

Annex VI to ED Decision 2022/014/R 'AMC & GM to Annex VIII (Part-SPO) to Commission Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 — Issue 1, Amendment 17'

The text of the amendment is arranged to show deleted, new or amended text as shown below:

- (a) deleted text is struck through;
- (b) new or amended text is highlighted in blue;
- (c) an ellipsis '[...]' indicates that the rest of the text is unchanged.

Note to the reader

In amended, and in particular in existing (that is, unchanged) text, 'Agency' is used interchangeably with 'EASA'. The interchangeable use of these two terms is more apparent in the consolidated versions. Therefore, please note that both terms refer to the 'European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA)'.



The Annex to Decision 2014/018/R of 24 April 2014 of the Executive Director of the Agency is amended as follows:

GM1 SPO.OP.101 Altimeter check and settings

ALTIMETER- SETTING PROCEDURES

The following paragraphs of ICAO Doc 8168 (PANS-OPS), Volume III provide recommended guidance on how to develop the altimeter setting procedure:

- (a) 3.2 'Pre-flight operational test';
- (b) 3.3 'Take-off and climb';
- (c) 3.5 'Approach and landing'.

AMC3 SPO.OP.110 Aerodrome operating minima — aeroplanes and helicopters

TAKE-OFF OPERATIONS

- (a) [...]
- (b) Visual reference
 - (1) The take-off minima should be selected to ensure sufficient guidance to control the aircraft in the event of both a rejected take-off in adverse circumstances and a continued take-off after failure of the critical engine.
 - (2) For night operations, ground lights should be available to illuminate the runway/final approach and take-off area (FATO) and any obstacles the prescribed runway lights should be in operation to mark the runway and any obstacles.

AMC4 SPO.OP.110 Aerodrome operating minima — aeroplanes and helicopters

DETERMINATION OF THE DH/MDH FOR INSTRUMENT APPROACH OPERATIONS — AEROPLANES

(a) The decision height (DH) to be used for a 3D approach operation or a 2D approach operation flown using the continuous descent final approach (CDFA) technique should not be lower than the highest of:

(1) [...]



AMC5 SPO.OP.110 Aerodrome operating minima — aeroplanes and helicopters

DETERMINATION OF RVR OR VIS FOR INSTRUMENT APPROACH OPERATIONS — AEROPLANES

- (a) [...]
- (b) [...]
- (c) [...]
- (d) [...]

Table 9

Visual and non-visual aids and/or on-board equipment versus minimum RVR — aeroplanes

Type of approach	Facilities	Lowest RVR	
		Multi-pilot operations	Single-pilot operations
3D operations	runway touchdown zone lights (RTZL) and runway centre line lights (RCLL)	No limitation	
Final approach track offset ≤15° for category A and B aeroplanes or ≤5° for Category C and D aeroplanes	without RTZL and RCLL but using HUDLS or equivalent system; coupled autopilot or flight director to the DH	No limitation	600 m
	No RTZL and RCLL, not using HUDLS or equivalent system or autopilot to the DH	750 m	800 m
3D operations	runway touchdown zone lights (RTZL) and runway centre line lights (RCLL) and		
	Final approach track offset > 15° for Category A and B aeroplanes or Final approach track offset > 5° for Category C and D aeroplanes	800 m	<u>1 000 m</u>
	without RTZL and RCLL but using HUDLS or equivalent system; autopilot or flight director to the DH		
	and	<mark>800 m</mark>	<mark>1 000 m</mark>
	Final approach track offset > 15° for Category A and B aeroplanes or Final approach track offset > 5° for Category C and D aeroplanes		
2D operations	Final approach track offset \leq 15° for category A and B aeroplanes or \leq 5° for Category C and D aeroplanes	750 m	2D operations



	Final approach track offset > 15° for Category A and B aeroplanes	1 000 m	1 000 m
	Final approach track offset > 5° for Category C and D aeroplanes	1 200 m	1 200 m

AMC9 SPO.OP.110 Aerodrome operating minima — aeroplanes and helicopters

EFFECT ON LANDING MINIMA OF TEMPORARILY FAILED OR DOWNGRADED GROUND EQUIPMENT — COMPLEX MOTOR-POWERED AIRCRAFT

- (a) [...]
- (b) Conditions applicable to Table 15:
 - (1) multiple failures of runway/FATO lights other than those indicated in Table 15 should not be acceptable;
 - (2) deficiencies failures of approach and runway/FATO lights are acceptable at the same time, and the most demanding consequence should be applied treated separately; and
 - (3) failures other than ILS or MLS affect the RVR only and not the DH.

[...]

GM10 SPO.OP.110 Aerodrome operating minima —aeroplanes and helicopters

USE OF COMMERCIALLY AVAILABLE INFORMATION

When an operator uses commercially available information to establish aerodrome operating minima, the operator remains responsible for ensuring that the information used is accurate and suitable for its operation, and that the aerodrome operating minima are calculated in accordance with the method specified in Part C of its operations manual and approved by the competent authority.

The operator should apply the procedures in ORO.GEN.205 'Contracted activities'.

AMC2 SPO.OP.116 Performance-based navigation – aeroplanes and helicopters

MONITORING AND VERIFICATION

[...]

(d) Altimetry settings for RNP APCH operations using Baro VNAV

[...]

- (2) Temperature compensation
 - (i) For RNP APCH operations to LNAV/VNAV minima using Baro VNAV:
 - (A) [...]



- (B) when the temperature is within promulgated limits, the flight crew should not make compensation to the altitude at the FAF and DA/H; and
- [...]

AMC2 SPO.OP.235(a)(2) EFVS 200 operations

VERIFICATION OF THE SUITABILITY OF RUNWAYS FOR EFVS 200 OPERATIONS

The operational assessment before authorising the use of a runway for EFVS 200 operations may be conducted as follows:

- (a) Check whether the runway has been promulgated as suitable for EFVS 200 operations or is certified as a PA category II or III runway by the State of the aerodrome. If this is so, then check whether and where the approach and runway lights installed (notably incandescent or LED lights) are adequate for the EFVS equipment LED lights are installed in order to assess the impact on the EFVS equipment used by the operator.
- (b) If the check in point (a) above comes out negative (the runway is not promulgated as EFVS suitable or is not category II or III), then proceed as follows:
 - (1) For straight-in IAPs, US Standard for Terminal Instrument Procedures (TERPS) may be considered to be acceptable as an equivalent to PANS-OPS. If other design criteria than PANS-OPS or US TERPS are used, the operations should not be conducted.
 - (2) If an OFZ is established, this will ensure adequate obstacle protection from 960 m before the threshold. If an OFZ is not established or if the DH for the approach is above 250 ft, then check whether there is a visual segment surface (VSS).
 - (3) VSSs are required for procedures published after 15 March 2007, but the existence of the VSS has to be verified through an aeronautical information publication (AIP), operations manual Part C, or direct contact with the aerodrome. Where the VSS is established, it may not be penetrated by obstacles. If the VSS is not established or is penetrated by obstacles and an OFZ is not established, then the operations should not be conducted. Note: obstacles of a height of less than 50 ft above the threshold may be disregarded when assessing the VSS.
 - (4) Runways with obstacles that require visual identification and avoidance should not be accepted.
 - (5) For the obstacle protection of a balked landing where an OFZ is not established, the operator may specify that pilots follow a departure procedure in the event of a balked landing, in which case it is necessary to verify that the aircraft will be able to comply with the climb gradients published for the instrument departure procedures for the expected landing conditions.
 - (6) Perform an assessment of the suitability of the runway which should include whether the approach and runway lights installed (notably incandescent or LED lights) are adequate for the EFVS equipment used by the operator.



(c) If the AFM stipulates specific requirements for approach procedures, then the operational assessment should verify that these requirements can be met.