

Stakeholders' Advisory Body

European Aviation Safety Agency

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/the-agency/other-easa-boards-and-bodies/advisory-bodies#sab>

SAB#09 2020-01

26th – 27th Feb 2020

EASA, Konrad-Adenauer-Ufer 3, Cologne, Germany

Minutes

Summary of Actions:

ID#	Action Description	Actionee	Status
SAB.05.04	SAB Chair and Vice Chairs to assist SAB Champions by attending sub-committees to promote the SAB Strategic Priorities - Industry priorities SAB Issue 1 2018-0614 . SAB09 update: C.COM, CAS.COM, GA.COM & ADR.TEC completed. Action ongoing.	SAB CG	Ongoing
SAB.06.03	Sector coordinators to review feedback from the SAB CG and submit proposal for update to SAB Strategic Priorities, within 1 month of receipt of consolidated Champions feedback. SAB09 update: Waiting SAB CG review of input from subcommittees.	SAB Sector Coordinators	Ongoing
SAB.07.03	SAB Champions to gather feedback from their groups on proposals for possible updates to the SAB Strategic Priorities document. SAB09 update: M.Jones confirmed that he had been sent input from the CAS.COM. A.Flanagan agreed that he would chase up input from ADR.TEC, who are the only outstanding committee. G.Buono confirmed that the SAB CG would now review provided input and supply feedback to the SAB Sector Coordinates - to support action SAB.06.03. Action considered Closed.	SAB Champions	Closed
SAB.07.10	Small working group to pull together an updated presentation / paper, highlighting importance of the Business Aviation Sector, to be given at the next MAB (16th/17th Oct). Proposal to be first circulated to the Plenary for endorsement (EBAA/ECOGAS/AOPA/AEI/GAMA). SAB09 update: J.Glantz thanked the SAB for supporting this issue but highlighted that it had proved more difficult than anticipated to develop a paper and requested that the action be closed. It was agreed that Action should be closed, unfinished.	Small working group (EBAA / ECOGAS / AOPA / AEI / GAMA)	Closed

SAB#09 2020-01 Minutes

SAB.08.01	Review of SAB RoP to ensure adequate escalation process in membership nomination requests. SAB09 update: SAB CG to propose updates to the RoP, including review of membership process and priorities.	SAB CG	Ongoing
SAB.08.02	Check use of the term 'General Aviation' in Chapter 8 of EPAS – R.Priego. SAB09 update: Item covered in presentation from EASA, with clarification on term 'General Aviation' within the EPAS. M.Erb confirmed that he was happy with clarification provided. Action Closed.	EASA (R.Priego)	Closed
SAB.08.03	Confirm details of EPAS Workshop SAB09 update: Closed.	Exec Secretary	Closed
SAB.08.04	SAB CG to discuss with EASA Management to establish way forward for Fast Track Rulemaking Process and adequate stakeholder consultation. SAB09 update: Action considered Closed, following presentation by J.Egerer, under agenda item 8.	SAB CG	Closed
SAB.08.05	Subgroup SAB Champions / Chairs to ask for feedback from TECs on ongoing rulemaking - drive for move towards better regulation. SAB09 update: Ongoing.	SAB Champions	Ongoing
SAB.08.06	SAB CG to reinforce message for need to move towards more better regulations at TEC meeting. SAB09 update: Ongoing, as part of SAB CG plans for participation to subcommittee meetings.	SAB CG	Ongoing
SAB.08.07	ACI to draft white paper, with support from CANSO / IAAPS and IATA - for presentation at 1st EASA Management Board meeting in 2020 - drive for move towards better regulation. SAB09 update: Aidan Flanagan (ACI) shared copy of draft outline paper. First draft to be circulated for comment with aim to have abstract available for possible presentation at the 2020 summer MB meeting. Action ongoing.	ACI	Ongoing
SAB.08.08	Include agenda item for next SAB meeting on standardisation (brainstorming / discussion on Industry concerns) and invite Jasper Rasmussen to meeting – M.Jones SAB09 update: Agenda Item 7 – Action Closed.	Exec Secretary	Closed
SAB.08.09	Include agenda item for next SAB meeting on concerns with EASA process on Flight Plan Adherence – M.Jones. SAB09 update: To be covered during closed session, agenda Item 12 – Action Closed.	Exec Secretary	Closed
SAB.08.10	EASA to provide clear explanation on legal position for sharing of non-financial MB papers with non-EU members.	EASA (J.Egerer)	Closed

SAB#09 2020-01 Minutes

	SAB09 update: J.Egerer circulated email on 27 th Nov 2019, reconfirming the position of EASA, i.e. MB papers will not be shared with non-European associations - Action closed.		
ID#	NEW Actions from SAB09 2020-01		
SAB.09.01	EASA to provide feedback following 2020 SAB EPAS Workshop – have they identified additional risk items beyond that submitted by the SAB?	EASA (R.Priego / R.Hamelijnck)	New
SAB.09.02	On contingency plans for Coronavirus and the MAB's medical expert group's public health action plan - EASA to confirm if they will consider consulting with the SAB prior to implementation of the plan. Note that during confirmation of actions raised, under agenda item 16, J.Egerer confirmed that EASA will be looking to seek comments from the SAB and, hence, new action was considered closed.	EASA (J.Egerer)	New / Closed
SAB.09.03	Exec Secretary to send reminder to TECs/COMs on need to raise any issues on standardisation to SAB plenary.	Exec Secretary	New
SAB.09.04	Include escalation of Standardisation issues as a standing agenda item at SAB Plenary meetings.	Exec Secretary	New
SAB.09.05	SAB CG to think more on how the SAB Strategic Priority list is defined, following comments made during CAS.COM SAB Subcommittee report discussions.	SAB CG	New
SAB.09.06	J.Egerer to consult within EASA on issues raised with the BIS process during R.COM SAB Subcommittee report discussions, and feedback to the SAB.	EASA (J.Egerer)	New
SAB.09.07	ACI to discuss with ADR.TEC Chair the need to involve relevant stakeholder experts on ground handling to be able to attend ADR.TEC meetings.	ACI	New
SAB.09.08	Members/Associations who wish to be involved in discussions for ICAO topics to contact Daniela Defossar (EASA, International Cooperation).	SAB Members	New
SAB.09.09	Re-circulate CANSO's draft paper on Flight Plan Adherence to SAB members, with request for comments within 2 weeks. Updated letter to be sent to Chair of MB.	Exec Secretary	New
SAB.09.10	Exec Secretary to send out 'Doodle' suggestions to confirm date of the 2020-03 Plenary meeting (most likely date being 3 rd /4 th Nov) and Chair to confirm if IATA's Madrid facilities are available as a potential venue.	Exec secretary / Chair	New
SAB.09.11	Members / associations to contact Daniela Defossar (EASA, International Cooperation) on any suggestion on agenda topics, or offer of support to panels, for the June EASA/FAA International Safety Conference.	SAB Members	New

Day 1: Wednesday 26th Feb

#	Subject
1.	Coffee / arrivals
2.	<p>Welcome and Introduction, including list of new Plenary nominations since previous meeting</p> <p>G.Buono started the meeting by welcoming everyone to the first SAB plenary meeting of 2020. It was noted that Aidan Flanagan (ACI) had recently changed from Alternate to full Member, with Ansgar Sickert becoming the new ACI Alternate. Robert Campbell-Smith was welcomed to the SAB, who was attending the plenary meeting as the new ERA Alternate. Anais Bensai was welcomed as an Observer for ECOGAS. It was also highlighted that due to restrictions imposed within Italy as a result of the Coronavirus outbreak, Elisabetta Dalla-Benetta (EHA) and Matteo Ragazzi (ASD) had sent in their apologies for not being able to attend the meeting.</p> <p>Rudolf Schuegraf announced that he will be stepping down as the Member for EAS and, hence, this would be his last SAB Plenary.</p> <p>Finally, Stuart Anderson was introduced to the group, who would be taking over from Mark Jones at the end of the week, with Mark having announced that his 3-year assignment to ASD was expiring on 28th Feb and that he would be returning back to Rolls-Royce, UK.</p>
3.	Approval of Agenda and minutes from SAB08 (2019-03)
	<p><u>Agenda</u> approved, with addition of three AOB items, namely: EASA response to Coronavirus, ICAO and FAA/EASA Safety Conference.</p> <p><u>Minutes</u> approved.</p>
4.	Approval of end of year SAB Report
	<p>3rd annual SAB Plenary report (SAB0010), circulated on 21st Jan 2020 was reviewed and formally adopted by the SAB.</p> <p>It was noted that updates will be required to capture changes within the list of SAB Sector Coordinators and Sub-Committee Champions, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air Sports Coordinator – Replacement for Rudolf Schuegraf • CAS.COM Champion – John Monks stepping down from the CAS.COM • R.COM Champion – Elisabetta Dalla-Benetta will be stepping down from the R.COM <p>New Champions to be agreed – SAB CG to note.</p>

	<p>M.Jones reminded everyone that any nominations for change of membership within the SAB and it's subcommittees should be made using the nomination form, ref: 'SAB/TeC/COM Nomination form'.</p> <p>J.Egerer to ensure form is updated to reflect change of Exec Secretary and EASA's administrative assistant.</p>
5.	Comments / feedback on EPAS workshop
	<p>G.Buono commented that he felt the previous day's EPAS workshop had been more structured than the first workshop held last year. He commented that a last minute push had resulted in 24 items being submitted and thanked everyone for their efforts. For next year's EPAS Workshop he proposed that short summary presentations should be prepared for each submittal / topic. He also expressed his opinion that although the MAB had not agreed to hold a joint workshop it must surely be best to have a common input and discussion on the EPAS, i.e. would like to see more collaboration with the MAB.</p> <p>J.Monks (A4E) questioned what will happen with the items that did not make it to the EPAS agenda? It was commented that reasons for items not being included in the agenda had been provided, but that respective associations/committees that had submitted items should feel free to contact EASA if not satisfied with the reasons provided and inform the SAB CG if still not satisfied.</p> <p>B.Swain (ASD) questioned whether EASA had thought of other items/issues that the SAB members had not submitted and that it would be good to get feedback from them.</p> <p>ACTION SAB.09.01: EASA to provide feedback following 2020 SAB EPAS Workshop – have they identified additional risk items beyond that submitted by the SAB?</p> <p>S.Pepper (AIA) commented that some of the topics that were covered during the workshop emphasised items that were already within the EPAS. He suggested that perhaps for future workshops the topics should be organised into new items first and then followed up with requests for reprioritisation of existing items.</p> <p>Need to have clear expectations of what type of actions we require.</p> <p>B.Swain commented that perhaps we should arrange the workshop differently – taking a more strategic perspective, with less detail. Possibly consider small number of new items but more focus on emphasis, priorities and approaches – identifying key things required.</p> <p>R.Campbell-Smith (ERA) raised item on EU261 (compensatory mechanism for delayed or cancelled flights), which did not make the list of agenda items for the workshop. He added that it is a significant topic within the ERA membership. ERA have been voicing concerns to EU261 on safety grounds for some months, the ERA supports the Croatian presidency amendment to the legislation. One possible situation which is of concern ed was the potential that flight crew are attempting to land rather than to go-round severe weather storms. J.Monks (A4E) commented that pilots need to be conscious of issues when deciding to go-round or not when trying to land in adverse weather conditions, adding that he has not seen evidence that decisions are being affected by EU261 compensation –</p>

	<p>need to be cautious in looking to make a direct link. G.Buono agreed that we need to be cautious in raising a safety card but acknowledged that this an issue for IATA whilst accepting that it is being worked within the Commission. O.Blomqvist (AEI) agreed with ERA's concerns, with system possibly putting pressure on front line personnel. G.Buono summarised that work is on-going but that we need to continue to monitor the situation.</p> <p>B.Swain (ASD) raised a question to the non-EU members of the SAB, specifically whether they had any comments on the EASA EPAS system vs what is available within the US, etc. S.Pepper (AIA) responded by saying that they appreciate the EU EPAS system, which does not exist within the US. He commented that the US do not have anything as robust as the EPAS, which could be seen as an example of best practice.</p>
6.	Review of Plenary open actions
	<p>SAB.05.04: SAB Chair and Vice Chairs to assist SAB Champions by attending sub-committees to promote the SAB Strategic Priorities (<u>Industry priorities SAB Issue 1 2018-0614</u>).</p> <p>C.COM, CAS.COM, GA.COM & ADR.TEC completed. Others to be attended in due course.</p> <p>Action remains an ongoing open action.</p> <p>SAB.06.03: Sector coordinators to review feedback from the SAB CG and submit proposal for update to SAB Strategic Priorities</p> <p>Update: Waiting SAB CG review of input from subcommittees, ref SAB.07.03. Action ongoing.</p> <p>SAB.07.03: SAB Champions to gather feedback from their groups on proposals for possible updates to the SAB Strategic Priorities document.</p> <p>Update: M.Jones confirmed that he had been sent input from the CAS.COM. A.Flanagan agreed that he would chase up input from ADR.TEC, who are the only outstanding committee. G.Buono confirmed that the SAB CG would now review provided and supply feedback to the SAB Sector Coordinates, to support action SAB.06.03</p> <p>Action considered Closed.</p> <p>SAB.07.10: Small working group to pull together an updated presentation / paper, highlighting importance of the Business Aviation Sector, to be given at the next MAB</p> <p>Update: J.Glantz thanked the SAB for supporting this issue but highlighted that it had proved more difficult than anticipated to develop a paper and requested that the action be closed. It was agreed that Action should be closed, unfinished.</p> <p>SAB.08.01: Review of SAB RoP to ensure adequate escalation process in membership nomination requests.</p> <p>Update: SAB CG to propose updates to the RoP, including review of membership process and priorities. Action ongoing.</p> <p>SAB.08.02: Check use of the term 'General Aviation' in Chapter 8 of EPAS – R.Priego.</p>

	<p>Update: Item covered in presentation from EASA, with clarification on term 'General Aviation' within the EPAS. M.Erb confirmed that he was happy with clarification provided.</p> <p>Action Closed.</p> <p>SAB.08.03: Confirm details of EPAS Workshop</p> <p>Update: Closed.</p> <p>SAB.08.04: SAB CG to discuss with EASA Management to establish way forward for Fast Track Rulemaking Process and adequate stakeholder consultation.</p> <p>Update: Action considered Closed, following presentation by J.Egerer, under agenda item 8.</p> <p>SAB.08.05: Subgroup SAB Champions / Chairs to ask for feedback from TECs on ongoing rulemaking - drive for move towards better regulation.</p> <p>Update: Ongoing.</p> <p>SAB.08.06: SAB CG to reinforce message for need to move towards more better regulations at TEC meeting.</p> <p>Update: Ongoing, as part of SAB CG plans for participation to subcommittee meetings.</p> <p>SAB.08.07: ACI to draft white paper, with support from CANSO / IAAPS and IATA - for presentation at 1st EASA Management Board meeting in 2020 - drive for move towards better regulation.</p> <p>Update: Aidan Flanagan (ACI) shared copy of draft outline paper. First draft to be circulated for comment with aim to have abstract available for possible presentation at the 2020 summer MB meeting. Action ongoing.</p> <p>SAB.08.08: Include agenda item for next SAB meeting on standardisation (brainstorming / discussion on Industry concerns) and invite Jasper Rasmussen to meeting – M.Jones</p> <p>Update: Agenda Item 7 – Action Closed.</p> <p>SAB.08.09: Include agenda item for next SAB meeting on concerns with EASA process on Flight Plan Adherence – M.Jones.</p> <p>Update: To be covered during closed session, agenda Item 12 – Action Closed.</p> <p>SAB.08.10: EASA to provide clear explanation on legal position for sharing of non-financial MB papers with non-EU members.</p> <p>Update: J.Egerer circulated email on 27th Nov 2019, reconfirming the position of EASA, i.e. MB papers will not be shared with non-European associations - Action closed.</p>
7.	<p>Standardisation - brainstorming / discussion on Industry concerns, agenda item following action SAB.08.08.</p>

	<p>Jesper Rasmussen (EASA, Flight Standards Director) joined the SAB Plenary meeting to support this agenda item.</p> <p>G.Buono provided a brief overview of concerns with the standardisation process, with the need for a common European system balanced against Industry's need for more performance-based regulation. He highlighted that this had also been raised during discussions at the previous day's EPAS workshop. Question is what can we do to help and improve the situation?</p> <p>J.Rasmussen commented that they have to balance working towards PBR whilst ensuring, as far as possible, a level playing field. It is a balance of requirements, not wishing to have a too detailed level of hard law regulation, that is one size fits all. When they do standardisation, they can only standardise up against the hard law. Countries may wish to follow whatever soft law is available, in their execution of their oversight, e.g. AMCs/GMs, etc. As an authority they need to find a way of doing oversight, together with industry, to find out what is being done correctly and what is not. Jesper commented that they hear from some companies that they experience large differences between authorities in how they interpret a given hard law. What he would like to see is that authorities should feel that they have the room to interpret a rule, taking into account the needs of the industry within a given country, i.e. not a single, narrow interpretation of a law. He commented that within some countries, interpretation has become a bit rigid. EASA have commented on this, highlighting when a neighbouring country may have another equally compliant interpretation of a law, i.e. suggesting a degree of flexibility, but this can only stay as an EASA recommendation and not a finding. Would be very interested in getting continuous feedback, not only from Members States but also from Industry – where are the pain points, what are the blockers and what can we do about it?</p> <p>On individual pain points J.Monks (A4E) asked how successful had conversation with NAA's been in highlighting that they are being too rigid with the strategic issue of EASA towards Standardisation? Jesper responded that they have spent significant effort in discussing implementation issues within each domain TeB, plus use of dedicated workshops. Have tried to get individual MS to present why they do what they do but can't insist that they do it in any other way.</p> <p>A.Baumann (A4E) commented that most NAAs lack understanding of possible alternative solutions, and that the issue is lack of understanding / lack of competence / lack of personnel / lack of tools for NAAs to do an effective oversight and not just follow a ticking the box exercise. This prevents them from being less rigid in their approach. Jesper admitted that there is still a lot of competence development to be done, especially in SMS evaluation. However, he feels that they are progressing, with less findings and increasing development of competence levels - but more can always be done. EASA can, and do, issue findings if they identify lack of resources and need for improved competences. EASA also offer technical training. It's important that Industry keep dialog open with NAAs and EASE will supplement this effort.</p>
--	--

G.Buono added that EASA has the system to ensure standardisation but that Industry sees the results and, therefore, have a lot of understanding of the problem. So, how can Industry help, in a structured way, to complement the work of EASA? He suggested that perhaps we need to set up more forums where Industry, EASA and MS can jointly discuss standardisation issues – an open dialog between the three parties. Can this happen with the present consultation system, through the TECs and TeBs, or is there a need for a new process? J.Glantz (EBAA) agreed with the suggestion of having joint meetings, looking to push NAAs to be more flexible. E.Garcia (CANSO) also supported need for a three-way dialog/forum, confirming that different interpretation of rules between NAAs is an issue.

A.Arroyo (EC) commented that there is a robust system in place with full implementing regulation to determine procedures to be used for inspections carried out by EASA. As such the EU has the safest process currently in place across the World. Have many domains within the aviation Industry. By definition, it is a complex area that needs prescriptive rules. He commented that performance-based regulations will not become the new paradigm and that aviation will continue to be a prescriptive area in terms of oversight of rules. In the EU, the oversight system doesn't stop with EASA - findings are discussed between the EC and EASA, but the EC has the enforcement power to take actions against MS who fail to comply. Is in favour of EASA providing ad hoc dedicated support to NAAs that are struggling. However, the Commission is very interested to hear from Industry what are the practical examples of problems where rules are not adequate or inappropriate interpretation of the rules by NAAs. He agrees that success realises on dialog, but that we should use the forum of the SAB and not create another forum.

Jesper commented that he would like to agree on how we can ensure a proper and good influencing process from Industry, suggesting the following tiered system:

- 1st Tier: Through the TECs, possibly with joint TEC/TeB meetings.
- 2nd Tier: 1 off dedicated workshops to discuss specific aspects, with Industry, EASA and authorities.
- 3rd Tier: Dedicated forum, for regular discussions that can't be handled by a 1 off workshop.

Jesper commented that he would be more than happy to see list of concrete issues from Industry that need escalating.

In response to above:

O.Hallquist (ACI) commented that with respect to Airdrome rulemaking, Implementing Rules were meant to be high level objectives, performance based if possible, AMCs/GM. MS then took different approach to implementation. EASA were going to provide support to help achieve a level playing field, with gradual introduction of standardisation across MS. Reality was somewhat different. On rules for runway safety, he commented that there has been a big shift with what was AMCs/GM being lifted into implementing rules, with standardisation apparently showing a need for prescriptive rules. Perhaps a different approach would have been better, as some MS were happy with the way rules had

	<p>previously been written, which provided the necessary flexibility to adapt to the different environments that airdromes operate under.</p> <p>T.Leoff (IAAPS) raised Upset Prevention and Recovery Training (UPRT) is an example and one that has previously been raised at the SAB and FS.TEC meetings. Need to identify solution to availability of simulators for pilot training, to satisfy hard law requirements.</p> <p>J.Glantz (EBAA) added that he appreciates that standardisation takes time and is a continuous process. Prescriptive regulation is one way to achieve standard goals and objectives but that there can be different interpretations of prescriptive rules.</p> <p>O.Blomqvist (AEI) added that he knows of examples of competent authorities being too rigid but also have examples of the opposite, raising concerns from a safety perspective and level playing field. System does not always catch up on issues identified. Would like to see more systemic work on standardisation and would look forward to seeing another approach to Standardisation from EASA and the Commission.</p> <p>A.Baumann (A4E) commented that standardisation is not about being prescriptive about how to do something but to standardise the way how things are assessed.</p> <p>O.Saafan (CANSO) commented that he welcomed Jesper's 3 stage approach, feeling that we need to have an action to ensure the TEBs identify examples of issues.</p> <p>B.Swain (ASD) expressed concerns with Alfonso's comments that we can't expect rules to be as performance based as Industry would wish, adding that Industry is in a very good position to understand when something needs to be covered by performance or prescriptive based regulation. She highlighted that Industry wants to achieve the best level of safety, hence the overall view from the Commission that Industry can't have as much performance-based regulation as we may wish shows a misunderstanding of what Industry can do.</p> <p>A.Arroyo (EC) responded by saying that within the EU there is a legal system, with the ECJ having ultimate decision over correct interpretation of rules. EC Legal Services view that AMCs do not have legal value of hard law, hence difficult to harmonise system if flexibility within the rules is permitted. However, Alfonso added that he would like to strike a balance with needs of Industry and, hence, would be very interested to hear of practical examples for improvement.</p> <p>On Standardisation issues, Jesper commented that yes, they do see authorities that are sometimes lenient and that his team do investigate this - spend more time on not only visiting but more on continuous monitoring. Relying on input from various sources that leads up to an investigation - input from Industry is welcome. He stated that he would be happy to come back to SAB to cover standardisation issues that have not been resolved by the TECs/TeBs, i.e. lower 1st tier. If concrete issues are brought to his attention, then he would be more than willing to look into addressing issues and find a way forward.</p>
--	--

	<p>ACTION SAB.09.03: Exec Secretary to send reminder to TECs/COMs on need to raise any issues on standardisation to SAB plenary.</p> <p>ACTION SAB.09.04: Include escalation of Standardisation issues as a standing agenda item at SAB Plenary meetings.</p>
8.	Fast track rulemaking process
	<p>J.Egerer provided a brief on the fast track / focused consultation rulemaking process (MB decision 18-2015, Article 16), as a follow up to action SAB.08.04. See slides for details - AI_08 Rulemaking process SAB 2020 01.</p> <p>E.Garcia (CANSO) agreed that an accelerated procedure is required but raised concerns when applying it to a controversial regulation, such as U-Space, stating that more than 1 month is required if the Agency wishes to receive quality input from the consultation process.</p> <p>O.Hallquist (ACI) raised a similar point to CANSO's, with specific focus on Ground Handling, which he also considered controversial, hence questioned why the accelerated procedure was used. Another issue being Runway Safety, which he commented was run without even establishing an expert group – as a result the NPA caused a lot of confusion and lack of understanding of the rationale behind it. A.Flanagan (ACI) added that he understood why the Agency wanted to avoid hundreds of comments from people who have no real interest / involvement in the issue but felt that Article 16 should not be the norm, i.e. should be the exception. Perhaps the standard process requires reviewing.</p> <p>B.Swain (ASD) commented that the focussed consultation process flow chart should include an option for the Focused Consultation group to help EASA with reviewing how the comments can be managed. i.e. review group on the CRD. Also, on the Article 16 wording, namely 'negligible impact, or rulemaking projects addressing issues of non-controversial nature or affecting a limited group of stakeholders', could be read by EASA that if only one stakeholder is not affected then the accelerated procedure could be employed. Perhaps this needs some clarification.</p> <p>J.Glantz (EBAA) questioned how EASA identify members of the expert groups, commenting that EBAA are often left out when forming the groups, or how can EBAA get access to the expert groups? EBAA can see need for the accelerated process but would like to express an interest in joining relevant groups.</p> <p>J.Monks (A4E) questioned the engagement around the decision making process to determine which rulemaking process is relevant. Lacking clarity on process selection and nominations to expert groups.</p> <p>A.Baumann (A4E), also questioned in what capacity are the experts selected, whether individual experts or association experts, single or multiple members of associations. Needs more governance on decision making process.</p> <p>N.Jones (ETF) commented that system does not appear to be very transparent, which is a concern if reviewing a large task that could have a big impact. She also expressed a</p>

	<p>concern that if there is a particular issue that needs reviewing, but is not in the EPAS, EASA have started to find ways to see where they can park the item to allow them to do the work on the rulemaking. She quoted Interoperability of flight crew as an example, where it was piggy backed onto RMT.0599, which she felt really had nothing to do with Interoperability, hence stakeholders were not aware that this work was progressing.</p> <p>G.Buono wrapped up discussion by saying that we don't dispute the need for an accelerated process in certain cases, but that we need a more structured process to decide when the accelerated process is appropriate and in choosing experts. Closer cooperation with the SAB Plenary should be helpful in providing suggested list of experts, whilst accepting that EASA have the final say.</p>
9.	<p>SAB subcommittee Briefs - SAB Champions</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C.COM - François Duclos (ASD) Refer to report for full details: AI 09 - SAB Champion Report - C.COM 2020-01 Issues identified for attention of the SAB Plenary covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ International cooperation ○ EASA engagement in standards organisations related to Certification ○ Non-Installed Equipment ○ DOA certification performance assessment ○ COSET recommendation to enhance worldwide aircraft-operator service difficulty reporting to Design Approval Holders (DAH) ○ SMS deployment <p>On standards development G.Buono commented that the recent CEN standard on Cabin Air Quality was an example of a standard being developed without full and appropriate involvement of Industry. B.Swain (ASD) commented that ASD was not in favour of pushing CEN standards, with the suggestion that developed preliminary standards should not become full CEN standards but remain under another governance regime that is more under control of Industry and, thus, easier to update.</p> <p>On Non-Installed Equipment, E.Parelon (ASD) commented that further discussions with EASA were needed, adding that this could be a big impact on operators / avionics suppliers, etc.</p> • CAS.COM – Johan Glantz Refer to report for full details: AI 09 - SAB Champion Report - CAS.COM 2020-01 CAS.COM report largely focused on the group's list of strategic safety priority areas and links to the EPAS. In addition, it was announced that John Monks, who is the current SAB CAS.COM Subcommittee Champion, was stepping down from the committee. G.Buono commented that he understood that the CAS.COM has an issue with regard to priority setting but requested that the CAS.COM need to be clearer on what they

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

want to see as an end result. He noted that they recognise the SAB strategic list as being more overarching than the CAS.COM safety priorities and yet they request an alignment between the two. He sees the need for the CAS.COM priorities finding their way into the EPAS, but asked whether the discussions at the previous day's EPAS workshop was enough to take into account the needs of the CAS.COM? If not, then this needs to be resolved. E.Moyson (AIRE) commented that we now have two separate lists 1) the SAB Plenary strategic priorities list (organise in 4 pillars, containing a list of 36 issues) and 2) the CAS.COM list of strategic safety areas (organised in 3 pillars – Operational, System/Enabling and Emerging/Future). Deference is that the CAS.COM list are the strategic safety areas, each with an EPAS mitigation measure. He highlighted that the CAS.COM list was a result of discussions between CAGs and the CAS.COM. Ask from the CAS.COM is for the SAB Plenary to endorse the CAS.COM strategic safety areas list and suggest that the SAB Plenary Strategic Priorities list needs to be shortened and made more workable. G.Buono responded that when we asked the TECs/COMs to provide feedback on the high level strategic priority list there was a strong message that the list was still relevant (ref feedback from action SAB.07.03). Following further discussions, it was agreed that in addition to existing action SAB.06.03 the SAB CG would look to review how the strategic priorities list is defined.

ACTION SAB.09.05: SAB CG to think more on how the SAB Strategic Priority list is defined, following comments made during CAS.COM SAB Subcommittee report discussions.

- GA.COM - Michael Erb (IAOP)

No update was provided, with their next meeting scheduled for the following week.

- R.COM – Elisabetta Dalla-Benetta

The report provide by Elisabetta was presented in her absence - refer to report for full details: [AI 09 - SAB Champion Report - R.COM 2020-01](#)

Issues identified for attention of the SAB Plenary covered:

- BIS Process
- Safety Data
- Bird Strikes

On the BIS process being too time consuming J.Egerer commented that she had instructed her colleagues to use the consultation page within the IMF SharePoint, which would help in providing full visibility, but agreed to take back the issue of size of BIS documentation.

ACTION SAB.09.06: J.Egerer to consult within EASA on issues raised with the BIS process during R.COM SAB Subcommittee report discussions, and feedback to the SAB.

On the Bird Strikes issue the Plenary took note of information and encouraged the R.COM to continue to pursue this.

- ADR.TEC - Øyvind Hallquist (AEI)

Refer to report for full details: [AI 09 - SAB Champion Report - ADR.TEC 2020-01](#)

Issues identified for attention of the SAB Plenary covered:

- Review of EASA's approach to Performance Based Regulation in future rulemaking
- A shift away from "rulemaking groups" to "focused consultations"

Concerns over EASA's apparent preference towards use of focused consultation, rather than rulemaking groups, was a subject that the group wished to raise with the SAB Plenary, in particular with the previously discussed Ground Handling task.

On topic of Ground Handling N.Jones (ETF) questioned whether there had been any progress with previously submitted requests for GH experts to join the ADR.TEC. It was highlighted that, as informed, the request for new seats to the SAB and its subcommittees had been put on-hold until conclusion of the review of the results from the AB survey. However, it was also highlighted that it had been discussed and agreed that chairs of subcommittees were free to invite additional experts, on an add hoc basis, to address specific issues.

ACTION SAB.09.07: ACI to discuss with ADR.TEC Chair the need to involve relevant stakeholder experts on ground handling to be able to attend ADR.TEC meetings.

- ATM/ANS.TEC - Eduardo Garcia (CANSO)

Refer to report for full details: [AI 09 - SAB Champion Report - ATM-ANS.TEC 2020 v2](#)

Issues identified for attention of the SAB Plenary covered:

- Regulation 2017/373
- ATCO IR
- SPI IR Amendment proposal
- RMT.0161 on Conformity assessment
- RMT.0524 on Data Link
- Social methodology

- DM.TEC – Dominique Bouvier (ASD)

Refer to report for full details: [AI 09 - SAB Champion Report - DM.TEC 2020-01 V1](#)

Dominique highlighted that the next DM.TEC meeting was scheduled the day after the SAB, i.e. 28th Feb. Hence, he had used the annual report of the DM.TEC as the basis for his brief.

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

	<p>Issues identified for attention of the SAB Plenary covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SAB strategic objectives and DM.TEC objectives ○ Implementation of the New Basic Regulation ○ Ecolabel ○ Innovation Cell <p>• EM.TEC – Erik Moyson (AIRE)</p> <p>Erik commented that he was not able to present a report from the EM.TEC as he was still waiting the formal minutes from the last meeting, which took place back on 5th Dec 2019. He stated that when he has been provided with a copy of the minutes he would then prepare brief and circulate to the SAB. It was highlighted that lateness of minutes was a recurring issue – Julia agreed to follow this up.</p> <p><u>Post-meeting note</u></p> <p><u>After investigation it appeared that the draft minutes had been sent to an incorrect mailaddress of the EM.TEC chair on 6 February; the minutes were reviewed and distributed to the EM.TEC members on 4 March 2020. For the next SAB meeting, the EM.TEC Champion will intergate his report in the second annual report of the EM.TEC.</u></p> <p>• FS.TEC - Thomas Leoff (IAAPS)</p> <p>Refer to report for full details: AI 09 - SAB Champion Report - FS.TEC 2020-01</p> <p>Issues identified for attention of the SAB Plenary covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Brexit ○ US/EU BASA ○ Updates to regulations Air Operations and Aircrew ○ Implementation of CS-FSTD Issue 2 <p>On Brexit the report provided the following link on the EU perspective on the Brexit Withdrawal Agreement and Transition Period: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/slides_the_wa_explained.pdf</p>
10.	<p>Update on EASA activities</p> <p>Luc Tytgat provided an update on EASA activities. Refer to linked presentation for full details: AI 10 EASA Update Luc Tytgat SAB 2020 01 PDF FINAL</p> <p>Luc's presentation covered updates on the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety in Aviation Forum for Europe (SAFE 360°) • International Cooperation Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ North America -US

Formatted

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ North Asia (China and Japan BASAO) ○ South East Asia ○ South Asia ○ Africa, LATAM and Caribbean ○ EU Neighbourhood <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Norway electrification project ● Environmental strategy, including EcoLabel ● Save the dates – Post meeting note: now obviously affected by the CoVid-19 outbreak. <p>On the EcoLabel initiative A.Flanagan (ACI) expressed support for the initiative, but highlighted importance of Airports and that they already have their own system in place. He urged EASA to avoid any duplication, overlap or misalignment. Luc responded that the Agency was fully inline, happy for operators to develop their own labelling programme, but that EASA, as a regulator, has a different role – to issue data / labelling systems based upon certified data – will be supplementary to what ACI has been doing. Happy for ACI to present its own programme. E.Garcia (CANSO) also expressed willingness to support the EcoLabel initiative with provision of experts.</p>
11.	AB survey update
	<p>Julia Egerer provide an update from the survey launched to assess efficiency of ABs. Refer to linked presentation for full details: AI 11 Survey Advisory Bodies.</p> <p>The presentation provided a brief summary of the MAB and SAB structure and initial results from the survey, which closed 31st January 2020. Proposed timeline for next steps, with continued involvement from the survey Task Force (CANSO, ASD, ECA, Austria and Finland) was shown in slides 8 & 9.</p> <p>G.Buono commented that he, as Chair of the SAB and Luc, as Chair of the MAB, should be jointly involved before drafting the final action plan. Julia agreed to take note of this request.</p>

Day 2: Thursday 27th Feb

#	Subject
12.	Closed session discussions - Comments from day 1, plus other issues that members wish to discuss
	<p>There were three specific topics that were discussed during the closed session, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flight Plan Adherence E.Garcia (CANSO) shared draft paper on Flight Plan Adherence, as a follow on to previous SAB discussions, ref action SAB.08.09. This was raised as a response to concerns from the unsigned/undated letter from EASA, instructing Airlines to comply with filed flight plans. ACTION SAB.09.09: Exec Secretary to re- circulate CANSO's draft paper on Flight Plan Adherence to SAB members, with request for comments within 2 weeks. Updated letter to be sent to Chair of MB. EcoLabel update F.Duclos and D.Munteanu, who joined the SAB for this topic, provided an update on progress. Boeing 737 Max <p>Further additional discussions included 1) concerns that senior EASA management, i.e. L.Tytgat, appeared to be reducing time spent attending the SAB, 2) problems encountered with maintenance providers struggling to answers survey questions on economic impact for input to BIS for potential maintenance rulemaking tasks and 3) concerns raised following A.Arroyo's comments against use of PBR and need for prescriptive rulemaking, specifically within the EC Legal Services – to be covered in ACI's draft white paper on drive for move towards better regulation.</p>
13.	Feedback to EASA as follow-on from closed session
	<p>G.Buono provided Luc with a brief verbal update of the various topics that were discussed during the closed session.</p> <p>On the planned Flight Plan Adherence paper, Luc thanked Giancarlo for the notification. On EASA's EcoLabel plans he commented that the project will not be allowed to go forward if not at the necessary maturity level - still in the 'proof of concept' phase and will need validation. EC legal services will be looking to have their say to ensure that it is compliant with EU policies.</p>

	<p>On the results of the survey carried out to assess efficiency of ABs, G.Buono took the opportunity to request that he, as the Chair of the SAB, should be consulted before release of action plan. Luc agreed with this request.</p> <p>At the close of the meeting, Luc apologised for not being able to spend more time at the meeting, due to need to attend to urgent matters, but reconfirmed his support to the Plenary.</p>
14.	Update on status of Boeing 737 Max
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ EASA update <p>Rachel Daschler provided a verbal update on activities associated with plans for the return to service of the Boeing 737 Max. She confirmed that EASA is continuing to be fully engaged in technical investigations necessary for preparing return to service of the aircraft, working in full coordination with the FAA, Transport Canada and Brazil, i.e. a full CMT effort. Have covered review of flight control system changes, plus wider human / machine interfaces. Involved in software and design assurance activities, with number of audits taking place. Have performed extensive set of simulator tests at Boeing. Regular meetings have been taking place with Boeing, FAA and CMT authorities. At present there is no fixed date set for return to service. Will need more face-to-face meetings to review full status of investigation. After FAA have carried out their certification flight tests EASA plan to carry out their own flight tests. Joint operational evaluation to be carried.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Status of Industry response/plans to recommendations within JATR report <p>François Duclos (ASD) and Walter Desrosier (AIA) provided an update on what the Manufacturers Sector were doing to address recommendations within the JATR and US Special Committee reports.</p> <p>François briefed the SAB using the following presentation: AI 14b - ASD presentation SAB 27-02-2020</p> <p>Walter provided additional verbal update, covering activities from AIA, AIAB, AIAC and ASD associations, which was summarised in the following presentation material: AI 14b - Manufacturer-Sector-Certification-Reviews-2020-02</p> <p>Rachel Daschler thanked the team for their efforts and commented that EASA were doing a similar process and keen to have an exchange of ideas.</p>
15.	Brexit, following UKs exit on 31st January 2020
	<p>Stephanie Rostren (EASA) provided a brief on the transition phase, following adoption of the EU-UK Withdrawal Agreement, using the following EC presentation (transition phase covered on slides 28 and 29): AI 15 Brexit Update</p> <p>Transition phase will last until 21st Dec 2020, but can be extended once, by up to one or two years.</p>

	<p>Presentation highlights the following main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ During the transition period, EU law continues to apply to and in the UK. ▪ The EU will treat the UK as if it were a Member State, with the exception of participation in the EU institutions and governance structures. ▪ The transition period will provide time for administrations, businesses and citizens to adapt. ▪ And it will provide the EU and the UK with time to negotiate the future relationship. <p>During the transition period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ EU law continues to apply. ▪ UK remains in the EU Customs Union and the Single Market. ▪ UK remains bound by obligations stemming from all EU international agreements. ▪ UK is no longer represented in EU institutions agencies and bodies. <p>Stephanie added that EASA are contributing to the EC effort for defining the future relationship with the UK. For the aviation sector, she stated that first round of negotiations are happening, with relationship probably governed by a BASA. Scope of BASA still under discussion. EASA still continuing with the early application process. B.Swain (ASD) asked if the Agency was reviewing a number of options for the BASA, to which Stephanie commented that they are preparing for all options, although a very limited option would give EASA the most work.</p> <p>S.Pepper (AIA) noted that it was stated that during the transition phase, EASA would remain the competent authority and that EASA will except new applications throughout the transition period. He asked what would happen with applications that are likely to extend over the end date of the transition period, i.e. would EASA complete the project? Stephanie felt that EASA would have to stop at the end of the transition period, as they would no longer be the competent authority.</p> <p>A.Sickert (ACI) questioned if there would be any concerns with UK nationals being part of an association, post Brexit. It was commented that the EU does not discriminate in terms of nationality, so as long as the UK national is a representative of an EU Association / Stakeholder then there should be no problem.</p>
16.	Confirmation of new actions raised
	M.Jones provide an overview of the 11 new actions raised.
17.	Confirmation of next meeting dates and AOB
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AOB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Coronavirus (covered during day 1 of SAB, prior to agenda item 7) <p>Julia Egerer commented that EASA had issued a SIB with recommendations in response to Coronavirus '2019-nCoV' outbreak, following a very short</p>

consultation with both the MAB and the SAB. She thanked everyone for the timely feedback provided. Ref:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/newsroom-and-events/news/easa-issues-sib-recommendations-response-coronavirus-%E2%80%99982019-ncov%E2%80%9999outbreak>

She further highlighted that information had been presented at a recent MAB meeting (1st week of February) under a pre-arranged agenda item entitled 'Public Health Action Plan'. EASA had for some time been preparing a presentation in conjunction with Commission responsible for health, looking to provide a clear, common and coordinated way forward to addressing public health issues related to aviation. An action plan had been prepared back in December by the medical expert group, under responsibility of the MAB. Main discussions during the MAB was focused on the Coronavirus. The Commission, with DG.MOVE, have fully supported the approach from EASA. It was clear that a coordinated response to the virus was required, covering all Member States.

J.Monks (A4E) asked when will the public health action plan be ready for implementation and will it be provided to the SAB for comment prior to publication? Julia responded saying that the medical expert group's plan has now been endorsed by the MAB, with final comments by mid-March. Formal consultation with the SAB was not foreseen but willing to take this back to the MAB.

ACTION SAB.09.02: On contingency plans for Coronavirus and the MAB's medical expert group's public health action plan - EASA to confirm if they will consider consulting with the SAB prior to implementation of the plan.

Note that during confirmation of actions raised, under agenda item 16, J.Egerer confirmed that EASA will be looking to seek comments from the SAB and, hence, new action was considered closed.

J.Glantz (EBAA) commented that he could see a connection with another group dealing with crisis management and health scenarios, namely the European Aviation Crisis Coordination Cell (EACCC), which has industry involvement. J.Egerer confirmed that they were fully aligned with the EACCC.

There followed some discussions that highlighted the need to not only cover the public health issues but also to consider impact on the network, operations and business continuity, etc.

R.Vermeiren (ESAM) confirmed that active consultations are taking place between all the European institutions and the Agency.

- **ICAO (covered during day 1 of SAB, prior to agenda item 11)**

	<p>D.Defossar (EASA) gave an update on ICAO priorities, topics at stake and requirements for preparation of high level events across 2020/2021. Refer to linked presentation for full details: AOB - Presentation SAB ICAO</p> <p>Sequence of ICAO events shown in slide 5, including an Innovation Fair in Dec 2020, High Level Safety Conference in May 2022 and the 41st ICAO Assembly in 2022.</p> <p>On the Innovation Fair, Daniela highlighted that the aim is to engage with Industry and learn about upcoming developments. If possible, they would like to have joint Industry / EASA presentations.</p> <p>For the high level safety conference, it was highlighted that working papers will be submitted – current list of proposed possible European topics was summarised on slide 7. Again, EASA are keen for joint presentations.</p> <p>Final slide provided a summary of how EASA wish to work with the SAB on ICAO matters, i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SAB to consider needs/demands and express them to EASA. ▪ Commonly promote new technologies / business models > for example at the upcoming events. ▪ Coordinate positions vis-à-vis ICAO, where relevant. <p>Daniela stated that she would like to see some coordination within the SAB to better align positions / proposals at ICAO level.</p> <p>ACTION SAB.09.08: Members/Associations who wish to be involved in discussions for ICAO topics to contact Daniela Defossar (EASA, International Cooperation).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ FAA/EASA Safety Conference (covered during day 1 of SAB, prior to agenda item 11) <p>D.Defossar also used the opportunity to give an update on the upcoming FAA/EASA International Safety Conference, scheduled for 23rd-25th June, Washington DC.</p> <p>Refer to linked presentation for full details, which provides a copy of initial draft agenda: AOB - Presentation SAB FAA-EASA Conference</p> <p>Daniela requested that people should share any ideas and suggestions for panels / moderators.</p> <p>ACTION SAB.09.11: Members / associations to contact Daniela Defossar (EASA, International Cooperation) on any suggestion on agenda topics, or offer of support to panels, for the June EASA/FAA International Safety Conference.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2020-02: 25th/26th May. (Monday / Tues)
--	--

Formatted: French (Belgium)

○ 2020-03:

The SAB were notified that G.Buono was no longer able to support the previously agreed dates of 20th/21st Oct and , therefore, requested that an alternative date be agreed. Proposed alternative being 3rd/4th Nov (Tues/Wed). There followed some discussions on the best available date, whilst also considering availability of resources, such as conference rooms, etc.

ACTION SAB.09.10: Exec Secretary to send out 'Doodle' suggestions to confirm date of the 2020-03 Plenary meeting (most likely date being 3rd/4th Nov) and Chair to confirm if IATA's Madrid facilities are available as a potential venue.

Annex 1: List Attendees:

SAB Member / Alternate	Association	Name
Alternate	A4E	Achim BAUMANN
Member	A4E	John MONKS
Member	Aerospace and Defence - ASD	Dominique BOUVIER
Member	Aerospace and Defence - ASD	Eroc PARELON
Alternate	Aerospace and Defence - ASD	Francois DUCLOS
Member	Aerospace and Defence - ASD	Belinda SWAIN
Member	Aerospace Industries Association of America Inc.-AIA	David SILVER
Member	Aerospace Industries Association of America Inc.-AIA	Scott PEPPER
Member	Aerospace Industries Association of Canada - AIAC	Mark BEAUREGARD
Alternate	Aircraft Engineers International - AEI	Ola BLOMQVIST
Member	Airlines International Representation in Europe - AIRE	Erik MOYSON
Member	Airports Council International - ACI	Aidan FLANAGAN (day 1)
Alternate	Airports Council International - ACI	Ansgar SICKERT (day 2)
Alternate	Airports Council International - ACI	Øyvind HALLQUIST
Alternate	Associação das Industrias Aeroespaciais do Brasil - AIAB	Alexandre BIANCHI
Alternate	Civil Air Navigation Services Organisation - CANSO	Eduardo GARCIA
Member	Civil Air Navigation Services Organisation - CANSO (SAB Vice-Chair)	Osman SAAFAN
Member	Europe Air Sports - EAS	Rudolf SCHUEGRAF
Member	European Aviation Maintenance Training Committee - EAMTC	Hans MAYER
Member	European Business Aviation Association - EBAA	Johan GLANTZ
Member	European Cockpit Association - ECA	Tanja HARTER
Observer	European Council of General Aviation Support - ECOGAS	Anais BENSAI
Member	European Independent Maintenance Group - EIMG	Alex SEGENS
Alternate	European Regions Airline Association - ERA	Robert CAMPBELL-SMITH
Member	European Society of Aerospace Medicine - ESAM	Roland VERMEIREN
Member	European Transport Workers' Federation - ETF	Nikki JONES
Member	General Aviation Manufacturers Association - GAMA	Walter DESROSIER
Member	International Air Transport Association - IATA (SAB Chair)	Giancarlo BUONO
Member	International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools - IAAPS	Thomas LEOFF
Member	International Council of Aircraft Owner and Pilot Associations - IAOPA	Michael ERB
Exec Secretary	SAB Plenary Exec Secretary	Mark JONES
Observer	Future SAB Plenary Exec Secretary	Stuart ANDERSON
	EC	Alfonso ARROYO
	EASA	Luc TYTGAT (part time)
	EASA	Massimo MAZZOLETTI (part time)
	EASA	Julia EGERER

SAB#09 2020-01 Minutes

	EASA	Various presenters
--	------	--------------------