



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
EASA MANAGEMENT BOARD
HELD ON
14 DECEMBER 2011 (MB 04/2011)
AND SUMMARY OF DECISIONS TAKEN**

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS

At its meeting held on 14 December 2011, the Management Board:

- Endorsed the European Aviation Safety Plan 2012-2016;
- Endorsed the Agency's Business Plan 2012-2016;
- Formally adopted the Agency's 2012 Budget.



0. List of Attendees (Please see ANNEX 1)

The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed all participants.

1. Adoption of the Agenda - Comments from the Chair

- The Agenda was adopted as presented with two modifications at the proposal of the Chair:

- a) The report of the FABS Committee will be discussed after the ED Report;
- b) The Business Plan 2012-2016 and the Budget 2012 will be discussed right after the FABS report.

- Norway and Romania also proposed to discuss under AOB the issue of training, including the question of the coherence between training provided by EASA and the one given by EUROCONTROL (ECTRL).

The Chair underlined the sensitivity of the issue. He went on indicating that he will further discuss the topic with Norway and Romania, with a view to preparing a discussion at a future meeting.

2. Adoption of the minutes of the previous meeting

The draft minutes of MB 03/2011 were adopted as presented.

3. EASA Accommodation Strategy (Cologne and Brussels)

(Please see Minutes of the EASA MB Special Meeting of 14 December 2011)

4. Comments from the Chair

The Chair indicated that the Work-Programme 2012 has been adopted through written procedure with no amendments.

5. Report of the Executive Director

(Presented by the Executive Director (ED))

- The Executive Director presented the report on EASA developments since MB 03/2011. He underlined *inter alia* the following elements of the report:

- a) 1% cut of the subsidy at request of the Member States;
- b) Income from fees and charges is less than the amount budgeted;



- c) 14 extensions to ATM of existing working arrangements have been signed. Only Ukraine and Turkey have not signed the extension;
- d) Success of the 3rd International Cooperation Forum (ICF) which took place in Singapore. Forum where the Agency provides support to non-EASA countries;
- e) Participation of the Agency in several international cooperation projects like MASC and TRACECA 2;
- f) The Loss of Control workshop was a great success;
- g) Participation of the Agency in the development of Annex 19: 1 staff member is permanently based in Montreal to directly cooperate with ICAO, and 1 staff member as technical advisor to the nominated EU representative;
- h) Development of a Working Arrangement between ICAO and EASA on the continuing monitoring approach (CMA) and the recognition by ICAO of the results of the EASA standardisation inspections.

In discussing the ED Report the following points were made:

- EAB indicated its concerns with SERA-B rules developments. It also referred to POA issues related to China, pleading for a Bilateral with this country. They also required further clarification with regard to the amount of money spent on impact assessments (ASSESS I).
- France raised the importance of the agreement with ICAO as regards CMA to avoid duplication of audits and indicated that ICAO intends to conclude similar agreements with other international organisations.
- EC, with reference to both China and the US, indicated its support to push for solutions for the benefit of European industry, and notably for the US it highlighted the role of the Bilateral Oversight Board (BOB) and the issue of the TSA rules for new MOAs. As highlighted by the EAB, EC also asked for clarification on the nature of the ASSESS I procurement issue. It noted its concern with the indications given for the Fees & Charges perspectives, and reiterated its interest in seeing the results of the trend analysis (including impact assessment and potential counter measures) which the ED had indicated to the FABS committee he would have carried out.
- Austria underlined the significance of the safety regulatory requirements for SESAR and asked for clarification as to EASA's possible role.
- EAB acknowledged constraints in the resources and finances of the Agency and asked how, in view of a lower applications rate, the level of activity remains constant. EAB also requested the Agency to provide the necessary support to the industry experts participating in the projects already launched and the EC to support the EU industry in front of the Chinese Authorities



- The ED clarified that the decrease of applications was foreseeable and that the Agency has enough reserves to deal with the impact. He indicated that a trend analysis would be carried out and a subsequent report to the MB would be given in March 2012. As for the FAB related tasks of the Agency, they are determined in the Regulation. The Agency has to evaluate the safety cases by June 2012. The first evaluation is being produced and the criteria to be used are being elaborated. On ICAO he welcomed the coordination of the two audits (EASA + ICAO).
- The Approvals and Standardisation Director, Francesco Banal, commented that for efficiency gains the implementation of the new standardisation procedure (single standardisation method) was a good move.
- The Rulemaking Director, Jules Kneepkens, indicated, in relation to RIAs, that putting in place a framework contract does not automatically mean that one has to use it (ref. ASSESS I).
- The Chairman noted the importance of monitoring and planning for the certification demand, highlighting the significance of having a budget reserve if needed, as well as the partnership needed to manage such situations so as to not leave the EASA in isolation.

6. Report from the FABS Committee

(Presented by Ellen Bien)

- The FABS Chair welcomed the new set-up of the Business Plan (BP). The FABS advised to adopt the 2012 Budget of the Agency. The justification for the certification officers are to be found in page 2 (number of applications received) and page 3. There is a need to reduce costs on outsourcing to NAAs (1%). The mid-term financial crisis will be incorporated to next BP. Finally, the FABS Chair informed that the FABS is still working on the KPIs.
- EC noted that most of the issues in the report would be tackled during the meeting, and so limited its comments to acknowledging the importance of the work on KPIs, indicating its expectations to see the work finished in time to be integrated in the Work-Programme 2013. The Chair added that the KPIs will be presented to next FABS meeting.
- France mentioned that the KPIs work was also of specific interest to the ENACT group, that would contribute to the fine tuning of these KPIs.
- Denmark requested more efficiency in the certification activities.
- The ED clarified that the efficiency of the process and overheads is governed by the administrative burden imposed by the financial Regulation.



- EAB indicated that the documents of the FABS are available quite late and expressed their disappointment on the lack of progress on the KPIs. They also requested the simplification of the invoicing process.

7. Business Plan 2012-2016 + Budget 2012

(Presented by the Finance Director, Luc Vanheel)

- The Finance Director introduced the BP 2012-2016 and the Budget 2012 pointing out mainly the following aspects:

- a) The EASA Business Plan 2012-2016 covers a period of challenge and change for the Agency and its stakeholders. It is based on Business Plan 2011-2015 but the text contribution reduced in length to a total of 20 pages;

- b) 2012 staff is in line with the MSPP 2012-2014, while from 2013 new requests for Fees & Charges financed posts are included;

- c) Fees & Charges revenues and costs are based on market and workload evolution and the current F&C Regulation. Also, the expenses are assumed to match the foreseen invoiced amount and the amount invoiced is assumed to be equal to the amount cashed for a given period.

- d) Compared to the previous Business Plan 2011-2015, the main changes are the reduction of the Subsidy with 1% compared to the originally requested amounts and any eventual budget surplus is incorporated in the following year. An increase in the Fees & Charges revenue and expenditure is mainly linked to additional tasks assumed to start in April 2012;

- e) Inflation rate of 2% is applied;

- f) The 2012 Provisional Budget is based on the assumption that the implementing rules related to the first extension will be adopted in April 2012 at the latest. This results in a headcount target of 634 TAs at the end of 2012, fully in line with the approved SPP 2012-2014.

- With specific regard to the BP 2012-2016 the Chairman reminded the MB that this was not for a MB Decision but for endorsement.

- Germany tabled the question whether the Agency will have to face further restrictions regarding its budget, notably with regards to the subsidy.

- EC congratulated the Agency for the new and improved format of the BP, due also to the constructive discussions in the FABS committee. It indicated its readiness to support the adoption of the BP 2012-2016, nevertheless highlighting the importance of giving timely and due consideration to the impact as a result of COM's proposal for the 2014-2020 Financial Perspectives. It further noted that the proposed budget and staff increases are in line with the BP assumptions approved in June 2011, but underlined that the financial and economic environment had changed since then and



that any increase in the budget or staff, when compared to the 2012 agreed figures, should be clearly justified with regards to the increase in activities of the Agency.

- France also welcomed the new format and indicated that the impact on the C+S activities of the opt-outs foreseen in the new implementing rules should be taken into account. Moreover, they pointed out the fact that there is no decision yet on the TCO in the EASA Committee, and the development of the mid-term strategy should be reflected in the plan.

- Norway emphasized that when deciding on the new Regulation the Rulemaking amount of work should be taken into consideration and the requests of the industry should be taken on board.

- Italy also welcomed the new format and stated that the increase of staff should be linked to the needs. Moreover, Italy considered necessary to align the BP with the mid-term strategy.

- EAB mentioned that a total system approach should be followed when financing EASA. The activities within the remits of the opt-outs have to be postponed.

- UK agreed on the new format and shared views of France with regard to the necessity to evaluate the impact of the opt-outs which should be reflected somewhere in the BP.

- EC indicated that EASA activities derive directly from the transfer of competences to the EU, and as part of this process MS must contribute actively.

- The Finance Director mentioned that as of 1st April the BP needs to be adapted to reality. On overheads (page 22), total support costs are reduced, the Agency is making efforts. The proposal of the Commission for a reduction of 1% per year of the increases has already been planned. An evaluation of the fees to be levied to compensate for the pensions contributions of Agency staff is needed.

- The ED called attention to the fact that if the pressure continues to decrease funding, safety issues could arise. It is a clear political decision of which our political masters need to be made aware of.

- Norway and Denmark fully supported the aforementioned statement of the ED

- The FABS Chair pointed out the 1% cut as proposed by FABS.

- France mentioned that a sentence should be included to address the uncertainty as regards the timing for the implementation of the new Regulation.

- The Chair mentioned the unique status of the Agency due to the tasks assigned to it. He added that the Agency would keep the Board informed about of the financial situation and on the regulation update. He concluded by stating that the BP 2012-2016 can be considered as endorsed.



- 2012 Budget: The FABS Chair mentioned that it is agreed. The Finance Director indicated that it is fully based on the BP, there are no new elements. The Chair added that it can be then considered as adopted.
- 2013 Budget: EC, with reference to earlier comments made in conjunction with the BP 2012-2016, reiterated that it could not commit to any figures beyond the EU subsidy granted for 2012, nor to any increase in staff for 2013.
- The Chair summarized the discussions and their outcome as follows:
 - a) The BP 2012-2016 has been endorsed;
 - b) The Budget 2012 has been adopted;
 - c) The mid-term strategy should be incorporated into the BP;
 - d) The 'Strategic Drivers' should be more visible in the BP;
 - e) The KPIs to be incorporated in the WP and BP when available;
 - f) Having in mind the resourcing uncertainties until 2015, effectiveness of Agency activities is the priority at this moment and should be clearly reflected in the BP;
 - g) There is a need to make clear to the political masters the safety consequences of reducing the financial support to the Agency.
 - h) NAAs must do their part in addressing efficiency gains for EASA and the system as a whole.

8. EASA Safety Strategy

8.1. Commission Communication

(Presented by the European Commission (EC))

- EC shortly presented the report and requested feedback from MS in this regard and indicated that it is time to flag it in their organisations. It reiterated the importance in giving it the visibility it deserves.
- Romania expressed concerns on the deadlines and the absence of SMS since the latter is required by ICAO for the MS to build their State Safety Plans (SSPs).
- Spain welcomed the report and also recommended to include the SMS aspects involving also the industry.
- France welcomed the report and highlighted the need to continue to pass a strong message at the political level in order to get consensus and support in this field.
- Germany considered that the content was not really new and they have not completely understood the added value of the new paper. However, it is a good basis to raise the issue to the political masters.



- Austria, in echoing the point made by Germany, re-emphasised the need for associated communication to highlight the added value, not additional burden.
- In response to these initial comments, EC indicated need to link with the Communication Strategy discussed on Day 1, and in doing so ensure a stronger impact possibly by linking the initiative with potential accident reduction rates.
- Sweden agreed with France's views. They considered necessary to adopt a promotion plan and take actions at the level of Ministries.
- Ireland considered the communication as a good initiative and mentioned that the same predictions were made in 1990. It is necessary to give credit to regulators but also to industry. The system as such is in principle reliable. It indicated that this should not be perceived as a replacement but as a further strengthening.
- The Netherlands mentioned the necessity of having a strategy to prevent accidents and identified the communication issue as the missing element in the paper. They also advocated the creation of a steering committee to drive actions follow-up impact for the EASp and EASP, as well as for NAAs.
- Finland indicated that the number of issues of the Plan should be reduced e.g. to 10 items.
- Cyprus supported the paper and expressed its availability to participate in the Steering Committee.
- EC took note of the feedback received mentioning that they would work to improve the communication strategy and would introduce the occurrence reporting as a concrete action.
- The Chair welcomed the report and summarized the discussions as follows:
 - a) Relevance of the communications issue;
 - b) There is a need to have the necessary resources to ensure safety. Therefore it is necessary to get it through our political masters;
 - c) EC will report regularly on progress to the Board on progress (every 6 months).

8.2. European Aviation Safety Plan (EASp)

(Presented by the Deputy Director for Strategic Safety, John Vincent)

- John Vincent explained that the main risk areas had not been changed in this second edition of the EASp and asked Member States to come forward and report on progress. There are currently 23 focal points nominated in the NAAs to progress the actions. In 2011, 13 actions were completed, whereas there are 26 new actions.
- The Netherlands mentioned that some areas could be emphasized even more alike the total system approach. In indicating that bird strikes could be a new issue to be



included, it asked for clarification on how the process for the identification of new issues.

- Romania highlighted the need to foster the State Safety Plan (SSP) and agreed on safety performance indicators. They further requested to include all objectives in a single document. Furthermore, they strongly suggested not to endorse the EASp at the meeting, as they were lacking internal coordination, but postpone the decision till January.

- EAB said that the new EASp is an improvement and indicated the importance of sharing of safety data. They also mentioned the need to improve the link between EASA and NAAs. Finally, they expressed their concern about the creation of the ICAO Regional Aviation Safety Group (RASG) in Europe in view of possible duplication that could emerge.

- France commended the work and indicated the need to be realistic when identifying new issues. It also requested more information on the creation of the network of analysts and the availability of sufficient resources, including from MS/NAAs.

- Spain congratulated EASA, requested to limit the number of actions and suggested to work on the synchronization of the BP and WP with the EASp.

- EC welcomed this work as a sound start on the road to a mature risk based, information driven, safety system, accepting that it is 'early days' in the development of the pro-active system, and that work continues in setting up the mechanisms required to set the process on a sound footing. It indicated that it will continue to work closely with EASA in this development work, and in particular the actions described in the recent Communication, especially those relating to improving the Occurrence Reporting system.

- UK very much welcomed the EASp and supported the top-down approach presented. Moreover, they agreed with the key actions of the plan. Furthermore, UK said that Section 2.8. "Governance" should be reviewed to correctly reflect the role of EASAC as an advisory Committee.

- Italy communicated that they would put their SSP in line with the EASp by the end of the month.

- Finland pointed out the link between the EASp and the AR OPs rules.

- Ireland welcomed the new EASp as well and said that it is important to be aware of the different requirements and pieces of legislation on occurrence reporting in the MS. Furthermore, Ireland considered that 93 actions is maybe too much, the number should be reduced and added that it should cover all domains.

- John Vincent agreed to reduce the number of actions and stated that the SSPs and the EASp must be consistent although they do not need to be exactly the same. He emphasized that the Network of Analysts (NoA) is now resourced and that the EASp



will continue to take input from the NoA and existing safety teams. Concerning the EUR RASG, he stated that it should build on what we already have in the EU and avoid duplicating activities. He furthermore underlined that the EASp had to focus on truly European issues, and not local ones.

- EC indicated that the readability should be improved to facilitate its understanding by non-experts.

- The Chair concluded by welcoming this latest iteration of the Safety Plan. He proposed that the Agency should group the identified actions into a limited number of priority areas to improve the presentation and readability of the Plan. He said that the document can be considered as endorsed by the Board.

9. Review of the Rulemaking process

(Presented by the Chair of the Working Group, the Rulemaking Director, Jules Kneepkens)

- The Rulemaking Director emphasized the following main points during his presentation:

a) The working group has worked hard in the last months to address the recommendations provided by the Board in its September meeting. The working group has also consulted AGNA and SSCC between October and November. The working group has completed the report with further concrete proposals: most of them are in Chapter 4 and in the Annexes, and has also revised the MB Decision on the “rulemaking procedure”.

b) The revised procedure includes mainly changes required to implement the proposals presented in the report. In addition, some textual improvements or updates are proposed.

c) RAG and TAGs will replace AGNA and the Commission will be a member of them. 4 TAGs are set up for the time being: Airworthiness, Flight Crew Licensing and Air Operations, ATM/ANS and Aerodromes.

d) MS and the Commission are entitled to nominate a member for each TAG, appointing qualified experts to advise authoritatively on the subject.

e) The rulemaking process is tailored in two steps: 1) At the Pre-RIA stage a first assessment of the complexity and controversy of the task is performed to propose the variant to be followed. This is reflected also in the timescale of the task as indicated in the Rulemaking Programme; 2) At the ToR stage such an assessment is enriched by updated considerations, and the process to be followed is further detailed in the description of the working method. The ToR gives the strict framework for the task to be performed.



The Agency decides on the final ToR shortly after consultation with RAG/TAGs and SSCC.

f) RAG and TAGs, in cooperation with SSCC, will ensure 1) a strategic approach by supporting the Agency in identifying whether there is a need for a rulemaking action (a Pre-RIA will be here used as supporting tool) 2) an upstream coordination with a view to improving agreement on principles guiding the rulemaking tasks to initiate, and 3) a final consultation on outstanding major objections prior to publication of EASA opinions.

g) The principles guiding complex or controversial tasks will be agreed by consultation of the concept paper (when available) and ToR. For simple and standard tasks, the consultation of the ToR will be used as a tool for agreeing on the principles. A final consultation on outstanding major objections will take place prior to publication of EASA opinions.

h) Next steps:

- March 2012: Presenting at the MB meeting the roadmap for implementing the proposals;
- March 2012: 1st meeting of TAGs;
- June 2012: 1st meeting of RAG.

- In welcoming the report, EAB requested to keep the CRD reaction period and the appropriate management of tasks.

- EC, indicating its support for the proposals, highlighted their timeliness since they respond to the problems and limitations identified as the catalyst for launching the process. Furthermore, they pointed out the necessity to separate the Rulemaking process from the process associated with the identification of safety issues relevant for Rulemaking. It called for a speedy implementation, and welcomed the data-driven approach for rulemaking activities to ensure proportionate and well motivated EU rules.

- France, noting that whereas clarification had been given on what remains a complex setup, also supported the proposals and considered that the Executive Director of the Agency should continue to play the central role as the responsible party to deliver the final opinions.

- Spain highlighted that the ToRs of RAG and TAGs should be clear and that a mature product should go to the EASA Committee.

- Sweden mentioned that the total system approach should be ensured by TAGs and there should be a link between the Single Sky and EASA Committees. They also added that the impact of the Lisbon Treaty should be evaluated and the link between the EASA and the Single Sky Committees should be discussed in the March meeting.



- The Netherlands emphasized also the safeguard of the total system approach and that EASA remains ultimately responsible for the outcome of the process.
- EC said that it should be ensured, to the extent possible, that highly controversial issues of a technical nature are agreed before the EASA Opinions arrives to the EASA Committee. It was also indicated that a joint committee (EASA Committee/SS Committee) will be organised when deemed necessary. With specific regard to the comitology procedures under the Lisbon treaty it was indicated that this is under preparation.
- The Chair concluded the discussion by stating that the proposal would be opened for eventual comments to the revised Draft Decision until the end of January and that the formal adoption will take place in March. However, the Agency could already start with the implementation of the new approach, and an implementation plan should be elaborated and presented to the MB in March.

10. Planning documents 2013

- EC mentioned that there appeared to be an inconsistency between the overall budget figures of the BP and those presented in the Staff Policy Plan (SPP) 2013-2015. It indicated that there appeared also to be an inconsistency between the assumptions outline in Section 2 of the MSPP and the Basic Assumptions of the BP. Finally, in mentioning that the efficiency gains reflected in the BP did not appear in the MSPP, it reiterated its inability to commit at this time to any figures beyond 2012.
- EAB queried the indications with regards to TCO staff numbers.
- The ED mentioned that both documents are aligned, with the SPP derived from the BP. OPs Department has limited resources and needs to hire TCO staff in advance to prepare the work in advance. The Agency awaits final decisions on the TCO rules.
- Romania mentioned that the existing support from EUROCONTROL should be re-assessed.
- The Chair indicated that the 2015 figures appeared to go somewhat against the grain of the current economic climate. He said that the discussions would be continued in March and the MS are invited to send written comments to the Agency.

11. The Fees & Charges Regulation: Extension of the scope

(Presented by the European Commission (EC))

- EC mentioned that the proposal has been adjusted by keeping the notion of the Third Country Operator (TCO) and removing the minimum number of hours. It reiterated that the inclusion of TCO does not pre-empt the final outcome of the TCO Implementing Rule discussions, but would allow EASA to levy fees when the final rule



becomes applicable without having to go through yet another amendment of the Fees & Charges Regulation. The proposal will go to the EASA Committee upon consultation through written procedure of the Management Board and the EAB.

- EAB indicated that a formal letter will be sent to the Management Board with their position. They also mentioned that an hourly rate of 226€ is too high and that the new remits should be reflected. They considered that there should not be fees for TCO since this is not in line with the intention of the legislator. There are concerns within the General Aviation community about the financial impact.

- France said that the reference to TCO should be removed and that this could be covered by the existing non-exhaustive sentence on tasks.

- The Netherlands proposed to remove it at this stage and consider to re-introduce in a second phase.

- Finland expressed their concerns about the fact that the TCO authorisation will be valid only for 12 months.

The Chair said that a written procedure would be used to seek Members' views on the draft Regulation, since the Board is required by the Basic Regulation to submit its Opinion to the Commission, having consulted the EAB.

12. Report from the ENaCT Group

(Presented by Maxime Coffin)

- Maxime Coffin briefly pointed out the following aspects:

- a) There is a follow-up of the Agency's outsourcing procedure. The tender is out and candidates (NAAs + QE) have been pre-selected in the first Phase.
- b) The possibility of placing EASA staff members in NAAs is being discussed.
- c) The review of the ToRs of the Group is on-going with the idea among others to limit the number of meetings. The new ToRs will be presented to the Board in June.

13. AOB + final comments of the Chair

- The Chairman concluded the meeting by anticipating the points of agenda for the MB 01/2012 to be held in March:

- a) Rulemaking implementation plan;
- b) MB Decision on the new Rulemaking Process;
- c) Rulemaking Report on the first extension;
- d) The ATM rulemaking programme;



- e) SPP 2013-2015;
- f) Other documents from FABS, including proposals on KPIs
- g) General Aviation paper to be presented by the Agency;
- h) Research paper to be presented by the Agency.

- IRL proposed to produce a paper on volcanic ash. The Norway approach could be presented.

- Romania indicated the need for a clarification of the training policy of the Agency.

- The Chair closed the session thanking all Delegations for the fruitful discussions.



ANNEX 1: List of Attendance

Members

	MEMBER	ALTERNATE	EXPERT
AUSTRIA	Karl Prachner	Franz Nirschl	
BELGIUM		Benoit Van Noten	
BULGARIA	Tilko Petrov	Eleonora Dobрева	
CYPRUS	Leonidas Leonidou		
CZECH REPUBLIC	Josef Rada	Vítězslav Hezký	
DENMARK		Per Veinberg	
ESTONIA			
FINLAND	Pekka Henttu		Kim Salonen
FRANCE	Maxime Coffin		Thierry Lempereur
GERMANY		Josef Schiller	
GREECE		Georgios Sourvanos	
HUNGARY		Eva Kallai	
ICELAND*	Petur Maack		
IRELAND		Kevin Humphreys	
ITALY	Alessio Quaranta	Benedetto Marasa	Carmine Cifaldi
LATVIA			Aigars Krastins
LIECHTENSTEIN*			
LITHUANIA			
LUXEMBOURG	Claude Waltzing	Claude Wagener	
MALTA			
NETHERLANDS	Ellen Bien	Jan-Dirk Steenbergen Pieter Mulder	Sjoerd Van Dijk
NORWAY*	Heine Richardsen	Oyvind Ek	
POLAND		Tomasz Kadziolka	Darius Gluszkiewicz
PORTUGAL		Paulo Alexandre Ramos de Figueiredo Soares	Antonio Jesús Bastos Estima
ROMANIA	Claudia Virlan		

* Members without voting rights



	MEMBER	ALTERNATE	EXPERT
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	Peter Patoprsty		
SLOVENIA		Jozef Slana	
SPAIN		José M. Ramírez Ciriza	
SWEDEN	Ingrid Cherfils	Lars Österberg	Magnus Molitor
SWITZERLAND*	Marcel Zuckschwerdt		
UNITED KINGDOM	Michael Smethers (Chair)	Susan Hamilton Pat Ricketts	
EUROPEAN COMMISSION		Mathiew Baldwin Eckard Seebohm	Peter Sorensen

Observers

	MEMBER	ALTERNATE	EXPERT
EASA ADVISORY BOARD¹	Vincent De Vroey	Gilles Garrouste	
ALBANIA¹			
BOSNIA AND HERZOGOVINA¹			Selma Hodzic
CROATIA¹			
FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA¹			
MONTENEGRO¹		Renato Brnakovic	
SERBIA¹			Dragan Tesla
U.N. MISSION IN KOSOVO¹			

¹ Observers without voting rights.



ANNEX 2: Action List

No.	Action number	Description action	Action holder	Deadline
1	04/MB 02/11	Convene EASA/EAB Working Group on Certification Methodology		MB 04/2011
2	05/MB04/11	ED to identify Focal Points for 6 priority areas – deadline “as soon as possible”	Agency	“as soon as possible”
3	06/MB04/11	Progress report on Implementation of Rulemaking Review	Agency	MB 01/2012
4	07/MB04/11	Decision on Revision to Rulemaking Procedure Decision	MB	MB 01/2012
5	08/MB04/11	Progress report on ATM rulemaking programme	Agency	MB 01/2012
6	09/MB04/11	Discussion on regulation of GA	Agency	MB 01/2012
7	10/MB04/11	Discussion on the EASA Research Programme	Agency	MB 01/2012
8	11/MB04/11	ED to inform MB on accommodation developments	Agency	On-going
9	12/MB04/11	Written consultation on draft Fees and Charges Regulation	MB	January 2012
10	13/MB04/11	Chair to discuss training with Norway and Romania	Chair	MB 01/2012