

## European Aviation Safety Agency

### Assessment of the individual flight time specification scheme approved to the operator Widerøe, derogating from ORO.FTL.210 (a) of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 – Case N° IFTSS 2020/002/NO

#### A) BACKGROUND

1. The individual flight time specification scheme (IFTSS) of Widerøe Flyveselskap AS (the operator) derogating from ORO.FTL.210(a) of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012<sup>1</sup>, was temporarily approved by the Norwegian competent authority (CAA-NO) in 2016. The operator's report on the derogation was reviewed by EASA under ARO.OPS.235 (d) *idem* in 2018-2019.
2. The 2019 review found that the data provided by the operator did not include data collected through actigraphy and also did not address individual fatigue levels from cumulative duties of more than 60 hours in 7 days. It was therefore considered necessary for the operator to carry out a new scientific study addressing these shortcomings. In addition, EASA raised an off-site finding (NO#21415) on the CAA-NO in relation to the lack of the scientific study.
3. During 2019-2020 the operator carried out a scientific study and sent a report<sup>2</sup> thereof to EASA. The off-site finding was lifted by EASA in May 2020.
4. On 24.11.2020, the CAA-NO made a formal notification to EASA under ARO.OPS.235 (d) stating their intention to confirm the derogation for an indefinite period. The CAA-NO stated that they have monitored Widerøe's IFTSS over several years and have been satisfied that "the IFTSS provides a high level of safety, and that the operator have implemented a robust FRM system." The CAA-NO therefore concluded that the derogation "produces a safety level which is equivalent to that attained by applying the regulation".
5. On 28.01.2021 EASA, assisted by an IFTSS Panel, conducted an independent review of the operator's report under ARO.OPS.235 (d).

#### B) LEGAL FRAMEWORK

6. ARO.OPS.235 (d) of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 reads as follows:

*'Approved deviations or derogations shall be subject, after being applied, to an assessment to determine whether such deviations or derogations should be confirmed or amended. The competent authority and the Agency shall conduct an independent assessment based on information provided by the operator. The assessment shall be proportionate, transparent and based on scientific principles and knowledge.'*

7. ORO.FTL.125 (d) of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 reads as follows:

*'For the purpose of point ARO.OPS.235 (d), within 2 years of the implementation of a deviation or derogation, the operator shall collect data concerning the granted deviation or derogation and analyse that data using scientific principles with a view to assessing the effects of the deviation or*

<sup>1</sup> Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 of 5 October 2012 laying down technical requirements and administrative procedures related to air operations.

<sup>2</sup> 'Fatigue and long duty hours for aircrew', T.Åkerstedt, T.Klemets, D.Karlsson, H Häbel, 2020



*derogation on aircrew fatigue. Such analysis shall be provided in the form of a report to the competent authority.'*

8. The deviation refers to ORO.FTL.210(a) which reads:

*'The total duty periods to which a crew member may be assigned shall not exceed:*

*(1) 60 duty hours in any 7 consecutive days;*

*(2) 110 duty hours in any 14 consecutive days; and*

*(3) 190 duty hours in any 28 consecutive days, spread as evenly as practicable throughout that period.'*

### **C) EVALUATION**

9. The review of the scientific study provided by the operator showed that:

a) The study is representative of the derogation; and

b) The level of fatigue of crew members who had their maximum accumulated duty periods in the interval '60+' hours across the preceding 168 hours is low, considering the low frequency of '60+' events and low number of flight hours (block time);

c) In case of an increase in the frequency of '60+' events and the number of flight hours, the cumulative fatigue levels of crew members with duty periods in the interval '60+' hours are most likely to show an exponential increase compared to those with duty periods in the interval '55-60' hours .

### **D) CONCLUSION**

10. It is recommended that the 2016 derogation approval is confirmed.

11. The operator should supplement the scientific assessment of fatigue levels of crew members who had their maximum accumulated duty periods in the interval '60+' hours across the preceding 168 hours with additional data representative for this segment in concern, should the frequency of '60+' events increase significantly above the magnitude shown in the study.

Signed on 08.02.2021

  
Jesper RASMUSSEN  
Flight Standards Director

