| ROADMAP | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **TITLE OF THE INITIATIVE** | Policy initiative on aviation safety and a possible revision of Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 on common rules in the field of civil aviation and establishing a European Aviation Safety Agency | | |
| **LEAD DG – RESPONSIBLE UNIT** | DG MOVE – E.3 | **DATE OF ROADMAP** | 06/05/2015 |
| **This indicative roadmap is provided for information purposes only and is subject to change. It does not prejudge the final decision of the Commission on whether this initiative will be pursued or on its final content and structure.** | | | |

## A. Context and problem definition

(1) What is the political context of the initiative?

(2) How does it relate to past and possible future initiatives, and to other EU policies?

(3) What ex-post analysis of existing policy has been carried out? What results are relevant for this initiative?

(1) This initiative is one of the deliverables of the overall aviation strategy which is part of the Commission Work Programme 2015. The present civil aviation safety system in the EU is based on a set of common safety rules designed for uniform application across the Union. The Joint Aviation Authorities (JAA) developed the first common standards for aviation safety in Europe based on a voluntary cooperation of Member States. With the adoption of Regulation (EC) No 1592/2002[1] and the subsequent creation of the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) in 2003 a new regulatory framework was created. It aimed above all at a high level of protection of European citizens while protecting the environment and facilitating the free movement of goods, persons and services in the internal market. Through further EU regulation the Agency's responsibilities and the scope of its work were increased. Regulation (EC) No 216/2008[2] extended the initial scope of EASA from airworthiness and environmental certification of aeronautical products to air operations, pilots' licences and the safety of third-country aircraft. Regulation (EC) No 1108/2009[3] extended the common rules to cover also the safety of aerodromes, air traffic management and air navigation services. The first generation of detailed rulemaking in all these areas is now largely completed.

EASA has become the centrepiece of the EU's strategy for aviation safety. The Agency works in close cooperation with the European Commission, and together with EU-Member States and National Competent Authorities (National Aviation Authorities, National Surveillance Authorities) forms the European Aviation Safety System. This system has been extended to a number of non-EU European countries[4] by means of international agreements and "working arrangements", and is therefore increasingly pan-European in scope. The Agency prepares draft rules for consideration in the European Union legislative procedures. In doing so EASA consults with stakeholders including organisations and associations representing industry, social partners and end user groups. Where national authorities are charged with implementing the adopted rules, the Agency monitors their implementation through continuous monitoring activities. For certification purposes the Agency issues specifications, acceptable means of compliance and guidance material. To this end it draws on expertise from the public and private sector. Certain certification tasks are directly incumbent on the Agency. In addition, all States involved in the system are Contracting States to the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) and thus have legal obligations under the Chicago Convention and related provisions emanating from it. The European aviation safety system has therefore to be seen in the context of safety requirements at a global level, many of which are now enacted or implemented at European level.

(2) This initiative has to be seen against the background of the 2011 Transport White Paper entitled "Roadmap to a Single European Transport Area"[5], stating the aim of the EU becoming the safest region for aviation. Moreover, in view of this goal, the Commission set out a number of specific actions contributing to moving towards a pro-active,

1 Regulation (EC) No 1592/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 July 2002 on common rules in the field of civil aviation and establishing a European Aviation Safety Agency, OJ L 240, 7.9.2002, p. 1–21.

2 Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 February 2008 on common rules in the field of civil aviation and establishing a European Aviation Safety Agency, and repealing Council Directive 91/670/EEC, Regulation (EC) No 1592/2002 and Directive 2004/36/EC, OJ L 79, 19.3.2008, p. 1–49.

3 Regulation (EC) No 1108/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 amending Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 in the field of aerodromes, air traffic management and air navigation services and repealing Directive 2006/23/EC, OJ L 309, 24.11.2009, p. 51–70.

4 Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway, and Switzerland.

5 COM(2011) 144 final 28.03.2011.

evidence-based management of aviation safety in a Communication to the Council and the European Parliament on "Setting up an Aviation Safety Management System for Europe"[6]. In response to a number of actions identified therein, Regulation (EU) No 376/2014 on the reporting, analysis and follow-up of occurrences in civil aviation[7] was adopted. It aims at improving existing reporting systems and ensures use of information for safety improvements. A coherent and comprehensive collection of occurrence related data and their analysis is crucial for identifying hazards and assessing the risk they pose, and constitutes an essential step towards a proactive and evidence-based aviation safety management system. The European Aviation Safety Programme[8]sets out how aviation safety is managed at EU level. It will be updated in the context of this initiative to describe the state of play of the aviation safety system at the moment of the adoption of the proposal. A European Aviation Safety Plan, which details necessary actions to be implemented for improving EU aviation safety, is updated by EASA on a regular basis to take account of EU wide identified high level risks. In addition, certain implementing rules to Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 contain management systems requirements, including safety risk management imposed on the Member States and on some service providers. All these activities constitute central elements in building an Aviation Safety Management System at EU level in accordance with the above mentioned Communication. However, while some elements of a safety management system, such as the requirement to collect data in view of identifying safety hazards and adopting necessary mitigation actions, have been integrated in EU legislation[9], the existing EU legal framework is incomplete and unequally developed across different industry segments. There is no general legal requirement yet for Member States to adopt State Safety Programmes.. At ICAO level Annex 19 on safety management has become applicable as of November 2013. It reinforces the role of the States in managing aviation safety in the framework of a State Safety Programme, using safety management systems in cooperation with service providers, and promotes a systematic approach to safety.

This initiative has also to be seen in the context of the Europe 2020 Strategy[10] for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, of which innovation is a centrepiece. The flagship initiative “Innovation Union”[11] also calls for screening the regulatory framework and for identifying the rules that need to be improved or updated, as well as for speeding-up and modernising standard-setting, in order to provide incentives to drive innovation. Improving certification processes in aviation is instrumental to underpinning European innovation in this sector. A performing European Aviation Safety system is necessary to reduce time to market and to keep European producers competitive.

Finally, a proposal for amending Regulation (EC) No 216/2008[12] was submitted to the European Parliament and to the Council as part of the revised Single European Sky package SES2+[13]. The amendments proposed in the context of SES2+ are limited to creating coherence with the recast of SES provisions, to aligning the rules to Articles 290 and 291 TFEU on delegated and implementing acts and to the implementation of core elements of the Joint Statement of the European Parliament, Council and Commission on decentralised agencies of 19.07.2012. The SES2+ proposal however has limited impact on EASA governance and does not seek to modernise aviation safety policy as such. Depending on the respective progress of the two initiatives, changes to Regulation (EC) 216/2008 will be further coordinated.

(3) According to Article 62 of Regulation (EC) No 216/2008, the EASA Management Board shall commission an independent external evaluation on the implementation of the regulation every five years, which examines how effectively EASA is fulfilling its mission as well as the impact of the regulation and the Agency's work on establishing a high level of civil aviation safety. The latest report dates from December 2013[14]. It concludes that while EASA in its relatively short life has succeeded in meeting high standards and adapting itself to a heavy workload, the present system is not sufficiently equipped to meet the challenges ahead, and provides a number of recommendations regarding the role and responsibilities of EASA and safety management. The problems presented below largely reflect this evaluation.

What are the main problems which this initiative will address?

The current European Aviation Safety System is characterised by consistently high safety levels. In 2012 the number of commercial air transport aeroplane flights under the EASA system was 10.5 million, the number of passengers carried was 925 million and there was only one fatal accident. Accidents and serious incidents at

6 COM(2011) 670 final, 25.10.2011.
7 OJ L 122, of 24.04.2014, p. 18.
8 SEC(2011) 1261 final, 25.10.2011.
9 For example, Commission Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 of 3 November 2011 laying down technical requirements and administrative procedures related to civil aviation aircrew pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council, and Commission Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 of 5 October 2012 laying down technical requirements and administrative procedures related to air operations pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council.
10 COM(2010) 2020 final.
11 SEC(2010) 1161 – Commitments n.15 and n.16.
12 COM(2013) 409 final, 11.06.2013.
13 COM(2013) 410 final, 11.06.2013.
14 Article 62 panel evaluation, final report – 9 December 2013: http://easa.europa.eu/system/files/dfu/Article%2062%20Report.pdf

aerodromes are also decreasing. The European Aviation Safety System has thus proven to be effective.

However, whilst the aviation accident rate continues to decline, the rate of decline has slowed since 2004[15]. Furthermore, global air transport is expected to grow by around 5% annually until 2030 and, according to major manufacturers the total number of commercial aircraft in operation is expected to double by 2031. This will likely lead to an increased risk of accidents as a by-product of steadily increasing traffic volumes. In order to preserve the current low level of fatalities and incidents, it has to be ensured that the rate of accidents continues to decline given the growing number of flights. In addition, aviation represents an extremely dynamic market subject to increasing capacity demands, global competition and environmental performance needs. Consequently, there are developments in the air transport industry of a technological, economic and organisational nature of which account has to be taken. These challenges need to be addressed in conditions of strain on the resources of Member States, National Aviation Authorities and EASA[16]. Therefore it is crucial for all partners in the European Aviation Safety System to reach greater efficiency in the use of these limited resources.

The core challenges to be addressed by this initiative can be divided into two groups – one regarding the current regulatory system and the other regarding the governance of the system:

- **Regulatory System**:
    - **The limits of the current system.** A number of rules in aviation safety have developed over time based on a predominantly reactive/prescriptive regulatory approach. While this system has so far assured a very good aviation safety record in Europe, other tools may be needed to drive further improvements. Prescriptive rules set out "one-size fits all" solutions which may not be equally effective and efficient in different conditions. Furthermore, to be effective a compliance-based system requires close compliance checks. In view of the number of rules, limits might be reached in terms of resources to perform these checks. Consequently the present regulations are often perceived by part of the industry as burdensome, costly and in certain cases hampering innovation. Moreover, part of industry considers prescriptive safety rules to be too complex, detailed, and occasionally redundant or inefficient with regard to the safety objective.

      With regard to safety improvements a reactive system also has its limitations. While in the past safety improvements were essentially resulting from technological progress, compliance with prescriptive regulation and lessons learnt from accidents and serious incidents, it is recognised today that further improvements require a proactive safety management. At international level ICAO has introduced a risk-based safety management system combining reactive and proactive methodologies.[17] Though the EU is moving in this direction by introducing evidence-, risk- and performance-based elements in some aviation legislation[18], it is still far from having fully integrated these concepts in its regulatory system.
    - **The system is not sufficiently responsive to adapt to a changing market**. New technologies and related products, as well as innovative operations and business models evolve quickly. These innovations or the situations they create are not necessarily covered by the existing legal framework (e.g. remotely piloted aircraft systems, commercial space transport, dual-use certification, new business models in the aircraft leasing market, multi-national operations, more transnational organisation of industry as opposed to national oversight). The European Aviation Safety System needs to address and oversee these industry developments by providing the adequate regulatory means, which otherwise might lead to new safety hazards.

- **Governance in the European Aviation Safety System - Remit, Organisation and Resources**:
    - **Complex institutional setup leading to inefficiencies.** An initially piecemeal approach to the European aviation safety policy and a gradual extension of the EASA mandate have created a system including numerous actors (EASA, Commission, National Aviation Authorities and National Supervisory Authorities) with a complex interaction between them. It is inter alia complemented by ICAO setting standards at international level and Eurocontrol activity in the domain of air traffic management. There are some uncertainties regarding the roles and responsibilities of these different players, leading to inefficiencies or lack of responsiveness when faced with new

15 EASA Annual Safety Review 2012.

16 See Article 62 panel evaluation, final report – 9 December 2013: http://easa.europa.eu/system/files/dfu/Article%2062%20Report.pdf

17 ICAO Safety Management Manual, third edition - 2012, Doc 9859, AN/747.

18 E.g. Commission Regulation (EU) No 691/2010 of 29 July laying down a performance scheme for air navigation services and network functions and amending Regulation (EC) No 2096/2005 laying down common requirements for the provision of air navigation services; Regulation (EU) No 376/2014 of the Parliament and the Council on the reporting, analysis and follow-up of occurrences in civil aviation, amending Regulation (EU) No 996/2010 and repealing Directive 2003/42/EC, Commission Regulation (EC) No 1321/2007 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 1330/2007.

developments. In particular in the area of oversight, the European Aviation Safety System relies on national authorities for most of the industry oversight tasks. There appears to be an increasing divergence of the various Competent Authorities in terms of aspiration and capability in the field of aviation safety regulation. The Article 62 evaluation (see above) has found that there is a lack of resources at the level of the Member States' authorities regarding budget and staff to fulfil their oversight obligations. This is partially due to an inefficient distribution of tasks and a fragmentation of the system, requiring each Member State irrespective of the size of its aviation sector to provide the necessary expertise in all domains. Consequently, there may be a safety risk if oversight obligations are not complied with. It may be that the system collectively has enough resources which however are not deployed in the most efficient way.
Also at international level responsibilities within the system are sometimes scattered, causing redundancies/contradictions in some areas (e. g. multiple replies to ICAO state letters from Member States). Maintaining a leading role in the development and implementation of international safety standards is essential for both safety and competitiveness in the rapidly developing global air transport market. This is primarily a question of the availability of resources which the EU and Member States can devote to international outreach and safety promotion activities.

- **Inconsistencies and differences in approach between different domains of aviation regulation.** There are numerous interdependencies between technical and operational regulation of different aviation domains with regard to safety, while following different regulatory approaches (e. g. safety and security in Air Traffic Management). There are inconsistencies within aviation safety legislation as well as in relation to other aviation legislation (e.g. lack of certification for ATM systems). Replies have to be found to requests from the military, customs, police or similar services to extend EU rules to aircraft of their sectors. Competences, including the specific remit of EASA, require review, as suggested by the Article 62 evaluation, to close possible loopholes, to ensure a consistent approach when regulating the different domains of aviation, including economic performance regulation, to ascertain availability of adequate expertise and to avoid wasting resources.

Who will be affected by it?

Directly the Commission, EASA, National Aviation Authorities, National Supervisory Authorities, Eurocontrol, SESAR Joint Undertaking, aviation service providers, aviation manufacturing and air transport industry, indirectly other airspace users and passengers.

Is EU action justified on grounds of subsidiarity? Why can Member States not achieve the objectives of the proposed action sufficiently by themselves? Can the EU achieve the objectives better?

Member States have already agreed that action at EU level is necessary to attain a high, uniform level of safety. According to Art. 100 (2) TFEU the European Parliament and the Council may lay down appropriate provisions for air transport. Aviation is frequently of transnational character and requires common action on European and international level. This has been demonstrated by the adoption of Regulation (EC) No 1592/2002 and Regulation (EC) No 216/2008. Since then, industry has become even more transnational in its operations in the single European market and the common external challenge - pressure of global competition on European champions in aeronautical manufacturing and services - has grown further. If the scope of Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 is suggested to be enlarged, subsidiarity will be looked at during the impact assessment.

## B. Objectives of the initiative

What are the main policy objectives?

The general objective of the initiative is to improve the performance of the European aviation system with regard to safety, competitiveness, and environmental protection, by setting the appropriate regulatory framework. Thus the initiative will contribute specifically to a "deeper and fairer internal market with a strengthened industrial base", a "new boost for jobs, growth and investment" and the EU becoming a "stronger global actor" among the Juncker Commission priorities.

More specifically, the initiative will seek to improve the effectiveness of the European Aviation Safety System by

- updating the regulatory system to
  - render it more proportional;
  - improve its ability to identify and mitigate safety risks, and monitor performance in a systematic manner;
  - address new developments in a timely and dynamic way.

- revising governance, in particular responsibilities of actors in the European Aviation Safety System to:
  - better cooperate throughout the system in order to maximize use of available resources and to increase safety and overall efficiency including at international level;
  - ensure a consistent approach between the different technical and operational domains of aviation regulation.

Do the objectives imply developing EU policy in new areas?

No

## C. Options

(1) What are the policy options (including exemptions/adapted regimes e.g. for SMEs) being considered?

(2) What legislative or 'soft law' instruments could be considered?

(3) How do the options respect the proportionality principle?

(1) Options are considered in two main domains to address different problem elements. The (sub-) options are not necessarily mutually exclusive and the impact assessment will consider combinations of options taking into account the interdependencies between the two domains.

**1. Update the regulatory system:**

1.1 Baseline: maintaining the current regulatory system: Prescriptive rulemaking with close compliance checks combined with evidence-, risk- and performance based elements in some aviation areas.

1.2 Implement proactive, risk, standards and performance based approach: Prescriptive rulemaking combined with both reactive and proactive approaches:

- A proactive and evidence-based approach to predict safety hazards and adopt mitigation action building on harmonised data collection and consistent aggregation and analysis.
- Risk-based approach to oversight to use scarce resources more efficiently:
  - Identify areas that require closer oversight than others based on a risk hierarchy
  - Introduce performance monitoring and audit type checks
  - Allow for industry self-oversight on the basis of clear legal conditions in areas of low risk and high performance.
- Introducing a more robust performance based approach to regulation in aviation safety where appropriate (building on experience gained in Air Traffic Management, Commission Reg. 691/2010 and Commission Implementing Reg. 390/2013) including better responsiveness to new developments.

1.3 Systemic introduction of safety management in the European Union: Promoting an EU Safety Management System comprising:

- Risk-based approach to safety.
- Completion of a just culture regime across the European Aviation Safety System (building on Air Traffic Management and Occurrence Reporting where this principle has already been introduced).
- Advanced data collection, exchange and analysis; the Agency is given greater powers to centralise the flow of data and the ability to analyse these data.
- Implementation of actions contained in the European Aviation Safety Plan as a legal obligation.
- State Safety Programmes and State Safety Plans as a legal obligation.
- Safety Management Systems to be implemented by the industry and operators as legal obligation.

1.4. Adapt the regulatory framework to enable safe integration of new technologies and business models.

**2. Revising governance/institutional roles and responsibilities in the EASA System:**

2.1 Baseline: keep responsibilities between the different actors as they are.

2.2 Optimise attribution of responsibilities:

- Remit: Responsibilities are shared between the Commission, the Agency and other actors according to different capacities.
- Organisation: Agency may outsource tasks to Member States' authorities or service providers; Member States may delegate responsibility for tasks of their Competent Authorities to the Agency or other Member States or outsource tasks to them or other service providers.
- Oversight:
  - Voluntary delegation of responsibility for oversight duties: Member States can authorise EASA or other Member States/Competent Authorities to take over national oversight duties in part or in full.
  - Mandatory delegation of responsibility for oversight duties: The Agency is mandated to identify and report to the Commission those States/Competent Authorities failing in their oversight obligations and to seek to resolve the problem with the Member States/Competent Authorities. If no solution can be found oversight tasks are executed by substitution by the Agency or other Member States/Competent Authorities.
- Resources: to be brought in line with distribution of responsibilities.
- Close cooperation where interdependencies to reduce inconsistencies
- Proactive international presence of EASA and promotion of EU standards according to distribution of responsibilities through technical cooperation, bilateral agreements and ICAO.

2.3.Centralised Agency for all safety aspects:

- Remit: The Agency is responsible for all aspects of aviation safety
  - with present scope of the system or
  - with extended scope of the system (e.g. to safety aspects of EU security measures, ground handling, commercial space transport)
- Organisation: The Agency becomes a single integrated body with local offices in Member States with a possibility to outsource certain tasks (e.g. hub and spoke system).
- Oversight: Full responsibility of EASA.
- Resources: financial independence.
- Centralised approach to avoid inconsistencies between aviation domains.
- Proactive international presence of EASA and promotion of EU standards according to its competences.

(2) All options (including the baseline) consist of a mix of regulatory and soft law measures.

(3) Proportionality of the regulatory and institutional setup is one of the objectives of this initiative and the proportionality of different options will thus be thoroughly assessed in the impact assessment.

## D. Initial assessment of impacts

What are the benefits and costs of each of the policy options?

All options aim at improving the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the European Aviation Safety System, i.e. guaranteeing safety benefits at a proportionate cost.

More concretely, a revised regulatory system (option group 1) should allow for more dynamic and proportionate rulemaking, with potential for lower compliance costs for industry. It would also support innovation and competitiveness in the sector. Member States might have to adapt to new rules but should profit from increased coherence. Social aspects, for example crew employment conditions under new business models, will have to be taken into account in this context. The impact assessment will also look at impacts on Small and Medium Sized Enterprises of which, due to the emergence of new technologies, an increasing number are becoming part of the aviation safety systems.

Streamlining the institutional roles within the European Aviation Safety System (option group 2) should lead to global efficiency (administrative and regulatory savings) and effectiveness (high safety levels) gains.

The measures addressing the current gaps in oversight, in particular as regards pooling or sharing of resources, can shift the capacities and burdens within the system, while filling gaps and exploiting idle resources. The Agency

or certain Member States could receive additional tasks which need to be backed up by additional resources. However, the costs for the system as a whole should reduce and administrative burden should be kept low.

In case additional tasks will be included in the Agency's mandate, which has to be justified by attainable safety and single market and trade benefits, there may be a need for additional/redeployment of resources for the Agency depending on the outcome of an impact assessment. According to the solution chosen this may also mean an increase or decrease in the resources of certain National Aviation Authorities.

Similarly, strengthening the external dimension would require extra or a redistribution of resources to enhance EU presence in international fora and step up technical cooperation. The measure is expected to support the competitiveness of the EU aviation industry in the long term.

Adjustments in the EASA financing mechanism might be necessary to meet possible additional needs in resources. The number of core employees in the Agency might need to be reinforced with a pool of contractual experts or through outsourcing certain activities.

Could any or all of the options have significant impacts on (i) simplification, (ii) administrative burden and (iii) on relations with other countries, (iv) implementation arrangements? And (v) could any be difficult to transpose for certain Member States?

(i) Yes, updating the regulatory system (option group 1) would lead to a simplified and more proportionate set of EU aviation safety rules. This concerns implementing rules and soft law measures under the remit of the Agency, or reliance on voluntary standards.

(ii) Ways to simplify administrative procedures will be sought across the revision process, using the experience of the Agency and Member States in relation to the current framework. However, it should be noted that applying proactive and risk-based principles in rulemaking (option group 1) would require, as a basis for decisions, a comprehensive set of monitoring data. This could lead to increased reporting obligations for stakeholders. An effort will be made to optimise the monitoring process so that same data can be used for multiple purposes by all participants in the European Aviation Safety System.

(iii) While no direct impacts on third countries are foreseen, certain options seek to strengthen the external dimension of EU aviation, which could contribute to a dissemination of European standards and practices to third countries.

(iv) An updated approach to rulemaking (option group 1) would have an impact on implementation arrangements, requiring the revision of existing practices in the Agency as well as in Member States.

(v) Transposition is not an issue, as all mandatory rules are set by regulations rather than by directives. Member States may need to make adjustments to their national aviation law, or make organisational changes. As the capacity of Member States to discharge their safety responsibilities may well be one of the main issues to be discussed in the impact assessment, there would need to be reassurance that any such changes would be proportional and well justified.

(1) Will an IA be carried out for this initiative and/or possible follow-up initiatives?

(2) When will the IA work start?

(3) When will you set up the IA Steering Group and how often will it meet?

(4) What DGs will be invited?

(1) Yes, an IA will be carried out and will be accompanied by a Commission proposal for a revised Regulation 216/2008, and an updated European Aviation Safety Programme.

(2) Q1 2014

(3) An IA Steering Group was set up in January 2014. A second meeting took place on 26 March 2015. Another meeting will take place on 7 May 2015.

(4) LS, SG, DG BUDG, DG GROW, DG ENV, DG CLIMA, DG EMPL, DG RTD, EEAS, DG NEAR, DG HR

(1) Is any option likely to have impacts on the EU budget above € 5m?

(2) If so, will this IA serve also as an ex-ante evaluation, as required by the Financial Regulation? If not, provide information about the timing of the ex-ante evaluation.

(1) Yes, in relation to the EU contribution to the EASA budget. If the mandate of EASA is modified, this may affect the EU contribution (increase or decrease).

(2) Yes.

## E. Evidence base, planning of further work and consultation

| |
|---|
| (1) What information and data are already available? Will existing IA and evaluation work be used?<br>(2) What further information needs to be gathered, how will this be done (e.g. internally or by an external contractor), and by when?<br>(3) What is the timing for the procurement process & the contract for any external contracts that you are planning (e.g. for analytical studies, information gathering, etc.)?<br>(4) Is any particular communication or information activity foreseen? If so, what, and by when? |
| (1) The Impact Assessment accompanying the Commission Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and the Council on Occurrence Reporting in Civil Aviation[19] will provide useful insights. Also the Article 62 Evaluation report will be used.<br>(2) Two external studies have been contracted:<br>o Study on performance schemes and a performance based approach in aviation safety;<br>o Study on resources deployed in aviation safety within the EASA system<br>(3) Both studies were launched in May 2014.<br>(4) Communication to the EASA committees, and to the EASA Management Board |
| Which stakeholders & experts have been or will be consulted, how, and at what stage? |
| Within the context of the Article 62 Evaluation, a consultation exercise was undertaken, which included a detailed questionnaire sent to Member States, National Aviation Authorities, international organisations, trade associations, other representative bodies and the manufacturing industry in both the public and private sectors. In addition, representatives at senior management level in civil aviation in and outside Europe were interviewed.<br>The Commission carried out a public consultation between May and September 2014. In addition, any revision of Regulation 216/2008 is prepared in close cooperation with the Agency, building on their interactions with stakeholders, and analysis based on established feedback loops and their opinion 01/2015[20] according to Article 19 of Regulation (EC) No 216/2008.<br>The Commission also envisages consulting the sectoral Social Dialogue Committee on civil aviation regarding this initiative. A meeting with the working group on ground handling of the Sectoral Social Dialogue Committee on Civil Aviation took place in October 2014. |

[19] SWD(2012) 442 final.

[20] Available at: http://easa.europa.eu/system/files/dfu/Opinion%20No%2001-2015.pdf