

Annex II to ED Decision 2022/014/R**'AMC & GM to Annex IV (Part-CAT) to Commission Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 —
Issue 2, Amendment 22'**

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

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

Note to the reader

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

The Annex to Decision 2014/015/R of 24 April 2014 of the Executive Director of the Agency is amended as follows:

GM1 CAT.OP.MPA.101(b) Altimeter check and settings

ALTIMETER SETTING PROCEDURES

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

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

AMC5 CAT.OP.MPA.110 Aerodrome operating minima

DETERMINATION OF RVR OR VIS FOR INSTRUMENT APPROACH OPERATIONS — AEROPLANES

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

Table 10

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

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

	Final approach track offset > 15° for Category A and B aeroplanes or Final approach track offset > 5° for Category C and D aeroplanes		
	without RTZL and RCLL but using HUDLS or equivalent system; autopilot or flight director to the DH and Final approach track offset > 15° for Category A and B aeroplanes or Final approach track offset > 5° for Category C and D aeroplanes	800 m	1 000 m
2D operations	Final approach track offset ≤15° for category A and B aeroplanes or ≤5° for Category C and D aeroplanes	750 m	800 m
	Final approach track offset > 15° for Category A and B aeroplanes	1 000 m	1 000 m
	Final approach track offset > 5° for Category C and D aeroplanes	1 200 m	1 200 m

(...)

AMC11 CAT.OP.MPA.110 Aerodrome operating minima

EFFECT ON LANDING MINIMA OF TEMPORARILY FAILED OR DOWNGRADED GROUND EQUIPMENT

[...]

(b) Conditions applicable to Table 17:

- (1) multiple failures of runway/FATO lights other than those indicated in Table 17 should not be acceptable;
- (2) deficiencies failures of approach and runway/FATO lights are acceptable at the same time, and the most demanding consequence should be applied; and
- (3) failures other than ILS, GLS, MLS affect the RVR only and not the DH.

[...]

AMC1 CAT.OP.MPA.115(a) Approach flight technique — aeroplanes

STABILISED APPROACH OPERATIONS — AEROPLANES

[...]

(g) The operator should specify the following in the operations manual:

- (1) the acceptable tolerances referred to in (d);
- (2) the means to identify the predetermined points referred to in (a) and (b). This should normally be the FAF.

(h) When the operator requests approval for an alternative to the stabilised approach criteria for a particular approach to a particular runway, the operator should demonstrate that the proposed alternative will ensure that an acceptable level of safety is achieved.

AMC1 CAT.OP.MPA.140(d) Maximum distance from an adequate aerodrome for two-engined aeroplanes without an ETOPS approval

[...]

(h) Dispatch/flight planning rules

[...]

- (4) ERA aerodrome(s): the operator should ensure that ERA aerodromes are available for the intended route, within the distance flown in 180 minutes based upon the OEI cruising speed, which is a speed within the certified limits of the aeroplane, selected by the operator and approved by the competent authority, confirming that, based on the available meteorological information, the weather conditions at ERA aerodromes are at or above the applicable minima for the applicable period of time, in accordance with CAT.OP.MPA.182~~5~~.

[...]

AMC9 CAT.OP.MPA.182 Fuel/energy scheme — aerodrome selection policy — aeroplanes

BASIC FUEL SCHEME WITH VARIATIONS — PLANNING MINIMA

- (a) Variations to the basic fuel schemes in the selection of aerodromes in regard to the planning minima are methods to reduce the meteorological margins based on the established mitigating measures.
- (b) As a minimum, the operator should:
- (1) use a suitable computerised flight-planning system;
 - (2) hold an approval for ~~limited~~ low-visibility approach operations for that fleet; and
 - (3) have established an operational control system that includes flight monitoring.

[...]

AMC2 CAT.OP.MPA.312(a)(2) EFVS 200 operations

VERIFICATION OF THE SUITABILITY OF RUNWAYS FOR EFVS 200 OPERATIONS

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

- (a) Check whether the runway has been promulgated as suitable for EFVS operations or is certified as a precision approach runway category II or III by the State of the aerodrome. If this is so, then check whether and where ~~the approach and runway lights installed (notably incandescent or LED lights) are adequate for the EFVS equipment~~ ~~LED lights are installed in order to assess the impact on the EFVS equipment~~ used by the operator.

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

¹ https://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/orders_notices/index.cfm/go/document.information/documentID/1038173