone races are organised by clubs and associations. In such cases, they may have received operational authorisations from their National Aviation Authorities in accordance with Article 16 of Regulation (EU) 2019/947, which also covers the organisation of such events.

If, instead, you want to conduct a race that is not within a club or association and with no spectators (in this context meaning uninvolved persons, see the definition above) present, you will fall under the **'open' category** and you can operate under subcategory A3.

Last updated:

14/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116510>

Is flying with goggles (first person view) authorised in the 'open' category?

Answer

The Regulation allows you to fly without keeping direct eye contact with the drone, provided you have a person next to you, a UA observer, keeping direct visual contact with the drone, scanning the airspace to make sure that you do not endanger other parties (e.g. aircraft or buildings or persons). **The UA observer must be located alongside you so they can immediately communicate with you** in case they see an obstacle, and give you instructions, such as to immediately land the drone.

Regulatory reference: Article 4(d) of EU regulation 2019/947.

Last updated:

14/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116511>

Are spectators allowed in the 'open' category?

Answer

When operating in the 'open' category, **flying over uninvolved people is not allowed**, so there must not be any spectators. See

also the explanation on uninvolved persons under [‘understanding EU Regulations 2019/947 and 2019/945’](#).

Last updated:

14/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116512>

Is beyond visual line of sight (BVLOS) operation possible for flying drones with goggles (first-person view (FPV)) operation?

Answer

NB This answer applies only to non-racing FPV operation.

One of the conditions to operate in the open category is for the remote pilot to keep the drone **invisual line of sight (VLOS)** at all times. There are only two exceptions where VLOS is not strictly applied:

- when using the follow-me mode with a drone with C0 or C1 label or below 250 g; and/or
- when operating in first person view (FPV) and using an **unmanned-aircraft observer** that is always looking at the drone.

It is important to note that the open category catalogues all lower-risk drone operations **without the need for prior authorisation**; this lighter provision is compensated by more restrictive conditions of operation.

FPV goggles by nature do not allow to have a wide field of view to see potential threats around the drone, so they do not enable VLOS. Hence, the requirement for an **unmanned-aircraft observer** for any FPV operation when operating in the open category. The **unmanned-aircraft observer** must look at the drone and be alongside the remote pilot so that the **unmanned-aircraft observer** can immediately inform the remote pilot in case of any threat around the drone.

With the above conditions, you are allowed to fly FPV in the open category. However, you need to be mindful of the risk to hit a person or other aircraft.

If you want to have a drone race in FPV, spectators are not allowed; please note that drones with a speed higher than 19 m/s are only allowed to operate in open subcategory A3 (far from people). Therefore, in case you want to have spectators, the FPV race should be conducted in the specific category (including standards scenarios). For more information, please refer to the following FAQ: [I am into drone racing and/or flying drones with goggles \(FPV\) ‘open’ category | EASA \(europa.eu\)](#).

For standard scenario (STS) 2, nothing prevents the remote pilot to fly in first person view when:

- an **airspace observer** scans the sky; and
- the remote pilots is assisted by an **unmanned-aircraft observer**.

The same person may be the **airspace observer** and the **unmanned-aircraft observer**, if that person complies with the requirements imposed for the two observers.

For STS 1, it is correct that at the moment, operating in FPV is not possible since the remote pilot is required to maintain VLOS.

Last updated:

25/06/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140037>

I build my own drones (privately built) ‘open’ category

Does my drone fall under the ‘open’ category?

Answer

Yes, privately built drones can be used, and depending on their weight, operated in the ‘open’ category or the ‘specific’ category. You, as the drone operator, need to fulfil all the requirements of the Regulation, and in the ‘open’ category, you can only operate under subcategory:

- A1 when the drone’s maximum take-off weight (MTOM) including its payload is less than 250 g and the maximum speed

is less than 19 m/s; or in

- A3 when the drone's MTOM including its payload is less than 25 kg.

Regulatory reference: UAS.OPEN.020 (5) (a) and UASOPEAN.040 (4)(a) Annex part A of EU regulation 2019/947.

Last updated:

14/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116513>

I plan to provide services (commercial and other) with drones 'open' category

How do I determine which category I can operate under, 'open' or 'specific'?

Answer

You can operate your services whether commercial or not, under the 'open' category, if you meet all the requirements defined for the 'open' category.

See Question on subcategory under "[understanding EU regulation 2019/947 and 2019/945](#)".

Regulatory reference: Article 4 of EU Regulation 2019/947; Annex part A and Article 5(1) of EU Regulation 2019/947.

Last updated:

14/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116514>

What is meant by the requirement for Operational procedures?

Answer

The drone operator should develop procedures adapted to the type of operations and to the risks involved. Therefore, **written procedures should not be necessary if the drone operator is also the remote pilot, or employs just one remote pilot. In this case the remote pilot** may use the procedures defined by the manufacturer's manual.

If a drone operator employs more than one remote pilot, the drone operator should:

- (a) develop procedures for drone operations in order to coordinate the activities between its employees; and
- (b) establish and maintain a list of their personnel and their assigned duties.

Regulatory reference: UAS.OPEN.50 under annex part A 2019/947.

Last updated:

14/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116517>

I am a non-EU visitor / drone operator 'open' category

I am a Non-EU resident visiting Europe and I plan to fly my drone in the 'open' category, do I need to register?

Answer

All drone operations conducted in the EASA Member States must comply with the Drone Regulation, no matter what the nationality of the operator or remote pilot is. Therefore, as a non-EU resident, you are also required to register with the National

Aviation Authority of the first EU country where you intend to operate.

You will then be issued with a **'drone operator registration number'** that needs to be **displayed** with a sticker **on all the drones you own**. You **must also upload it into** the **'remote identification system'** of your drone(s).

Once registered in the host country, the drone operator's registration **will be valid** across Europe and the operator will be required to follow all the provisions of the Drone Regulation.

If you intend to operate in the 'specific' category, you must submit a declaration for a standard scenario or apply for an operational authorisation to the National Aviation Authority of the EU Member State(s) where you registered.

If you want to conduct operations in a Member State different from the one in which you registered, you need to follow the same procedure as all other national citizens of the Member State where you registered. Refer to question ['I plan to provide services \(commercial and other\) with drone\(s\)'](#).

Regulatory reference: Art.41 (1) and (2) of EU regulation 2019/945.

Last updated:

14/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116519>

As a non-EU resident, are my competencies for the 'open' category recognised in the EU?

Answer

Given that there is not yet any mutual recognition established between EASA and other countries, in the domain of drones, the training or qualification obtained in your country of residence will not be accepted in the EU. Therefore, you will have to undergo the required training before you can fly your drone. In the meantime, other nations may develop regulations that may be considered by the EU commission as equivalent to those in Europe. Information on future recognition will be published on the EU Commission website as soon as it is finalised.

Last updated:

14/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116520>

Conduct an Operation in the open category in a state other than the one I am registered

Do I need to apply for an authorisation?

Answer

No you are not required to do anything different from what is required when flying in the state where you are registered. Make sure before starting the operation you check if the area is covered by a geographical zone published by the state.

Regulatory reference Article 4 of EU Regulation 2019/947

Last updated:

10/09/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/131130>

When I buy a drone to be operated in the open category or in standard scenario (STS) in the specific category, what should I do?

Answer

The operator is responsible for obtaining a reasonable confidence that the drone he/she is acquiring complies with requirements applicable to its C class 1 - 6 (ref: Annex of Delegated Regulation (EU) 2019/945).

In particular, the operator needs to ensure that:

- buying directly from outside the EU should be avoided as the UAS may not be intended for the EU market and may not comply with EU legislation.
- the drone bears the appropriate class label from 1 to 6 and it comes with a declaration of conformity showing compliance with the Drone Regulation (EU) 2019/945.
- when buying a second hand UAS, obtain reasonable confidence that the UAS has not been damaged or modified in a way that affect its initial compliance with the Drone Regulation (EU) 2019/945.
- the initial compliance of the UAS to the requirements of its C Class is maintained throughout its lifetime, in particular, that the UAS is not damaged or modified in a way that could affect it.

Last updated:

12/04/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136359>

Specific category**Understanding the 'specific' category**

How do I determine I fall under the 'specific' category?

Answer

A drone can be operated in the 'in the 'specific' or the 'certified' category, when it does not meet the requirements laid out under the open category. See FAQ - [How do I determine I fall under the 'open' category?](#)

Regulatory reference: Article 4 and Article 20 of EU Regulation 2019/947; Annex part A and Article 5(1) of EU Regulation 2019/947, Parts 1 to 5 Annex of EU Regulation 2019/945.

Last updated:

08/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119225>

Training requirements in the 'specific' category

Are all remote pilots in the 'specific' category required to train to fly a drone?

Answer

For operation falling under the 'specific' category, the training depends on the operation you intend to conduct. So unless the operation falls into a standard scenario, after the risk assessment, you will need to propose a possible training course to the National Aviation Authority. The authority will, in each case, evaluate the adequacy of the training, and if they confirm it in the operational authorisation, the training will become the required training.

If your operation falls into a standard scenario, the remote pilot must:

- hold a certificate of remote pilot theoretical knowledge for operation under standard scenarios;
- hold an accreditation of completion of the STS-01 practical skill training.

To do so, the remote pilot must complete and successfully pass an online training course.

Both the certificate and accreditation can be issued by a competent authority or an entity chosen to do so.

Regulatory reference: UAS.SPEC.050 (d) and UAS.SPEC.060 (b) of EU Regulation 2019/947

Last updated:

08/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119226>

Who issues the remote pilot competency certificate for the 'specific' category and how long is it valid for?

Answer

For standard scenarios, the National Aviation Authority is responsible for issuing the certificates. A certificate for Remote Pilot competency **is valid for 5 years**. If the revalidation is conducted before the certificate expires, the remote pilot may attend a seminar provided by the National Aviation Authority or by an entity recognised by it, otherwise competencies need to be re-demonstrated.

For operations in the 'specific' category that are not covered by standard scenarios, the training will be defined in the operational authorisation provided by the National Aviation Authority.

Regulatory reference: Article 12 of EU Regulation 2019/947 and UAS.STS-01.020

Contact your National Aviation Authority for further information

(see <https://www.easa.europa.eu/domains/civil-drones/naa>).

Last updated:

13/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119227>

Will the competency certificate for the 'specific' category be recognised throughout Europe?

Answer

Yes, training conducted in one EASA Member State will be recognised in all others.

Last updated:

13/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119228>

Operational authorisation requirements for the 'specific' category

Do I need to obtain an authorisation before flying my drone in the 'specific' category?

Answer

When operating under the 'specific' category, if the operations can be conducted within the limitation of a standard scenario and using an appropriate drone, the drone operator only needs to submit a declaration to the National Aviation Authority and wait for the confirmation of receipt and completeness. For all other operations in the 'specific' category, an operational authorisation issued by the National Aviation Authority is needed.

Last updated:

08/10/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119229>**I fall under the 'specific' category, so how do I obtain an authorisation?****Answer**

Firstly check whether your operation can be accommodated within a **standard scenario**. If it can, you do not need an authorisation, but you do need to submit a declaration to the National Aviation Authority. A standard scenario is an operation defined in the Appendix to the drone regulation (EU Regulation 2019/947). You need to use a drone marked with the appropriate class identification label (5 or 6). After submitting the declaration to the National Aviation Authority, you will receive the confirmation of receipt and completeness from the National Aviation Authority and operate following the limitations of the standard scenario.

Otherwise, there are other means to obtain an operational authorisation under the 'specific' category, depending on the level of risk the operation poses. The drone operator can apply for:

1. **An operational authorisation by conducting a risk assessment of the intended operation** using a methodology for the risk assessment; one possible method is the SORA (specific operation risk assessment) that you can find as [AMC1 to Article 11 to Regulation \(EU\) 2019/947](#). This methodology helps to identify the risk level of the operation and to identify the mitigations and operational safety objectives needed to make the operation safe. When the drone operator believes they have put in place satisfactory measures to ensure the safety of the operation, they send all the information to the National Aviation Authority and apply for an operational authorisation. When the National Aviation Authority is satisfied, it provides the drone operator with the authorisation, and the operation can be started.
2. **An operation authorisation through a predefined risk assessment' (PDRA)** as a simplification of the drone operator conducting a risk assessment. For those operations that will be the most common in Europe, EASA will carry out the risk assessment and will publish, as an acceptable means of compliance with the drone regulation, the list of the actions that the drone operator needs to put in place in order to conduct the operation safely. An application for an authorisation to the National Aviation Authority is still needed, however, both the drone operator and the National Aviation Authority will benefit from the standardised measures defined in the PDRA. The PDRA's are published by EASA as [AMC to Art 11 to Regulation \(EU\) 2019/947](#); more are already under development.
3. **Light UAS operator certificate (LUC)**: this is a voluntary certification, after which the National Aviation Authority may allocate some privileges to the drone operator.

Drone operators may ask the National Aviation Authority to assess their organisation to evaluate whether they are capable of assessing the risk of an operation themselves. The requirements to be demonstrated by drone operators are defined in Part C of Regulation (EU) 2019/947. When the National Aviation Authority is satisfied, they will issue a light UAS operator certificate (LUC) and they will allocate privileges to the drone operators based on their level of maturity. The privileges may be one or more of the following:

- To conduct operations covered by standard scenarios without submitting a declaration;
- To self-authorise operations conducted by the drone operator and covered by a PDRA without applying for an authorisation.
- To self-authorise all operations conducted by the drone operator without applying for an authorisation.

Regulatory reference: article 12 of EU regulation 2012/947.

Last updated:

13/10/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116462>

Responsibilities as a drone operator or remote pilot in the 'specific' category

What are my responsibilities as a drone operator in the 'specific' category?

Answer

As a drone operator flying in the 'specific' category, you **must**:

- ensure that the drone displays the drone operator registration number (e.g. with a sticker) and the same number is uploaded into the remote identification;
- develop operational procedures (written procedures are required when the drone operator employs more than one remote pilot, otherwise it is enough that the remote pilot follows the procedures defined by the manufacturer in the user's manual);
- ensure that there is no radio interference that may affect the command and control link of the drone;
- designate a remote pilot for each operation; it is important that it is clear who is the person responsible for each flight;
- ensure that the remote pilot and the personnel supporting the operation of the drone are familiar with the user's manual and with the drone operator's procedures, have appropriate competency, and are provided with the relevant information concerning any geographical zones published by the MS;
- ensure that the maps in the geo-awareness system of the drone are up to date, unless you are flying in a geographical zone where geo-awareness is not required;
- ensure that, unless you are using a privately built drone, it has a declaration in conformity to the CE class mark and its class label (0 to 4) is affixed to the aircraft; and
- ensure that the persons involved in the operation of the drone is aware of the risks involved in operations under subcategories A2 and A3.
- carry out each operation within the limitations defined in the declaration or operational authorisation;
- develop procedures to ensure the security of the operation;
- establish measures against unlawful interference and unauthorised access;
- ensure that the privacy of people is protected, and there may also be a requirement to conduct a data protection impact assessment if requested by the National Aviation Authority;
- provide the remote pilot with guidelines on how to minimise the nuisance caused by noise and emissions;
- ensure that the pilot conducting the operation and the other personnel in charge comply with all the conditions required for operating in the 'specific' category;
- keep a record of the drone operation; and
- maintain the drone in a suitable condition to ensure safe operation.

Regulatory reference: UAS.SPEC.050 of EU Regulation 2019/947

Last updated:

08/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119232>

What are my responsibilities as a remote pilot in the 'specific' category?

Answer

As a remote pilot you **must**:

Before the flight:

- complete the training and examination required for the type of operation you will be involved in;
- have relevant up-to-date information about any geographical zones published by the National Aviation Authority;
- check for obstacles and the presence of people not involved in the operation of the drone (unless operating in the A1 subcategory with a privately built drone or a drone with a CE class 0 mark);
- check that the drone is fit for flight and the operation it will undertake;
- check that the remote control works properly (if applicable); and

- ensure that the weight of the drone is within the limit of the category or subcategory of the intended operation.
- ensure that the operating environment is compatible with the authorised or declared limitations, and
- ensure that Air Traffic Services , airspace users and other stakeholders are informed of the intended operation.
- During the flight in the 'specific' category, you **must**:
- not operate the drone when you are unfit either due to the consumption of psychoactive/ hallucinogenic substances or alcohol, or unfit due to sickness;
- keep the drone at a distance such that you can clearly see it; you may use a UA observer to scan the airspace when you want to fly in first person view. UA observers must be located alongside you such that they can immediately communicate in case they see an obstacle and give you instructions such as to immediately land the drone.
- if you or the UA observer see a manned aircraft, give way to it, and make sure you are far away from it. If you have any doubt about the operation, you should land the drone immediately.
- comply with the limitation of the geographical zones;
- operate the drone according to the manufacturer's user manual;
- comply with the operator's procedure; and
- do not operate where an emergency response service is ongoing (e.g. in the case of an accident, keep away from that location since an emergency helicopter may be required to be used);
- Comply with the authorised or declared limitations.

Regulatory reference: UAS.SPEC.060 of EU Regulation 2019/947

Last updated:

13/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119233>

When I buy a drone to be operated in the open category or in standard scenario (STS) in the specific category, what should I do?

Answer

The operator is responsible for obtaining a reasonable confidence that the drone he/she is acquiring complies with requirements applicable to its C class 1 - 6 (ref: Annex of Delegated Regulation (EU) 2019/945).

In particular, the operator needs to ensure that:

- buying directly from outside the EU should be avoided as the UAS may not be intended for the EU market and may not comply with EU legislation.
- the drone bears the appropriate class label from 1 to 6 and it comes with a declaration of conformity showing compliance with the Drone Regulation (EU) 2019/945.
- when buying a second hand UAS, obtain reasonable confidence that the UAS has not been damaged or modified in a way that affect its initial compliance with the Drone Regulation (EU) 2019/945.
- the initial compliance of the UAS to the requirements of its C Class is maintained throughout its lifetime, in particular that the UAS is not damaged or modified in a way that could affect it.

Last updated:

25/04/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136385>

Drones without class identification label in the 'specific' category

I fall under the 'specific' category will I be able to fly my old drone after 31 December 2020 ?

Answer

Drones in the 'specific' category do not need a class identification label (except if operating in a standard scenario).

Last updated:

08/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119236>

Under the 'specific' category do I still need training, given that I was flying drones before the rules became applicable?

Answer

Any certificates of remote pilots' competency issued by national authorities will remain valid until 1 January 2022, after which your National Aviation Authority will have to convert your national certificate(s) to new one(s) that comply with this Regulation.

Whether or not you have to undergo more training after that date will depend on the conversion process that your National Aviation Authority decides to put in place.

As of 31 December 2020, if you do not have a national certificate for your remote pilot competency, you will have to undergo the required competency training as required for the 'open' category.

Regulatory reference: Article 21 and Annex part A (UAS.OPEN.020) and (UAS.OPEN.040) of EU Regulation 2019/947.

Last updated:

13/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119237>

I am into drone racing and/or flying drones with goggles (FPV) 'specific' category

Which authorisation do I need?

Answer

Normally drone races are organised by clubs and associations. In such cases, they may have received operational authorisations from their National Aviation Authorities in accordance with Article 16 of Regulation (EU) 2019/947, which also covers the organisation of such events.

If there are spectators, the operation falls into the 'specific' category, and you need to apply for an authorisation from the National Aviation Authority

Last updated:

08/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119238>

Is flying with goggles (first person view) authorised in the 'specific' category?

Answer

The Regulation allows you to fly without keeping direct eye contact with the drone, provided you have a person next to you, a UA observer, keeping direct visual contact with the drone, scanning the airspace to make sure that you do not endanger other parties (e.g. aircraft or buildings or persons). **The UA observer must be located alongside you so they can immediately communicate with you** in case they see an obstacle, and give you instructions, such as to immediately land the drone.

Last updated:

13/10/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119240>**Are spectators allowed in the 'specific' category?****Answer**

If the event is organised by a club or association that received an authorisation from the National Aviation Authority, or the organiser received an operational authorisation for an operation in the 'specific' category, then spectators are allowed.

Last updated:

13/10/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119241>**Is beyond visual line of sight (BVLOS) operation possible for flying drones with goggles (first-person view (FPV)) operation?****Answer****NB This answer applies only to non-racing FPV operation.**

One of the conditions to operate in the open category is for the remote pilot to keep the drone **invisual line of sight (VLOS)** at all times. There are only two exceptions where VLOS is not strictly applied:

- when using the follow-me mode with a drone with C0 or C1 label or below 250 g; and/or
- when operating in first person view (FPV) and using an **unmanned-aircraft observer** that is always looking at the drone.

It is important to note that the open category catalogues all lower-risk drone operations **without the need for prior authorisation**; this lighter provision is compensated by more restrictive conditions of operation.

FPV goggles by nature do not allow to have a wide field of view to see potential threats around the drone, so they do not enable VLOS. Hence, the requirement for an **unmanned-aircraft observer** for any FPV operation when operating in the open category. The **unmanned-aircraft observer** must look at the drone and be alongside the remote pilot so that the **unmanned-aircraft observer** can immediately inform the remote pilot in case of any threat around the drone.

With the above conditions, you are allowed to fly FPV in the open category. However, you need to be mindful of the risk to hit a person or other aircraft.

If you want to have a drone race in FPV, spectators are not allowed; please note that drones with a speed higher than 19 m/s are only allowed to operate in open subcategory A3 (far from people). Therefore, in case you want to have spectators, the FPV race should be conducted in the specific category (including standards scenarios). For more information, please refer to the following FAQ: [I am into drone racing and/or flying drones with goggles \(FPV\) 'open' category | EASA \(europa.eu\)](#).

For standard scenario (STS) 2, nothing prevents the remote pilot to fly in first person view when:

- an **airspace observer** scans the sky; and
- the remote pilots is assisted by an **unmanned-aircraft observer**.

The same person may be the **airspace observer** and the **unmanned-aircraft observer**, if that person complies with the requirements imposed for the two observers.

For STS 1, it is correct that at the moment, operating in FPV is not possible since the remote pilot is required to maintain VLOS.

Last updated:

25/06/2024

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/140038>

I build my own drones (privately built) 'specific' category

Can my drone operate in the 'specific' category?

Answer

Privately built drones of any weight can be operated in the 'specific' category, if included in the operational authorisation issued by the National Aviation Authority.

Last updated:

08/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119242>

I plan to provide services (commercial and other) with drone(s) 'specific' category

Will I need to validate my operational authorisation with every other EASA Members state?

Answer

By 31 December 2020, any authorisation given by one MS will be valid in the rest of Europe. The drone operator is required to first submit the declaration (if intending to conduct an operation covered by a standard scenario) or receive an operational authorisation from the National Aviation Authority of the state of registration.

For an operation covered by a standard scenario (SS), the drone operator must send to the National Aviation Authority where it intends to operate, a copy of the declaration and a copy of the confirmation of receipt and completeness received by the National Aviation Authority of the state of registration. Then the drone operator may start the operation following the requirement of the standard scenario and verifying the geographical zone published by the National Aviation Authority where the operation is conducted.

For operations not covered by a standard scenario in the 'specific' category, the drone operator must ensure that the mitigating measures submitted in his original risk assessment are appropriate to the new environment it plan to operate in or update them is necessary.

Then the drone operator must provide the National Aviation Authority of the Member State of the intended operation with an application, which must include:

- (a) a copy of the operational authorisation granted by the National Aviation Authority of the Member State of registration; with
- (b) the location (s) of the intended operation, including the updated mitigation measures.

Upon receipt of the application, the National Aviation Authority of the Member State of the intended operation will review the updated mitigation measure proposed. They will confirm to the drone operator that the application is satisfactory. Once the operator receives the confirmation, they may start the intended operation.

If the drone operator has been granted, by the National Aviation Authority of the state of registration, an LUC (a light UAS operator certificate) with privileges to self-authorise its operations, they must provide the National Aviation Authority of the State of the intended operation with

- a copy of the term of approval of the LUC and
- the location or locations of the intended operation;

Regulatory reference: article 13 of EU regulation 2019/947.

Last updated:

13/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116515>

What will happen to authorisation granted by NAAs before the 31st of December 2020?

Answer

After 31 December 2020, all existing approvals/certificates/authorisations/declarations issued by National Aviation Authorities will still be valid until 1 January 2022.

After 1 January 2022, all approvals, certificates, authorisation and declarations must be converted to the EU Regulation. New applications for authorisations/certificate submitted after 1 January 2022 need to follow the new EU Regulation.

Last updated:

13/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116516>

I am a non-EU visitor / drone operator 'specific' category

I am a Non-EU resident visiting Europe and I plan to fly my drone under the 'specific' category, do I need to register?

Answer

All drone operations conducted in the EASA Member States must comply with the Drone Regulation, no matter what the nationality of the operator or remote pilot is. Therefore, as a non-EU resident, you are also required to register with the National Aviation Authority of the first EU country where you intend to operate.

You will then be issued with a **'drone operator registration number'** that needs to be **displayed** with a sticker on **all the drones you own**. You **must also upload it into** the **'remote identification system'** of your drone(s).

Once registered in the host country, the drone operator's registration **will be valid** across Europe and the operator will be required to follow all the provisions of the Drone Regulation.

If you intend to operate in the 'specific' category, you must submit a declaration for a standard scenario or apply for an operational authorisation to the National Aviation Authority of the EU Member State(s) where you registered.

If you want to conduct operations in a Member State different from the one in which you registered, you need to follow the same procedure as all other national citizens of the Member State where you registered.

Regulatory reference: Art.41 (1) and (2) of EU Regulation 2019/945

Last updated:

08/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119253>

As a non-EU resident, are my competencies under the 'specific' category recognised in the EU?

Answer

Given that there is not yet any mutual recognition established between EASA and other countries, in the domain of drones, the training or qualification obtained in your country of residence will not be accepted in the EU. Therefore, you will have to undergo the required training before you can fly your drone. In the meantime, other nations may develop regulations that may be considered by the EU commission as equivalent to those in Europe. Information on future recognition will be published on the EU Commission website as soon as it is finalised.

Last updated:

13/10/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119254>**I would like to know about the light UAS operator certificate (LUC)****What is a LUC?****Answer**

A **light UAS operator certificate (LUC)** is an organisational approval certificate. Drone operators may ask the National Aviation Authority of registration to have their organisation assessed to demonstrate that they are capable of assessing the risk of an operation themselves. The requirements to be demonstrated by drone operators are defined in Part C of Regulation (EU) 2019/947. When the National Aviation Authority is satisfied, they will issue a light UAS operator certificate (LUC) and they will assign privileges to the drone operators based on their level of maturity. The privileges may allow the organisation to self-authorise operations without applying for an authorisation.

The privileges may be one or more of the following:

- Conduct operations covered by standard scenarios without submitting the declaration;
- self-authorise operations conducted by the drone operator and covered by a PDRA without applying for an authorisation;
- self-authorise all operations conducted by the drone operator without applying for an authorisation.

Last updated:

10/10/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116522>**Who can apply for a LUC?****Answer**

You need to be an organisation to be eligible to apply for a LUC, however you can subcontract some of the activities.

Regulatory reference: UAS.LUC.010.

Last updated:

13/10/2020

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116523>**Do I need to obtain an authorisation before flying my drone? (LUC)****Answer**

It depends on the privileges granted by the National Aviation Authority.

Regulatory reference: Article 5 of EU Regulation 2019/947.

Last updated:

13/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/119298>

How long is a LUC valid?

Answer

The validity of a LUC is unlimited as long as the organisation remains compliant with the LUC's requirements. An LUC can be revoked or surrendered.

Regulatory reference: UASE.LUC.080 of EU regulation 2019/947.

Last updated:

13/10/2020

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/116524>

Conduct an Operation in the specific category in a state other than the one I am registered

What is the process to apply for an operational authorisation?

Answer

When you intend to conduct an operation in the specific category, in a state other than the one you are registered, firstly you need to get an operational authorisation from the competent authority of the state you are registered. This competent authority will evaluate your risk assessment identifying if the mitigation means you propose and the safety objectives are adequate to conduct such type of operation.

Then you need to apply to the competent authority of the state of operation for a confirmation of a cross border operation, providing them evidences on how you apply the mitigations means to the location and in case how you comply with the local conditions.

Regulatory reference Article 13 of EU Regulation 2019/947

Last updated:

10/09/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/131129>

Why I cannot apply directly to the competent authority of the state of operation?

Answer

The authorisation process requires that the authority agrees with the proposal of the operator ensuring the safety of the operation. The level of verification from the authority depends on the level of risk of the operation and on the level of trust on the maturity of the operator. Therefore applying always to the same authority allows to build this trust. Moreover all authorities needs to conduct periodical oversight audits to all operators they issued an operational authorisation or a LUC or received a declaration, being responsible of their national operators is more convenient for both authorities and operators.

Regulatory reference Article 18(h) of EU Regulation 2019/947

Last updated:

10/09/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/131128>

When I buy a drone to be operated in the open category or in standard scenario (STS) in the specific category, what

should I do?

Answer

The operator is responsible for obtaining a reasonable confidence that the drone he/she is acquiring complies with requirements applicable to its C class 1 - 6 (ref: Annex of Delegated Regulation (EU) 2019/945).

In particular, the operator needs to ensure that:

- buying directly from outside the EU should be avoided as the UAS may not be intended for the EU market and may not comply with EU legislation.
- the drone bears the appropriate class label from 1 to 6 and it comes with a declaration of conformity showing compliance with the Drone Regulation (EU) 2019/945.
- when buying a second hand UAS, obtain reasonable confidence that the UAS has not been damaged or modified in a way that affect its initial compliance with the Drone Regulation (EU) 2019/945.
- the initial compliance of the UAS to the requirements of its C Class is maintained throughout its lifetime, in particular, that the UAS is not damaged or modified in a way that could affect it.

Last updated:

12/04/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/136360>

I am a drone manufacturer and I need to test my product in flight to obtain a Class marking. Do I need to apply for a 'specific' operation authorisation?

Answer

No. A drone under development can be considered 'privately built' that can fly in the 'Open' sub-category A3. In fact, a '*privately built UAS*' means a UAS assembled or manufactured for the builder's own use, not including UAS assembled from sets of parts placed on the market as a single ready-to-assemble kit. In this case, the UAS is manufactured/assembled for the manufacturer's use.

Last updated:

06/07/2023


Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/138195>

Drones with class identification label C0-C6

Are drones with class identification label presently available on the EU market?

Answer



Drones bearing a class identification label are progressively appearing on the market. However, the presence of a class identification label on the drone does not guarantee its compliance to [Regulation \(EU\) 2019/945](#) (R945). Compliant drones are expected to appear slowly towards the end of the year.

Until at least March 2022, it will not be possible to have compliant drones of classes C1, C2 and C3 on the market, due to the absence of the procedures necessary to demonstrate their conformity. In addition, the absence of standards supporting the requirements of R945 until at least the end of the year makes difficult for manufacturers to ensure compliance of their products. This is especially the case for classes C0 and C4 to C5. Therefore, we recommend great caution at least until the end of the year

when buying drones with a class identification label.

Market surveillance authorities are responsible for ensuring that the drones placed on the Union market with a class identification label are compliant to R945. However, you, as individual, should also take measures to get sufficient confidence that you are operating a compliant drone (see FaQ 3).

If you have any question on compliance of drones with the EU regulation, please [contact us](#).

Last updated:

08/02/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/135901>

How as a manufacturer should I demonstrate compliance with the EU regulation?

Answer

Drones are subject to several Union harmonisation legislations (e.g. Radio equipment directive 2014/53/EU, Machinery directive 2006/42/EC). It is your responsibility to identify all applicable legislations and demonstrate compliance to those regulations using the procedures defined by each of them.

Drones bearing a class identification label are, in addition, subject to the Union harmonisation legislation set by Chapter II of [Regulation \(EU\) 2019/945](#) (R945). You must demonstrate compliance of the drone with the requirements of R945 using one of the procedures defined by article 13 of R945. The following table defines the procedure available for each class of drone:

	C0	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6
Internal production control (Part 7 of R945)	X				X	X	X
EU-type examination and conformity to type based on internal production control (Part 8 of R945)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Conformity based on full quality assurance (Part 9 of R945)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

The EU-type examination and the conformity based on full quality assurance require the intervention of a Notified Body. The [NANDO website](#) provides the list of conformity assessment organisations notified under R945.

Once the conformity of the drone to all applicable legislations has been demonstrated, you should:

- draws up an EU Declaration of conformity as per Part 11 or 12 of R945 referencing to the Regulation (EU) 2019/945 and the other applicable regulations
- provides a copy of the declaration of EU conformity (or its simplified version) with the drone, this copy must bear the serial number of the drone
- affix the CE marking on the drone

These products are subject to the control of the national market surveillance authorities responsible for the different applicable legislations.

Last updated:

08/02/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/135902>


How as an individual do I know what is valid?

Answer

While market surveillance authorities are responsible for ensuring that the drones placed on the Union market with a class identification label are compliant to [Regulation \(EU\) 2019/945 \(R945\)](#), you, as individual, should take the following measures to obtain reasonable confidence that the drone you intend to operate under the open category complies with R945:

- buy the drone in a reliable shop or online market place (in particular, avoid buying a drone on-line directly from outside Europe, since it may not be compliant with EU legislations);

- verify the presence of a valid class identification label as per R945: the logo must have the exact shape defined by the drawing below, where 'X' is replaced by the number of the class (e.g. '1'). Any other logo will not constitute a valid class identification label allowing the drone to be operated in the open category or under declaration.



- verify the CE mark on the UAS and the presence of the EU declaration of conformity in the package;
- verify that the declaration of conformity refers to R945 and bears the drone serial number.
- verify that the drone provides the following:

	C0	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6
A maximum weight below 250 g	X						
A maximum weight below 900 g		X					
A maximum weight below 4 kg			X				
A maximum weight below 25 kg				X	X	X	X
A low speed mode (< 3 m/s), excepted for fixed-wing			X				
A low speed mode (< 5 m/s), unless tethered						X	
An indication of the noise emission		X	X	X		X	X
A direct remote identification function		X	X	X		X	X
A geo-awareness function		X	X	X			
A low-battery warning		X	X	X		X	X
A flight termination system, unless tethered						X	X
A geo-fencing function							X
Information of drone position, speed and altitude						X	X

Last updated:

08/02/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/135903>

What are the responsibilities of importers and distributors?

Answer

The responsibilities of importers and distributors are defined in Articles 8 and 9 of [Regulation \(EU\) 2019/945 \(R945\)](#). Sections 3.3 and 3.4 of the [Blue Guide](#) provides additional information.

One of those responsibilities is to ensure that the drone placed on the market bears a class identification label when required, i.e. when intended for use in the open category or under declaration. Therefore, where it is clear that the targeted group of customers will use their drone in the open category or under declaration, importers and distributors should ensure that they only make available to such group of customers drones with a class identification label. Drones made available without a class identification label must clearly target customer intending to operate in the specific category.

Last updated:

08/02/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/135905>

Are drones with class identification label required to operate in the specific category?

Answer

An operator conducting an operation in the specific category must demonstrate that the drone used is compliant with the technical requirements defined in the operational authorisation issued by the competent authority. The technical requirements depend on the level of risk of the operation. For operations with lower risk (e.g SAIL I and II according to SORA) the competent authority may accept a drone with class identification label.

Last updated:

08/02/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/135906>

What can happen to me if I buy a drone with an invalid class indication label?

Answer

Only drones compliant to [Regulation \(EU\) 2019/945 \(R945\)](#) are safe and therefore authorised to be operated in the open category (unless the drone is privately built, [please see the related FAQ](#)). If you operate a drone in the open category without a class identification label or if it is not compliant with R945 you may expose other people to risk and you may be persecuted by the law. In order to obtain reasonable confidence that the drone you are using is compliant, you must apply the measures described in the FAQ above.

Last updated:

08/02/2022

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/135904>

Model aircraft

Does the new EU Regulation on drones also apply to model aircraft?

Answer

Yes, the [EU Regulation on drones](#) applies also to model aircraft. However, model aircraft are not the main 'target' of the new rules. EASA is aware that aeromodelling is a hobby that has been practised for almost a century by many pilots throughout Europe, with an excellent safety record. EASA is also aware that it's a hobby that has always been important for the development of aviation technology and attracts young people to aviation-related professions.

Last updated:

26/10/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/132023>

Why have model aircraft been considered the same as drones?

Answer

Both model aircraft and drones are unmanned aircraft and therefore it makes sense that both need to be considered under the same regulation.

With the inclusion of model aircraft in the EU UAS Regulation, the intention of the legislator was not to introduce new restrictions, but to enable [EASA Member States](#) to continue applying their current requirements for model aircraft. It explicitly encourages States to do so and provides various options for this, with one important exception: the need for the model aircraft owner to register themselves as UAS operator and make their registration number visible on (or easily accessible within) the aircraft while on the ground.

Last updated:

26/10/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/132024>

What distinguishes a model aircraft from a drone?

Answer

They both have a flying part and a remote control. In addition, both may be used for recreational purposes. In reality, the difference between them lies more in how the aircraft is operated:

- Pilots of model aircraft are generally more interested in the pleasure of the flight and in directly controlling the aircraft's flight surfaces.
- Pilots of drones on the other hand are generally more interested in checking the video being filmed with the on-board camera in the drone and prefer to use automatic functions to stabilise the drone.

What is the result? Pilots of model aircraft are passionate aviators and normally quite well informed about the safety rules, especially when they operate within the framework of a model aircraft club or association.

Last updated:

26/10/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/132025>

In some specialised forums we see some discussions on the applicability date of the EU Regulation on drones. Can you confirm that it has been in force since December 31, 2020? Are you aware of any EASA Member States requesting a postponement of the application of the Regulation?

Answer

Correct! On December 31, 2020 the EU UAS Regulation became applicable in all EU Member States, plus two of the [EFTA](#) States: Norway and Liechtenstein. It is expected that it will soon become applicable in Switzerland and Iceland too. The Regulation includes transitional provisions so that certain elements become applicable later and the full Regulation will become applicable on the January 1, 2023. There are no plans to postpone this.

It is important to note that until January 1, 2023 the EU UAS Regulation does not apply to operations conducted in the context of model aircraft clubs and associations. After this date clubs or associations could receive an authorisation from their State (according to Article 16 of the EU UAS Regulation) allowing them to operate with different limitations and conditions, as set in that authorisation.

Therefore, model aircraft clubs and associations need to address this with their national aviation authorities. Other elements of the Regulation, like the definition of geographical zones, etc. have been already applicable since December 31, 2020.

Last updated:

26/10/2021

Link:


<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/132026>

You mentioned that the Member States have the power to identify designated areas for the purpose of aeromodelling where drone and model aircraft operations are exempt from some of the 'open' category requirements. What are the advantages/disadvantages of this 'option'?

Answer

This is a very flexible tool at the disposition of the States. Depending on their risk, drone and model aircraft operations in some areas in the country may be exempt from some of the 'open' category requirements. This may apply also to mountainous areas where slope soaring flights with model sailplanes are conducted. For example, the Regulation allows slope soaring flights with unmanned sailplanes up to 10 kg to exceed the 120 m limit from the ground, as long as the aircraft remains below 120 m from the position of the remote pilot (see picture below).

Operations with unmanned sailplanes up to 10 kg



The State authorities may create a zone where the limitations are even extended; for instance, the maximum height limit or the maximum weight can be increased. Several of these zones have already been published and EASA is aware of initiatives of citizens discussing with the State authorities to obtain exemptions in some areas. The exemption defined under these requirements is applicable to all pilots operating in such areas.

Last updated:

26/10/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/132028>

EASA's Basic Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 (as the name indicates) is the top-level regulation that defines the main scope of EASA's functions and its limits in terms of delegation provided by the European Commission. On this basis, the EU UAS Regulation states in the recitals: '(27) Since model aircraft are considered as UAS and given the good safety level demonstrated by model aircraft operations in clubs and associations, there should be a seamless transition from the different national systems to the new Union regulatory framework, so that model aircraft clubs and associations can continue to operate as they do today, as well as taking into account existing best practices in the Member States'. Has this indication been taken into account? If so, how?

Answer

Yes! When drafting the legislation, we took into consideration the multiple comments provided by European aeromodellers. This is the main reason why the legislator has not introduced new restrictions for European aeromodellers. The regulator offered instead three options to pilots of model aircraft:

1. **Operate within the framework of a model aircraft club or association (according to Article 16)** Model aircraft clubs and associations provide an environment emphasising a strong safety culture and, in many cases, offering extensive guidance, safety information and courses to their members and the wider model flying community. This creates a safety culture that all pilots operating within the framework of the model aircraft club or association are willing to follow. Model aircraft clubs and associations may receive from their national aviation authority an operational authorisation that sets the conditions for the operation of model aircraft. This can be based on relevant national rules or the established procedures defined by the club or association. The limits defined by the authorisation may be different from those for the 'open' category (e.g. flying with drones/model aircraft heavier than 25 kg, at a height more than 120 m, etc.). EASA considers this the best way to operate model aircraft.
2. **Operate in a UAS geographical zone where drone and model aircraft operations are exempt from some of the 'open' category requirements (according to Article 15)** States may identify geographical zones where drone and model aircraft operations are exempt from some of the 'open' category requirements (e.g. flying with drones/model aircraft heavier than 25 kg, at a height more than 120 m, etc.). Each pilot operating in these zones can benefit from these exemptions.
3. **Operate in subcategory A3 of the 'open' category** All model aircraft may be operated in subcategory A3, following the operational limitation defined in the Regulation. New 'ready to fly' model aircraft (sold as a complete system) purchased after the 1st of January 2023 need to have a C4 class identification label if they are to be operated within the 'open' category. This label will ensure that the aircraft comes with proper instructions from the manufacturer. The requirement for C4 labelling does

not apply to privately built (or assembled) model aircraft.

Last updated:

26/10/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/132027>

Regarding Article 16 (authorisations to model aircraft clubs and associations), is it in the ‘spirit’ of the Regulation to have ‘few and concentrated’ clubs/associations or to facilitate clubs/associations distributed throughout the national territory to access this ‘authorisation’?

Answer

It was certainly not the intention of the regulator to limit or concentrate in any way access to an authorisation, or bring advantage to certain clubs or associations over others. The intent is to foster a safety culture that has been preserved and encouraged within clubs and associations.

EASA is aware of the very frequent international competitions as well as the importance of model aircraft tourism, also for the local economy (hotels, restaurants, etc.) in some regions. For this reason, the phrase ‘operations in the framework of’ was used in the Regulation. By requiring the authorisation under Article 16 to apply to operations ‘in the framework of’, the legislator allows Member States to grant this authorisation to a broader set of pilots than members alone. This also includes, for instance, guest pilots, competitors, and all the persons listed in the authorisation provided by the State. It is decisive that the national legislator is sufficiently satisfied that the pilots operating under this authorisation are aware of and adhere to the requirements under the authorisation. How this is done is for the national authorities (and authorisation holders) to decide.

Last updated:

26/10/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/132032>

In what ways may the requirements for an Article 16 authorisation differ from those for the ‘open’ category?

Answer

The only compulsory requirement is that related to the operator’s registration. However, with the agreement of the competent authority, even this can be carried out by the club/association on behalf of its members.

Everything else can be agreed between the club/association and the competent authority including height limits, weight limits, age limits and competency requirements.

Last updated:

26/10/2021

Link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/132033>

Are control line (circular tethered) flights within the scope of the EU UAS Regulation? What about tethered and non-tethered free-flight aircraft?

Answer

Yes. In general, the EU Regulation applies to all tethered UAS heavier than 1 kg and having a propulsion system. If they are tethered free-flight aircraft (such as kites), the EU UAS Regulation applies only if the weight is more than 25 kg. Changing this requirement would require a change in the Basic Regulation and this cannot be done through an implementing regulation.

Non-tethered free-flight aircraft weighing less than 250 g do not need to comply with any requirement.

Last updated:

26/10/2021

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/132034>

According to the EU UAS Regulation, States ‘may’ issue national regulations for allowing for model aircraft operations. Can the ‘national’ Regulation be in contraposition with the ‘European’ Regulation?

Answer

The regulator included in the Regulation the option for the States to issue the operational authorisation to model aircraft clubs or associations on the basis of either national rules or on procedures established by the club or association, defining the purpose of such procedures.

Other than this, States cannot develop national regulations related to the safety of flights. In case of security, privacy or environmental risk, then the Member States may define additional requirements.

Last updated:

26/10/2021

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/132035>

Can we ‘Sunday aeromodellers’ report/suggest changes to the Regulation? Who should we contact?

Answer

Sure! EASA has set up a [webform](#) to receive questions and comments from all involved stakeholders. However, it would be more effective if proposals are discussed at the level of the EU associations (such as the European Model Flying Union (EMFU)) so that a consolidated position is provided to EASA. We encourage model aircraft flyers to monitor the [EASA website](#) and subscribe to receive news since we constantly publish informative material.

We would love to hear — from you particularly — what we can do to clarify any aspects of the rules, e.g. more concrete articles, webinars, podcasts, explanatory leaflets, more translations, etc. There are a few EASA staff members too who are keen aeromodellers. They would also be more than happy to support.

Periodically we hold consultations with stakeholders leading to changes to the acceptable means of compliance (AMC) and guidance material (GM). These support aeromodellers in complying with the Regulation. However, it is worth pointing out that modifications to the regulations require a completely different and longer process.

Last updated:

07/01/2022

Link:<https://www.easa.europa.eu/de/faq/132036>