



MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE

EASA MANAGEMENT BOARD

HELD ON

21 SEPTEMBER 2010 (MB 03/2010)

AND SUMMARY OF DECISIONS TAKEN

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS

At its meeting held on 21 September 2010, the Management Board:

- Formally adopted the Agency's 2010 2nd Amending Budget.



0. List of Attendees – Please see ANNEX 1

The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed all participants, especially the new representatives from Hungary, Sweden and the European Commission.

1. Adoption of the Agenda

The Agenda was adopted as presented. Two additional points to be raised under AOB were requested by Germany (Art. 83bis ICAO) and the European Commission (update on EC position re Work Programme 2011).

2. Adoption of the minutes of the previous meeting

The Chair asked to replace the word "EMSA" (p.3) by "EMA". The Netherlands raised concern on the timing foreseen for the adoption of the EASA Work Programme 2011 (p.30) and asked whether an agreement had been reached on a reduction of the PDB by 2.8 M€ (p.17). The Chair said that the Work Programme 2011 would have to be adopted by written procedure before 30 November 2011 and that no concrete conclusion had been drawn on the PDB reduction. The draft minutes of the MB 02/2010 were adopted as presented.

The Board went through the action list attached at Annex 2 of WP02. The Chair reported that Ms Ingrid Cherfils (Sweden) had taken over Chairmanship of the Legal Working Group on the MB RoPs. A first discussion on the revised RoPs would take place at MB 04/2010 in December. He also said that a discussion on EASA's medium-term strategy would take place at that meeting.

3. Comments from the Chair

The Chair spoke of the new representation of the European Commission to the Board and thanked the Director General of DG MOVE for taking part in forthcoming Board meetings. The new Commission representative explained the cascading system with 3 MB Alternate Members. He recalled that building up EASA had been a good institutional exercise and constitutional experiment. Bearing in mind the multiple challenges for EASA (e.g. workload, budgetary constraints, F&C etc.) he underlined the Commission's readiness to provide continuous support to EASA.

Netherlands asked whether other Member States would also be entitled to nominate additional MB Alternate Members. The Chair said that such idea could generally be supported by the Board, provided that it would not affect the representation/composition at Board meetings, in particular during closed sessions. The RoPs Working Group should have a closer look at this issue.



The Chair commended the work being done regarding SES 2 implementation, highlighting the arrangements between the Agency and EUROCONTROL and the good collaboration between the two institutions.

Finally, he said that the MB Share-point site launched by the MB Secretariat has proven to be an excellent tool. Access problems faced by several Members would be solved by EASA IT services shortly.

4. Report of the Executive Director

The ED presented his report on developments since MB 02/2010 (WP03). He underlined inter alia the following elements of the report:

- Visit by Mr Siim Kallas, Vice-President of the EC in charge of Transport;
- TC for SaM 146 engine: Cooperation EU/Russia re Sukhoi Superjet 100;
- TC program for Boeing 787 postponed;
- 1st extension: Focus on timely delivery of planned CRD and rule text;
- 2nd extension: 1st phase opinions (fast-track) on 3 elementary ATM rules;
- Active cooperation EASA-EUROCONTROL;
- International Cooperation: BASA with Brazil and Canada;
- Safety Analysis: Active contribution re volcanic ash issue;
- Information request by France re AF 447 accident;
- F&C Regulation (incl. new fee structure) launched for official approval;
- EASA Audit Section certified by IIA;
- ISO9001: 2008 certification from September;
- EASA Conference on the impact of Climate Change on Aviation Safety;
- EASAC: Work on European Safety Programme and Plan continues.

In discussing the ED report, the following points were made:

France asked why less POA applications were received from China and Russia. The ED explained that for Russia a certain reluctance is visible, possibly because it sees a way to use its own system e.g. via mutual recognition. China seems to be more concerned with the development of their domestic market at present.

Romania asked for reasons for the delay in the B787 TC program. The ED said that the 2-years delay was caused by ongoing certification by the FAA (primary certification authority) and a hold-up of the flight test program.

UK asked for further details on the ongoing work of EASAC. The ED explained that EASAC is facing a challenge in structuring and drafting the European Safety Programme and Plan in particular as some fields of aviation safety are less mature than others. A detailed report is planned for MB 04/2010 in December.



Several members asked for further details of the Agency's space optimisation programme. The ED said that the building infrastructure at the Koeln Triangle is posing various difficulties for the Agency's work. Negotiations are currently ongoing regarding a possible removal to the former Lufthansa building which is managed by the same landlord and will be completely refurbished by 2013. A report would be provided to the Board shortly. Members shared the view that space optimisation is a very encouraging project but that costs would have to be looked at.

UK asked for further details on whistle blower cases handled by the Agency. Considering the risks involved and reiterating the importance of a "just culture" in aviation, the Board noted that only the number of cases but no further details should be disclosed. Ireland pointed out that the term "whistle blower" should be used carefully, as it implies criminal activity. Some other terminology should be used for this anonymous information.

The Commission said that the BASA between EU and Canada will come into force in October 2010. Regarding Accident Investigation, the Commission said that the EU rules are in process of being finalised.

On Fees & Charges, the Commission underlined the importance of reaching a cost-based approach and of finding a fair balance between EU and non-EU industry. While a certain change to the fee system is needed, the new system should minimise the impact on EU aviation industry, which is still suffering from the economic crisis and operating in a competitive market. EASA should also consider the existing reserve stemming from Fees & Charges (carry-over). The EAB announced that industry is currently preparing an official letter to the Agency addressing their concerns. The ED said that Fees & Charges are of the utmost importance for EASA. The existing reserve is the natural consequence of the change from post-priori to a-priori payment. EASA, together with the FABS Committee, would need to consider how to make best use of this reserve (e.g. reallocation to other resources or use for "bad" years), respecting that this reserve actually "belongs" to industry.

Netherlands asked for further clarification regarding the issue of Koito seats, in particular on the status of discussions between EASA and the FAA and in view of ensuring a level playing field. EASA explained that the Agency would come up with a proposed AD shortly following discussions with both Airbus and Boeing, in order to establish a coordinated/harmonised approach. While it is proposed that airlines would have to replace seats within a period of 10 years, the actual timing is determined by individual test results. As regards the level playing field, some difficulties seem to exist due to the fact that the FAA does not have an equivalent to PART 21, defining specific legal deadline requirements. Airlines should be thankful to EASA/FAA for discovering this non-compliance issue (falsification of documents by Koito for more than 10



years) and finding a “good compromise” approach. A conference with stakeholders will be held on 14 October 2010.

5. Follow-up on Volcanic Ash issues

The ED reported that a progress report on the volcanic ash issue had been provided to MB Members at the end of July 2010. Several meetings were held relating to advising, coordinating and communicating the issues concerning volcanic ash; including 2 workshops with engine manufacturers. The Agency also contributed to a working paper on volcanic ash for the 37th ICAO General Assembly. The intention is that the discussion with manufacturers is taken over by ICAO in order to find a sustainable solution at a global level. EASA at the same time will closely follow-up on the work carried out by ICAO and endeavour to speed-up the process of gathering detailed information on the ingestion of volcanic ash by aircraft engines. The ED apologised for not being able to present a list of key actors involved in the coordination of the volcanic ash issue (e.g. ICAO, EASA, EUROCONTROL) and on “who is doing what”. He promised to make such information available to Board Members soon after the ICAO General Assembly.

The Chair noted that gathering precise data on the ash concentration in the atmosphere is also of great importance and asked whether EASA is coordinating this. The ED said that this issue was discussed at the EASA conference on the impact of climate change on aviation safety. It was noted that due to the lack of a common legal basis, all institutions involved work independently. A coordinated approach will be developed soon but a lot of work still needs to be done. Members thanked the Agency for organising this conference, particularly as it helped to create awareness on other climate related issues that could adversely affect aviation (e.g. icing, bird-strike).

Iceland spoke of the 3 main conclusions of the conference held on volcanic ash, namely (1) that the airspace closure was too long, (2) that the ash composition on subsequent eruptions could be different and (3) that the issue is not only an operational/airworthiness issue but also requires coordination with the ATM sector.

France underlined that Europe needs to be prepared for a similar situation in the future, in particular through reliable measurements and data available. While the overall coordination should be with EASA, NAAs should also take coordinated action at the nation level in order to support EASA and ICAO.

Ireland said that the recent ash crisis was more an “economic crisis” than a “safety crisis”. Moreover Ireland said that defining common engine tolerance levels must be done cautiously, as engines are so advanced that “not one



size might fit all". One should also consider that increased tolerance levels can have negative impacts on fuel consumption and noise.

EAB said that from the perspective of industry/operators there is an urgent need for a common solution as soon as possible. While work on a sustainable technical solution would need to be achieved at ICAO level, EASA should take the initiative to ensure proper coordination at the EU level.

The Commission underlined the importance of the Agency in taking initiative/leadership at the EU level, while working in close collaboration with the Commission and noting that the system would need to be made operational (e.g. via the crisis coordination cell). Two core elements for EASA were identified: (1) Continuous examination of technical data to define engine tolerance levels (in close cooperation with manufacturers) and (2) Coordination of effective measurement centres in order to ensure that reliable data is available and correctly analysed. In addition, the Commission, EUROCONTROL and NAAs would need to support the work of EASA in order to be prepared for a similar situation in the future.

The Chair summarised the discussion as follows:

1. Members felt that the Agency has an ongoing important role in the coordination of the volcanic ash issue;
2. Members agreed with the two core issues identified by the Commission: (1) Defining tolerance levels for engines and (2) Coordination of measurement activities and gathering of proper data;
3. The Board noted that "not one size fits all" and different approaches might have to be considered in defining engine tolerance levels;
4. Members noted that coordination activities are a 2-way process, involving both the Agency and NAAs;
5. The Board agreed that EASA should circulate a list of key actors involved in the coordination volcanic ash (e.g. ICAO, EASA, EUROCONTROL) and on "who is doing what", soon after the ICAO General Assembly.

6. Rulemaking in the context of the extension of Community competences

The Agency's Rulemaking Director introduced WP04, providing a summary of EASA rulemaking activities on the 1st and 2nd extension since MB 02/2010.

As regards the 1st extension, he covered inter alia the following aspects:

- Planning of CRD and Opinion publications: EASA will continue along the agreed lines and concentrate on the timely delivery of CRDs and rules;
- OSD/SD: 2-month delay on OSD/SD due to absence of the project leader;



- CRD OPS technical parts: Part-CAT, Part-SPA and Parts-SPO/NCC/NCO to be delivered almost at the same time; NAAs should carefully plan the review of CRDs to cope with the expected workload;

On the 2nd extension, the Rulemaking Director highlighted the following:

- First phase ("fast-track") opinions were issued in May 2010;
- A progress report was delivered to the SES Committee with focus on the "fast-track" Opinion; positive feedback and support of the regulatory approach were received;
- EASA/Commission Conference with stakeholders held on 24 June 2010;
- References to ICAO Annexes in ANSP rules: Assessment provided to the Commission End July 2010;
- Second phase of ATM rulemaking: EASA continued to develop measures for the full implementation of the extended Basic Regulation; priorities are set and work is well in progress;
- EASA launched rulemaking tasks highlighted by the Commission as (new) priorities; opinions for these tasks will be issued in 2012 and beyond;
- Aerodrome rulemaking: 3 key tasks launched and progressed; main challenge remains aerodrome certification basis ("customised compliance");
- Stakeholder relations: Fundamental progress achieved in cooperation with EUROCONTROL; very active (positive) contributions from industry;
- Military has been invited to AGNA and RM groups ("doors are open").

Discussion on 1st extension

Members welcomed the report provided by the Rulemaking Director and commended the Agency for the good progress made in the past 12 months.

EAB noted that the final Opinion on FCL might be mistaken if some industry concerns are not taken into account before adoption by Comitology. France noted that all impacts would need to be properly evaluated before the EASA Committee votes on the entire package. The Rulemaking Director said that the Opinion on FCL only contains the essential elements in order to fulfil the requirements, but is not considered as the sole Rulemaking product on FCL. Additional Rulemaking work will start in January 2011 to address various other issues.

On OPS, EAB said that there are still open concerns, noting that the rulemaking procedures are too complex and that there are too many proposals to review at the same time. Netherlands said that new amendments taken on board should be communicated to all parties as early as possible. This could be an element for discussion in the Rulemaking Review Group. Moreover, there should be greater visibility with respects to the views expressed in a CRD.



UK reiterated its request for having a global overview on how the different packages fit together, including a clear indication on timelines for the application of rules. Considering that the UK is currently receiving lots of queries regarding FCL and noting that transparency is of particular interest for stakeholders, the relevant information should be provided as soon as possible. The Rulemaking Director said that timelines would need to be coordinated with the Commission and agreement would need to be reached on how this would be presented in a cover regulation.

The Commission commended EASA in managing the heavy workload regarding the 1st extension and for finding the right timing for important rulemaking tasks. The Commission underlined the importance of the guiding principles (1) Smooth transition and (2) Close alignment with existing rules (deviations to be justified by safety indications). The Rulemaking Director assured the Board that the Agency is strictly adhering to the guiding principle of changing existing rules only when there are safety indications and that any changes will be made visible.

France noted that while the current discussion focuses mainly on the 1st and 2nd extension, EASA should also provide an overview on the status of "old" regulations e.g. in the field of airworthiness. The Rulemaking Director agreed that such information would be provided to the Board.

The Chair summarised the discussion on the 1st extension as follows:

1. The Board commended the progress made by the Agency and noted that the Agency is adhering to the principles agreed by the Board;
2. The Board noted that there are further issues on FCL and OPS to be addressed in the future;
3. The Board noted that the issue of transition/application of rules as well as the communication to stakeholders is complex. As much transparency as possible is required here;
4. The Board agreed to review the status of rulemaking activities in the field of airworthiness at MB 04/2010 in December.

Discussion on 2nd extension

Members commended the progress made by the Agency regarding the 2nd extension rulemaking tasks and welcomed the achievements made on the arrangements between EASA and EUROCONTROL.

Considering the significant amount of work with the second phase of ATM rulemaking, Netherlands said that it should be for the Board to assess in more detail the kind of work demanded by the Commission as well the impact on resources and on the Agency's work programme. The UK raised concern on whether the timetable foreseen for the 2nd extension (e.g. the



publication of the NPA Aerodromes by 2011) can be achieved and also asked for a detailed timetable/planning for the ATM/Aerodrome rulemaking.

The Chair said that deadlines set out in the Basic Regulation for OPs, Licensing and Aerodromes must be respected, but there was a question as to whether the “fast-track” ATM rules met the requirement to have rules in place by end 2012 and the next tranche of ATM rules could be handled on a somewhat slower timetable. The Rulemaking Director said that there currently is no need to change the planned deadline for ATM rules. He restated the priorities agreed by the Board and said that work packages need to be addressed in sequence. The Commission said that the timetable is set by the legislator and that deadlines can not suddenly be changed or delayed. Nevertheless, there could be the possibility for “opt-outs” or transitional elements in some areas.

As regards ATM/ANS safety regulation, the Rulemaking Director explained that the basic ATM rules are now on the Commission’s desk, but updates would still be necessary to comply to the Basic Regulation. Moreover, coordination with the Commission and SESAR is needed to see what are the expectations related to the Agency’s potential tasks and in order to prioritise them in the total work packages.

France said that the MB should be provided with an overview of the different working arrangements in place at the EU level regarding the 2nd extension. Moreover, NAAs should be invited to review and comment on the Agency’s concept paper on aerodrome safety regulation. The Rulemaking Director agreed that an update on arrangements would be provided at the next MB meeting and said that the concept paper has been published on the EASA website for stakeholder’s attention.

The Chair summarised the discussion as follows:

1. The Board noted the good progress made regarding the 2nd extension rulemaking tasks and welcomed the achievements made on the arrangements between EASA and EUROCONTROL;
2. The Board agreed that a close follow-up of the related activities needs to be ensured during forthcoming MB meetings.

7. 2010 2nd Amending Budget

The Agency’s Finance and Business Services Director introduced the Agency’s 2010 2nd Amending Budget for adoption, highlighting the following elements:

- Income analysis: Increase from revenues from F&C activities of 2.7 M€;



- Expenditure analysis: Revision of budget for Certification outsourcing by 2.3 M€, for legal expenses by 100.000 €, for set-up of the Internal Occurrence Reporting System (IORS) by 300.000 €;
- 2010 2nd Amending Budget sent to the FABS Committee by the end of July and approved via written procedure.

The FABS Chair advised that the FABS Committee would prefer discussing budget papers during their meetings rather than having to approve documents by a written procedure. At the same time the FABS Chair noted that this was not possible in the current case due to the summer break.

The Chair requested further information regarding the set-up of the IORS and the increased need for litigation. The ED explained that the system is needed in order to systematically gather safety related information and to organise the amount of data and information received into one single database. The system will be based on ECCAIRS taxonomy and shall ensure the Agency's responsibility on continuing airworthiness, in particular the systematic follow-up of occurrences. On increased costs for legal advice, the ED explained that the Agency had to contract specialised law firms to provide specific legal advice in preparing for the Agency's involvement in the court case related to the AF447 accident.

The EAB raised concern that F&C seems to generate more money than actually needed. The EAB also noted that costs related to the IORS and for legal advice should not be covered by F&C but by EC contributions.

Austria asked why reductions were made on budget line 3800 (Technical Training). EASA explained that the Agency carries out a continuous review of all budget lines, allowing for a shift between budget lines.

8. Standardisation Strategy

The Head of the Standardisation Department introduced the Agency's Standardisation Strategy (WP06), highlighting the following aspects:

- 3 pillars of EASA's standardisation strategy: (1) Regulatory Compliance Verification, (2) Pro-active measures, (3) Regulatory feedback;
- On pillar 1: Standardisation process mature and very successful;
- Continuous improvement of quality, efficiency and effectiveness (e.g. "Standardisation of Standardisation");
- Need to increase product sampling;
- Transition to CMA and "risk-based targeting";
- Integration of ICAO USOAP activities;
- On pillar 2: Proactive standardisation e.g. via standardisation meetings, information sharing tools (Sinapse), technical training of NAA inspectors;



- Pillar 3: Regulatory feedback e.g. via participation of EASA Rulemaking in Standardisation Meetings and Finding Classification Committee, Systematic analysis of impact of regulations;
- OPS/FCL/FSTD: EASA to fill gap until IRs enter into force and to ensure smooth transition from JAA activities;
- ATM/ANS: EASA responsible for standardisation once IRs enter into force (2011); start of inspections in 1st semester 2011 ;
- Peer-reviews: Unique to ATM/ANS; additional proactive standardisation;
- Aerodromes: Diverse national aerodrome regulations and administrative structures; States may need more time to implement new IRs.

The Board commended the Agency's report as a "genuine" strategic paper, noting the very positive development in the field of standardisation and generally supporting the Agency's strategy ("3 pillars").

Noting the importance of standardisation activities for aviation safety, the Board agreed that standardisation is an essential part of the Agency's work. Members saw a great potential for the Agency's standardisation activities to improve compliance and enhance safety performance at the NAA level and thereby driving-up the safety standard across Europe. Looking at the overall concept of standardisation, some Members said that focus should be put on providing continuous support rather than putting too much emphasis on "uniformity". The view was shared that partnership and cooperation between EASA and NAAs is of core importance, in particular as regards the new areas of competence. The Commission underlined that within Europe, EASA should be the lead-body in the field of standardisation and recalled the need for a proactive but coordinated approach. In addition, Members noted that there is no particular forum to discuss standardisation issues between NAAs and EASA, similar to AGNA or ENACT. The idea of having such a specialised forum was generally supported. The Head of the Standardisation Department agreed to take this idea on board.

While acknowledging that there should be only one standard level of safety, the Board agreed that there might be different acceptable ways to comply with this standard, since rules leave room for interpretation. The Board agreed. It was proposed that EASA provides some guidance on how to interpret the rules and ensure compliance, e.g. by the closer involvement of Rulemaking experts in the overall process of standardisation. Noting that standardisation is an important element of the "safety chain", the EAB said that the interpretation of safety rules should not be done from a legal perspective only and should also take safety objectives into account. No innovative legal interpretation should take place.

The Head of the Standardisation Department explained that there is a clear mandate for standardisation activities in the Basic Regulation, whereby the



Agency is responsible for “monitoring the correct implementation of rules”. EASA is currently exploring ways for an even stronger “standardisation effect” as standardisation is essential in achieving a high uniform safety level in Europe. EASA has to respect the principle of the free market and ensure a level playing field. The EASA system is designed not to be too prescriptive and EASA attempts to work in a most cooperative manner. He said that in practice, the cooperative approach already exists and that the number of closed findings demonstrates the efficiency of the present system. In fact, Member States had subscribed to the present system of checks and balances, in which EASA offers a solution, NAAs can agree/disagree and the Commission/Court can enforce.

On the 1st pillar (“Compliance verification”), the Board saw a need to continuously improve the standardisation process in terms of quality, efficiency and effectiveness. A revision of Regulation (EC) 736/2006 is needed to adequately reflect the Agency’s new fields of activity.

Members raised several comments on the measures foreseen by EASA regarding further development of the 1st pillar. On “Standardisation of Standardisation” Germany raised concern as to whether there should be similar requirements (“one standard”) for different areas, taking into account the different approaches e.g. for aerodromes and airworthiness. Austria noted that a distinction would need to be made between old and new fields of activity. Several Board Members expressed reservations regarding the idea of increased product sampling at national level, saying that balance and cooperation would be needed here. Netherlands said that product sampling should be combined with the system approach while Sweden noted that product sampling could reduce the regulatory burden for NAAs.

Denmark reminded that compliance verification in aviation is slightly different from other areas, as compliance is also measured against AMC & GM. Measuring the level of compliance based on these very complex rules often causes difficulties for NAAs. A possible solution would be a better exchange between EASA and NAAs. Denmark also raised concern as to whether SAFA standardisation would become obsolete once the Agency is competent in the authorisation of 3rd country operators, taking into account the relationship with the EU Blacklist.

The Board generally supported the Agency’s strategy to move to the CMA approach and towards risk-based targeting in noting that this new concept would bring about challenges for both EASA and NAAs. The Commission said that the transition to CMA and a more risk-based approach is a new terrain and requires the development of competences. As cooperation with ICAO is important in this context, the Commission will sign a Memorandum of Cooperation with ICAO shortly to better define the level of EU engagement.



Several Members raised concerns regarding the integration of ICAO USOAP into the European CMA. It was noted that due to the different approaches taken by ICAO and EU/EASA, it might be difficult to properly align ICAO USOAP with EASA's tasks. France said that the cooperative approach envisaged by EASA is less present within ICAO where there is a greater focus on conformity and compliance. Members saw a need for more transparency on how the Agency intends to coordinate their activities with ICAO. The Head of the Standardisation Department said that the transition to the CMA approach is still in a conceptual phase and a common way to describe the method still needs to be found.

Regarding the 2nd pillar ("Proactive Standardisation Efforts"), Members shared the view that activities should be concentrated here. France suggested that the pillar should be renamed "proactive and cooperative" in order to reflect the partnership between NAAs and EASA in exchanging technical knowledge and finding the right way to implement/interpret rules. Standardisation meetings should also be used to discuss best practices regarding the application of regulations, in particular in the case of findings. Members welcomed the idea of better involving rulemaking in standardisation meeting and supported the initiative of EASA to further enhance Technical Training for NAA inspectors and to allow for the participation of NAA inspectors in standardisation inspections. Austria said that safety analysis aspects should also be taken into account in the 2nd pillar.

On the 3rd pillar ("Regulatory Feedback"), Members encouraged EASA to further enhance the mechanism for regulatory feedback, considering that this would also improve transparency regarding the follow-up of findings raised during a standardisation visits. Netherlands asked for more transparency regarding the effects of standardisation visit findings on rulemaking.

The Board expressed a certain need for care regarding standardisation in new fields of activity (e.g. OPS/FCL/FSTDs, ATM/ANS and Aerodromes), where there is less convergence between NAAs. Members took note of the various difficulties for NAAs to fully adjust to a new set of common rules, the wide range of standardisation (activity) types e.g. in the field of ATM, as well as the level of resources required. Visits based on conformity/compliance might cause substantial difficulties here. The view was shared that EASA should come up as soon as possible with a coordinated approach/plan regarding the design of standardisation activities in the field of ATM/ANS and aerodromes. Members also noted the possibility of transition periods or "opt-outs". In addition, Germany said that a more detailed discussion on the concept of "Peer-review" in the field of ATM would be required.

The Commission said that standardisation activities in EASA's new fields of activity should be developed cautiously, not only taking into account the gaps between EU Member States but also the current budgetary constraints. In



this context, Denmark said that resources might be needed on all levels (e.g. Commission, EASA and NAAs). Austria suggested to further analyse whether additional staff would be needed or whether a sharing of work between EASA and NAAs could be foreseen. Netherlands asked whether EASA intends to use existing expertise and knowledge in EUROCONTROL. The Head of the Standardisation Department explained that resource planning has been initiated, but that it is too early at this stage to make concrete decisions.

The Chair thanked the Board for the interesting comments and summarised the discussion as follows:

1. The Board commended the Agency's report as a genuinely strategic paper, noting the very positive development in the field of standardisation and generally supporting the Agency's strategy ("3 pillars");
2. The Board agreed that standardisation is an essential part of the Agency's work and noted that standardisation activities can have a wider beneficial impact than that which is actually foreseen by the Basic Regulation;
3. Members saw a great potential in the Agency's standardisation activities to improve compliance and enhance safety performance;
4. The Board saw a need to continuously improve the standardisation process in order to driving-up the safety standard across Europe. Members saw a need to amend Regulation (EC) 736/2006 in the future;
5. The Board welcomed the idea of establishing a specialised forum to discuss standardisation activities and asked EASA to further consider this;
6. The Board expressed certain reservations regarding the idea of increased product sampling at national level, reminding that a good balance and cooperation would be needed here;
7. The Board noted the issues related to the SAFA standardisation in view of EASA's competence regarding the authorisation of 3rd country operators and the relationship with the EU Blacklist;
8. Members expressed their support to EASA in focusing on cooperation and feedback, as partnership between EASA and NAAs is of core importance.
9. The Board generally supported Agency's strategy to move to the CMA approach and risk-based targeting;
10. The Board noted that EU/EASA should take due care regarding the possible integration of EASA standardisation activities with ICAO's proposed Continuous Monitoring Approach to USOAP, whilst underlining the importance of the Memorandum of Cooperation between the Commission and ICAO in order to avoid a duplication of work;
11. The Board expressed a certain need for care regarding standardisation in new fields of activity, while taking into account the difficulties for NAAs to fully adjust to a new set of common rules, the wide range of standardisation (activity) types e.g. in the field of ATM as well as the level of resources required.



9. Human Resources Strategy

The Head of the Human Resources Department presented his report on HR strategy (WP07), covering inter alia the following elements:

- Global Development of EASA: Currently 552 staff members;
- Distribution of staff by year and category: Positive achievements re internal composition, remarkably stable, rapid but planned growth;
- Age groups: Agency to be prepared for retirement risk/competency gaps;
- Average age: EASA was able to attract qualified experts; also lower level positions are not necessarily filled by juniors;
- Gender distribution: EASA committed to achieve better balance, but the specific labour market for technical experts is unbalanced;
- Nationality Distribution: 27 different nationalities employed at EASA;
- Turnover 2009: average rate of around 5% is very reasonable; for CAs (being cheaper in salary scale) turnover is higher (11%);
- Recruitment: 94 selection procedures, 3317 applications; in 2010 lower recruitment pace;
- Establishment Plan: Total of 91% posts filled;
- Absences: Average sickness days 5,1;
- Worked Hours: Average 10% overtime;
- Main projects: Evaluation of posts, Staff motivation survey, Competency Framework, Advanced Selection Techniques; Technical Traineeship Programme.

The Chair thanked for the information and said that a more strategic discussion should take place at the Board meeting in March 2011. During this discussion, EASA should also provide further details on the main projects, in particular (1) Competency Framework, (2) Staff Motivation and (3) Technical Traineeship Programme. The Chair invited Board Members to raise issue that will be addressed during the strategic discussion in March. The following questions/proposals were listed:

1. Staff competences: Better understanding on educational background and previous fields of employment ("competence breakdown");
2. Succession Planning: In which areas are competences leaving, how can they be replaced?
3. Seconded National Experts: Is there a tendency to employ more/less SNEs? What is favourable, what are blockages in employing SNEs?
4. Age profile: Better understanding of age profile of technical experts;
5. Career development: What are the measures taken/foreseen by EASA on competence building, personal development and flexibility?;
6. Outsourcing: Employment of external people for specific EASA projects?



7. Overtime: In which areas of work (operational, support activities) is overtime generated? What is EASA's approach towards reducing overtime and workload for EASA staff?
8. Resources: Are current resources adequately matching EASA's tasks?;
9. Place of residence: How many staff members live in Cologne/outside?

The Chair thanked the Board for the good range of questions. The Board agreed to come back on HR issues at the March meeting, with a focus on challenges/risks and their possible solutions.

10. AOB

The Commission provided an update regarding their opinion on the Agency's 2011 Work Programme and highlighted the following main aspects:

- Budgetary constraints and the limits on the Agency's Budget for 2011;
- Potential redeployment of EASA staff;
- Rulemaking programme;
- Emphasis in standardisation on the transition to CMA approach; readiness to consider possible developments of Regulation (EC) No 736/2006;
- Outsourcing principles for certification tasks;
- EASA's role regarding accident investigation.

The Chair explained that the Board would have to adopt the Agency's Work Programme 2011 by written procedure before 30 November 2010. Relevant documents for decision-making would be distributed by the MB Secretariat via MB Share-point or email in due course.

Germany introduced the issue of the continuing application of Art. 83bis ICAO Convention in EU Member States. While Art. 83bis foresees the transfer of operational and technical surveillance duties from the State of Registry to the State of Operator via a bilateral agreement, it seems that this provision is contradictory to Regulation (EC) 216/2008 in certain aspects and bilateral agreements might no longer be required in EU Member States. This issue had already been discussed in AGNA. Germany asked how other EU Member States handle this issue and whether EASA could give further advice. Ireland noted the importance of Art. 83bis in ensuring the international acceptance of transfer of responsibility from one State to another. The Chair said that this issue is not within the remit of the Board and recommended that it be put it on the Agenda for the next EASA partnership meeting.

The Chair announced that the next meeting would be held on 14/15 December 2010, with an (informal) strategic session in the afternoon of day 1 and the formal Board meeting on day 2. He closed the session thanking all participants for a fruitful meeting.



ANNEX 1: List of Attendance

Members

	MEMBER	ALTERNATE	EXPERT
AUSTRIA	Karl Prachner		Walter Gessky
BELGIUM		Benoit Van Noten	
BULGARIA		Eleonora Dobрева	
CYPRUS		Andrea Paspilades	
CZECH REPUBLIC	Josef Rada	Vítězslav Hezký	
DENMARK	Kurt Lykstoft Larsen	Per Veinberg	
ESTONIA	Koit Kaskel		
FINLAND	Kim Salonen		
FRANCE	Maxime Coffin		Genevieve Eydaleine
GERMANY		Josef Schiller	
GREECE			Georgios Sourvanos
HUNGARY	Mate Gergely		
ICELAND*	Petur Maack		
IRELAND		Seamus Ryan	Kevin Humphreys Brian Skehan
ITALY	Salvatore Sciacchitano		Carmine Cifaldi
LATVIA			
LIECHTENSTEIN*			
LITHUANIA			
LUXEMBOURG			
MALTA			
NETHERLANDS	Ellen Bien	Jan-Dirk Steenbergen	Pieter Mulder
NORWAY*	Heine Richardson	Oyvind Ek	Tom Egil Herredvela
POLAND		Tomasz Kadziolka	Darius Gluszkiewicz

* Members without voting rights



	MEMBER	ALTERNATE	EXPERT
PORTUGAL		Anacleto Santos	
ROMANIA		Tudorel Roman	
SLOVAK REPUBLIC			
SLOVENIA		Jozef Slana	
SPAIN		José M. Ramírez Ciriza	
SWEDEN	Ingrid Cherfils	Lars Österberg	Magnus Molitor
SWITZERLAND*	Marcel Zuckschwerdt		
UNITED KINGDOM	Michael Smethers (Chair)		Pat Ricketts Susan Hamilton
EUROPEAN COMMISSION	Matthias Ruete	Eckard Seeböhm	Nathalie Vande-Velde

Observers

	MEMBER	ALTERNATE	EXPERT
EASA ADVISORY BOARD¹	Vincent De Vroey		Thomas Loeff Mick Sanders
ALBANIA¹		Genci Resuli	
BOSNIA AND HERZOGOVINA¹			
CROATIA¹			
FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA¹			
MONTENEGRO¹			
SERBIA¹	Nebojsa Starcevic	Goran Jovicic	Dragan Tesla
U.N. MISSION IN KOSOVO¹			

¹ Observers without voting rights.



ANNEX 2: Action List

Action number	Description action	Action holder	Deadline
# 03/MB 03/08	Amend & resubmit the proposed Procedure for the Selection of EASA Directors following submission to the Commission	EASA	Awaiting response from Commission
# 01/MB 01/10	Review of MB RoPs re voting procedures in the light of the recommendations from the IAS audit	EASA/MB	MB 04/2010
# 01/MB 03/10	Progress report on rulemaking in the context of the extension of Community competences	EASA/Commission	MB 04/2010
# 08/MB 02/10	Prepare further options for reducing the budget, for consideration at the next FABS meeting and for inclusion in final Budget 2011	EASA	MB 04/2010
# 09/MB 02/10	Submit paper on EASA certification strategy	EASA	MB 03/2010
# 01/MB 03/10	Progress report on EASAC activities	EASA	Awaiting ENaCT blessing
# 02/MB 03/10	Status report on Fees & Charges Regulation	EASA/Commission	MB 04/2010
# 03/MB 03/10	Provide list of key actors and roles re volcanic ash issue	EASA	After 37 th ICAO General Assembly
# 04/MB 03/10	Review of status of rulemaking activities in the field of airworthiness certification	EASA/MB	MB 04/2010
# 05/MB 03/10	Strategic discussion on EASA HR issues	EASA/MB	MB 01/2011