

Organised by Jean-Marc Cluzeau, former Head of Flight Standards Department,
 former Rulemaking Directorate

Ref. Draft

List of Participants

Attendees	<p>Members</p> <p>Vanya NAUMOVA (DG CAA, Bulgaria)</p> <p>Maja MIHALJEVIC (Civil Aviation Agency, Croatia)</p> <p>Oyvind HALLQUIST (Directorate General for Mobility and Transport, European Commission, EC - DG MOVE)</p> <p>Frantz CHOUT (Direction Generale de l'Aviation Civile, France)</p> <p>Dirk SAJONZ (Luftfahrt-Bundesamt, Germany)</p> <p>Páll S. PÁLSSON (Civil Aviation Administration, Iceland)</p> <p>Marco SILANOS (ENAC, Italy)</p> <p>Leonard BOER (DGCA, Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment, Netherlands)</p> <p>Tom Egil HERREDSVELA (Civil Aviation Authority, Norway)</p> <p>Vicentiu DINU (Civil Aeronautical Authority, Romania)</p> <p>José Luis LOZANO LOZANO (Aviation Safety Agency, Spain)</p> <p>Jonas GAVELIN (Transport Agency, Sweden)</p> <p>Heinz MARTI (Federal Office of Civil Aviation, Switzerland)</p> <p>Cliff WHITTAKER (Civil Aviation Authority, United Kingdom)</p> <p>Observers and Further Participants/Alternates</p> <p>Manuel Antonio GONZALEZ LOPEZ (European Defence Agency, EDA)</p> <p>Helena PIETILÄ (Transport Safety Agency, Finland)</p> <p>Christian KUCHER (Austro Control, Austria)</p> <p>Wiktor ROSIŃSKI (Civil Aviation Authority, Poland)</p> <p>Michael SIEDER (Luftfahrt-Bundesamt, Germany)</p> <p>EASA</p> <p>Matthias BORGMEIER (MBO, EASA)</p> <p>Jean-Marc CLUZEAU (in part) (JMC, EASA) – Chair (outgoing)</p>
-----------	--

	Giulio DE CRESCENZO (GDC, EASA) Daniela DEFOSSAR (DDE, EASA) Marcel KOMPARE (MKO, EASA) Georges REBENDER (GRE, EASA) – Chair Julia SCHOLL (JSC, EASA) – Secretary Willy SIGL (in part) (WSI, EASA) Claudio TREVISAN (CTR, EASA) – Chair
Apologies	Henrik CADUFF (HCA, Office of Economic Affairs Division of Civil Aviation, Liechtenstein)

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introduction
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. EASA gearing up for new challenges — Agency's new structure as of 01 September 2014
4. Agenda item 4:
 - FCL&OPS TAG meeting management handover to the Air Operations and Aircrew&Medical Departments
 - Presentation by EC on the Aircrew Regulation amendment package
 - ECQB status update
5. Adoption of the minutes of the previous meeting and review of actions
6. Progress update on ongoing FCL&OPS rulemaking tasks from the Rulemaking Revised Programme (RMP) 2014-2017
7. Technical issues
8. Review of current action items and planning of future meetings

Related Links/Documents:

MoM Distribution:
FCL&OPS TAG members

MoM prepared by	Julia Scholl	25.09.2014	Signature
MoM reviewed by	Georges Rebender	01.10.2014	Signature



1. Opening and welcome

Presented by: Jean-Marc Cluzeau

The meeting started at 9:30 and the Chair Jean-Marc Cluzeau welcomed the attendees.

2. Adoption of the agenda

Presented by: Jean-Marc Cluzeau

The Chair presented the Agenda which was adopted with the recommended items order.

Conclusion/Action: The Agenda was adopted with the recommended items order.

Action owner: N/A

Due date: 3 September 2014

3. Agenda Item 3

Presented by: Jean-Marc Cluzeau

The Chair Jean-Marc Cluzeau provided a presentation on the reorganisation of the European Aviation Safety Agency ('the Agency') and introduced the new structure (for details, see the presentation 'Agenda Item 3 - EASA gearing up for new challenges').

Several questions were raised by the participants and the Chair replied as follows:

1. There has been no decision yet on whether there will be one or two TAGs for OPS and FCL in the future. Both options will be considered as there are pros and cons in either case.
2. Continuing airworthiness is within FS.
3. With regard to the change of CA coordinators for STD purposes in the future, the following clarification was provided on Regulation (EU) No 628/2013: one National Standardisation Coordinator is mandatory as a single point of contact for each Authority; one or more Sectorial Focal Points (SFPs) can be appointed to closely coordinate on technical matters.
4. In the future, the new name Aircrew should be used for standardisation inspections instead of FCL.

Conclusion/Action: The new structure of the Agency will provide for facilitation of technical and interface issues.

Action owner: N/A

Due date: N/A

4. Agenda Item 4

Presented by:

4.1	Jean-Marc Cluzeau, Georges Rebender, Claudio Trevisan
4.2	Oyvind Hallquist
4.3	Willy Sigl

— FCL&OPS TAG meeting management handover to the Air Operations and Aircrew&Medical Departments

The [outgoing](#) Chair Jean-Marc Cluzeau handed over to the new Co-Chairs Georges Rebender and Claudio Trevisan. The Co-Chairs introduced themselves and it was decided that Georges Rebender would take over the role of the Chair during this meeting.

— Presentation by EC on the Aircrew Regulation amendment package

Oyvind Hallquist (EC) explained the status of the upcoming amendment package for Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 after the discussions at the EASA Committee in July. The outcome of the discussions as



well as the written comments received after the meeting had now been reviewed by the EC and EASA and the legal text was in the final stages of Commission Interservice Consultation. The main changes since the July EASA Committee were explained. These mainly cover transition arrangements for small ATOs and provisions for LAPL, SPL and BPL licences. In addition, the amendment covers some changes stemming from derogation requests, text errors, the GA-initiative and new ICAO provisions for Upset Prevention Recovery Training (UPRT) and age limitation for pilots involved in commercial air transport. Finally, the EC will propose to change the requirement for third-country licences for pilots involved in non-commercial operations by extending the date of applicability by one year, to 8 April 2016 due to a foreseen delay in the BASA with the US. The final text will be presented for vote at the October EASA Committee. AT pointed out the challenges presented to MS in communicating the proposed changes as well as the changes foreseen by the EASA GA-initiative to stakeholders. The EC explained that the Information Note on ATOs which was issued to MS on 18 July 2014 following requests at the EASA Committee in July will be updated. In addition, EASA is preparing a Concept Paper, also requested, which will explain in broad terms the changes to the Aircrew Regulation foreseen by the GA Task Force.

— European Central Question Bank (ECQB) status update

ECQB project manager Willy Sigl made a presentation on the ECQB (see presentation 'Agenda Item 4 - ECQB status update').

1. Finland expressed the wish to attend an ECQB training course before reviewing the questions. Willy Sigl explained that tools and procedures will be ready by the end of 2014. An online training course (including training for Technical Reviewers/Validators) should be available in the 2nd half of October 2014, therefore, the review can start in November. WSI added that currently there are 10 000 existing questions in the question data bank and that the review will start with 2 000 questions which have been already amended by CAA UK.
2. Finland asked [how the questions are submitted to NAAs](#). Willy Sigl replied that [they will be distributed via the IT tool and that](#) CAs are responsible for providing questions to ATOs; however, in the future, EASA may offer this service, if requested. ECQB focal points will be informed about new releases of the ECQB by e-mail making the package available from a file box, the file will be password-protected and have MDB format as it was in the past (L-plus platform). An annual update cycle is planned with a release in November of each year, with advance information on changes in case translation is needed.
3. Germany asked whether the presentation would be made available. The project manager answered in the affirmative and informed the attendees that official communication with CAs is foreseen for the 2nd half of September 2014.

Conclusion/Action: TAG members were provided an update on the Aircrew Regulation amendment package and ECQB.

Action owner: N/A

Due date: N/A

5. Adoption of the minutes of previous meeting and review of actions

Presented by: Georges Rebender; Daniela Defossar; Matthias Borgmeier

There were no questions or comments on the minutes of the previous meeting, therefore, the Chair proceeded to the review of actions:

- 2012-01-04 (open). Since MS did not submit any relevant proposals, DDE suggested that this action point should be closed pending a review of the set-up of TAG and STD meetings, etc. GRE stated that the role of STD and TAG meetings should be reconsidered, e.g. STD meetings could focus on implementation issues and TAG meetings - on horizontal implementing issues. Germany mentioned



[Department: Air Operations Department] [Meeting: FCL&OPS Thematic Advisory Group (TAG) Meeting 2/2014]
[Date: 3 September 2014]

TE.GEN.00404-003 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved. ISO9001 Certified.

Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

that there is still an FCL partnership group and MBO explained that this is the TAG-SSCC FCL group that will be most probably renamed (an update will be provided during the next meeting that will take place in December 2014). Germany considers it very useful based on the positive feedback from FCL colleagues and suggests setting up such a group for OPS since it gives time to discuss technical issues in more depth. GRE replied that this suggestion will be considered.

Action closed.

- 2012-01-06 (open). The following issues were addressed:
 - SM.3 are in the lead regarding the ICAO compliance checklists for Annex 1, related documents are available in SINAPSE.
 - Annex 1 was uploaded in June, many comments were received and are being processed. Part MED was added and an update will be uploaded in the next days.
 - Annex 18 was uploaded some time ago, no comments received yet.
 - Annex 6 should be uploaded within the next two weeks, the Agency would welcome comments.
 - Work on Annex 6 as regards the non-commercial SARPS has started.
 - Germany requested that documents be also distributed by e-mail, as access to SINAPSE/CIRCA is cumbersome and as it is important to receive the lists as soon as possible on a working basis. DDE responded that compliance tables are managed under an agreed process between EASA International cooperation and NCMCs from MS, who have access to SINAPSE. State Letters are coordinated by EC and SM.3, it might be possible to make the process more efficient. GRE suggested including it as an action point.
 - Germany emphasised that when a SL requires RM action, States depend on the RM process, which may take more time than the ICAO deadline and asked what can be done to improve it. GRE replied that MS are also part of the ICAO consultation process, the loop needs to be closed and ICAO should be requested to set more reasonable deadlines. This is a strategic issue that might have to be discussed in the RAG meeting.
 - Croatia made a suggestion regarding how to handle different ICAO/EASA applicability dates: a difference is filed to bridge the dates of application which could also be coordinated by EASA.
 - Germany would like to avoid filing differences due to a delay in the applicability date (EASA), especially if there is no difference in the technical requirement but only in the implementation date. This also has shortcomings, e.g. overflying Russia. MBO replied that the Agency would recommend filing a difference for the current changes in the SARPS regarding age limitation and upset recovery training (UPRT), as ICAO made changes to Annex 1 which the Agency follows as close as possible, e.g. on loss of control. However, according to experts, it does not make sense to introduce the UPRT requirements without AMC. Therefore, a rule change should be introduced immediately as a political signal to the outside world (as agreed with the EC) with a 3 years opt-out to have time to develop AMC/GM. DDE added that the ICAO Secretariat is often not transparent in its working methods: once a SL type I closes, ICAO assesses the comments and makes changes. Experts from MS or EASA are often not involved and might see the final product only when it comes to the Panel for adoption. Sometimes further changes are made before ANC adoption of which experts are also not informed. On Secretariat documents, there is sometimes no visibility at all. This has been raised several times with ICAO. More transparency on the side of ICAO is needed so that the EASA RM activity can be better aligned with the ICAO process. Furthermore, better coordination with the EU MS is to be achieved, e.g. EASA schedules preparation meetings before the ICAO OPS or DG Panel, and would welcome broader attendance and input/feedback. Another issue is that EASA is criticised for too much



rulemaking. Consequently, rulemaking tasks have been postponed, among them a number of ICAO-alignment tasks. In comparison with the Agency, ICAO does not have to provide detailed impact assessments. However, EASA has suggested to ICAO in the past that it should do some high-level RIA on issues like FDR. Furthermore, there are amendments on contentious issues such as EDTO which cannot be pushed through a fast-track process. If not properly consulted, discussions will take place in the EASA Committee which should be avoided as it is a political rather than a technical group. Finally, ICAO is limiting the amendments to Annex 6 to a 2-year cycle, and the Agency pointed out the need for more generous implementation dates. However, ICAO intends to put pressure on States, as an implementation date of 3-5 years could mean postponing action until close to the deadline. Annex 18 is less of an issue as the Agency works through direct references to the ICAO documents. However, coordination meetings are needed to bring the EU views to the ICAO DG panel. GRE emphasised that this is clearly a strategic issue which has to be discussed internally and in the RAG meetings to improve the situation. OHA replied that EC is aware of this issue and is looking for ways to improve it, but it requires active contribution and participation of MS. Germany remarked that direct reference to ICAO documents may be tricky. Regarding coordination of work, it is understandable that some ICAO panel members from MS hesitate when coordinating with EASA beforehand as they work for the State and not for EASA.

- Finland asked when UPRT rule and AMC would be ready. MBO explained that there is mainly one sentence (e.g. “training on UPRT has to be included in CPL training”) so far included. However, it will only be applicable in 2018 so that a “normal” rulemaking package will deliver the rule and AMC by that deadline.
- Sweden supported DDE on the lack of visibility in ICAO rule drafting. A member of ICAO Panel is bound by the Panel directives, some guidance from the EC/EASA might be beneficial to ensure harmonisation of the EU’s position. GRE requested whether there is a unified position on SLs announcing the final ICAO proposed amendment. Sweden responded that for ICAO type 1 SL the EU comments are already based on a recommendation from the EC prepared by EASA. GRE summarised that it is necessary to work on this since facing ICAO implementation dates that cannot be met is an issue for all MS. Sweden thanked for the recommendations received on the SLs related to Amendment to Annex 6.
- The Netherlands asked how it could access ICAO documents in SINAPSE. DDE replied that all MS NCMCs have access to these documents.

Action item remains open.

- Action 2014-01-05 (open). DDE informed the attendees that the questions were mainly related to ORO.FC, the answers have been compiled and will be circulated to all TAG members after the meeting. Any further question is welcome.
Action closed.
- Action 2014-01-06 (open). DDE explained that the nominations for experts were received and the list is being created. TAG members will soon be informed of further steps.
 - Sweden requested an update of the focal points’ list. DDE emphasised that regarding 2 actions in question (1 for MS to nominate experts, 1 to update the focal points’ list) the focus was on the “panel of experts”. However, a network of FTL focal points might also be created and a meeting is scheduled end of November to discuss implementation issues. Sweden replied that



the financing issue might need further discussion. DDE explained that meetings might be organised through WebEx to avoid additional costs. An agreement on provisional dates should be reached; if derogations are received, a WebEx meeting could take place. CTR provided an explanation on WebEx highlighting very positive feedback from NSCs in terms of cost-efficiency.

- Italy requested clarification regarding the cost for the pool of experts. DDE replied that reimbursement is not yet decided on, but EASA will not charge the applicant as it is covered by the subsidy and not by F&C, (similar to Article 14 flexibility provision). However, Authorities might have expectations for reimbursement.

Issue pending.

Conclusion/Action: The Group adopted the minutes of the FCL&OPS TAG meeting 1-2014.

Action owner: N/A

Due date: N/A

6. Progress update on ongoing FCL&OPS rulemaking tasks from the Rulemaking Revised Programme (RMP) 2014-2017

Presented by: Matthias Borgmeier; Daniela Defossar; Georges Rebender

MBO and DDE provided a presentation related to progress on ongoing FCL&OPS rulemaking tasks (for details, see the presentation 'Agenda Item 6 - Progress update to FCL & OPS TAG 2-2014').

DDE informed the participants that in the future implementation support would focus also on NCO/NCCC/SPO, so if a national/regional workshop is needed, MS should inform the Agency.

GDC stated that the task force on inspectors and examiners qualification has prepared a proposal for the inspectors qualification criteria to amend AMC to ARA.

The following questions were raised by the participants and replied to:

1. Austria: how often are the updates to the examiners' difference document published? MBO replied that it is not fixed, usually an update is issued every 3-4 months (unless in exceptional cases). GRE explained that the intention is to have a stable document, therefore, it should not change every two weeks.
2. France: which category of inspectors is concerned? GDC replied that this is only valid for flight inspectors.
3. GRE on BASA: it is important to know who is responsible for which part. MBO gave an example by stating that first of all it has to be an IR rating on the FAA licence, then it is a conversion process of this IR (e.g. person holding a UK PPL), and then an IR could be endorsed also on the EU side. EASA Technical Training is developing online courses on the IPL and on the related special conditions for the persons involved in conversion/validation in MS. They should be available by the end of 2014. Action on EASA to verify the date and inform MS.

A post-meeting note: timelines for the training courses related to the new Licensing Annex

- On FSTD: The training courses should start in early 2015. At the same time the official adoption process should be ongoing. The BOB decision is expected to be on the agenda by April 2015.
- On FCL: The training courses are likely to commence in April 2015. It is always difficult to predict the exact timeline but this estimation is rather realistic.

More precise dates might be provided after coordination with the FAA. The FAA has recently received the analysis of their LS on the draft Annex 3 which has to be reviewed by their Legal Department first.



[Department: Air Operations Department] [Meeting: FCL&OPS Thematic Advisory Group (TAG) Meeting 2/2014]
[Date: 3 September 2014]

TE.GEN.00404-003 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved. ISO9001 Certified.

Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Page 7 of 14

Conclusion/Action:	Verify the date of online courses on the IPL and inform MS.
Action owner:	Matthias Borgmeier
Due date:	31 December 2014

7. Technical issues

1. Sweden mentioned the interface between SERA and NCO. SERA foresees VFR flights at night if allowed by the MS, with conditions attached. Night VFR on top of clouds (which is now forbidden in Sweden) will become possible. Sweden asked the participants if they are ready to share their risk assessment. UK suggested that if more restrictive rules are to be kept at the national level, the MS should apply for an Art. 14(1). DDE explained that SERA states “when so prescribed by the CA”, so in principle Sweden might forbid it. The ANS SERA colleagues have to be consulted. Germany informed the attendees that night VFR on top are permitted and offered to provide more information on the German position. Italy stated that the key element is interface issues OPS/ANS and VFR is just an example. SE asked to put the issue forward in writing so that it can be discussed with ATM colleagues.
2. Sweden requested if EASA could introduce the paper related to focussed consultation on in-flight security and OPS rules. DDE explained that, when transposing EU-OPS, EC asked EASA not to transpose anything except reinforced cockpit door, as all the rest should have been dealt with by Regulation 300/2008. However, this did not happen. Therefore, the lack of legal basis for CAs to require/take enforcement. This issue was discussed twice at the EASA Committee and at the last meeting it was agreed that EASA would propose a solution via fast-track consultation, hence the focussed consultation. EASA considers that on some topics AMC is enough except for the search procedure checklist and reporting acts of unlawful interference which require an IR amendment and will be dealt with through an ongoing RMT. ED Decision is foreseen before the end of October to amend ORO AMC/GM. Sweden mentioned ORO.SEC.100 and CCTV. DDE replied that the question was discussed at the EASA Committee which decided that CCTV and alternative procedures are acceptable. EASA had been tasked to work on these alternative procedures. GRE added that after 9/11 a fully clear position had not been reached, therefore, CCTVs is clearly the best solution. However, this is a security risk. Does it mean introducing safety risks (pilot having to leave the seat to check the area outside) to mitigate a security risk? Switzerland supposed that it is more a matter of money. They forced all operators to install CCTV and this was expensive, but now the regulator proposed alternative means. Does it mean they acted too fast? Italy confirmed that it also applied to them: an alternative procedure was accepted only for a very limited period of time, such as short-term wet lease. DDE stated that today SAFA has a PDF on CCTV which accepts other ways than CCTV, whereas the initial position of the Air Safety Committee (ASC) was that CCTV is the preferred method, and if an STC or a modification is available, every operator should fit the CCTV. However, this was never enforced by all Authorities, and even new aircraft were bought by some operators deselecting the CCTV factory option. In Germany both options seem to be possible (to be checked) but Germany agreed that CCTV is the best option.
3. Italy has Search and Rescue regulations which address events not related to Annex 12 (mountain accidents, especially hostile area, etc.). Should HEMS requirements be applied, e.g. for performance requirements? Commission Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 seems not to address this issue. Italy regards SAR as a segment of the HEMS activity and even a level playing field issue. DDE responded that SAR could be split in different phases and search could be considered as aerial work and rescue as CAT or HEMS. However, for the time being SAR is outside the EASA mandate. Italy said that BR 1(2)a excludes SAR, however, they understand that the SAR meant there is the one under ICAO Annex 12; in Italy (and



probably elsewhere) there are other types of SAR which are delegated to private entities under public contracts, it would appear inconsistent to consider HEMS in isolation from the SAR component of a HEMS mission. Search might indeed be part of SPO, but Rescue implies the possibility to recover the victim and bring him/her to the hospital (hence HEMS). DDE explained that the SAR in BR 1(2) is all types of SAR, not only Annex 12. Some States even designate HEMS as a State activity, which is therefore under national rules. Germany suggested a wider discussion on BR Art 1(2), e.g. why police aircraft should not be maintained to the same Part-145 standard? This issue has to be discussed in the context of the BR revision (ongoing A-NPA). GRE invited Italy to produce a paper on the matter for further discussion.

4. Island asked: FTL exclude air taxi for the time being, what about operators conducting CAT and air taxi at the same time? Should there be two sets of rules? DDE replied that legally two sets of rules apply, Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 for CAT operations and Subpart Q for air taxi or national rules for all other operations.

Conclusion/Action: Produce a paper on the interface between SERA and NCO related to VFR flights at night.

Action owner: Sweden

Due date: TBD

Conclusion/Action: Draft a paper on the Search and Rescue issue for further discussion.

Action owner: Italy

Due date: TBD

8. Review of current action items and planning of future meetings

GRE suggested a brainstorming on the future of FCL&OPS TAG:

1. In March the Agency held a first joint industry/CA OPS workshop (1 day) followed by CA STD meeting (one day) to discuss both implementation issues and the results of the previous day' workshop. The feedback was very positive.
2. Should the joint OPS/FCL TAG be kept or should it be split in OPS TAG and FCL TAG?
3. Should we have a joint TAG/Sub-SSCC? GRE reminded attendees to bear in mind the budget restrictions.

The participants expressed the following ideas:

- For OPS, it is useful to have more targeted meetings with MS on specific issues (e.g. meeting with helicopter inspectors (joint R/S), the cabin safety workshop, etc.) rather than large meetings of a general nature. At the same time, it is important to also have wider inputs from MS on overarching policy issues (e.g. prioritisation of the RMP, ICAO matters, etc.).
- The next meeting of the FCL implementation forum takes place 23-24.09.14 in Paris, documents are on SINAPSE, EASA is invited to take part in these meetings. The agenda for the next meeting is better harmonisation with other official EASA bodies like TAG.
- Experience made with the GA roadmap group – good to exchange ideas. More specific technical groups, they could facilitate faster decisions.
- Not too many groups, then you lose global overview, rather work with small groups of experts. OPS and ACW cannot be divided, they belong together, but a line could be drawn not between OPS/ACW but rather between complex/non-complex or other splits.



- When talking about technical issues, it is difficult to have the right expertise in the room, but the opportunity to discuss high-level/general issues is also appreciated. A common tool to share questions and answers, discussion platforms etc. to tackle technical implementation problems.
- EASA could set discussion fora where you can ask questions and provide answers. However, setting up an online forum is also a time-consuming issue requiring extra resources.
- Need to have clear roles on who can answer and on the “validity” of the answer (binding/non-binding: if the group agrees on a given interpretation but no power to enforce it, then it can be the standard EASA answer but still individual MS or undertakings are entitled to deviate).
- Possibility for MS to get together with other MS (mutual assistance – exchange of best practices).
- SINAPSE was also intended to be a platform for MS to discuss issues and exchange views, maybe it is not used enough or it is not the right platform.
- Avoid creating subgroups, the TAG meeting is appreciated as it provides a clear picture of the situation for RM and the STD meetings and implementation. Something in the middle might be needed, to collect information and feedback from other Authorities. When I ask a question on SINAPSE, it is like admitting my incompetence – psychological “barrier”.
- Need for a discussion forum for OPS similar to the FCL TAG-Sub-SSCC meeting, e.g. until the end of the opt-outs.
- Building partnerships with the industry.
- Avoid to create too many groups, often the same persons attend OPS and FCL meetings, try to have meetings close to each other.

GRE encouraged the participants to use SINAPSE as it is a confidential forum and the information available there would not be misused.

Conclusion/Action:	Date of next meeting will be coordinated internally and the information will be passed to TAG members.
Action owner:	Georges Rebender
Due date:	TBD

9. Closing

Presented by: Georges Rebender

The Chair thanked the TAG members for their participation and valuable contribution to the discussion. The meeting closed at 16:15 p.m. on 3 September 2014.

Next meeting:

The date of the next meeting will be coordinated internally and the information will be passed on to TAG members.



Action table					
Action	What	Who	When	Status	Comments
2012-01-01	Update on Circa's AGNA website access	Agency	Prior to Next Meeting	C	<p>The Agency is currently deciding on the IT platform to use (main candidates are CIRCA and YAMMER). A working group composed by some RAG and some SSCC members will be testing the new platform before it will be officially implemented.</p> <p>Oct. 2013 status: on-going, still open.</p> <p>April 2014 status: closed.</p>
2012-01-04	Operations specialists to consider whether an Operations Partnership Group should be formed	Member States	Prior to Next Meeting	C	<p>MS should send to EASA possible topics to be discussed at an OPS meeting.</p> <p>Oct. 2013 status: awaiting MS and Industry feedback.</p> <p>Next Standardization meeting planned for 04 Dec.2013</p> <p>Thematic workshops: assessment of SMSs</p> <p>Conclusion: on-going, still open</p> <p>September 2014 status: closed.</p>
2012-01-06	Prepare List of Status of compliance with ICAO SARPS	Agency	t.b.d.	C	<p>EASA is currently working with European National Continuous Monitoring Coordinators to establish guidance material on how to complete ICAO Compliance Checklists.</p> <p>The task has been made difficult because ICAO guidance on what constitutes a difference is lacking and there are differences of opinion.</p> <p>Anyway, we have fairly clear guidance for the Compliance Checklists and a few EASA Departments will be completing these over the</p>



Action table					
Action	What	Who	When	Status	Comments
					<p>coming months. Once completed, MSs NCMCs will be consulted.</p> <p>Oct. 2013 status: ICAO to provide a definition on what constitutes a difference.</p> <p>A SL in July, feedback provided. Process led by ICAO too long for EASA.</p> <p>At the EASA level: policy should be ready by Oct.2014</p> <p>Conclusion: on-going.</p> <p>September 2014 status: ongoing. Document (FCL+MED) to be ready around June 2014, one of the priorities.</p> <p>OPS: Tables to be consulted with MS around mid of 2014 (for CAT)</p>
2013-02-01	Agency to share the GA Paper with TAG for feedback.	Agency	tbd	C	<p>Closed.</p> <p>April 2014 status: closed.</p>
2013-02-02	FCL & OPS TAG to provide comments to the GA Paper by 15 November	Member States	15 November 2013	C	<p>Closed.</p> <p>April 2014 status: closed.</p>
2014-01-01	Agency to clarify the extended opt-out period provided by new Regulation (EU) No 245/2014 in its article 1(3) referring to Article 12(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 and replacing Article 12(4), by allowing Member States to decide not to apply the provisions of the regulation to pilots holding a licence and associated medical certificate issued by a third country involved in the non- commercial operation of aircraft until 8 April 2015.	Agency	As follow-up action to the TAG meeting of 03 April 2014	C	<p>Closed.</p> <p>Agency's response (as shared by e-mail on 08 April 2014):</p> <p>The Agency further reviewed the issue and would like to confirm that Member States wishing to extend their opt-out to take advantage of the new date have to notify this to the Commission and the Agency. Taking into account that the date in 12(4) is a maximum – meaning that MS may choose to end their opt-out before that date – in the absence of a new notification their first notification would still be valid, meaning, ending</p>



Action table					
Action	What	Who	When	Status	Comments
					on the date indicated therein. Please take into account that the new notification still needs to comply with 12(7) which means that the related timing has to be indicated.
2014-01-02	Agency to inform MS on the upcoming ATO and joint TAG –SSCC events organised by the Flight Standards Department and planned to take place in May, respectively June	Agency	In due time, prior to the ATO meeting	C	Closed. Invitation shared via email on 08 April 2014.
2014-01-03	MS to send feedback on the Working Paper on FTL, (distributed per e-mail prior to the TAG Meeting of 03 April 2014)	Member States	Deadline: 17 April 2014	C	Closed. Deadline expired.
2014-01-04	MS to send proposals to the Agency of possible means to contribute and support the scientific study on FTL	Member States	Deadline: 02 May 2014	C	Closed. Deadline expired.
2014-01-05	Agency to reply in written to the questions submitted by FR prior to the meeting	Agency	As follow-up action to the TAG meeting of 03 April 2014	C	Closed. Two questions already replied. The response for the FC issues still require further in-house coordination. To be addressed during May 2014.
2014-01-06	Agency to share the existing list of FTL experts with the MS and MS to notify in case there are any changes	Agency and Member States	Prior to the next meeting	C	Closed. The Agency shared the existing list of experts via email on 08 April 2014. Some feedback from the MS was already received.
2014-02-01	Agency to discuss with EC and SM.3 more efficient ways to coordinate State Letters.	Agency	In due time	O	Open.
2014-02-02	Verify the date of online courses on the IPL and inform MS.	Agency	End 2014	C	Closed. The Agency included a post-



[Department: Air Operations Department] [Meeting: FCL&OPS Thematic Advisory Group (TAG) Meeting 2/2014]
[Date: 3 September 2014]

TE.GEN.00404-003 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved. ISO9001 Certified.

Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Action table					
Action	What	Who	When	Status	Comments
					meeting note related to the courses on the IPL in the minutes of meeting .
2014-02-03	Produce a paper on the interface between SERA and NCO related to VFR flights at night.	Sweden	TBD	O	Closed
2014-02-04	Draft a paper on the Search and Rescue issue for further discussion.	Italy	TBD	O	Closed

