



**EASA MB 01/2012**  
**13 March 2012**  
Minutes of EASA MB Special Meeting  
13/14 December 2011

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING**  
**OF THE**  
**EASA MANAGEMENT BOARD**  
**HELD ON**  
**13 AND 14 DECEMBER 2011**



**DAY 1: 13 DECEMBER 2011**

**0. List of Attendees** (Please see ANNEX 1)

- The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed all participants.
- The Chair welcomed the new member of the Portuguese Delegation.

**1. Adoption of the Agenda**

- The Agenda was adopted as presented.
- Finland anticipated that it would raise a question under AOB with regard to the implementation of EU regulations related to the 1<sup>st</sup> remit extension by Member States (MS).

**2. Comments from the Chair**

- The Chair explained that if necessary the discussions on the EASA Accommodation Strategy will be continued on Day 2 to allow for a more in-depth discussions.

**3. EASA Medium Term Strategy**

(Presented by the European Commission (EC))

- EC presented WP02, the report of a group consisting of Commission, Agency and Management Board representatives and chaired by the Director General of DG MOVE, which had considered follow-up to the Board 's discussion at MB 04/2010. The report recommended that the Agency undertake specific work in six key areas, identifying in each area the target to be achieved and what steps should be taken, and reporting progress to the Board on a regular basis.
- The Chair reminded the Board that its original discussion, and the subsequent work of the Commission-led group, had been driven by three interlinked factors: the likely resource constraints facing the Agency in the next few years; the move towards more evidence-based, risk-related regulation; and the need to view the aviation safety regime in Europe as a system involving many players with the Agency at its heart. It was noted that the 6 identified areas for further work did not constitute an exhaustive list but rather a list of critical elements to be focused on in the weeks/months to come.
- France fully supported the paper and agreed on the six lines of action. They also pointed out that the efficiency aspects did not appear to be sufficiently reflected in any of the 6 actions. Furthermore it was suggested that there is a need to improve and simplify the regulations in particular with regard to General Aviation (GA). It also mentioned the importance of Point 3 (CMA) of the Report and the need to avoid heavier burden, duplication and unnecessary work as a consequence.



- Spain underlined the importance of the link between a risk-based approach and the optimised use of resources, thereby allowing for a move beyond pure compliance through an enhanced cooperation between all actors of the system and the establishment of a network of safety information. They also mentioned the relevance of standards and the sharing of experiences. Finally, with reference to the Commission's opinion on the 2012 Work Programme, it reiterated the need to reduce the complexity of the system, notably with regards to the Certification Strategy and consideration for General Aviation.
- EAB considered the report a good overview and shared France's comments.
- UK warmly welcomed the report and also endorsed the need for specific attention to be given to the efficiency aspects regarding resources. They also expressed their concerns regarding GA and the need for a specific discussion in this regard.
- The Netherlands fully supported the report indicating the joint responsibility of all parties involved and the leading role of EASA. It also emphasised the need to focus on efficiency gains through best use of available resources.
- Norway welcomed the work done in the report and considered a risk-based approach necessary, in particular with regard to GA. They also pointed out the importance of cooperation among all actors together with the reinforcement of the standardisation, harmonisation and efficiency within the system. They reiterated the necessity of involving the Non-EU EASA members and the partnership of the different actors taking into consideration their respective functions and procedures.
- Germany considered it as a good report. They specified that the system should not be too complex but recognised that this may not be easily achieved, and would necessitate reflection on the appropriate level of safety oversight, as well as clarification on the shared responsibilities between EASA, NAAs and the private sector. Furthermore it noted that not only GA but also commercial transport should be subject of a specific discussion. It added that the Continuous Monitoring Approach (CMA) should not focus on specific issues.
- Belgium considered the CMA as a very important tool to avoid duplication between ICAO and EASA. It also indicated that standardisation should focus on best practices and be based in the partnerships between EASA-MS and MS-MS following a more integrated approach, and in this respect it queried how this could be facilitated.
- Cyprus also deemed the report as a good paper and pointed out the need for more flexibility in the system in striking the right balance between regulations and a risk-based approach.
- The Executive Director called attention to the fact that when doing this exercise we should focus on the system and not only on EASA. The efficiency of the system is what is at stake i.e. what needs to be resolved. Some changes will be made in the organisation of the Agency to improve efficiency. He added that it was too early to nominate focal points and that a 3 months period is a too short period of time to



achieve improvement in efficiency. He also mentioned that the Board should not request too much work from the focal points.

- The Chair acknowledged the Executive Director's views but considered an early progress report on implementation of the Rulemaking Review and on ATM rulemaking would fit into the normal course of Board business, accepting that it would be too soon to demonstrate concrete efficiency improvements.
- Norway insisted on the need to ensure the efficiency of the system with all parties involved.
- France also emphasized the need for the efficiency of the system with all parties involved and that EC-EASA are better placed to identify the relevant issues.
- Ireland pointed out the central importance of the effectiveness of the system and EASA, drawing a distinction between efficiency and effectiveness
- The Chair summarised the discussion as follows:
  - a) The Board welcomed the Commission's paper and endorsed its conclusions built round six priority areas of work;
  - b) whilst the Agency would continue to work in many areas in addition to these six areas, identifying priorities would assist the Board in its ongoing oversight of the Agency. Overall good progress would be ensured if these six areas go well;
  - c) Several Board Members had commented that whilst strengthening EASA's internal efficiency had not been cited as one of the six priority areas, it was an essential factor in all of them;
  - d) Progress reports to the Board should always include sections on the implications for resources and how the Agency was ensuring efficient and effective working; how the work was furthering a more risk-based approach to regulation; and the impact on - and contribution of - the EASA system as a whole;
  - e) The Executive Director would nominate Agency focal points for each of the six areas as soon as possible, and inform the Board accordingly. MB members were invited to participate as MB representatives in the various groups;
  - f) Where appropriate, work in these priority areas would be followed by existing groups (eg ENaCT, FABS, EASAC or the Rulemaking Review Group). For other areas - ATM rulemaking, standardisation and international work - Board Members were invited to volunteer to be associated and take a special interest;
  - g) The Board had identified a seventh area of work requiring special attention, the regulatory burden on the smaller end of General Aviation. This raised some wide questions concerning the role of the regulator. The Agency would produce a discussion paper for MB 01/2012, setting out the present situation,



the state of play on current initiatives in this area, and questions for the Board to debate; and

h) In line with the recommendations in the paper, the Board would receive reports at MB 01/2012 on implementation of the Rulemaking Review and on ATM rulemaking.

#### **4. EASA Communications Strategy**

(Presented by the Head of the Communications Section, Dominique Fouda )

- Dominique Fouda presented the communications strategy of the Agency by highlighting the following aspects:
  - a) A 3-axis strategy is needed: internal communication, interaction with external parties and a crisis response. The strategy will be developed in a 4-year strategy communication plan;
  - b) There should be a proactive and reactive approach and suit the audience with a consistent and strategic targeting: communication is not equal to information;
  - c) Clear, accessible and coherent messages must be delivered to raise awareness and protect reputation;
  - d) The Agency has set up an Aviation Safety Portal as a communication network between EASA and NAAs;
  - e) A crisis response coordination including training and crisis exercise should be part of the communication strategy;
  - f) Challenges: To speak with one voice, communicate complexity in simple terms and ensure consistent messages across Europe and among all aviation safety players.
- EC indicated the need to consider jointly how to give a European perspective. In doing so it agreed to the need for a proactive approach, but also highlighted the need to ensure that the reactive approach ensures a harmonised and coordinated approach across Europe between all parties involved (EC, EASA, ECTRL, NAAs).
- EAB pointed out the importance of communication and the necessity to have a close link to all actors including the accident investigators. It mentioned that it is also important to have proactive discussions with the media in general. Nevertheless, the Agency should be cautious with information on technical details.
- Norway highlighted the importance of communication also among NAAs (network approach).
- UK indicated that the industry has raised wider concerns on communication aspects. They added that it is important to be able to appropriately target different



audiences and to present the practicalities to the relevant parties. It suggested that the Agency could develop common lines on specific issues.

- France welcomed the fact that the Agency is taking this matter very seriously. They also pointed at the importance of speaking with one voice, of a prompt reaction at the first moment and the consistency of the messages. It noted the need to consider with care the language to be used.
- Germany mentioned the need to adapt the communication activities to the different media and sectors with the highest priority on the quality of work. In this regard it noted the difference between a 'Branding Strategy' as opposed to a 'Communications Strategy' in view of the target audience.
- Ireland also indicated that the communication exercise needs to target the audience but also the organisations involved. It added that it should deal with facts and not with speculations.
- The Netherlands shared the views of UK on this subject.
- Cyprus identified a need to channel communication using also NAAs.
- Romania called attention at the importance of the promotion of safety communication and indicated that this should be one of the objectives of EASp.
- The ED mentioned that the Agency has been very cautious as regards information given in case of accidents.
- Dominique Fouda added that it is very important to stick to the facts.
- Germany and EAB insisted in the importance of safety promotion and of giving information to the stakeholders. The EASA portal with access limited to the communicators of EASA and the NAAs was considered a very good initiative.
- In conclusion, the Chair thanked Mr Fouda for his excellent presentation, and congratulated the Agency on the progress it had made in developing its communication strategy. The debate had demonstrated that improvements were being made across a wide range of different communications mechanisms. He particularly welcomed the work of the network of communicators between EASA and NAAs, and echoed those delegates who had stressed the potential safety gains from using communications tools as a means of safety promotion.

## **5. AOB**

- Finland raised the issue of the difficulties for NAAs and organisations in the implementation of EU regulations related to the 1<sup>st</sup> remit extension. It indicated that there are grey areas and it is necessary to ensure a common understanding among NAAs and organisations. It added that it is necessary to establish an Agency's support plan in this regard to ensure a standardised interpretation of the rules.



**EASA MB 01/2012**

**13 March 2012**

Minutes of EASA MB Special Meeting

13/14 December 2011

- PGO mentioned that as regards certification activities a list of PCMs will be published on the EASA web-site. In support to this, the Agency Rulemaking Director indicated that a dedicated FCL implementation task force would be established.
- EAB supported the request from Finland and emphasized that the interpretation of the rules should focus on their safety intent and not legal issues.
- The Netherlands also supported the request from Finland and indicated that the clarification of the correct implementation is beneficial for all parties of the system.
- The Chair mentioned that this issue could be discussed during next partnership meeting and that there is a need to close the loop between rulemaking and standardisation.
- Due to the limited amount of time still available for the EASA Accommodation Strategy, the Chair announced that this agenda point will be moved to Day 2.
- The Chair closed the session thanking all Delegations for their participation.



**DAY 2: 14 DECEMBER 2011**

**3. EASA Accommodation Strategy (Cologne and Brussels)**

(Presented by the Executive Director (ED))

- Cologne: The ED started by saying that staff members are having difficulties with the Cologne building in particular in the tower when moving from one floor to another. The Agency will have to stay in the current building until 2016. He added that the former Lufthansa building is not an option anymore and other location will not be available before 2016. In the meantime the Agency is exploring the possibility to concentrate more people in the offices of the available floors. Already at this stage the project of the new building needs to be communicated to the EU Budget Authority due to the dimension of the issue.

- Brussels: The ED communicated to the Board that the Agency has already a provisional office in Brussels, managed by a Head of Office, and with two staff members from Standardisation Directorate who are experts in ATM. He added that the idea is to rent an office in the building where the SESAR-JU is located. The number of staff to be assigned to the Brussels office will be 10 in 2012 and will be increased in the coming years with a limit of 30 staff members. He also indicated that the office in Brussels has been established with the following main objectives in mind:

- a) Proximity to strategic partners ensuring direct and permanent cooperation with the European Commission, EUROCONTROL and SESAR-JU;
- b) To provide assistance to the Agency's staff on mission in Brussels; and
- c) Compensation of the space limitations at the Köln Triangle

- Sweden indicated that the Brussels office should contribute to improve the productivity and efficiency of the Agency. It also raised the question why the number of staff has been increased from the 10 originally planned to 30 and whether the expertise will be only from the ATM field or also other areas of EASA activities will be represented. Moreover, the number of staff in Brussels should not undermine the office in Cologne. Furthermore, it should be clarified whether the Office Manager would be reporting to the Head of Cabinet, in other words there should be a clear distinction of the roles and responsibilities. The policy decisions should be always taken in Cologne. Sweden also mentioned that the improvement of the working conditions of the Cologne building should be a priority. It is not easy for visitors either.

- Denmark emphasized that the Agency should be careful not to establish a big office i.e. not to split the Cologne office which was established by a Decision of the Council of the EU.

- Germany mentioned that this report shows the weakness of the present situation and that support should be provided by the local authorities. Moreover, clear links of reporting to and cooperation with the hierarchy in Cologne should be created.





- EAB highlighted that the work that ECTRL is doing should be taken into consideration to avoid duplication of resources.
- Spain supported the establishment of the office in Brussels and indicated that independence from the customers should be guaranteed. It also indicated that clarity should be provided as to the final objective of establishing a Brussels office.
- EC pointed out that the MB should be assured of the cost effectiveness of establishing a Brussels office. With regards to the tasks and detailed organisation of the office this is rather for the Agency's to determine. In recognising the strategic objective of the Agency of working closer with EC, ECTRL and SESAR, thus contributing to the improvement of the way the Agency works, the EC also indicated its support in view of envisaged strengthened collaboration in relation to the increasing number of tasks.
- Whilst aligning itself with previous remarks, Italy raised concerns on the efficiency of the Agency and the additional costs associated with an increase in staff numbers, indicating that this did not reflect the situation in MS.
- Finland emphasized that the establishment of the Brussels office represents a very demanding exercise for the Agency. It should be clarified whether this satellite is a temporary or permanent arrangement.
- Iceland, whilst supportive of the Brussels initiative, indicated the need to carefully monitor that the management role equilibrium is maintained.
- France agreed with the establishment of the Brussels office, noting that the cost savings rationale associated with this exercise should be maintained. A temporary agreement would be positive from a financial perspective.
- The Netherlands gave its support for the Cologne part of the strategy. With regards to the Brussels initiative, it expressed mixed feelings since the idea was to have a "bureau de passage" and now there will be 30 people and probably more in the future. Moreover, 500 m<sup>2</sup> for 30 staff members is not a very efficient way of running the office.
- UK shared previous concerns expressed by other Delegations and indicated that the number of people and the role of the Head of Office should be further clarified.
- Belgium indicated that efficiency should be ensured.
- Cyprus indicated its support for the Cologne part of the strategy, and mentioned that an update on the status and functioning of the Brussels office should be provided every 6 months.
- The ED informed that the Agency is looking for alternatives to the current Cologne building for 2016. As regards the Brussels office, the objectives have not changed. The decision making exercise will remain in Cologne in the hands of the Executive Director. The decisions on the staff will come later. He added that the rent prices are lower in Brussels and the office there can be also seen as remedy to some extent for the lack of space in Cologne. The office in Brussels will improve the efficiency of the Agency as



regards its interaction with EC, SESAR and ECTRL and also of the overall system. He can assure that the main structure and the functioning of the Agency will not be affected and will remain in Cologne. With specific regard to the comments made by Germany, he indicated that efforts to approach local authorities had been made in the past without any success.

- Norway insisted on the aforementioned organisational issues and requested a clear differentiation of roles between ECTRL and EASA.
- Finland considered that the scope of activities of the Brussels office should be limited to ATM.
- Cyprus raised the issue of other EU Agencies having already an office in Brussels. The Executive Director confirmed this, mentioning e.g. OHIM. Cyprus added that an overlap with ECTRL should be avoided.
- Ireland stated that it was a natural move of the Agency to establish an office in Brussels since the latter is the centre of the EU decision making. They added that it is important to appropriately inform the industry in this regard to avoid any kind of misunderstandings.

In conclusion, the Chair acknowledged the difficulties with the current building in Cologne and the intention of the Agency to move in 2016. The offer of help by Germany in this regard is appreciated. The Chair added that a back-up plan should be created and the Board should be kept informed.

With respect to the Brussels office, the Chair confirmed the Board's consent to the creation of this office, whilst re-stating some of the concerns raised by the different Delegations. The discussion had demonstrated the need for (a) careful management of the office; (b) the establishment and maintenance of clear reporting lines; (c) a cautious approach to increasing the size of the office; and (d) care that office should not change the internal organisational structure of the Agency. He asked the Executive Director to keep the Board informed of future developments.



## ANNEX 1: List of Attendance

### Members

	MEMBER	ALTERNATE	EXPERT
<b>AUSTRIA</b>		Franz Nirschl	
<b>BELGIUM</b>	Frank Durinckx	Benoit Van Noten	
<b>BULGARIA</b>	Tilko Petrov	Eleonora Dobрева	
<b>CYPRUS</b>	Leonidas Leonidu		
<b>CZECH REPUBLIC</b>	Josef Rada	Vitezlav Hezky	
<b>DENMARK</b>	Per Veinberg		
<b>ESTONIA</b>	Koit Kaskel		
<b>FINLAND</b>	Pekka Henttu		Kim Salonen
<b>FRANCE</b>	Maxime Coffin		Thierry Lempereur
<b>GERMANY</b>	Gerold Reichle	Josef Schiller	
<b>GREECE</b>		Georgios Sourvanos	
<b>HUNGARY</b>		Éva Kállai	
<b>ICELAND*</b>	Pétur Maack		
<b>IRELAND</b>		Kevin Humphreys	
<b>ITALY</b>	Alessio Quaranta	Benedetto Marasa	Carmine Cifaldi
<b>LATVIA</b>			
<b>LIECHTENSTEIN*</b>			
<b>LITHUANIA</b>			
<b>LUXEMBOURG</b>	Claude Waltzing	Claude Wagner	
<b>MALTA</b>	Ian Falzon		
<b>NETHERLANDS</b>	Ellen Bien	Jan-Dirk Steenbergen Pieter Mulder	Sjoerd Van Dijk
<b>NORWAY*</b>	Heine Richardsen	Oyvind Ek	
<b>POLAND</b>		Tomasz Kadziolka	Darius Gluszkiewicz
<b>PORTUGAL</b>		Paulo Alexandre Ramos de Figueiredo Soares	Antonio Jesús Bastos Estima
<b>ROMANIA</b>	Claudia Virlan		
<b>SLOVAK REPUBLIC</b>	Peter Patoprsty		
<b>SLOVENIA</b>		Jozef Slana	

\* Members without voting rights



	<b>MEMBER</b>	<b>ALTERNATE</b>	<b>EXPERT</b>
<b>SPAIN</b>		José M. Ramírez Ciriza	
<b>SWEDEN</b>	Ingrid Cherfils	Lars Österberg	Magnus Molitor
<b>SWITZERLAND*</b>	Marcel Zuckschwerdt		
<b>UNITED KINGDOM</b>	Michael Smethers (Chair)	Susan Hamilton Pat Ricketts	
<b>EUROPEAN COMMISSION</b>		Matthew Baldwin Eckard Seebohm	Peter Sorensen

**Observers**

	<b>MEMBER</b>	<b>ALTERNATE</b>	<b>EXPERT</b>
<b>EASA ADVISORY BOARD<sup>1</sup></b>	Vincent De Vroey	Gilles Garrouste	Mick Sanders
<b>ALBANIA<sup>1</sup></b>			
<b>BOSNIA AND HERZOGOVINA<sup>1</sup></b>			Selma Hodzic
<b>CROATIA<sup>1</sup></b>			
<b>FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA<sup>1</sup></b>			
<b>MONTENEGRO<sup>1</sup></b>			
<b>SERBIA<sup>1</sup></b>			Dragan Tesla
<b>U.N. MISSION IN KOSOVO<sup>1</sup></b>			

\* Members without voting rights

<sup>1</sup> Observers without voting rights.