

MAB Minutes of the Meeting

(1) Welcome and Introduction

Presenters: Maria Rueda, Safety Management, Sustainability and Global Outreach Director and MAB Chair



Maria Rueda (Chair) opened the meeting and welcomed the participants to the third and last MAB of 2025.

The Chair extended a warm welcome to the:

- new member from Denmark Ms Doris Tranberg Jørgensen,
- new alternate member from Denmark Ms Bolette Halkjær Skov Sørensen (onsite),
- new member from Austria Ms Ingrid Kernstock (onsite),
- new member from Germany Mr Nabil Naoumi (onsite),
- new alternate observer from Eurocontrol Mr Predrag Vranjkovic (onsite).

The Chair informed MAB that following the endorsement of MED TeB creation, the Agency reviewed and revised MAB RoP, which was shared with MAB on 18 September. The deadline for comments was set to 24 October. The Agency received positive replies from most MS, with comments from IE (editorial change) and ES (adding a paragraph on inclusion of the list of different MAB groups on the Platform). Both proposals were accepted, and a final revised version was shared with MAB with the deadline for additional comments 31 October. No additional comments were received and the RoP was considered approved. Final version of the RoP will be shared after the MAB meeting.

The Chair informed the MAB that an Information Paper on Rule Making Task status update, on TeB Annual Report and on International cooperation status update have been shared with the MAB, however no agenda items were foreseen. No questions were raised on the three documents.

(2) Adoption of the agenda and minutes of the last meeting**Presenter: Chair, MAB Secretariat**

The draft **agenda** was shared with the MAB on 30 September 2025, followed by several revisions. The latest revision was shared with MAB a day before the meeting (rev-3).

The following AOB items have been included:

- Digitalisation network update (suggested by EASA)
- Preparation of Member States to implement new Ground Handling Regulation (suggested by EASA)
- Update on US drugs and alcohol testing requirements, including feedback on the BOB meeting (June 2025) and the way forward (suggested by FR)
- Establishment of a network on the topics of knowledge and competence management (suggested by AT)
- Part-66, Accessibility and Safety, Data Exchange with UKCA, and DJI mini 5 pro – C0 label (all suggested by HU)
- Update on BVLOS (suggested by CH)
- Helicopter FTL (RMT.0494): implications for safety and level playing field; proposal to maintain regulatory reflection (suggested by ES)

The **minutes** of the MAB 02-2025 meeting were shared with MAB on 27 June 2025 with the deadline of 31 August 2025. Comments from IE, CH, FI and FR were received. A revised version has been shared with MAB on 1 September 2025 and is considered approved.

(3) Review of open actions**Presenter: MAB Secretariat**

The following actions were closed:

- EASA to share outcomes of U-space standardisation visits to support MS in the implementation of the U-space Regulation (2024-03/#06)
- With regards to F&C EASA to provide detailed explanation on different charging options (2025-01/#01)
- With regards to GNSS disturbance NO and FI called for inclusion of northern parts of their countries on the GNSS map as there are several disturbances reported in these regions. EASA to review and revise the maps and include northern parts of NO and FI. (2025-01/#02)
- With regards to the REPIF deadlines EASA to rediscuss the deadlines internally and with the Commission. (2025-01/#04)
- With regards to the outcome of the U-space implementation survey EASA to provide (in writing) an elaborated answer on when the survey has been shared. (2025-02/#01)
- EASA to update MAB RoP to include MED TeB (2025-02/#04)
- With regards to Art. 89 study, to include in the study a robust collection of data across Europe on drug and alcohol abuse within the aviation sector. (2025-02/#06)
- With regards to the deadline to nominate/appoint the account administrator, EASA to send the request, with reasonable deadline, before summer 2025. (2025-02/#08)
- With regards to FAA rule on alcohol and drug testing Member States to fill in the questionnaire and send it to DG MOVE prior to the BOB meeting. (2025-02/#11)

- With regards to HR request on drone detection EASA to collect replies from the MAB on how such systems are regulated, particularly regarding market placement, legal requirements for installation and rules for handling and processing data. (2025-02/#14)

(4) EASA Update

Presenter: Chair

The Chair presented an update on EASA activities since the last meeting. The presentation included the following topics:

- **Fees and charges**

The Chair shared positive news regarding the outcome of a vote on fees and charges at the last EASA Committee meeting. The engagement and feedback from participants were acknowledged, especially on TCO charges, which received the most feedback.

The Agency reassured that the implementation of TCO charging would be monitored. Any effects or consequences would be looked into with the Commission, and a reassessment would be conducted if necessary.

The Chair informed MAB that charges, expected to come into effect from 1 January 2026, would address around 70% of the total revenues for EASA. This is expected to have a significant positive impact on the financial sustainability of the Agency. The remaining 30% of revenue, which comes from subsidies and earmarks, is still under consideration. EASA is working on the subsidy element of its income and on the Multi-Financial Framework (MFF). Plans will be shared with the participants.

- **Article 89**

EASA informed MAB that a study on Article 89 is being conducted, focusing on safety performance indicators and risk areas. The aim is to prepare a scientific and unbiased study, considering comments from various stakeholders. The study includes a literature review, a survey, 2 case studies, ECR data collection, and analysis. The survey addressed to all EU Pilots, Cabin Crews and OCC personnel was launched with a deadline by the end of November 2025 and aims to be scientific and unbiased, with collaboration from various stakeholders, including ECA, ETF, ERA, A4D and DG MOVE. The Chair requested MAB members to disseminate the survey link to all licensed pilots in EU via their respective NAA's.

Link: [EASA Launches Survey on the Effect of Socio-Economic Factors on Aviation Safety | EASA](#)

POST MEETING UPDATE: We now have a 3rd case study "Avion Express". All major players across the European aviation market (low-cost, network and ACMI) are now covered.

NO noted the simultaneous occurrence of three studies and encouraged collaboration between EASA and the European Labour Authority (ELA). Furthermore, NO enquired about the involvement of National Aviation Authorities (NAAs) in the study.

EASA replied that NAA might be contacted for data from standardisation visits and that collaboration with ELA is ongoing, supported by regular meetings and assistance in accessing Eurocontrol data. One of the potential recommendations in the final report could be to strengthen this cooperation (e.g., through a Memorandum of Cooperation between EASA and ELA), including joint EASA standardisation visits and ELA inspections, with the further involvement of NAAs, particularly in relation to atypical contracts and the potential associated risks of poor safety performance.

IE expressed interest in seeing the survey in advance for comments and inquired about the advisory board composition and intermediate report.

EASA replied that Advisory board (Stakeholder Focus Group) includes ECA, ETF, ERA, A4E and the DG MOVE. The intermediate report detailing the methodology will be provided to the MAB members. The majority of comments on the survey have been made by the Stakeholder Focus Group and the final online version is designed to avoid bias, specific airline name-shaming and mainly focusing on identifying safety risks.

EASA assured MAB that the study aims to be as scientific as possible and encouraged distribution of surveys to all ATPL holders to gather more data. The Agency also reiterated the commitment to considering all inputs and potentially adjusting timelines if necessary to ensure a thorough and unbiased study.

- **AI update**

On the topic of AI update EASA informed MAB that the orientation of RMT.0742 Part AI has been cancelled and the link to EU AI Act in aviation is now done via so called Detailed Specification which is a soft law approach. This approach enables to link Aviation to the EU AI Act but also provide the necessary flexibility and proportionality needed in aviation as well as leveraging the current aviation specific processes and oversight. The domains in scope for the EU AI Act Art. 108 include airworthiness, drones, and ATM/ANS. The aim is to address these domains in a second step through amendment of each specific domain regulation, mostly via guidance materials. EASA is also working with the EC to extend the scope of the Art. 108 to other aviation domains such as CAW. This would enable to leverage already in place aviation specific processes and oversight simplifying the approach for both industry and Member States.

ES expressed concern about the impact on national aviation authorities' workforce and the need for training inspectors for AI.

EASA replied that current focus is not on NAAs but rather on design aspects, however future expansions may require additional training.

CY questioned the timeline, suggesting that the AI landscape changes rapidly, and regulations might be outdated by 2027.

EASA replied that efforts are being made to speed up the process, and special conditions are being issued to address current AI technologies.

FR inquired about discussions with the Commission regarding the scope of the AI Act and potential changes to the basic regulation.

EASA replied that the focus is on creating aviation-specific regulations to avoid industry compliance with the broader AI Act, simplifying the compliance process.

POST MEETING QUESTIONS RAISED BY AT (including replies)

- current frameworks, roadmaps and concept papers affect (airworthiness, ATM/ANS and drones); guidance for other domains - especially authorities - is not yet on the roadmap (subtask 4) - what are the expectations towards authorities?

EASA reply: EASA is working with the EC to open the scope to other domains in order to avoid that they would be fully impacted by the AI Act and to leverage already existing processes and oversight. Pending this extension is agreed, nothing is needed. Once agreed, the Agency will

engage with the National Authorities to get to a good proposal and to evaluate potential impact as it may require some staff upskilling and training.

- in general (not mentioned in the presentation): practical collaboration and exchange might be useful; e.g. EASA is working on an AI powered Rule Query Assistant - many authorities (including AT) are experimenting with the same; combining forces and experience would be very useful

EASA reply: EASA welcomes the proposal from AT to combine forces on an AI-powered rule query assistant. This module is part of the development plan for eRules and is scheduled for 2027, assuming availability of funding and development resources. It is proposed to incorporate this project into a wider common initiative on digitalisation, to be established in 2026.

- **ICAO Assembly take away**

EASA reported that the outcomes for Europe were satisfactory, with strong coordination between the EU and ECAC member states. Key resolutions were passed on safety, navigation, environment, and cybersecurity.

IT emphasised that a successful Assembly requires thorough preparation at the Navigation Conference. Pressure should be maintained on the ICAO secretariat to organise the 50th Navigation Conference in 2027.

- **Partnership Agreement – International Cooperation**

The Agency informed MAB that a positive outcome was achieved on amending the partnership agreement to include international cooperation. This will reduce administrative burden and provide more flexibility. The current contract for international cooperation expired in July 2025, and efforts are underway to finalise the new agreement by the end of 2025.

FR inquired about the current operational status, given the transition between the old framework contract (FWC) and the new partnership agreement (PA).

EASA indicated that the final green light is awaited to proceed with the PA. The FWC is no longer in use, and activities cannot continue without the new agreement. It is expected to be finalised within weeks or by the end of the year.

ES asked about the timeline for the management board's approval.

EASA expressed hope for approval in the December management board meeting. If not, the approval will be sought in writing.

IT raised concerns about maintaining transparency in task allocation, similar to the current system.

The Agency assured that clear and transparent criteria for task allocation will be established and shared with all parties.

AT inquired about the inclusion of international cooperation in the PA (will it be included automatically) and the need for qualified entities. The use of qualified entities may not be necessary due to existing framework contracts for logistics and tasks.

- **Guidance when installing military equipment at civil aerodromes**

The focus on military equipment and its integration with civil aviation, where the importance of coordination between civil and military sectors was emphasised.

EDA confirmed its active involvement and mentioned that this aspect would be covered in the military mobility package to be issued by the end of 2025.

CH expressed appreciation for the work done to support coordination between civil and military domains.

AT raised a question about the interface between the RMT.0763 and the guidance material provided.

POST MEETING NOTE: During the works of the Task Force (TF) it was identified that the role of the ATM/ANS is important for the safety and regularity of the operations at an aerodrome jointly used by civil and military operators on a temporary or permanent basis. The need for prior cooperation of all stakeholders, including the ones related to the ATM/ANS domain (competent authority and service providers) was highlighted. However, since the TF focused on the installation of military equipment from the aerodrome operations point of view, other organisational and operational aspects were treated only superficially. In this sense, the guidelines that were compiled, do not reach the level of detail regarding the ATM/ANS aspects and the SES regulatory framework, that would be required to consider them as related to RMT.0763.

ECTL expressed appreciation for the document provided and confirmed their interest in supporting further activities.

IT shared their experience with military airports and the issue of increased risk for civil deviations.

SI asked about the concrete expectations from member states regarding these questions.
The Agency replied to follow the published guidelines and anticipate more inputs for consideration.

- **Part-IS**

On Part-IS the Agency reported that the implementation of Part-IS regulations is underway, with support provided to Member States through training, guidance material, and collaboration within the Part-IS Task Force mechanisms. The focus is on harmonised oversight and effective implementation. Moreover, EASA reported its readiness to exercise its responsibility in this additional area.

CH raised two questions. One referred to the QE qualification and whether EASA would support applications from individuals within the framework of an existing partnership program between the EASA and the NAA and the second one on derogation hotline, where CH asked what the purpose and applicability of the derogation hotline is.

With regards to QE qualification the Agency replied that this possibility is already foreseen under PA and is considered as a parallel channel to the QE accreditation. With regards to derogation hotline EASA replied that the hotline aims to normalise the approach towards granting delegations to ensure a consistent level of organisation and invited NAAs to contact the hotline via email to discuss any doubts.

HU asked how can compliance be addressed when the actual activity is done at NCA's level but with the systems and procedures of the Agency?

The Agency replied that procedures are distributed to inspectors working on behalf of the Agency. The intention is to make available the Agency's procedures to all authorities for inspiration. Regular updates on the ISMS setup will be provided to the task force.

LU thanked EASA for organising train the trainer course being very valuable.

AT suggested that standardisation teams should summarise issues and discuss them with the task force to support Member States in the implementation of Part-IS.

The Agency gave reassurance that Part-IS will be added to standardisation starting in 2027 with continuous monitoring activities. Inspections on Part-IS will start in 2028.

DE asked how many Member States are taking the option to delegate the entire task to the National Information Security Agency and whether NAA need to oversee the Information Security Agency.

EASA replied that there have been no specific surveys conducted, but some states like FI, SE, and GR have configured their civil delegation authorities to be in charge of cyber security. In addition, EASA emphasised that it is not an oversight but a collaboration and that an agreement defining respective responsibilities and interfaces is necessary.

At the end of the topic a call was made to MAB to put forward candidates for the chairperson position in the NAA Part-IS task force.

- **Halon update**

The Agency mentioned that deadline for installing halogen-free fire extinguishers of in-service aircraft is December 2025. Member States need to apply for derogations if they cannot comply. The Agency is providing support to the European Commission on this matter.

IT sought clarification on whether the deadline impacts the design of new systems or current operations.

EASA replied that the deadline specifically affects in-service aircraft.

AT sought clarification on whether all portable fire extinguishers are affected, including those in general aviation, business aircraft, and airline aircraft.

The Agency confirmed that it applies to all.

SE emphasised the importance of adhering to the regulation and phasing out Halon.

FR shared its approach in cases fire extinguishers are found after 31 December 2025 – in such cases inspectors would not raise findings on such issues but observations as long as the operators are still compliant against AIROPS and Part 26. In addition, FR inquired whether there are plans to modify safety requirements in Part-26 and the process for requesting exemptions or derogations.

The Agency confirmed there is no plan to amend Part-26 and that the deadline of 2025 is under another regulation (ozone regulation).

DE sought clarification on the new resolution addressing cargo compartments and the assessment of Halon reserves. The Agency replied that the resolution addresses cargo compartments and the need for further assessment of Halon reserves. The assessment involves the European Commission and Member States, with the Agency providing technical support.

- **Events**

EASA provided an update of future events and informed MAB that the MAB 02-2026 (5-6 May 2026) will be hosted by Cyprus.

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|----------|
| Action 2025-03/#01 | With regards to the inclusion of QE in international cooperation tasks EASA to clarify the need for QE for international cooperation tasks. | EASA | End 2025 |
| Action 2025-03/#02 | MS to put forward candidates for the chairperson position in the NAA Part-IS task force. | MS | End 2025 |

(5) Environmental update

Presenters: David Solar

EASA informed about the main results of the recently published Annual Technical Report, provided an update on the flight emission label (FEL) and the cooperation with AF/KLM for the testing phase, and summarised the planned EASA contributions to CAEP/14.

On Flight Emission Label FR suggested aligning with the new EU regulation on content emissions. Feasibility of the airline sustainability index and the technical criteria for the technological index. Objective of the proposal and the involvement of EU manufacturers.

The Agency acknowledged the need to align with the EU regulation and integrate it into studies and recognised the complexity and sensitivity of the airline sustainability index and the need for objective criteria. EASA furthermore emphasised the importance of technical criteria and the support of EU manufacturers.

With regards to the exemption for operators ES inquired about the possibility of removing exemptions for operators with fewer than 50 flights at EU airports.

The Agency replied that the proposal is under discussion with the Commission, considering the potential political and operational impacts.

With regards to the Flight Emission Label AT welcomed the study on the airline sustainability index and advocated for including environmental, social, and governance dimensions.

Also, on Flight Emission Label SE emphasised the voluntary nature of the label and cautioned against introducing new requirements.

The Agency acknowledged the voluntary nature but highlighted the need for a unique system to ensure fairness and transparency.

CH thanked the Agency for its work on ReFuel Regulation and emphasised the importance of a normalised interpretation of the regulation and close coordination among stakeholders. On Flight Emission Label CH congratulated the Agency on the agreement with one airline and, for the second generation of the label encouraged a robust assessment for the airline index and technological index to ensure their feasibility and objectivity. Finally, CH thanked the Agency for its important efforts in supporting CAEP's work and encourage this support to be maintained for the next cycle 14.

With regards to noise standards NO thanked the Agency for the work on reviewing noise standards for helicopters, light propeller aircraft, and drones.

With regards to airline index DE expressed reluctance and concerns about the administrative burden on operators and thanked the Agency for its support with regards to Training and Capacity Building and emphasised the need for further support, especially for smaller operators.

IT thanked the Commission for its support and emphasised the need for cooperation with other MS.

NL inquired about specific ideas for strengthening ICAO in light of the ETS review and long-term aspirational goals.

The Agency reply that the aim is to align ICAO with ETS for unified reporting worldwide, acknowledging it as a long-term aspirational goal.

HU inquired about the impact of the SAF supply chain's carbon footprint and the potential long-term challenges.

The Agency acknowledged the marginal impact of transport emissions but highlighted the potential challenges due to China's SAF mandate and the need to transition to e-SAF.

Concerning ReFuelEU, AT welcomed EASA engagement to simplify the regulation and reduce administrative burden for aircraft operators. This is relevant in particular for smaller and business aviation operators, as the regulation does not sufficiently take into account the specific nature of their operations. With regards to the Flight Emissions Label and next steps, AT welcomed the planned study on an Airline Sustainability Index that would also include an airlines' social responsibility performance, as this has been something AT has advocated for in the past. AT is looking forward to further information on the matter.

Following EASA update, an Update on ICAO CAPE activities was delivered by Alexandre Triverio (CH).

(6) Safety Risk Management (SRM) – updated process

Presenter: Michael Gerhard

The Agency provided an update on the ongoing review of the SRM process including:

- expanding the access to sources of relevant safety information and ensuring an integrated risk management,
- rationalising the safety risk portfolio to better highlight what the most important safety issues are,
- identifying Top Safety Topics within the safety risk portfolio,
- strengthening the governance of the process by integrating the new management board SAS AG and by revisiting the responsibilities of the ESC and other internal bodies to prepare well-informed safety decision making.

The review of the SRM process goes hand in hand with the review of the EPAS, where other elements resulting from the SRM process review (like better highlighting safety topics and better connecting risks and related mitigation actions) are addressed.

MAB members supported the points presented by the Agency to further strengthen the SRM process and raised some questions and comments:

On **D4S** DE sought clarification how D4S will be used to support the safety assessments and how it can be ensured that data collected through different systems can be assessed.

The Agency confirmed that D4S will be used for safety issue assessments, for ad-hoc safety analysis and for monitoring and detecting safety issues. It will become an integral part of the Agency's safety intelligence and is intended to become operational in 2026. The Agency emphasised the need to avoid duplication of existing systems.

ES highlighted the need for expanding the access to data and to consider them in the process. They asked whether D4S would change the decision-making process, of the SRM.

EASA explained that the integration of datasets will be managed within the D4S framework and that the methodologies for risk evaluation will follow established (SRM) processes. D4S is a means to support the assessment of safety issues and to detect and monitor those.

FI highlighted the need for expert knowledge, next to data, as an input to the SRM process.

The Agency confirmed that expert knowledge is integral to the D4S process and the entire SRM process, from defining queries to assessing results.

With regards to the **Safety Risk Portfolio**

IT expressed concerns about the effectiveness of mitigating actions which are just recommendations (example: SIBs) and highlighted the need for impact assessments before implementing regulatory changes.

EASA acknowledged the need for impact assessments and emphasised the role of the best intervention strategy in deciding the appropriate course of action.

AT suggested considering new safety risks such as space operations and space debris, as well as socioeconomic factors affecting safety.

EASA acknowledged the importance of these factors and emphasised the need for continuous review and prioritisation.

With regards to **Top Safety Topics**

MAB members supported the candidate TSTs, with IT, LUX and others specifically agreeing to runway incursion as an important one.

On **Governance and Decision-Making**

AT inquired about the roles of the Management Board, SAS AG, and MAB in the governance process.

The Agency explained the roles and responsibilities of each body in the governance process, ensuring robust decision-making. The role of the MAB is not supposed to change with the creation of the SAS AG.

CH expressed support to the SRM process and asked about the involvement of MSs in reviewing the safety risk portfolio and identifying TSTs.

The Agency assured that MSs are and will be involved in the process, and the advisory bodies will play a role in advising on TSTs.

With regards to **Cybersecurity and Integrated Risk Management** PT sought clarification how the SRM process can ensure that security sensitive information (as an example) can be considered (inquired about the data sources for cybersecurity and the coordination among EASA, the Commission and MSs). EASA explained that it does not require access to security sensitive information, but only the information of the security risk management that is relevant to know to manage possible safety risks.

(7) Organisation of the EPAS (2027 edition)**Presenter: Guillaume Aigoin**

The Agency informed MAB on the introduction of a new concept for EPAS 2027, organised in three self-contained parts: safety, rule modernisation, and sustainability. The safety part of the new EPAS would include a strategic direction (safety vision, safety goals aligned with ICAO GASP goals, safety targets and safety indicators) and safety topics identified either through the SRM process (groupings of safety issues that require mitigation) or through the management of change (to address the safe integration of new technologies, new societal needs, emerging safety risks). The safety topics with highest priority would be identified as 'top safety topics' (refer to agenda item No 6). The description of each safety topic would include information on the related safety issues and the programmed safety actions. The rule modernisation part would cover the priorities related to simpler, fairer, and more efficient rules (rule simplification and harmonisation, proportionality, level playing field, efficiency, cost-effectiveness, reducing administrative burden). Finally, the Agency announced that a written consultation of the MAB on a concept paper detailing these proposals and a mock-up of EPAS 2027 would be launched in the following weeks.

POST MEETING NOTE: The text of the proposed safety goals No 1 and 2 has been slightly changed:

Safety Goal No 1: the new text is 'Achieve a continuous reduction of operational safety risks'

Safety Goal No 2: the new text is 'Strengthen the critical elements of safety oversight'

These updated texts appear in the concept paper and the mock-up of EPAS that is consulted with the MAB.

FR supported the separation of safety, rules modernisation, and environmental protection and is looking forward to the concept paper and mock-up for more concrete details.

AT expressed appreciation to the prioritisation of strategic issues and requested information on the timeframe for providing comments.

CH expressed support to the project and to the objective to make the EPAS more concise. Furthermore, CH suggested to consider an EPAS structure with only two parts: a safety part and a part covering all the other topics, as well as proposed to tie the safety targets and indicators to the safety goals. CH also cautioned about mentioning environmental protection policies as a challenge to safety, as this could be misunderstood. CH also asked for clarity on what would be the MAB contribution in the new EPAS organisation.

ES expressed support to the proposed structure and the alignment with the GASP and suggested to ensure coordination with the RASP (Regional Aviation Safety Plan). ES furthermore recommended to use moving averages over several years for computing safety performance indicators for CAT aeroplane operations (as there are very few accidents in that aviation segment and a single event has a significant impact on the annual accident rate) and proposed to extend the scope of safety performance indicators to cover emerging issues and systemic safety issues.

SESAR JU emphasised the need to continue the very good cooperation with EASA regarding coordination of the EPAS with the ATM Master Plan and suggested reassessing the safety impact of strategic deployment objectives of the ATM Master Plan.

PT expressed support on the way forward and looks forward to the mock-up. Furthermore, PT suggested reflecting GASP Goal 6 ('Expand the use of industry safety assessment and safety data sharing

programmes') to leverage on Data4Safety programme and proposed to include modernisation and harmonisation of organisations' management systems in the rule modernisation part.

NO expressed support for the new EPAS structure and the explicit connection between the EPAS and the GASP. Furthermore, NO encouraged taking further steps in standardising incoming occurrence reports in the European Central Repository (as lack of standardisation result in significant differences in quality) and proposed monitoring precursors, not only numbers and rates of accidents. In addition, NO requested sharing the revised SIPI method and tool.

DE raised questions on how to ensure no further burden on Mss when aligning the EPAS with the GASP and RASP and wondered whether the new EPAS organisation could lead to relieve MSs from issuing a national aviation safety plan (NASP) in the future.

IT expressed reservations about the proposed safety goals, suggesting a distinction between different types of aviation operations, and emphasised the importance of ensuring that actions in the EPAS do not require national rulemaking in addition to the EPAS rulemaking tasks.

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|------|----------|
| Action 2025-03/#03 | With regards to written consultation of the MAB on a concept paper and a mock-up of EPAS 2027, EASA to provide a timeframe for providing comments. | EASA | End 2025 |
|-----------------------|--|------|----------|

(8) Rotorcraft Safety Roadmap Update

Presenter: Jan Loncke

The Agency provided an update on the rotorcraft safety roadmap, which aims to improve overall safety by 50% within the next ten years and make positive changes to safety trends within the next five years. Emphasis was placed on the need to harmonise processes and procedures to reduce administrative burdens for small helicopter operators and the importance of Member State Tasks (MST) 0002 and 0041.

ES requested clarification on whether the 2025 deadline could be extended to allow for more effective coordination and delivery. Furthermore, ES expressed interest in participating in Safety Promotion Tasks SPT 0128 and SPT 0112 and called for coordination with other domains (e.g. SMS TeB).

GE asked about the trend in oversight and measures taken to address challenges in executing requirements, particularly for operators not using control zones.

The Agency acknowledged the challenging question and encouraged any MS with insights to share them with stakeholder management team.

BE provided feedback on MST 0041, stating that harmonisation of AOC applications and OPS specifications changes and MEL might have limited impact since operators generally work within one CA. BE also stated that it was suggested that certain CAs should be examined to ensure that their procedures and checklists do not contain excessive requirements so that this can be aligned with the EASA requirements when necessary. BE highlighted that potentially the greatest impact can be made with guidance on EFB (Electronic Flight Bag) implementation. BE believes that a standardised approach would significantly simplify the application procedure and one of the options could be to make a list of approved applications and hardware so that companies do not have to test them individually each time. BE also mentioned that the Helicopter Expert Group agreed on new target dates for the deliverables, potentially extending them to Q2 2026.

DK sought clarification on the difference between small operators and non-complex operators and the need for both terms.

The Agency clarified that small operators can have complex aircraft, and the focus is on the size of the operation rather than the complexity of the aircraft.

IT referred to Opinion 02/2025 and expressed concerns about the cost and feasibility of creating a detailed obstacle map for rotorcraft safety. IT also highlighted the risks associated with flying in marginal VFR conditions and the need for safety margins closer to IFR.

DE raised an issue with the implementing regulation 2024/2954, which creates difficulties for helicopter operators regarding fuel system safety and crash safety, particularly for reimported helicopters. The Agency suggested to forward this issue in writing to stakeholder management team for further consideration.

CH expressed support for the rotorcraft safety roadmap and emphasised the importance of simplifying management systems for small operators to reduce administrative burden.

IE commented on the need for standardisation among authorities and the importance of understanding why certain states are perceived as easier to deal with. IE also suggested collecting data to investigate this issue and ensure harmonisation across Europe.

(9) IAM Hub update

Presenter: Kai Bauer

The IAM Hub was presented as a flagship action under the drone strategy, providing services for MSs, the drone economy, and the general public. The hub includes the drone economy dashboard, the drone rule navigator, and other tools to support drone operations and safety.

MAB raised various questions and comments during the discussion.

CH supported continued financing however suggested limiting the scope to essentials to save costs and highlighted the need for the Hub to remain high-quality and free of charge.

SE emphasised the importance of GDPR compliance and proposed financing through paid services. SE also suggested coordination with efforts within the repository.

The Agency assured that the IAM Hub does not include personal data, focusing on statistical information only.

ES noted technical difficulties and the need for a stable, functional system with secured funding before further commitments. ES expressed preference to option 1B for financial sustainability.

PT raised a question regarding the type of expertise required for the IAM API working group and inquired about the number of accesses to the IAM Hub.

With regards to requested nominations for technical experts, the Agency replied that the experts should ideally be those involved in API discussions for the repository.

NL supported further development of the IAM Hub and advocated for option 1A (legal mandate under drone rules 945/947). Furthermore, NL emphasised advancing the repository for seamless integration.

LU expressed concerns about the integration of UAS geographical zones and the need to understand the scope of work and benefits before committing to funding.

With regards to geozone integration the Agency mentioned an upcoming workshop to finalise the digital format for geozone standardisation.

FR raised a question on how comments on the new Annex 7B were taken on board, particularly regarding legal issues and data protection and inquired about the deadline and process for nominating experts.

POST MEETING NOTE: For the existing modules of the IAM Hub no personal data is expected to be transferred from NCA to the Hub, only Statistical Data and Geo Zone Data. In principle, the responsibility for data protection and security of the data before submission lies with the NCAs. After data provision by the NCA, EASA is bound by the same data protection and security provisions as in all other areas of its activity including certification. Consequently, the same processes and technologies are applied by the Agency.

AT expressed support to the IAM Hub initiative and opted for option 1B (legal mandate and REPIF) for funding. Furthermore, AT emphasised the need for a legal basis for mandating authorities to provide information.

DG MOVE expressed a note of caution as the funding options that were presented by EASA are not contained in EASA's resource planning. DG MOVE also referred to the EASA's overall resource situation.

(10) Update on Annex 4c and Annex 3a – Research and Innovation

Presenter: David Solar

The Agency provided an update on the progress of Annex 4C and 4A, focusing on research and innovation projects and emphasised the importance of research and innovation in improving safety and addressing emerging challenges in aviation. EASA also highlighted two significant projects with NO and NL, focusing on electric and hydrogen aircraft testing respectively. The projects with NO and NL were seen as mutual learning opportunities for innovative aviation technologies and regulatory sandboxes were considered a useful tool for testing new technologies and gathering learnings for establishing regulatory frameworks.

SE raised a question whether there is a standard method used when developing a special regulatory regime for testing new technologies?

The Agency replied that the current focus is on operational testing in real conditions, not just development testing. The goal is to test the entire ecosystem, including grounding operations, pilot training, and ATM insertion. The framework is more about operational flights rather than flight testing.

PT sought clarification on the format and mechanisms to implement regulatory sandboxes in each MS. The Agency explained that the plan involves several steps (maximising the use of the current framework, leveraging articles in the basic regulation that promote research and innovation, amending the basic regulation to include a specific article or expanding Article 71 to enable such operations).

NO shared their experience with regulatory sandboxes and the need for a legal framework that can compass everything, from electric aircraft to hydrogen testing. Furthermore, NO emphasised the importance of learning and sharing new wisdom with all MSs to move forward collectively.

IT expressed interest in setting up a sandbox at their airport in Puglia and requested to restart activities and receive instructions.

AT expressed interest in learning how did NO start the sandbox processes, and what were the specific challenges, including what does it mean in terms of resources for the authorities.

NO explained that it is essential to have political will and financing to set up a sandbox. Without these, it is challenging to proceed.

(11) Collaboration with ICAO on USOAP Programme

Presenter: Bernard Bourdon

The feedback from states indicates a mix of support and concerns regarding the collaboration with ICAO. There is strong support for adopting a risk-based approach and addressing the inefficiencies of the current compliance-based system. However, there are also concerns about the use of protocol questions and the need for more information on specific aspects of the collaboration. Continuous feedback and collaboration are essential for making informed decisions and improving the ICAO system.

FR mentioned the shortcomings of the compliance-based USOAP audit, which requires extensive documentation and asked how can we move towards a risk-based approach?

The Agency acknowledged ICAO shortcomings with burdensome administrative process and recognising that lack of resources is a triggering point for becoming more efficient and risk based.

GR agreed with FR comments while understanding that ICAO cannot change the model quickly. In addition, GR complemented EASA's efforts and asked whether discussions on cascading will also include ICVM.

On ICVM, the Agency replied that discussions include re-energising ICVM, which was abandoned after COVID. EASA also reported increasing the number of USOAP auditors and offering validation missions.

DE sought clarification on EASA contribution to the expert group working on the evolution of the USOAP and requested receiving more information about the transfer of responsibility from the state to EASA. DE also expressed concern about the growing number of protocol questions referencing guidance material instead of SARPs.

With regards to the Expert Group, the Agency reported that the level of involvement still has to be decided. On cascading the Agency offered to provide a detailed presentation from the ICAO representative and made itself available for further discussions. With regards to PQs the Agency agreed that the volume of questions high and that a risk-based approach requires a change in mindset. Concerns about the use of guidance material were acknowledged.

IE recognised the importance of the ICAO USOAP for less mature regions and noted that Europe's own system can also be cumbersome. IE also emphasised the need to recognise the global advantage of the ICAO system and encouraged to improve it.

(12) Rules simplification

Presenter: Micaela Verissimo

EASA updated the MAB on the progress made under the EASA Simplification initiative, focussing on achievements in 2025 and upcoming work in 2026.

IT emphasised the importance of aligning rule changes with the AIRAC cycle for ATM and SI domains to avoid confusion and ensure consistency.

DE highlighted the importance of a mindset change among stakeholders and the need to maintain ICAO standards as a benchmark.

GR supported the rule simplification initiative and emphasised the need to strike a balance between prescriptive and performance-based requirements. Furthermore, GR suggested sharing methodologies underlying compliance decisions.

HU stressed the importance of legal consistency and the need to consider the legal status of Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMCs) and their application in practice.

BE highlighted the need for a strategic reflection on the future of European aviation regulation, addressing overregulation and ensuring a level playing field for the industry.

AT discussed the issues of 'gold-plating' and inconsistent implementation of regulations and emphasised the need to reconsider ongoing rule-making tasks and their necessity.

As a [POST MEETING COMMENT](#) AT suggested to keep in mind that the technical dimension of rules and guidance material has a huge impact on simplicity of implementation. AT also suggested whether there could be a shared vision to move away from the idea of rules as documents and instead view rules as data that can be easily integrated into compliance monitoring systems, checklists, and audit tools to simplify executing and monitoring their application?

SE promoted the harmonisation of Authority Requirements (ARs) and Organization Requirements (ORs) and acknowledged the complexity of the task.

NO suggested developing tools to help the industry navigate the complex regulatory landscape, similar to the drone rule navigator in the IAM Hub.

FR emphasised the need to consider the regulation production process and ensure that new regulations do not complexify the system.

The meeting concluded with a consensus on the importance of the rule simplification initiative and the need for continued collaboration among stakeholders. The discussions highlighted the complexity of the task and the necessity of addressing implementation challenges and harmonisation efforts.

(13) Repository Steering Committee

Presenter: Jeroen Jansen

General presentation:

The Agency provided a comprehensive discussion on the development and implementation of the TRACE repository. Key points included feedback from the steering board, updates on regular update tasks, planning for future releases, and detailed discussions on the qualitative assessment of the Annex 1.

MAB raised various questions and comments during the discussion.

HU expressed concerns about the sensitivity of health data and requested clarification on why it is not considered highly sensitive according to GDPR.

EASA explained that it concerns the limitations on medical certificate. The Repository steering board, EASA's Data Protection Officer and EASA's medical experts were of the opinion that the limitations are not sensitive data.

CH expressed support for reducing the number of objects for efficiency and resources and emphasised the importance of increasing safety in civil aviation and suggested adding a point under key assessment criteria. On existing databases CH welcomed the fact that existing databases will not have to be entered into TRACE separately. Furthermore, CH suggested that the current status of the list, including planned changes are shared before changes are published on the official channel.

CY supported the idea of having different account administrators for different domains. With regards to medical data sensitivity CY expressed concerns about the sensitivity of medical data and supported CH request for a clear list of changes.

FR asked if account administrators could delegate access to other administrators within their authority and inquired about the possibility of supporting two templates of information objects simultaneously during a transition period.

EASA said that possible enhancements of the access tool have not been discussed in that detail. Regarding the templates, yes, where necessary, EASA can support two templates, but that should be for a temporary period.

BE requested a detailed planning roadmap for TRACE.

EASA responded that the high-level planning has been provided and that the detailed information will be provided in 2026.

Discussion on the information paper:

France wondered why only 44 information objects were assessed and if Flextool could be considered being part of TRACE.

EASA explained that for the other objects the usefulness to share the information was obvious, but that MS can provide their opinion if they do not agree with that. For the Flextool: this has been assessed, but it would mean that all requirements for TRACE regarding data security and data protection would need to apply to Flextool as well, requiring quite some investments.

SE suggested to keep in mind the vision of Article 74 and the need to revisit the original intentions and goals.

AT expressed concerns about the integration of medical examiners with the new European health data platform, especially those using paper systems and emphasised the need to revisit the original intention of Article 74 and consider whether the repository is meeting its vision, also on how to avoid "medical shopping" by pilots.

EASA explained that the medical shopping should be avoided by EAMR, not by TRACE. AT also suggested to see how we can make it easier for medical examiners to share data, instead of making it more difficult.

DG MOVE highlighted that EHDS is an interesting option, but it needs to be checked if it meets the requirements of Article 74. DG MOVE stressed that this required further discussions.

ES supported the qualitative assessment of Annex 1 and the need to periodically review and adapt the list of Information Objects (IOs) in TRACE to operational needs. ES explained that the exchange of medical data is a long-standing and sensitive issue, and that cooperation requires access to such information, particularly for licence transfers. ES therefore supported exploring the EHDS as an alternative solution for exchanging medical data provided that it can: (i) accommodate the specific requirements of aeromedical data; (ii) be technically integrated with national licensing and medical applications to avoid double data entry; (iii) ensure appropriate access rights for NCAs; and (iv) cover all relevant certificate classes (Class 1, 2, 3, etc.). ES also highlighted the need for interim solutions until the EHDS is operational.

FR stated that, although it is worth investigating to use EHDS as an alternative to TRACE, it must be cautiously managed as EHDS seems to be intended for exchanges within the framework of care medicine (where the patient can make changes to their file), whereas we are in the context of expert medicine (exchanges between doctors only). FR also asked EASA whether the addition of new regulations (e.g. for aerodrome safety-related equipment) would also lead to amendments to the TRACE regulation to include new Information Objects. The Agency indicated that the Rulemaking process is likely to be amended to add the need for such an amendment and for an impact assessment.

DE expressed concerns about the criteria used for removing objects and provided examples where the criteria might not have been respected. DE also emphasised the need to evaluate the removal of medical objects carefully.

IE suggested that the aircraft registers should be considered at a global level rather than just a European level and requested an update from the legal team on the impact of Article 119 on the repository, ensuring that data is well protected.

Several States showed reluctance on adding the aircraft register. EASA asked MAB to consider adding the registers, as it will be a very useful addition for all.

The Chair asked MS to provide written comments on the information paper by 1 December 2025 and noted a question about the impact of Article 119 on the repository, with a request for an update from the legal team in the next MAB meeting.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|-----|---------|
| Action 2025-03/#04 | Provide an update from the legal team on the impact of Article 119 on the repository, ensuring that data is well protected. | EASA | MAB | 01-2026 |
|-----------------------|---|------|-----|---------|

(14) Qualified entities – first experience with direct expression of interest call

Presenter: Irja Graeber

SE raised concerns about the long-term effects of outsourcing, specifically the loss of in-house competence over time and suggested the need for a balanced approach to maintain indoor competence.

FR agreed with SE and asked how internal resources and NCAs are considered before looking for qualified entities. FR also inquired about the possibility of a public list of accredited qualified entities. FR asked how aerodromes safety-related equipment for future accreditation are considered.

With regards to capacity of NCAs The Agency explained that Annex 2C is used to replan and assess the capacity of NCAs annually. In this respect surveys are conducted to determine if NCAs can cover new domains before considering qualified entities

On Public List of Accredited Entities, the Agency confirmed the intention to publish a list of accredited qualified entities, initially on the website and later in TRACE.

With regards Aerodromes Safety-Related Equipment EASA replied that this is a potential area for future consideration but is currently in very early stages.

(15) Feedback on the comments received on the draft proposal “Memorandum of accreditation of qualified entities” and the way forward

Presenter: Gerli Rebane

EASA emphasised the need for harmonised rules for Member States to accredit and allocate tasks to qualified entities and informed MAB that feedback from Member States has been addressed. The Agency also clarified the requirements and procedures for accreditation.

SE expressed concerns about the impact on the information network and informal networking between inspectors and sought clarification on administrative burden.

The Agency replied that the proposal aims to increase the level of accreditation for qualified entities and clarified that only member states using qualified entities need to establish the accreditation system. EASA also acknowledged the need to discuss the possibility for competent authorities to decide which qualified entities to accredit.

FR noted the existence of provisions in sectorial regulations and the use of qualified entities in FR. FR requested grandfathering rights for existing qualified entities and AMC and GM for clarifications.

The Agency confirmed that grandfathering rights are already covered by the basic regulation and can be explicitly stated.

NL supported SE and FR concerns and noted the absence of information on the possibility for an NCA to select whom to accredit.

(16) ATM update

Presenter: Jesper Rasmussen, Athanassios Tziolas

NL expressed appreciation for the planned workshop on obstacle data. Furthermore, NL expressed concerns about the limited capacity of EASA in the U-space domain and the need for support in implementing U-space rules.

The Agency acknowledged the concerns and mentioned ongoing implementation support in the U-space domain through existing regular meetings and dedicated arrangements at bilateral or multilateral level (such as the recent USSP TF). EASA encouraged MAB to reach out for specific needs and support.

ES raised the issue of the standard ED 339, which is essential for the certification of U-space service providers in Spain and urged for support in reviewing and closing outstanding comments to facilitate the publication of the standard.

The Agency indicated that it is following up on the work of Working Group 339 and hopes EUROCAE concludes very soon.

POST-MEETING NOTE: EASA provided detailed response to ES on this topic, which closed the issue. The resolution of the EASA comments on the ED-339 is satisfactory, enabling short team publication of the standard being prepared by the Eurocae editorial team. Nevertheless, the publication of the standard does not induce immediate effective use for certification. The standard must be beforehand duly recognised as an Acceptable Mean of Compliance integrated within the U-space framework. The revision of the U-space AMC/GM is addressed by the RMT.0748 planned to be launched Q1 2026 for publication by end 2027.

HU critiqued the rushed rule-making process for opinion 3-2025, which led to current situations and lack of clarity. HU requested proper communication and change management regarding rule-making procedures.

The Agency acknowledged the need for better communication and change management in general, nevertheless the urgency of this regulatory activity (aligning 373 to SES2+ regulatory framework) was extensively presented in the Explanatory Note of the said opinion.

FR requested the inclusion of aerodrome experts in the workshop on obstacle data and emphasised the need to consider simplification and strengthen impact assessments in future regulatory activities. The Agency highlighted EC request during the EASA Committee meeting for a multidisciplinary approach in the workshop deliberations.

IT emphasised the need for EASA to monitor and manage the alignment between EU rules and ICAO requirements in the field of ATM of high number of ICAO SARPS, Annexes and PANS leading to increased efforts and complexity on EU side, both EASA and MS. IT highlighted the issues with low-level obstacles and the need for community support.

The Agency acknowledged the complexity and the need for holistic approaches in addressing high number of ICAO SARPS, Annexes and PANS relevant to ATM and is pleased with IT support on the proposed obstacle & terrain data provisions.

AT inquired about the planned date and invitees for the workshop on obstacle data.

The Agency mentioned that the Commission is working on defining the agenda and date for the workshop, emphasising the need for a multidisciplinary approach (ref: 527-531).

POST MEETING NOTE: The invitation to a workshop has been sent by DG MOVE. The workshop will take place on 21 November.

(17) AOB – Digitalisation network update

Presenter: Robert Wiener

CH expressed appreciation for the network as a lively platform for exchange and sharing best practices. CH fully supports the identified obstacles, particularly the lack of a standardised aviation data communication protocol. Finally, CH encouraged the Agency to keep this Network a lively platform by identifying the next step with a clear agenda to ensure that the next steps will be delivered with a good speed in order to keep the momentum.

NO noted that the work had a good start but expected more progress and consolidation from the EASA. NO is looking forward to completing the important task.

AT supported NO comments and emphasised the need to structure the network with clear objectives and tasks. AT provided detailed comments in writing.

AT written comments:

- p4: Many of the identified obstacles revolve around lacking data structure, especially in data disseminated by EASA (rules, guidance material, but also assignments etc.) - that requires manual work in the member states and weakens efficiency of digitalisation options.
- p5: Identification of best practices is definitely a good idea; it might be useful
 - to be more specific - good practices in what?
 - to facilitate an overview first. It's hard to tell what is good and not so good practice, if there is no common ground. Instead of aiming directly for best practices, it might be more helpful to start an exchange, collect and discuss information and then discuss about good practices.
- p5: "Consider existing fora, where the network's results might server as input": definitely; but I'm not sure if members of the digitalisation network are aware of discussions going on in other fora; some more exchange might be helpful in order to sharpen and streamline input from the digitalisation network

IT clarified to have adopted a protocol (AI EXAM 1.5) for AIP, which validates data transmission.

The Agency acknowledged the progress made by the network and the challenges faced by MS in providing input due to resource constraints. EASA furthermore emphasised the need to identify the appropriate forums where the network's results can serve as input, such as the repository steering board, IAM Hub, and AI programme. The Agency also proposed to take the discussions internally and come back to the group with suggested ways forward.

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|------|------|
| Action 2025-03/#05 | With regards to identifying appropriate forums where the network's results can serve as input, such as the repository steering board, IAM Hub, and AI programme the Agency to discuss internally and address MAB with suggested ways forward. | EASA | 2026 |
|--------------------|---|------|------|

(17) AOB – Preparation of Member States to implement new Ground Handling Regulation

Presenter: Eduard Ciofu

NL acknowledged the challenges mainly at the national level and thanked EASA for the coordination efforts.

DE expressed appreciation for EASA's commitment and highlighted the importance of addressing ground handling as a top safety issue. DE also raised concerns about the fragmented nature of training standards and requested guidance on ensuring consistency.

ES shared their preparation for implementation, including a roadmap with milestones and responsibilities and emphasised the need for harmonised supervision and coordination between authorities.

IE praised the collaborative approach and the well-structured process for regulation and implementation. IE also expressed comfort with the timelines and acknowledged the interaction and workshops.

CH thanked EASA for its continued commitment to implementing this new regulatory framework, which addresses a real safety issue (one of the top five occurrence categories, which causes some financial consequences for the whole industry). CH appreciated that EASA is highlighting at the MAB level the importance of ensuring an effective implementation of this regulation.

In its response, the Agency highlighted the importance of knowing the industry and the size of the sector for effective implementation and emphasised the need for a proportionate approach, avoiding over-regulation or under-regulation.

The Agency also acknowledged the need for training criteria and the use of industry standards, with a joint effort involving MS.

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|----|----------|
| Action 2025-03/#06 | Member States to nominate experts to the GH Network. | MS | End 2025 |
|-----------------------|--|----|----------|

(17) AOB – US Drugs and Testing requirements

Presenter: Karl Specht

The Agency presented an update on the new drug and alcohol testing regulations issued by the FAA in May 2025. These regulations are being imposed globally, and the FAA's stance is that this is a safety issue. The European side believes that the data from the last 20 years does not suggest any safety issues related to this topic in Europe. However, the FAA insists that this is a safety issue.

The issue was discussed at the bilateral oversight board in June, where the European Commission raised concerns with the FAA. The discussions were inconclusive, but the FAA committed to providing further clarification through EASA.

The FAA claims that this regulation is part of FAA rule Part 01.20, which is not covered by the bilateral agreement. They expect all foreign repair stations to comply with this regulation.

The European side highlighted the challenges related to data protection rules in Europe, which prevent the sharing of medical data or results of medical exams outside EU MS. This was discussed with the FAA's chief surgeon's office and drug abatement team, who were reportedly unaware of these regulations.

The FAA's drug abatement team and chief surgeon's office have not been willing to share their guidance material or engage with the European side before drafting the guidelines. This has led to frustration.

The ongoing FAA government shutdown has halted substantial communication. It is estimated that it will take the FAA at least three weeks to resume normal operations after the shutdown ends, pushing the expected release of guidelines to Q1 2026.

Possible Solutions and Waivers

Options for Compliance: There are three options for compliance with the FAA regulations: Country Waiver: Apply for a waiver at the country level (FAA rule Part 01.20.10 or .91), Organisational Waiver: Each organisation can individually apply for a waiver, or Direct Compliance: Each organisation can choose to comply with the FAA regulation directly.

The FAA has verbally encouraged countries to apply for waivers, but there is no written guidance available yet. The European side is still discussing the possibility of waivers with some MS.

NL suggested they will use Direct Compliance Option however they are unsure if this is the standard approach. The FAA has stated that this issue cannot be addressed by EASA because each MS has different regulations regarding medical certificates and data.

The Agency clarified that there is no option to apply for a waiver at EASA level. The European Commission had requested this possibility, but it was rejected by the FAA.

MAB expressed hope that the US government shutdown would end soon to allow further engagement and support on this issue.

(17) AOB

Establishment of a network on the topics of knowledge and competence management (suggested by AT)

AT presented an idea for a network to share information on maintaining staff competencies, establishing training programs, and feeding into the pool of experts within the partnership agreement between Agreement and Access. The proposal is based on existing platforms, networks, and previous discussions during MAB meetings.

Background information:

In the light of the increasing complexity and regulatory demands within the European aviation sector, it is proposed to establish a systematic and continuous exchange platform among civil aviation authorities across Europe. This initiative would focus on the enhancement of competence management, knowledge management, and training practices for personnel working within European aviation authorities.

The exchange should contribute to ensuring that all participating authorities maintain a consistent and high standard of qualification and operational readiness. Such collaboration would foster mutual learning, improve regulatory oversight, and support the development of a resilient and future-ready aviation workforce.

NO, LU, FI, BE GR, DE, NL and SE expressed strong support for AT idea.

The Chair concluded that the initial reaction was supportive and would take the idea on board to organise further steps.

Third country applicants – Part 66 (suggested by HU)

HU would appreciate any meaningful update from the Commission.

DG MOVE apologised for the delay in clarification on an issue that has been ongoing for a long time and mentioned that the legal service has not yet provided conclusions, making it difficult to provide a clear response. DG MOVE furthermore explained that HU question has triggered a deeper legal reflection on the EU's obligations and the system to accept requests from outside the EU and indicated that the current legal framework does not mandate member states to process applications from non-EU residents, but it can be done voluntarily where feasible. DG MOVE suggested that an amendment to

the EASA Basic Regulation might be necessary to ensure legal clarity and uphold the principle of legitimate expectation.

HU expressed its disagreement and requested a written clarification together with a detailed legal explanation of DG MOVE's position asserting that the licensing of third-country applicants is merely a voluntary action for Member States. HU underlined that the Regulation defines the competence of the authority solely on the basis of where the applicant submits the application, without introducing any limitation of scope, power, or mandate that could serve as a legal basis for refusing an application on the grounds of non-EU residency.

Accessibility and safety (suggested by HU)

HU would appreciate the opportunity for the short workshop held after the previous MAB meeting for NEBs. We would be glad to hear about the Agency's/ Commission's future plans on continuing this initiative

The Chair noted HU interest in future activities and suggested following up when resources are available.

EU-UK Data exchange on Mandatory Occurrence Reports (suggested by HU)

HU recently experienced discrepancies in our occurrence reports and the ones at UK CAA regarding our operators. Considering the significant traffic concerned in this relation HU would like to start a discussion if there is an intention to have an EU-UK framework for exchanging such information regarding the TCO holders or this shall be managed at MS level.

The Chair acknowledged HU point and agreed that an EU-level approach would be better than bilateral efforts. They committed to discussing this with UKCAA at an upcoming meeting at the end of November.

DJI mini 5 pro – C0 label (suggested by HU)

During the last UAS TEB the matter of the new DJI Mini 5 Pro was raised. By the spec sheet the weight of the UAV is 249.9 g +3%, however the UAS is holding C0 label as per regulation 945, which says explicitly under 250 g UAS can obtain C0 label. If the drone's weight is exceeding 250g than it is not entitled to be C0 marked nor commercially distributed as such. Considering the upcoming holiday season, HU would like to have an update from the Agency on this matter.

The Agency replied that the regulation sets a limit of 250g for C0 drones. However, prEN 4709-001 was published identifying the criteria to comply with the requirements of Reg 2019/945. The pr EN indicates a tolerance of +3% on the weight. So drones up to 257g may be acceptable. The prEN was developed by CEN and consulted with industry and authorities.

DG MOVE discussed this topic with DG Defis (in charge of regulation 2019/945) and the market surveillance authorities, and the following was clarified:

- The prEN 4709 has been finalised and it is in the process to be transformed in the EN4709 in the next weeks or months. No changes are envisaged.
- When the EN4709 will be published, according to the market regulation process compliance with such standard will provide presumption of compliance with the regulation. So drones up to 257g will be acceptable as C0.
- From a safety, security, privacy, environmental point of view there is no difference between a 250 or 257g drone.
- The recommendation from the EC is to already accept that a drone with a weight up to 257g may be classified as C0 (even if the prEN has not been transformed yet in EN 4709)

HU expressed concern about DG MOVE’s position, as it means that an industry standard is overruling an EU Regulation, which allows deviation, from the applicable law contradicting to the rule of law principle and called for the need for a coordinated approach among MS.

Update on BVLOS (suggested by CH)

CH requested an update on the BVLOS agenda item that was initially put on May MAB agenda and was then removed.

The Agency confirmed that the topic will be included in the 2026 UAS TeB work programme, likely towards the end of the year. The work programme still needs to be finalised and approved.

Helicopter Flight time Limitations (FTL) (RMT.0494): implications for safety and level playing field; proposal to maintain regulatory reflection (suggested by ES)

ES noted the decision to remove RMT.0494 from the EPAS. From ES’s perspective, the absence of a harmonised EU framework for helicopter FTL may have implications both for safety and for maintaining a level playing field across Europe, particularly as cross-border helicopter activities become more frequent. ES would also seek clarification on the apparent inconsistency whereby rulemaking is progressing for airships—including FTL provisions—while no equivalent work is maintained for helicopters, which represent a far more established and operationally relevant sector.

The Agency explained that RMTs.0494 and 0495, related to developing EU-level FTL requirements for helicopter and aeroplane operations, have been removed from the EPAS following a prioritisation exercise. While no safety impact has been identified from the absence of EU-level FTL requirements for helicopters, the current situation does affect the level playing field, particularly for cross-border operations. However, this concern was not deemed sufficient to prioritise rulemaking given available resources.

This assessment was supported by the limited number of MS that considered this task a priority, not only based on the input from Air OPS TEB members to the survey sent out during the development of the draft EPAS, but also on the feedback from MAB and SAB during the EPAS consultation. EASA further clarified that that removing the task from the EPAS was also intended to provide clarity for MS, allowing them to address the matter at the national level in the current EPAS cycle. The decision does not imply that FTL for helicopters is unimportant; EASA will continue to monitor the topic and re-assess the need for rulemaking if safety data warrants it.

ES re-stated its concern and argued that the lack of response from some MS in the survey does not necessarily mean opposition to prioritising FTL for helicopter operations.

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|---------|
| Action 2025-03/#07 | With regards to the establishment of a network on the topics of knowledge and competence management EASA to coordinate with AT to organise further steps. | EASA | Q4 2025 |
|-----------------------|---|------|---------|

MoM Distribution:

MAB Members, Observers and Alternates, and EASA management

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| MoM prepared by | Mojca Melaranta | |
| MoM approved by | Maria Rueda | |

| |
|-------------------------------------|
| Annex - List of Participants |
| |