



**COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT (CRD)  
TO NOTICE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT (NPA) 2008-17B**

**for an Agency Opinion on a Commission Regulation establishing the Implementing  
Rules for the licensing of pilots**

**and**

**a draft Decision of the Executive Director of the European Aviation Safety Agency on  
Acceptable Means of Compliance and Guidance Material on the licensing of pilots**

***"Implementing Rules for Pilot Licensing"***

**c.10 - Appendices**

**c.11 - AMC**

<b>B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 1: Crediting of Theoretical Knowledge</b>	p. 72-73
---	----------

comment	<p>216 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA - The Netherlands</i></span></p> <p>Appendix 1</p> <p>(A) 2. CPL One of the subjects is not fully described (see appendix 2 of JAR-FCL1.050):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Aircraft Performance and Flight Planning</u></li> </ul> <p>(A) 3. ATPL One of the subjects is not fully described (see appendix 3 of JAR-FCL1.050):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Aircraft Performance and Flight Planning</u></li> </ul>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Item 032 of the syllabus only deals with performance.</p>

comment	<p>338 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Michel Lacombe AF TRTO</i></span></p> <p>Numbering error in paragraph 1.</p> <p>1. LPL, PPL, BPL and SPL</p> <p>1.1 For the issue of a LPL, the holder of a LPL in another category of aircraft shall be fully credited with theoretical knowledge on the common subjects established in FCL.120(a)(1).</p> <p><del>1.1</del> <b>1.2</b> Without prejudice to the paragraph above, for the issue of a LPL, PPL, BPL or SPL, the holder of a licence in another category of aircraft shall pass theoretical knowledge examinations to the appropriate level in the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aircraft General Knowledge;</li> <li>• Flight Performance and Planning;</li> <li>• Operational Procedures and Principles of Flight.</li> </ul> <p><del>1.1.2</del> <b>1.3</b> For the issue of a PPL, BPL or SPL, the holder of a LPL in the same category of aircraft shall be credited in full.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment. The numbering will be made consistent.</p>

comment	<p>697 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>FOCA Switzerland</i></span></p> <p>Appendix 1: Crediting of theoretical knowledge 1.1.2 LPL, PPL, BPL and SPL</p> <p><b>With regard to credit the common subjects, this shall only be possible if the content of the subjects is similar for the issue of each licence category.</b></p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>It is intended that the theoretical knowledge instruction is at the same level for</p>

LPL and PPL for the common subjects.

comment 698 comment by: FOCA Switzerland

Appendix 1 Crediting of theoretical knowledge

Proposal

- **1.1: FCL.120 (a)(1) lists "Navigation" as specific subject, though it is missing under this paragraph.**
- **2.2: JAR-FCL divides subject "Flight Performance and Planning" in 3 subchapters (31: Mass and Balance; 32: Performance; 33: Flight Planning and Monitoring). It is desired to add the subjects 31 and 33 and also to be taken as exam topics.**

response *Partially accepted*

1.1: The Agency also agrees that the subject 'Navigation' has to be inserted. Subject 'Navigation' will be added in Appendix 1 under the changed paragraph 1.2 as one of the topics for which an additional theoretical knowledge examination will be required.

2.2: 31 and 33 should not be added. Indeed, in Subject 'Flight performance and planning', topic 'Performance' is aircraft specific, and that is why this is the one mentioned in this Appendix.

comment 1045 comment by: CAA Belgium

1: Wrong numbering: 1.1 should be 1.2 and 1.1.2 should be 1.3

According FCL.120 (a)(1) topic NAVIGATION should be added.

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing the comment.

The numbering will be made consistent.

The Agency also agrees that the subject 'Navigation' has to be inserted. Subject 'Navigation' will be added in Appendix 1 under the changed paragraph 1.2 as one of the topics for which an additional theoretical knowledge examination will be required.

comment 2004 comment by: Nigel Roche

Neither the 2.3 nor 4.2 CPL or IR respectively take into account the full commonality of the NPA-25 Learning objectives as per [http://www.jaa.nl/licensing/jar-fcl/jar-fcl\\_Aug2008\\_frame.html](http://www.jaa.nl/licensing/jar-fcl/jar-fcl_Aug2008_frame.html). It is these that the ATOs are having to work to as the presumed EASA syllabus Learning objectives (Los), if EASA does not intend to use the NPA-25 LOs then this observation like many others will be invalid.

If a review of the Instruments 022 (parent directory 224899) is carried out, it will be seen that each line that is required by the IR is also required by the CPL(A) & CPL(H).

I therefore suggest:

1. That as 022 Instruments is common to both IR and CPL(A) & (H) it is credited to holders of a CPL(A) or CPL(H) for an IR. (line 2.3)

2. That as 022 Instruments is common to both CPL(A) & (H) and the IR, it is credited to holders of a CPL(A) or CPL(H) for an IR. (line 4.3)

I would further comment that as the learning objectives for CPL helicopter, CPL aeroplanes and IR are identical throughout the subjects that passing the theory for IR (A) should give the student a theory pass in IR (H)

I cannot comment on the CPL (As) or IR(As) as I have not seen the syllabus or LOs.

response *Noted*

Thank you for your comment.

The learning objectives will be added to the EASA system following the rulemaking task FCL.002. It will then be possible to assess whether further credits may be granted, as proposed in your comment.

comment

2005

comment by: *Nigel Roche*

I would suggest that the way the initial order for the CPL(A), CPL(H) IR(A) and IR(H) have been put into different sections as per below, the orders and the detail has become disjointed and therefore items have been overlooked in the compilation of this manual and if the authority can overlook such items it will inevitable mean that the end user will also overlook items.

Aeroplanes

FCL.025, FCL.310, Appendix 1 (2), Appendix 3 (C) or (D) and AMC to Appendix 3 (C) or (D)

Helicopters

FCL.025, FCL.315, Appendix 1 (2), Appendix 3 (H) or (I) and AMC to Appendix 3 (H) or (I)

IR aeroplanes

FCL.025, FCL.615, Appendix 1 (4), Appendix 6 (A) for aeroplanes, AMC No 1 to Appendix 6, AMC No 2 to Appendix 6

IR Helicopters

FCL.025, FCL.615, Appendix 1 (4), Appendix 6 (B) for helicopters and AMC No 1 to Appendix 6

My suggestion is that:

For each licence or rating all the orders, appendices and AMCs are compiled together to ensure that every element has been covered.

Ideally each would make up a separate section referring to any appendices or AMCs held within the section

If this is not acceptable then place appendices that are common towards the

	rear of the book and place the AMC that refer to them directly behind them, cross reference all orders appendices and AMCs to each other.
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The Agency has tried to assess the best way of presenting requirements which are applicable to all categories of aircraft and those which relate to a specific category. Each method has advantages and drawbacks. However, specific handbooks will be derived in the future, thanks to a dedicated electronic tool, to enable selecting requirements according to specific criteria.</p>
comment	<p>2561 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAA Belgium</span></p> <p>§1.1 Replace "<i>shall pass</i>" by "<i>shall have received theoretical instruction and shall pass.</i>" Reason: see § 2.1, 3.1 of this appendix.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>The text will be amended accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>2607 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAA Belgium</span></p> <p>§ <span style="float: right;">1.1</span> Comment; a) The word "subjects" instead of "topics" should be used in this paragraph. b) B) 5 subjects should be mentioned in this paragraph (see FCL 120 (a)(2) where the 5 specific subjects concerning the different aircraft categories are given). Proposal: mention the 5 subjects as follows (as in FCL 120 (a)(2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Principles of flight</li> <li>•Operational procedures</li> <li>•Flight performance and planning</li> <li>•Aircraft general knowledge</li> <li>•Navigation.</li> </ul>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>a)"Topics" will be replaced by "Subjects". b)The lay-out will be reviewed for the said topics.</p>
comment	<p>3148 <span style="float: right;">comment by: FTO 09-157 FRENCH AIR FORCE</span></p> <p><b>APPENDIX 1 crediting of theoretical knowledge CPL (A) IR (A) integrated course</b></p> <p>The aim of the CPL (A) IR (A) integrated course is to train pilots up to the required proficiency level to operate single-pilot single-engine or multi-engine aeroplanes in commercial air transportation and to obtain the CPL (A) IR . Some theoretical subjects could be a common matter when passing CPL (A) IR (A) and ATPL (A). Considering the arrival and increasingly important use of new high-performance aeroplanes, such as HPA-type single-pilot aircraft, a</p>

holder of CPL (A) IR (A) and a holder of ATPL (A) more and more rub shoulders with in the same airspace areas. A significant number of common skills are now necessary to fly safely. An ATPL (A) applicant does not have to take VFR and IFR Communication tests if he already owns a CPL (A) IR (A) (Appendix 1, chapter 3.3 and 3.5). A refresher in some subjects (bridge course) during the ATPL (A) exam would thus be sufficient, such as AIRLAW (010) and METEOROLOGY (050) subjects. When comparing ATPL (A) and CPL (A) IR (A) Learning Objectives, the number of differences that appear is very limited. Distributing the few missing LO within CPL and IR teaching units (within an integrated training) would then be sufficient. This could subsequently allow to cut into ATPL courses volumes and into teaching durations and costs.

**A appendix 1 after 4.2 could be added as follows:**

**5. CPL IR integrated course (A)**

An applicant for an ATPL (A) having followed a CPL IR integrated course and having passed the relevant theoretical examination for a CPL (A) and IR (A) is credited towards the theoretical knowledge requirements in the following subjects:

- AIR LAW
- HUMAN PERFORMANCE
- METEOROLOGY
- VFR communications
- IFR communications

The applicant could receive theoretical knowledge refreshers in these subjects during the ATPL (A) course.

response

*Noted*

Learning objectives will be added as a result of the rulemaking task FCL.002. It will then be possible to assess possible commonalities between the said syllabuses.

comment

3207

comment by: *Susana Nogueira*

According FCL 120(a)(1) topic NAVIGATION should be added

response

*Accepted*

The Agency also agrees that the subject 'Navigation' has to be inserted. The Subject 'Navigation' will be added in Appendix 1 under the changed paragraph 1.2 as one of the topics for which an additional theoretical knowledge examination will be required.

comment

3665

comment by: *M Wilson-NetJets*

72

- All Appendices should be categorised as AMC's

Suggestion:

Clarify legal standing of all Appendices and Annexes, and their proposed relationship with recognised AMC's

response

*Noted*

Taking into account the comments received, the Agency will change the status of some of the proposed appendices to AMCs after assessing them. However, in the case of this particular appendix, since credit towards requirements is being established, it is necessary to leave it in the rule.

comment 3760 comment by: DGAC FRANCE

**Appendix 1 A.1.**

§1.1.2

Justification :

According to FCL 035 (b)(4), Appendix 1 deals with crediting towards the requirements for theoretical knowledge instruction and examination for a licence in another category of aircraft. It is not the content of paragraph A 1 §1.1.2.

Modification :

**Transfer paragraph A 1 § 1.1.2 from appendix 1 to the FCL 035(b).**

response *Partially accepted*

The paragraph you mention (now paragraph 1.3) deals with crediting of theoretical knowledge instruction and examination. The text will be clarified accordingly.

comment 3817 comment by: OAA Oxford

All Appendices should be categorised as AMCs. Suggestion: Clarify legal standing of all Appendices and Annexes and their proposed relationship with recognised AMCs

response *Noted*

Please see the reply to comment 3665 above.

comment 3879 comment by: Luftfahrt-Bundesamt

APP1:

App. 1, A. 1.1 and A.1.1.2 appear to be mislabelled (we suggest 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment.  
The numbering will be made consistent.

comment 4354 comment by: Baden-Württembergischer Luftfahrtverband

**Wording in the NPA  
CREDITING OF THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE**

**Our proposal**

Add:

A.1.2 For the issue of a LPL, the holder of a license for micro lights shall be credited with theoretical knowledge required for this license. The competent authority defines the extent to which the theoretical knowledge will be credited

toward license applied for based on the national requirements for the micro light license.

**Issue with current wording**

Holders of a national license for aircraft excluded by Annex 2 shall be credited appropriately against theoretical knowledge required for the LPL

**Rationale**

The holder of a 3 axis controlled micro light already has received extensive theoretical training. It is not justifiable that this is ignored for applicants of a license based on this regulation. Since licensing for micro lights is regulated national the local competent authority must define to which extent the theoretical knowledge of a holder of a micro light license can be credited.

response *Noted*

Annex II aircraft are excluded from the scope of Community competence, and therefore the Agency cannot regulate them in detail.  
However, the provisions on crediting of flight time for the LPL and the PPL have been amended in order to take these issues into account. Please see replies to comments in Subparts B and C and the related amended text.

comment

5310

comment by: *AEA*

**Relevant text:** Appendices 1 to 12

**Comment:**

The requirements in Appendices 1 to 12 are forming part of the implementing rules. This doesn't allow any innovation in training means or adaptation with new training tools. Some items are incompatible with modern aircrafts (i.e. fly-by-wire, glass cockpit ...).  
Some new features are not taken into account in the theoretical knowledge or in the skill tests (i.e. FMS)

**Proposal:**

Transfer the requirements of Appendices 1 to 12 into AMC and GM to Part FCL.

response

*Noted*

Please see the reply to comment 3665 above.

comment

5529

comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

Delete text:

1.1 For the issue of a LPL, the holder of a LPL in another category of aircraft shall be fully credited with theoretical knowledge on the common subjects established in FCL.120(a)(1).

~~1.1 Without prejudice to the paragraph above, for the issue of a LPL, PPL, BPL or SPL, the holder of a licence in another category of aircraft shall pass theoretical knowledge examinations to the appropriate level in the following topics:-~~

~~Aircraft~~

~~General Knowledge;~~

~~Flight~~

~~Performance and Planning;~~



Operational  
 Procedures and Principles of Flight.  
 1.1.2 For the issue of a PPL, BPL or SPL, the holder of a LPL in the same category of aircraft shall be credited in full.

Justification:

A person with a LPL sailplane, or balloon, has not received at all the theoretical training needed for the issue of a PPL, even with that the proposed extra training. Furthermore, it is not acceptable that a lower level license, with less training, gives full credits to a higher license. ECA cannot agree on the transfer of credits from LPL's to JAR licenses. If paragraphs 1.1.1 & 1.1.2 stay, the rule would allow students to bypass the PPL theoretical training by getting credits from LPL. This is not an acceptable way forward.

response *Not accepted*

It is intended that the theoretical knowledge instruction is at the same level for LPL and PPL for the common subjects.

comment 5669

comment by: *Geschäftsführer Luftsportverband RP*

Die Vorschläge enthalten keinen Hinweis auf Anerkennung für moderne dreiachs gesteuerte Ultraleicht. Der Unterrichts- und Prüfungsstoff ist der gleiche wie beim LPL. Notfalls könnte man den Zusatz machen: wenn die UL-Theorie-Prüfung gemäß dem Ausbildungssyllabus des LPL erfolgt. (Die modernen Ultraleicht-Prüfungsfragen werden sich später sowieso den LPL-Fragen anschließen). Daher sollte hier unter 1.1 noch ergänzt werden:

1.1. For the issue of a LPL, the holder of a LPL in another category of aircraft **or 3 axis microlight** shall be fully credited....

response *Noted*

Please see the reply to comment 4354 above.

comment 5876

comment by: *EFLEVA*

EFLEVA agrees with item 1.1.2 providing full crediting.

response *Noted*

Thank you for your positive comment.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*  
 5913

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response *Noted*

After careful consideration of the comments received on the Appendices, as well as feedback received from stakeholders, the Agency has decided to leave the majority of the Appendices content in the rule, and only pass certain elements to AMC, after an individual analysis, based on concrete comments. In the case of this particular appendix, since credit towards requirements is being established, it is necessary to leave it in the rule.

See also reply to comment No 3665 above.

comment

6000

comment by: *CTC Aviation Services Ltd*

**Comment** ---The material contained in the Appendices 1 through 12 should be under continuous constructive review, to address changes both of deletion and addition, as technical knowledge and training experience develops.

**Proposed Action** ---- All Appendices should be in AMC material and their legal status clarified to facilitate amendment in an appropriate timescale.

response

*Noted*

Please see reply to comment No 3665 above.

comment

6192

comment by: *Icelandic CAA*

Ref para. 1.1.2. This crediting shall only be possible in case LPL subject contents ad examination is at the same level as for PPL.

response

*Noted*

It is intended that the theoretical knowledge instruction is at the same level for LPL and PPL for the common subjects.

comment

6266

comment by: *Jonathan Coote*

	<p>The training syllabus and administration for gliding pilots is best left to the British Gliding Association who have the appropriate experience and safety record for the task. The existing approach of empowering experienced and qualified instructors to certify the completion of training activities via logbook endorsements is effective and proven; no additional administrative burdens should be imposed to hamper this activity, or try to impose any particular syllabus. The highest quality of training will result from allowing experienced qualified instructors a full mandate to endorse students to criteria which they themselves interpret; otherwise a tickbox approach could disempower instructors from using their discretion to prevent a pilot who is deemed unsafe from flying having completed a prescribed set of exercises adequately.</p>	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	<p>Thank you for your comment.  The decision to have harmonised rules for pilot licensing in Europe was taken by the European Parliament and the Council and is reflected in the Basic Regulation.  This NPA makes proposal regarding those common requirements.  The implementation of the rule stays within the Member States' competence.</p>	
comment	6620	comment by: <i>Light Aircraft Association UK</i>
	<p>The LAA endorses item 1.1.2 providing full crediting.</p>	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	<p>Thank you for your feedback.</p>	
comment	6799	comment by: <i>CAA CZ</i>
	<p>Appendix 1 A. 1.1  Second provision 1.1 should be corrected to 1.1.1.</p>	
response	<i>Partially accepted</i>	
	<p>Thank you for providing this comment.  The numbering will be made consistent.</p>	
comment	6800	comment by: <i>CAA CZ</i>
	<p>Appendix 1 A. 1.1.1  We recommend to put the subject Principles of Flight on a separate line, as in 2.2.</p>	
response	<i>Partially accepted</i>	
	<p>The layout will be reviewed for the said topics.</p>	
comment	6801	comment by: <i>CAA CZ</i>
	<p>Appendix 1 A. 2. a 3.  According to syllabus in Appendix 2 A. the subject 032 is only for airplaines, so the 034 Performance - Helicopters should be added or Appendix 2 A should be corrected.  "Aeroplanes" in the title of subject 032 should be removed and crosses in</p>	

	columns for helicopters should be added (Helicopter ATPL/IR , ATPL, CPL).	
response	<i>Accepted</i> Text will be changed to clarify this point.	
comment	<b>6803</b> Appendix 1 A. 3.2 According to syllabus in Appendix 2 A. the subject 081 is only for airplains, 081 to <b>080</b> should be changed, as in para 2.2.	comment by: <i>CAA CZ</i>
response	<i>Accepted</i> 081 will be changed into 080.	
comment	<b>7011</b> <b>Paragraph:</b> Appendix 1 <b>Page No:</b> 72 & 73 of 647 <b>Comment:</b> Crediting of Theoretical Knowledge examinations – Is this the same are bridging under JAR-FCL, currently candidates are required to complete a Composite paper which is a mixture of subjects in one whole paper and other subjects, under the new crediting for Theoretical Knowledge this is not the case <b>Justification:</b> Clarification of this statement.	comment by: <i>UK CAA</i>
response	<i>Noted</i> This appendix gives the technical requirements to be applied for the crediting of theoretical knowledge. Examination procedures are set in the proposed Authority Requirements (NPA 2008-22).	
comment	<b>7330</b> GENERAL COMMENT ON AMC's and APPENDICES Issue: All Appendices should be categorised as AMC's Suggestion: Clarify legal standing of all Appendices and Annexes, and their proposed relationship with recognised AMC's	comment by: <i>ECOGAS</i>
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see reply to comment No 3665 above.	
comment	<b>7495</b> In order to allow the introduction of modern training methodology and take into account the use of improved training devices the contents of this Appendix should be transferred to AMC and GM for the appropriate section.	comment by: <i>British Airways</i>
response	<i>Partially accepted</i> Please see reply to comment No 3665 above.	
comment	<b>7659</b>	comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i>

response	<p>App 1 A 1.1.2: Comment: PPL and LPL, SPL and LPL(S), BPL and LPL(B) theoretical knowledge training and exams must then be equal.</p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>It is intended that the theoretical knowledge instruction is at the same level for LPL and PPL for the common subjects.</p>
comment	<p>7918 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Atlantic Training Support</i></span></p> <p>Clarify legal standing of all annexes and appendices and their proposed relationship with recognised AMC's</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Appendices are binding rules. AMCs are non binding.</p>
comment	<p>8163 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>F Mortera</i></span></p> <p><b><u>2. About the conditions, requirements, syllabus and tests for getting a LPLB or a BPL and their "performance" privileges</u></b></p> <p>FCL.110.B "LPL Experience reqs.", (page 11 )  FCL.210.B "Experience reqs. And crediting", (page 22)  AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 (Syllabus LPL B) (page 189) = AMC N° 3 to FCL.210.B and FCL.215.B "Syllabus BPL", (page 321)  AMC to FCL.110.B and FCL.210.B "Flight instruction", (page 254)  AMC N° 2 to FCL.125.B and FCL.235 "Skill test", (page 206)  AMC N° 1 to FCL.135.B and FCL.225.B "Extension of class and class and group privs.", (page 262)  AMC N° 2 to FCL.135.B and FCL.225.B (") "Class extension", (page 263)  AMC N° 3 to FCL.210.B and FCL.215.B (Syllabus BPL) page 321 = AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 "Syl. LPL B" (page 189)  <b>APPENDIX 1 / CREDITING T K / A / 1</b></p> <p>Probably I missed something but, except for the skill test for BPL, they seem identical. Obviously their privileges are different, but considering that the syllabus is the same for a new balloon pilot, getting their first licence, what does make the difference to choose one or other licence? Is it just the price? It looks reasonable to share same amounts of minimum training hours, exams and processes according the responsibility of flying a balloon, but what is the real difference if their programs are the same? Just the legal capability of use balloons sized "139" or "141" and receive remuneration or not respectively? It has not too much sense for me.</p> <p>I'm not suggesting that the BPL requirements must be harder, <a href="#">but they could be simplified for LPLB or reduced their privileges alternatively, to get the BPL revaluation. For instance the LPLB can not fly in controlled air space (it should not be necessary ATC liaison methods), over cities...</a></p> <p>That is the only different here in Spain. As a private pilot (even with a radio rate), we can not fly in CTR or TMA. Only when we are flying for authorized Aerial Works Companies, making commercial flights, we can use the ATC services.</p>

I think that differences must be established between both LPLB and BPL licences not only in economical privileges, but also in their syllabus, training and real performance capabilities.

Even considering carrying passengers as the main balloon commercial activity, advertising and filming are also commercial flights (I understand sponsorship is different to aerial advertising). And as far as I understand they soon will be considered in this way in Europe.

In my experience, the best advertising flights or flights for images recording are those with a little "65", where the pilot is alone in the basket or only with a camera operator. The "risky" flights close the sea, in ATC areas, in very fast winds, landings in small parks into the cities... can be done better with small balloons without passengers.

These other flights, not CAT, have been (and still they are) the economical support in most of the balloon companies that I know. In this case, the big balloons are not only unnecessary, but rather they are not practical.

Establishing different performance capabilities (restrictions) will permit to have a "light" licence, capable to offer a reasonable club / sponsor relationship and a good platform to jump to a professional environment, without favouring misunderstandings about capabilities or privileges between LPLB and BPL.

response *Noted*

It is true that the content of the training syllabus of the LPL(B) and the BPL are similar.

The Agency came to the conclusion that the requirements for the BPL were already a minimum, and therefore could not be lowered for the LPL(S).

However, there is still a main difference between the two licences, i.e. the medical certificate required, which justifies the existence of both.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 2: Theoretical knowledge syllabus for the ATPL, CPL and IR**

p. 74

comment 467

comment by: *London Metropolitan University*

Appendix 2 should be removed from Part-FCL and made into an AMC. All other TK syllabi for licences other than the ATPL, CPL and IR are as an AMC. By placing the TK syllabus as an AMC it means that the syllabus can be changed or amended relatively easily. If the ATPL/CPL/IR syllabus remains in the Part-FCL any changes, additions or deletions would have to go through the whole process to make them European Law which can take at least 3 years to get approved and implemented.

If this is moved then references to Appendix 2 on pages 25 and 27 need to be removed.

response *Accepted*

After carefully reviewing the comments received, and taking into account the fact that the main list of theoretical knowledge subjects is included in the rule,

the Agency has decided to pass the detailed content of the syllabus in this Appendix to AMC.  
Consequently, the references to this Appendix in the main text of Part FCL will be reviewed.

comment 836

comment by: *Heliswiss AG, Belg*

The theoretical knowledge syllabus is the only syllabus in the regulation that is in Part 1 and therefore unalterable. All other syllabi are in Part 2 (AMC's). To be in line with all the other syllabi, this syllabus should be moved to Part 2 as well. Regarding the importance, we do not share the view of the rulemakers - the PPL syllabus is as important as the CPL syllabus. There you lay the basis of your skills and knowledge.

Additionally, we feel that the theoretical knowledge syllabi are greatly overrated and if you look at the scope and depth of the questions in the data bank and the number of lessons, the theoretical knowledge part gains an importance over the practical training that is not justified and disproportionate. If students learn to pass the test and afterwards forget about 80% of what they have learned (based on own experience and experience from students in our flight school with CPL and ATPL knowledge) because they do not use it, then there is a definite flaw in the system! The points in the syllabus are ok, but the depth it gains through the compulsory number of lessons and the questions asked is disproportionate.

response *Partially accepted*

Please see reply to comment No 467 above.

Additionally, please note that the issue of depth of knowledge was assessed and subsequently reflected in learning objectives developed within the JAA framework. These Learning Objectives will be reviewed by the rulemaking task FCL.002 and will be proposed as AMC material in the related NPA.

comment 926

comment by: *FTO 09-157 FRENCH AIR FORCE*

the tables don't contain the detailed theoretical knowledge syllabus of the following subjects :

- 010 air law and ATC procedures
- performance (helicopters)
- principles of flight (helicopters)

response *Accepted*

Thank you for your comment.

It is true that items:

- 010 Air law and ATC procedures;
- 034 Performance helicopters;
- 082 Principles of flight helicopters;

are missing from the syllabus. This was due to an editorial error when transferring the content of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.470 and 2.470. These items will be added. The Agency has also conducted an editorial review of the whole content of this Appendix to ensure that all the items included in the JARs are mentioned.

comment	<p>1046 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAA Belgium</span></p>
	<p>AIR LAW appears to be missing in part A of this appendix.</p> <p>Wrong indication f.i. 021 14 etc on helicopters appear to be obligatory items for aeroplane. 092: IFR communications seem to be obligatory for CPL and ATPL(H) !</p> <p>PROPOSAL SET WG.</p> <p>SUGGESTION: these appendixes should be very carefully reconsidered by experts before publication.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>In regard to Air law, see reply to comment No 926 above.</p> <p>As for items 021 and following, they were already mandatory for aeroplanes in Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.470.</p> <p>Also items 092 were mandatory for helicopters in Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.470.</p> <p>At this time, the Agency does not intend to change the theoretical knowledge requirements as established in the latest amendments of JAR-FCL.</p> <p>However, the Agency is planning a follow-up task (FCL.002), where the issue of whether the items you mention should be reviewed may be discussed.</p>
comment	<p>1099 <span style="float: right;">comment by: Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)</span></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The syllabus topics emergency equipment, doors/exits and fire fighting are missing. It seems that they are important topics enough to be included in the syllabus.</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> Insert the above mentioned subjects in the correct syllabus.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>These topics were not included in Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.470 and 2.470.</p> <p>They are fundamentally related to operator training, and included in the syllabus for that training in Part-OR.OPS.</p>
comment	<p>1106 <span style="float: right;">comment by: Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)</span></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The entire subject of Air Law, syllabus subject 010 is missing.</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> Insert the subject 010 in the syllabus.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 926 above.</p>



comment	<p>1405 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Bristow Helicopters</i></span></p>
	<p>Recommend that the TKI Syllabus for the professional licences and IR are in the form of an AMC rather than an Appendix to the rule. Justification: With changes in aircraft technology and teaching methods, it is likely that this material will require change. This can be managed more effectively via the AMC and Alternative AMC procedure, rather than the full legal EU process of change associated with the Rules and Appendices. Common standards and transparency across all EU Member States should still be ensured by the Alternative AMC process, which requires National Authority approval, EASA acceptance and publication of alternative AMC's throughout the Community.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 467 above.</p>
comment	<p>1557 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>IAAPS</i></span></p> <p>010 is missing; Items 021 14 to 021 17, 022 07, 071 03, are irrelevant to aeroplanes</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>For Air law, please see reply to comment No 926 above.</p> <p>For the remaining items, please see reply to comment 1046 above. The same reasoning presented for items 021 14 to 17 applies to items 021 07 and 071 03.</p>
comment	<p>1623 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Helikopter Air Transport GmbH / Christophorus Flugrettungsverein</i></span></p> <p><b>STATEMENT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The "X" is always in the main title;</li> <li>• Syllabus 010 Air Law and ATC procedures is missing;</li> <li>• Title 020 00 00 00 is missing;</li> <li>• Performance Helicopter is missing;</li> <li>• 071 03 is limited to helicopters;</li> <li>• Syllabus 082 Principles of flight helicopter is missing;</li> </ul> <p><b>PROPOSAL</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mark the relevant sub items with an "X" (not only the main title).</li> <li>• Insert the chapter 010 Air Law.</li> <li>• Insert the Title 020 "Aircraft General and System knowledge".</li> <li>• Insert 034 "Performance Helicopter".</li> <li>• 071 03 delete "helicopter".</li> </ul> <p>Insert 082 Principles of flight helicopter.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>The marking of the relevant subjects follows what was established in Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.470 and 2.470.</p> <p>For items 010, 034 and 082, please see reply to comment 926 above.</p> <p>For item 071 03, please see reply to comment 1557 above.</p>

Title 020 did not exist in the latest amendments of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.470 and 2.470.

comment 1775

comment by: REGA

**STATEMENT**

- The "X" is always in the main title;
- Syllabus 010 Air Law and ATC procedures is missing;
- Title 020 00 00 00 is missing;
- Performance Helicopter is missing;
- 071 03 is limited to helicopters;
- Syllabus 082 Principles of flight helicopter is missing;

**PROPOSAL**

- Mark the relevant sub items with an "X" (not only the main title).
- Insert the chapter 010 Air Law.
- Insert the Title 020 "Aircraft General and System knowledge".
- Insert 034 "Performance Helicopter".
- 071 03 delete "helicopter".
- Insert 082 Principles of flight helicopter.

Recommend that the TKI Syllabus for the professional licences and IR are in the form of an AMC rather than an Appendix to the rule.

Justification:

With changes in aircraft technology and teaching methods, it is likely that this material will require change. This can be managed more effectively via the AMC and Alternative AMC procedure, rather than the full legal EU process of change associated with the Rules and Appendices. Common standards and transparency across all EU Member States should still be ensured by the Alternative AMC process, which requires National Authority approval, EASA acceptance and publication of alternative AMC's throughout the Community.

response *Partially accepted*

Please see replies to comments No 926 and 1623 above.

comment 3666

comment by: M Wilson-NetJets

Appendix 2

- Air Law and ATC procedures missing from theoretical knowledge list

Suggestion: Add Air Law and ATC procedures to list

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment No 926 above.

comment 3689

comment by: Susana Nogueira

Include Air Law.

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment No 926 above.

comment	3691	comment by: <i>Susana Nogueira</i>
	For a suitably explanation to the students of all subjects contained in this programme and to answer questions of the CQB, is necessary to insert Learning Objectives, as an AMC.	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	
	Thank you for your comment.	
	It is intended to propose learning objectives in a future NPA, related to the rulemaking task FCL.002.	
comment	3819	comment by: <i>OAA Oxford</i>
	Air Law and ATC procedures missing from theoretical knowledge list. Suggestion: add Air Law and ATC procedures to list	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	
	Please see reply to comment No 926 above.	
comment	4373	comment by: <i>DCA Malta</i>
	Include Air Law and Principles of Flight for Helicopters	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	
	Please see reply to comment No 926 above.	
comment	4420	comment by: <i>Bond Offshore Helicopters</i>
	Recommend that the TKI Syllabus for the professional licences and IR are in the form of an AMC rather than an Appendix to the rule. Justification: With changes in aircraft technology and teaching methods, it is likely that this material will require change. This can be managed more effectively via the AMC and Alternative AMC procedure, rather than the full legal EU process of change associated with the Rules and Appendices. Common standards and transparency across all EU Member States should still be ensured by the Alternative AMC process, which requires National Authority approval, EASA acceptance and publication of alternative AMC's throughout the Community.	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	
	Please see reply to comment No 467 above.	
comment	4665	comment by: <i>Héli-Union</i>
	Recommend that the TKI Syllabus for the professional licences and IR are in the form of an AMC rather than an Appendix to the rule. Justification: With changes in aircraft technology and teaching methods, it is likely that this material will require change. This can be managed more effectively via the AMC and Alternative AMC procedure, rather than the full legal EU process of change associated with the Rules and Appendices. Common standards and	

	transparency across all EU Member States should still be ensured by the Alternative AMC process, which requires National Authority approval, EASA acceptance and publication of alternative AMC's throughout the Community.
response	<i>Accepted</i> Please see reply to comment No 467 above.
comment	<b>4884</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>HUTC</i></span> Recommend that the TKI Syllabus for the professional licences and IR are in the form of an AMC rather than an Appendix to the rule. Justification: With changes in aircraft technology and teaching methods, it is likely that this material will require change. This can be managed more effectively via the AMC and Alternative AMC procedure, rather than the full legal EU process of change associated with the Rules and Appendices. Common standards and transparency across all EU Member States should still be ensured by the Alternative AMC process, which requires National Authority approval, EASA acceptance and publication of alternative AMC's throughout the Community.
response	<i>Accepted</i> Please see reply to comment No 467 above.
comment	<b>4969</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>FOCA Switzerland</i></span> Appendix 2  Comment The entire subject of Air Law, syllabus subject 010 is missing.  Proposal Insert the subject 010 in the syllabus.
response	<i>Accepted</i> Please see reply to comment No 926 above.
comment	<b>5374</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span>  <b>Comment:</b> The syllabus topics emergency equipment, doors/exits and fire fighting are missing. It seems that they are important topics enough to be included in the syllabus.
response	<i>Not accepted</i> Please see reply to comment No 1099 above.
comment	<b>5575</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CTC Aviation Services Ltd</i></span>  <b>Comment</b> ---"Air Law and ATC procedures" has been omitted from the theoretical knowledge syllabus for A. aeroplanes and helicopters. <b>Action</b> -- add the item
response	<i>Accepted</i>

Please see reply to comment No 926 above.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response

*Partially accepted*

Please see reply to comment No 467 above.

For the other Appendices, please see replies to relevant comments.

comment

6063

comment by: *UK CAA*

**Paragraph:** Appendix 2 – Theoretical Knowledge Syllabus for the ATPL, CPL and IR

**Page No\*:** 74 of 647

**Comment:** 010 Air Law & ATC Procedures, 034 Performance (Helicopters) and 082 Principles of Flight are missing.

**Justification:** Syllabus for these subjects in JAR-FCL 1 & 2

response

*Accepted*

Please see reply to comment No 926 above.

comment	6760	comment by: <i>Adventia, European College of Aeronautics</i>
	We should also like to point out that in Appendix 2 the syllabus of Air Law is missing.	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	
	Please see reply to comment No 926 above.	
comment	6919	comment by: <i>Roger B. Coote</i>
	The BGA training syllabus is adequate in all respects (except, perhaps cloud flying) where additional training (+ endorsement) is needed.	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	It was already indicated in the Explanatory memorandum to Part-FCL, that the issue of qualifications for flying in Instrument Meteorological Conditions (IMC) is currently being discussed in a separate Rulemaking task: FCL.008.	
	The comments received on the A-NPA 14-2006 and on this NPA dealing with the issue of the qualifications to fly in IMC/cloud flying will be taken into account by this working group. The task FCL.008 will result in an NPA which will be submitted to public consultation, and on which you will be able to make your comments.	
comment	7067	comment by: <i>CAA Norway</i>
	Appendix 2 The syllabi tables for ATPL, CPL and IR needs a thorough proof reading, as e.g. the entire subject 010 Air Law is missing, also several other parts are missing, such as 082 Principles of flight (Helicopters), etc etc.	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	
	Please see reply to comment No 926 above.	
comment	7315	comment by: <i>Hermann JACOBS</i>
	I consider the Theoretical Knowledge Syllabus (Appendix 2) for IR ratings, for a non-commercial PPL applicant, as far too overloaded. This is obvious by having ATPL, CPL, and IR more or less on the same required level. In my opinion, this will lead to private pilots refraining from acquiring instrument flying skills which would vastly improve flight safety. I recommend to separate a "IR only" syllabus from the ATPL and CPL syllabus. There might be an IR rating that is in between the level proposed here and the IMC rating for private pilots which is today available in the UK.	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	Please see reply to comment No 6919 above Assessing the adequacy of the IR syllabus for non commercial pilots is also part of the rulemaking task FCL.008.	
comment	7496	comment by: <i>British Airways</i>
	In order to allow the introduction of modern training methodology and take	

into account the use of improved training devices the contents of this Appendix should be transferred to AMC and GM for the appropriate section.

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment No 467 above.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 2: Theoretical knowledge syllabus for the ATPL, CPL and IR - A. Aeroplanes and helicopters** p. 74-77

comment 6 comment by: *Gennaro Esposito*

Sorry , my mistake.  
Please see my suggestions in my second account.  
MAny thanks.

Gennaro Esposito

response *Noted*

comment 7 comment by: *Gennaro Esposito*

Sorry, my mistake.

Please see my suggestions joined in the second account  
espgen@vodafone.it

Many thanks  
Gennaro Esposito

response *Noted*

comment 99 comment by: *Norbert Bönig*

In Appendix 2, Theoretical Knowledge for aeroplanes and helicopters, number 080 principles, of flight the entire chapter helicopter is missing.

response *Accepted*

It is true that items:

010 Air law and ATC procedures;  
034 Performance helicopters;  
082 Principles of flight helicopters;

are missing from the syllabus. This was due to an editorial error when transferring the content of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.470 and 2.470. These items will be added. The Agency has also conducted an editorial review of the whole content of this Appendix to ensure that all the items included in the JARs are mentioned.

comment 320 comment by: *CAA Belgium*

1) subject AIR LAW is missing in the Appendix  
2) wrong marking for AEROPLANE ATPL and CPL for items

021 14 00 00  
 021 15 00 00  
 021 16 00 00  
 021 17 00 00  
 3) wrong marking for COMMUNICATIONS under 090 00 00 00  
 Should be differentiated under 091 00 00 00 and 092 00 00 00

CONCLUSION: THE APPENDIX SHOULD BE VERY CAREFULLY EXAMINED BEFORE PUBLICATION.

response *Partially accepted*

1) Please see reply to comment No 99 above.

2) Items 021 14 and following were already mandatory for aeroplanes in Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.470.

3) The Agency does not understand your comment. The items are differentiated.

comment **468** comment by: *London Metropolitan University*

There is no syllabus for 010 Air Law or 034 helicopter performance or 082 helicopter principle of flight.  
 These need to be added.

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment No 99 above.

comment **560** comment by: *Peer Ketterle*

In this area it seems to me that the IR is solely seen as a step up to higher licence-levels. But, like in the USA it should be seen as a valid and appropriate way to enhance the safety and planability of flights for the average PPL-A-holder.

That means, that you should take care to minimize the effort needed to obtain an IR-rating and please do not inflate it unnecessary. For example, a PPL-IR-applicant doesn't need to know about turbines. If he is ever going to fly a plane that is so equipped, he must earn a type rating and demonstrate almost ATPL-knowledge for this goal. It is not right to put too much into the IR-rating itself.

Please review this part and only include what is necessary to fly a e.g. Cessna 172, IFR-equipped through IMC. everything else that may be needed, is already tied to the requirements of the plane rating, high-performance or complex-rating etc.

I'm a JAR\_FCL-PPL(A) holder. I would have obtained an IR-rating, if it was as affordable as it is in the USA. And I know a lot of other people who are in the same situation: An IR-rating is very welcome for PPL-holders, but the costs are prohibitive due to the unnecessary inflated curriculum. It enhances safety for GA by a big margin, because it teaches basically the skills necessary to survive a flight into IMC, which is still one of the main risks when operating light GA aircraft.



response

Please review this item so that it promotes safety throughout all of Europe's GA, not only those who want to become commercial pilots anyway.

*Noted*

The adequacy of the IR syllabus for non-commercial pilots is part of the rulemaking task FCL.008.

comment

897

comment by: *ERA*

Appendix 2 Theoretical knowledge syllabus for the ATPL, CPL and IR

The explanation regarding the applicable items for each licence or rating being marked with an 'X' is confusing. It seems (according to the table and crosses) that for an aeroplane licence, the study of items concerning helicopter (e.g. 021 14, 15, 16 and 17 and 071 03) is required. This is an example of a minor change requiring European Parliamentary approval if this Appendix is not transferred into an AMC

response

*Noted*

The marking of the relevant subjects follows what was established in Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.470 and 2.470.

Items 021 14 to 17 and 071 03 were already mandatory for aeroplanes in Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.470.

At this time, the Agency does not intend to change the theoretical knowledge requirements as established in the latest amendments of JAR-FCL.

However, the Agency is planning a follow-up task (FCL.002) where the issue of whether the items you mention should be reviewed may be discussed within that task.

Please note also that after carefully reviewing the comments received, and taking into account the fact that the main list of theoretical knowledge subjects is included in the rule, the Agency has decided to pass the detailed content of the syllabus in this Appendix to AMC.

comment

1100

comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

**Comment:** Syllabus for Principles of flight -Helicopter is missing.

**Proposal:** Insert the above mentioned subject in the syllabus.

response

*Accepted*

Please see reply to comment No 99 above.

comment

1101

comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

**Comment:** Syllabus for Performance Helicopter is missing.

**Proposal:** Insert the above mentioned subject in the syllabus.

response

*Accepted*

Please see reply to comment No 99 above.

comment **1304** comment by: *Vincent Lambercy*

As a PPL(A) with IR flying SEPs only, I always wondered why I had to learn about turbines, hydraulics, ...

response **Noted**

Please see reply to comment No 560 above.

comment **1566** comment by: *IAAPS*

Should be an AMC

response **Accepted**

After carefully reviewing the comments received, and taking into account the fact that the main list of theoretical knowledge subjects is included in the rule, the Agency has decided to pass the detailed content of the syllabus in this Appendix to AMC.

Consequently, the references to this Appendix in the main text of Part FCL will be reviewed.

comment **1568** comment by: *IAAPS*

Appendix 2 should be removed from Part-FCL and made into an AMC.

All other TK syllabi for licences other than the ATPL, CPL and IR are as an AMC. By placing the TK syllabus as an AMC it means that the syllabus can be changed or amended relatively easily. If it remains in the Part-FCL any changes, additions or deletions would have to go through the whole process to make them European Law which can take at least 3 years to get approved and implemented.

If this move is accepted then the reference to Appendix 2 on pages 25 and 27 needs to be removed.

response **Accepted**

Please see reply to comment No 1566 above.

comment **2278** comment by: *Bundespolizei-Fliegergruppe und Polizeihubschrauberstaffeln/ -fliegerstaffeln der Länder*

It seems like there are a few mistakes in this syllabus:

010 Air Law is missing completely!

021 14/15/16/17 - do future aeroplane pilots have to learn the helicopter specified

systems?

022 06/07 - similar mistake like above

- helicopter performance is missing completely

- principles of flight helicopter is missing completely

092 - do future VFR-pilots have to learn IFR-communications?

response

*Partially accepted*

In relation to Air law, please see reply to comment No 99 above.

For the other items, the marking of the relevant subjects follows what was established in Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.470 and 2.470. These items were already mandatory there.

At this time, the Agency does not intend to change the theoretical knowledge requirements as established in the latest amendments of JAR-FCL.

However, the Agency is planning a follow-up task (FCL.002) where the issue of whether the items you mention should be reviewed may be discussed within that task.

comment

3598

comment by: *Swiss Power Flight Union*

This syllabus is absolutely useless.  
See <http://www.jaa.nl/licensing/jar-fcl.html>  
010 Air law is missing  
034 Performance Helicopter is missing

response

*Noted*

Please see reply to comment No 99 above.

comment

3690

comment by: *Susana Nogueira*

Include Principles of flight and Performance for Helicopters

response

*Accepted*

Please see reply to comment No 99 above.

comment

3717

comment by: *DGAC FRANCE*

Appendix 2

See Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.470

See Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.470

***All subject 010 (Air law and ATC procedures) is missing in appendix 2***  
***All subject 034 (performance helicopter) is missing in appendix 2***  
***All subject 082 (principles of flight – helicopter) is missing in appendix 2***

response

*Accepted*

Please see reply to comment No 99 above.

comment

3880

comment by: *Luftfahrt-Bundesamt*

APP2-A. Aeroplanes and helicopters:

The Subject **010 00 00 00 Air Law** is missing.

The **headline 020 000000 Aircraft General Knowledge** is missing.

	<p>The Subject <b>034 00 00 00 Performance Helicopters</b> is missing.  The Subject <b>082 00 00 00 Principles of Flight Helicopters</b> is missing.  The Subject 021 00 00 00 is not applicable for IR!</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Please see replies to comments No 99 and 2278 above.</p>
comment	<p><b>5546</b> comment by: <i>ECA- European Cockpit Association</i></p> <p>Chapter "AIR LAW AND ATC PROCEDURES" missing.</p> <p>This chapter was in JAR FCL Appendix 1 to JAR FCL 1.470 or NPA 2008-17b App. 2 B. (As)  This must be a lost text when transferring the text from the old JAR's, but it's clear that this subject cannot be deleted from the theoretical knowledge.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 99 above.</p>
comment	<p><b>5569</b> comment by: <i>Dr Gennaro Esposito</i></p> <p>Good day;</p> <p>In the Appendix 2 (Theoretical Knowledge Syllabus for the ATPL,CPL and IR) i don't see the the plan of subject " AIRLAW".</p> <p>I see "Airlaw and ATC Procedures" in <b>B. Airship</b> , but not in <b>"A. Aeroplanes and helicopters"</b>.</p> <p>I should like to propose some suggestions concerning the Theoretical knowledge instructions for the subject "AIRLAW and ATC PROCEDURES"- Appendix 2 " A.Aeroplanes and helicopters"</p> <p>I hope EASA experts will take into account the following suggestions:</p> <p><b>1. AIRLAW</b> (Part)</p> <p>It is advisable to add a new chapter titled:  <b>" European Community Air Transport Legislation"</b>.</p> <p>The scope and the substantial elements of :</p> <p><b>a)</b> Regulation (EC) No. 1008/2008 on common rules for the operation of air services in the Community;  <b>b)</b> Regulation (EC) No.785/2004 "on insurance requirements for air carriers and aircraft operator";  <b>c)</b> Regulation (EC) No.2027/97 on "Air carrier liability in the event of accident";  <b>d)</b> Regulation (EC) No.889/2002 "Amending Council Regulation (EC) No 2027/97 on air carrier liability in the event of accidents";  <b>e)</b> Regulation(EC) No.261/2004 "establishing common rules on compensation, assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and cancellation of long delays of flights";  <b>e)</b>The EU-US Air Transport Agreement (Open Sky).  Decision 2007/339/EC signed on 30 April 2007 "on application of the Air Transport Agreement between the European Community and its Member</p>

States, and the United States of America" ;  
**e)** other Community Regulations, if necessary.

- As far as the "**International private Law**" is concerned (ref. current JAA FCL Syllabus of theoretical knowledge instructions"), it is advisable to erase the Warsaw Convention and all following Protocols, because the Warsaw system has been completely substituted by the Montreal Convention of 1999 applicable in all EU member States (approved on behalf of the European Community by Council Decision of 5 April 2001 - see also Reg. EC 889/02).

- About "**The authority of PIC** (measures and actions to be taken on board) is ok the study of Tokyo, Haye and Montreal Conventions, but it is advisable to add all rules concerning the powers and obligations of the pilot in command listed into **EU OPS1** (now Community law) Annex3 to Regulation CE n. 3922/91 as amended by Regulation CE n. 859/2008 August 20-2008).

## **2. ATC PROCEDURES (PART)**

**1)** About topics relating to **ICAO Doc 8168**" Aircraft Operations" :

**a)** It is noted that the Doc 8168 contains SARPS mainly addressed to member States and their Aircraft Operators and not to pilots.

So it is advisable to erase from the syllabus "the construction of omni-directional, straight and turning instrument departures".

My opinion is that pilots need to know:

a) the scope of SIDs; b) how to execute it; c) ICAO denomination.

**b)** The following topics :

-Accuracy of fixes;

-Fixes formed by intersections;

-Intersection fix tolerance factors, and

-Other fixes tolerance,

they have nothing to deal with the subject "Air Law"

(General navigation?).

**c)** And also:

i. Area navigation (RNAV) approach procedures based on VOR/DME;

ii. Use of FMS / RNAV equipment to follow conventional non-precision approach procedures,

which should be introduced into: " Radio Navigation" .

Many topics (ATC Procedures Part) of the current JAA FCL 1 Plan (see Amendment JAA LO 19/06/2008) are into EU-OPS1. So these topics have to be referred to the Community law, and not more to ICAO DOCS.

At last, the introductory of all topics needs to be respected.

This introductory function has not been respected in the current JAA plan.

Thank you very much for your attention;

Dr Gennaro Esposito  
 Air Traffic Controller retired -  
 Forlì -Italy

Teacher for the subjects:  
 Airlaw/ATC Procedures and  
 Communications.

response

*Partially accepted*

In regard to Air law, please see reply to comment No 99 above.

As for your other suggestions, at this time the Agency does not intend to change the theoretical knowledge requirements as established in the latest amendments of JAR-FCL.

However, the Agency is planning a follow-up task (FCL.002) where the issue of whether the items you mention should be reviewed may be discussed within that task.

comment

5733

comment by: *Civil Aviation Training Europe*

AirLaw is missing in section A. Aeroplanes and Helicopters!

response

*Accepted*

Please see reply to comment No 99 above.

comment

5913❖

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response	<i>Accepted</i> Please see reply to comment No 1566 above.
comment	6205 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Icelandic CAA</i></span> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many items seem to be missing in the syllabus e.g. air law.</li> <li>• Table is apparently not completed and should be compared more closely to the existing syllabus provided by JAR-FCL.</li> <li>• Reference to learning objectives is not in place.</li> <li>• Consider replacing this section into AMC section for easier future amendments.</li> </ul>
response	<i>Partially accepted</i> Please see replies to comments No 99 and 1566 above.  The Agency has conducted an editorial review of the whole content of this Appendix to ensure that all the items included in the JARs are mentioned.  As for the learning objectives, as defined within the JAA framework, the Agency plans to introduce them as AMC through the rulemaking task FCL.002.
comment	6804 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA CZ</i></span> The subject <b>010 Air Law</b> is missing in the syllabus. Should be completed.
response	<i>Accepted</i> Please see reply to comment No 99 above.
comment	6805 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA CZ</i></span> The subject <b>034 Performance – Helicopters</b> is missing in the theoretical knowledge syllabus so it should be added or "– Airplanes" should be removed from the title of subject 032 "– Airplanes". Crosses in columns for helicopters should be added. (Helicopter ATPL/IR , ATPL, CPL).
response	<i>Accepted</i> Please see reply to comment No 99 above.
comment	6806 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA CZ</i></span> The subject <b>082 Principle of Flight – Helicopters</b> is missing in the theoretical knowledge so it should be added or "– Airplanes" should be removed from the title of subject 081 "– Airplanes". Crosses in columns for helicopters should be added. (Helicopter ATPL/IR , ATPL, CPL).
response	<i>Accepted</i> Please see reply to comment No 99 above.
comment	7287 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Aero-Club of Switzerland</i></span> Please take a look at

	<p><a href="http://www.jaa.nl/licensing/jar-fcl.html">http://www.jaa.nl/licensing/jar-fcl.html</a></p> <p>010 Air law is missing 034 Performance Helicopter is missing in the Agency's proposal.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 99 above.</p>

comment	<p>7333 <span style="float: right;">comment by: ECOGAS</span></p> <p>Issue: Air Law and ATC procedures missing from theoretical knowledge list Suggestion: Add Air Law and ATC procedures to the theoretical knowledge list</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 99 above.</p>

comment	<p>7660 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAA Finland</span></p> <p>App 2 A: 010 Air law missing (obviously just a printing error).</p> <p>Remark: As long as national authorities may issue a difference to ICAO, national aviation regulations / law shall be included in 010.</p> <p>033/034 helicopter performance missing (obviously just a printing error).</p> <p>082 Principles of flight / helicopters missing (obviously just a printing error).</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 99 above.</p>

<p><b>B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 2: Theoretical knowledge syllabus for the ATPL, CPL and IR - B. Airships</b></p>	<p>p. 77-81</p>
---	-----------------

comment	<p>3881 <span style="float: right;">comment by: Luftfahrt-Bundesamt</span></p> <p>APP2-B. Airships:</p> <p>The lines <b>030 00 00 00 Flight Performance an Planning</b> and <b>031 00 00 00 Mass and Balance- Airships</b> are located at the wrong position. They should be replaced in front of <b>031 01 00 00 Purpose of Mass and Balance considerations</b>.</p> <p><b>031 01 00 00 Purpose of Mass and Balance considerations</b> should be written in regular font-weight.</p> <p>Layout and the "philosophy " of assembling the x-es should be aligned with APP2A.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p>



Editorial accepted.  
The text will be changed as proposed, and layout will be aligned.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response

*Partially accepted*

After carefully reviewing the comments received, and taking into account the fact that the main list of theoretical knowledge subjects is included in the rule, the Agency has decided to pass the detailed content of the syllabus in this Appendix to AMC.

Consequently, the references to this Appendix in the main text of Part FCL will be reviewed.

For the other Appendices, please see the related comments.

comment

5999

comment by: *CFAC, ZHAW*

**4 Syllabus for Theoretical Knowledge / Repetition of requirements**

**a) Starting position**

Paragraph 20ff of NPA 17 a explains nicely the efforts that have been made by its writers in order to avoid repetitions of similar or even identical requirements. However, in spite of these efforts, NPA 17 (EASA-FCL) has become a big volume with quite a lot of repetitions.

This is especially the case with the syllabi for theoretical knowledge. Not only are they listed in different formats, they also lack a common underlying philosophy:

**Presentation of theoretical knowledge requirements:**

**as Implementing Regulation in JAR-FCL format**

Page 74 - 83

APPENDIX 2 THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE SYLLABUS FOR THE ATPL, CPL AND IR

*010 is missing, this may be an editorial mistake*

A. Aeroplanes and helicopters

B. Airships

**as AMC in ICAO Annex 1 Edition 10 format**

Page 189 - 196

SUBPART B LEISURE PILOT LICENCE – LPL

AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120

SYLLABUS OF THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE FOR THE LEISURE PILOT LICENCE

splitted in COMMON SUBJECTS and ADDITIONAL SUBJECTS FOR EACH CATEGORY

**as AMC in JAR-FCL format**

Page 269 - 316

SUBPART C PRIVATE PILOT LICENCE (PPL), SAILPLANE PILOT LICENCE (SPL) and BALLOON PILOT LICENCE (BPL)

AMC No 1 to FCL.210 and FCL.215

Syllabus of theoretical knowledge for the private pilot licence – aeroplanes and helicopters

Page 317-320

AMC No 2 to FCL.210 and FCL.215

Syllabus of theoretical knowledge for the private pilot licence – airships

These requirements are edited in different formats and therefore they are not ready for publication.

**b) Considerations**

The description of the specific standards required for most courses is based on common theoretical knowledge and does not need to be repeated in the description of the courses for the individual categories.

Therefore there is no need to repeat the common theoretical knowledge in every single category. Instead it is sufficient to merely state the differences between them is sufficient

**c) Proposal**

In view of the above the requirements for all types of theoretical knowledge have to be reviewed.

For this a Working group has to be established with members with different background (Science, Education, Authorities, Training etc.) should participate

For the purpose of licensing the requirements for theoretical knowledge have to be subdivided in

General knowledge, relevant for all Categories

Special knowledge for Categories

Knowledge relevant for a Type Rating. This kind of knowledge has to be mentioned with general remarks, but not detailed.

(see Attachment )

response *Accepted*

After carefully reviewing the comments received, and taking into account the fact that the main list of theoretical knowledge subjects is included in the rule, the Agency has decided to pass the detailed content of the syllabus in this Appendix to AMC.

Consequently, the references to this Appendix in the main text of Part FCL will be reviewed.

It is true that items:

010 Air law and ATC procedures;

034 Performance helicopters;

082 Principles of flight helicopters;

are missing from the syllabus. This was due to an editorial error when transferring the content of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.470 and 2.470. These items will be added. The Agency has also conducted an editorial review of the whole content of this Appendix to ensure that all the items included in the JARs are mentioned.

Additionally, please note that the Agency is planning a follow-up task where all questions related to Theoretical Knowledge will be reviewed: FCL.002.

comment 6495

comment by: *Austro Control GmbH*

Comment: Subject Air Law is missing

Proposed Text: **Add subject Air Law**

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment No 5999 above.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 3: Training courses for the issue of a CPL, an ATPL and an IR**

p. 82

comment 469

comment by: *London Metropolitan University*

See comment on FCL.515

There is no mention of ATPL modular course and needs to be addressed.

response *Partially accepted*

The ATPL modular course (as included in Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.285 and Appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 2.285) was included in the proposal, in paragraphs FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H, and the respective AMCs.  
To improve consistency and clarity, the Agency will transfer this text to Appendix III.

comment **1049** comment by: *CAA Belgium*

A.3: additional training must be foreseen in case the applicant has to extend the 36-months period.

A.10 in fine: why should we credit if the IR training is part of an integrated ATPL course ?

response *Partially accepted*

A.3:  
The Agency's proposal was based on its understanding of what were the safety relevant requirements in § 3 to Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165(a)(1). Based on your comment, and others received on the same issue, it seems that it is not an essential safety element that the course is completed in 36 months. Therefore, the Agency will delete paragraph A.3 and include in the AMC to Appendix 3 A. the text of JAR-FCL mentioned above, including the mention that the period may be extended if additional training is provided.  
The same change will be made in the ATPL(H) integrated courses, for reasons of consistency.

A.10: The credit is for students who have already completed the basic instrument flight module outside of the ATPL integrated course.

comment **1406** comment by: *Bristow Helicopters*

Recommend that the Syllabi for the professional licences and IR are in the form of an AMC rather than an Appendix to the rule.

Justification:

With changes in aircraft technology, training device technology, and teaching methods, it is likely that this material will require change. This can be managed more effectively via the AMC and Alternative AMC procedure, rather than the full legal EU process of change associated with the Rules and Appendices. Common standards and transparency across all EU Member States should still be ensured by the Alternative AMC process, which requires National Authority approval, EASA acceptance and publication of alternative AMC's throughout the Community.

response *Noted*

The detailed syllabi for theoretical knowledge instruction have been transferred to AMC. Please see replies to comments on Appendix 2.

As for the flight training syllabi and skill test contents, included in Appendix 9, the Agency considers that for the moment they should remain in the rule.

As for Appendix 3, it does not contain syllabi, but general rules on how the training courses for commercial licences should be organised. It is the Agency's opinion that at this time it should remain included in the rule; however, it is possible that certain elements which are identified as non-essential based on

the comments received will be transferred to AMC.

comment *1912* comment by: *Nigel Roche*

Please note although this is appendix 3 when using adobe navigator for NPA2008-17b it is shown as being appendix 2 please see attached screen print and look at the greyed box on the navigator column.

response *Noted*

comment *1981* comment by: *Nigel Roche*

**APPENDIX 3  
TRAINING COURSES FOR THE ISSUE OF A CPL, AN ATPL AND AN IR**

This appendix describes the requirements for the different types of training courses for the issue of a CPL, ATPL and IR.

The title and introduction are misleading, there is no reference in this appendix to an a IR modular course. This is given under **APPENDIX 6 MODULAR TRAINING COURSES FOR THE INSTRUMENT RATING A. IR(A) - Modular flying training course and B. IR(H) - Modular flying training course**

I would recommend correcting the title and introduction to the following:

**APPENDIX 3  
TRAINING COURSES FOR THE ISSUE OF FOLLOWING LICENCES  
ATPL(A), ATPL(H), ATPL(H)/IR , CPL/IR(A), CPL/IR(H),CPL/IR(As),  
CPL (A), CPL(H) and CPL(As)**

This appendix describes the requirements for the different types of training courses for the issue of a ATPL, CPL/IR and CPL. As listed below

- A. ATP integrated course - aeroplanes**
- B. CPL/IR integrated course aeroplanes**
- C. CPL integrated course aeroplanes**
- D. CPL modular course aeroplanes**
- E. ATP/IR integrated course helicopters**
- F. ATP integrated course Helicopters**
- G. CPL/IR integrated course - Helicopters**
- H. CPL integrated course Helicopters**
- I. CPL modular course Helicopters**
- J. CPL/IR integrated course - Airships**
- K. CPL integrated course airships**
- L. CPL modular course airships**

Another observation

This list was made up of titles copied from the NPA2008-17b, please note that in some titles there is a - other are without, some have the category of aircraft given with upper case others lower case.

I would suggest that one standard is accepted and applied throughout the manual.

response *Accepted*

The text will be reviewed for editorial consistency.

comment 3208 comment by: *Susana Nogueira*

General remark

There are some differences with App 1 to JAR-FCL 1.160.

It might be useful to reconsider compliance for some items:

- 1) Introduce possible extension of the training period if additional training is performed.
- 2) There is no knowledge evaluation of the applicant before entry to the training.
- 3) Definition of an hour of training (= 60 minutes).

response *Partially accepted*

1) Please see reply to comment No 1049 above.

2) The requirement for the ATO to evaluate the knowledge of the applicant for the course is included in OR.ATO.145 (see NPA 2008-22c). The Agency will nevertheless include a provision in the AMC to Appendix 3 to clarify this point.

3) The Agency considers that there is no need to establish that an hour comprises 60 minutes. This is a universal standard. However, since the Agency has received several comments on this issue, a general paragraph will be added to the AMC to clarify that whenever there is a reference to a certain amount of hours of training this means a full hour, not including any breaks.

comment 4424 comment by: *Bond Offshore Helicopters*

Recommend that the Syllabi for the professional licences and IR are in the form of an AMC rather than an Appendix to the rule.

Justification:

With changes in aircraft technology, training device technology, and teaching methods, it is likely that this material will require change. This can be managed more effectively via the AMC and Alternative AMC procedure, rather than the full legal EU process of change associated with the Rules and Appendices. Common standards and transparency across all EU Member States should still be ensured by the Alternative AMC process, which requires National Authority approval, EASA acceptance and publication of alternative AMC's throughout the Community.

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment No 1406 above.

comment 4666 comment by: *Héli-Union*

Recommend that the Syllabi for the professional licences and IR are in the form of an AMC rather than an Appendix to the rule.

Justification:

With changes in aircraft technology, training device technology, and teaching methods, it is likely that this material will require change. This can be managed more effectively via the AMC and Alternative AMC procedure, rather than the full legal EU process of change associated with the Rules and Appendices. Common standards and transparency across all EU Member States should still

	<p>be ensured by the Alternative AMC process, which requires National Authority approval, EASA acceptance and publication of alternative AMC's throughout the Community.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 1406 above.</p>
comment	<p><b>4885</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>HUTC</i></span></p>
	<p>Recommend that the Syllabi for the professional licences and IR are in the form of an AMC rather than an Appendix to the rule.</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>With changes in aircraft technology, training device technology, and teaching methods, it is likely that this material will require change. This can be managed more effectively via the AMC and Alternative AMC procedure, rather than the full legal EU process of change associated with the Rules and Appendices. Common standards and transparency across all EU Member States should still be ensured by the Alternative AMC process, which requires National Authority approval, EASA acceptance and publication of alternative AMC's throughout the Community.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 1406 above.</p>
comment	<p><b>5150</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAE</i></span></p>
	<p>Complete Appendix 3 (starting page 82)</p> <p>Propose an increase in the number of creditable hours for flight training devices for all licenses and ratings as the FSTD technology has significantly improved since these numbers were derived.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment. At this time the Agency does not intend to deviate from the credits that were established in JAR-FCL. However, the Agency already has in its rulemaking programme a task that will deal with the introduction of the amendments to the ICAO manual on FSTDs. This task will also review Part-FCL for consistency and will re-assess the crediting provisions.</p>
comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p>
	<p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b><u>Comment:</u></b></p> <p>Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.</p> <p>Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.</p>

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment No 1406 above.

comment

5994

comment by: *CFAC, ZHAW*

**Maximum time for courses**

**a) Starting point**

In NPA 17 b EASA-FCL maximum times are defined for courses for higher licences

EASA-FCL *Page 82 of 647*

APPENDIX 3

TRAINING COURSES FOR THE ISSUE OF A CPL, AN ATPL AND AN IR

Maximum times for a licence course

A ATP integrated course – aeroplanes

3. The applicant shall complete the course within a maximum period of 36 months.

B. CPL/IR integrated course aeroplanes

3. The applicant shall complete the course within a maximum period of 30 months.

C. CPL integrated course aeroplanes

3. The applicant shall complete the course within a maximum period of 24 months.

**b) Considerations**

When licence courses are combined with academic studies e.g. for a Bachelor



of Science in Aviation or a Master Degree, then the maximum time for a course as defined in EASA-FCL Appendix 5 may be too short. As the time necessary for the completion of the studies does vary depending on the kind of studies, no general time limit can be defined for these courses.

In this case the maximum time should be agreed between the University/FTO and the supervising Authority.

**c) Proposal for change**

APPENDIX 3

TRAINING COURSES FOR THE ISSUE OF A CPL, AN ATPL AND AN IR

A ATP integrated course – aeroplanes

3. The applicant shall complete the course within a maximum period of 36 months or a period agreed with the Approval of the Course.

B. CPL/IR integrated course - aeroplanes

3. The applicant shall complete the course within a maximum period of 30 months or a period agreed with the Approval of the Course.

D. CPL integrated course - aeroplanes

3. The applicant shall complete the course within a maximum period of 24 months or a period agreed with the Approval of the Course.

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment No 1049 above.

comment 6067

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:** Appendix 3

**Page No:** 82 of 647

**Comment:** The title of the Appendix indicates that it covers the training course for the issue of an IR but there is no mention of the IR course other than as part of another integrated course. The Appendix 6 (page 109) contains details of the IR course and therefore the title of Appendix 3 should be changed.

**Justification:** The title of Appendix 3 is misleading

**Proposed Text: (if applicable)**

Change the title to read "TRAINING COURSES FOR THE ISSUE OF A CPL AND AN ATPL"

response *Accepted*

The title will be changed accordingly.

comment 6073

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:** Appendix 3 A/B/C/D

**Page No\*:** 82-86

**Comment:** The Basic Instrument Module (BIM) and the Modular CPL allow 5 hours instrument time to be conducted in a BITD. However, the use of a BITD is specifically excluded from the integrated CPL, CPL/IR and ATPL even though the total instrument time required is similar or the same. Thus, although the course standard on a Basic Instrument Module should be consistent, some BIMs will be worth more than others when being credited to integrated

	<p>courses.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> If the BITD truly generates an inferior product then its use should not be allowed at all; if it is adequate for the modular CPL then its use on the integrated courses should be allowed.</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Remove the 'no BITD' restriction from integrated courses.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>After carefully assessing your input, the Agency has decided to keep the text as proposed in the NPA.</p>
comment	<p>6439 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DCAA</i></span></p> <p>Appendix 3 General comment:</p> <p>Specify requirement for instructors conducting SPIC.</p> <p>MCC should be deleted from ATP integrated course and be combined in the applicants first multi-pilot type rating.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>In relation to your first comment, they will be instructors with privileges to conduct training for the IR, as determined in Subpart J.</p> <p>In relation to your second comment, the intention of the ATP integrated course is to have a package ready for the first type rating. Therefore, if the first type rating is a multi-pilot one, the integrated course needs to have MCC. This was already the case in JAR-FCL.</p>
comment	<p>6954 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>UK CAA</i></span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> Appendix 3 – Training Courses for the issue of a CPL, ATPL and IR <b>Page No*:</b> 82 to 86 of 647 <b>Comment:</b> A. ATP integrated course – aeroplanes</p> <p>paragraph 3 - does not state if the Authority can extend the course beyond 36 months;</p> <p><b>C. CPL(A) integrated course</b></p> <p>paragraph 7 - states 350 hours theoretical knowledge instruction, JAR-FCL states 300 hours</p> <p><b>D. CPL(A) Modular Course</b></p> <p>paragraph 7 states 250 hours theoretical knowledge instruction, JAR-FCL states 200 hours;</p> <p>Paragraph 13 – does not mention 10 hours instrument instruction and 5 hours night flight time as per JAR-FCL 1.155 (c) (3) &amp; (4)</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Consistency with current requirements.</p>

	<b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Existing requirements as per App 1 to JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165(a) (1), (2), (3), (4).
response	<i>Partially accepted</i>  § A.3 — Please see reply to comment No 1049 above.  & C.7 — As indicated in the explanatory note to this NPA, the Agency had agreed with the JAA to include the text of draft NPA FCL-34 in its proposals. The text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165(a)(3) had been amended by this NPA from 300 to 350 hours.  § D.7 — As indicated in the explanatory note to this NPA, the Agency had agreed with the JAA to include the text of draft NPA FCL-34 in its proposals. The text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165(a)(4) had been amended by this NPA from 200 to 250 hours.  § D.13 — Accepted. Text has been amended accordingly.
comment	<b>7497</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>British Airways</i></span>  In order to allow the introduction of modern training methodology and take into account the use of improved training devices the contents of this Appendix should be transferred to AMC and GM for the appropriate section.
response	<i>Noted</i>  Please see reply to comment No 1406 above.
comment	<b>7664</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span>  App 3: Based on comments from training organization there are some mistakes in this appendix and should be checked. I do not have the details.
response	<i>Noted</i>  Please see replies to related comments.

<b>B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 3: Training courses for the issue of a CPL, an ATPL and an IR - A. ATP integrated course – aeroplanes</b>	p. 82-83
---	----------

comment	<b>163</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Irish Aviation Authority</i></span>  ATP integrated course  Skill Test It is not entirely clear that the VFR skill test must be taken with a duly authorised examiner on completion of the VFR training phase of the ATP integrated course i.e. not at the end of the course. ( <i>NFC</i> ) Is ATP an accepted abbreviation for ATPL, both are used quite liberally within these Appendices. John swan 1.9.2008
response	<i>Noted</i>

The qualification of the examiner must comply with FCL.1005.FE(a)(1) which follows paragraph JAR-FCL 1.435(a).  
ATP can be used only for ATP integrated course.  
ATPL is related to the Air Transport Pilot License.

comment 699 comment by: FOCA Switzerland

Appendix 3

- A. ATP integrated course- aeroplane; Para 10 (b)
- B. CPL/IR integrated course - aeroplane, Para 9 (b)

Clarification for course duration and SPIC-time as it is not defined in FCL.010

Proposals

**Provision to extend course duration, with extra training if needed, should be foreseen. This applies for all courses.**

**Take wording for SPIC as stated in JAR-FCL 1.001 "Definitions and Abbreviations" .**

response *Noted*

1. The Agency's proposal was based on its understanding of what were the safety relevant requirements in the Appendices to JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165. Based on several comments received on the same issue, it seems that it is not an essential safety element that the course is completed within a certain time limit. Therefore, the Agency will delete paragraph A.3 and include in the AMC to Appendix 3 A. the related text of JAR-FCL, including the mention that the period may be extended if additional training is provided.  
The same change will be made in all the integrated courses, for reasons of consistency.

2. Referring to Appendix 3 A. Para 10(b) extra SPIC time is possible, but only up to 20 hours instrument flight time can be counted as pilot-in-command flight time. Definition for SPIC has been included in FCL.010. Please see replies to comments on this segment.

comment 823 comment by: OAA Oxford

A.3 - The option to extend the course beyond the 36 month maximum currently available under Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165 (a) (1) (3) has been removed. Recommendation: re-instate

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment No 699 above.

comment 900 comment by: ERA

Appendix 3 Training courses for the issue of a CPL, an ATPL and an IR

Section A 10(b) in Appendix 3 to IR-FCL. Puts forward the condition that "*the instrument flight time as SPIC shall only be counted as pilot-in-command flight time up to maximum of 20 hours.*" This is not in Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL. ERA

response	<p>members would like to understand the reason for now including it in the IR-FCL.</p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>After carefully reviewing your input and the text of JAR-FCL, the Agency has decided to keep the text as proposed in the NPA. The reason is that at least 50 hours need to be flown solo.</p>
comment	<p><b>1062</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p>General remark for all training courses. There are some differences with app.1 to JAR-FCL 1.160. It might be useful to reconsider compliance for some items:</p> <p>1) introduce possible extension of the training period if additional training is performed: A.3, B.3, C.3, E.3, etc  2) no transfer foreseen: A.6  3) there is no knowledge evaluation of the applicant before admission to the training  4) definition of an hour of instruction (= 60 minutes) has been deleted.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>1) Please see reply to comment 699 above.</p> <p>2) Text of paragraph 6 of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.160 &amp; 1.165(a)(1) will be included in FCL.515 as a general requirement applicable for all training courses.</p> <p>3) The requirement for the ATO to evaluate the knowledge of the applicant for the course is included in OR.ATO.145 (see NPA 2008-22c). The Agency nevertheless includes the provision for the applicant to have sufficient knowledge of mathematics, physics and English in order to facilitate the understanding of the content of the course in the AMC to Appendix 3.</p> <p>4) Appendix 3 A.7, B.7 and C.7:  The Agency considers that there is no need to establish that an hour comprises 60 minutes. This is a universal standard. However, since the Agency has received several comments on this issue, a general paragraph will be added to the AMC to clarify that whenever there is a reference to a certain amount of hours of training this means a full hour, not including any breaks.</p>
comment	<p><b>1558</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>IAAPS</i></span></p> <p>"An applicant may be admitted to training either as an ab initio entrant, or as a holder of a PPL(A) or PPL(H) issued in accordance with ICAO annex 1". And : "the course shall comprise : (a) theoretical instruction to the ATPL(A) knowledge level"</p> <p>Is an applicant holding an ATPL theory certificate eligible ? The first sentence does not address this issue, the second suggests a negative answer. We think he/she should be eligible. It has been a usable practise without any negative effect on safety.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency follows in Appendix 3 closely Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.160 &amp; 1.165</p>

(a)(1) paragraphs 4 and 8, and does not intend to change it at this point. However, please note that holders of an ATPL are eligible and covered, since they hold the privileges of a PPL.

comment **1559** comment by: *IAAPS*

Should be an AMC, for added flexibility. At least the parts "theoretical knowledge" and "flying training". All numerical values are arbitrary, conflicting with competence based concepts. As an example, will FNPT2 never give VFR credits?

response **Noted**

The detailed syllabi for the theoretical knowledge instruction have been transferred to AMC. Please see replies to comments on Appendix 2.

As for the flight training syllabi and skill test contents, included in Appendix 9, the Agency considers that for the moment they should remain in the rule.

As for Appendix 3, it does not contain syllabi, but general rules on how the training courses for commercial licences should be organised. It is the Agency's opinion that at this time it should remain included in the rule; however, it is possible that certain elements that are identified as non-essential based on the comments received will be transferred to AMC.

In relation to the issue of credits given by FSTDs, at this time the Agency does not intend to deviate from the credits that were established in JAR-FCL. However, the Agency already has in its rulemaking programme a task that will deal with the introduction of the amendments to the ICAO manual on FSTDs. This task will also review Part-FCL for consistency and will re-assess the crediting provisions.

comment **1569** comment by: *IAAPS*

See comment on FCL.515  
There is no mention of ATPL modular course and needs to be addressed.

response **Noted**

The ATP modular course (as included in Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.285 and Appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 2.285) was included in the proposal, in paragraphs FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H, and the respective AMCs.

To improve consistency and clarity, the Agency will transfer this text to Appendix 3.

comment **1909** comment by: *Nigel Roche*

GENERAL

Item 6

An applicant failing or unable to complete the entire **ATP(A)** course...  
Should read ATPL(A)

THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE

Item 7

An **ATP(A)** theoretical....  
Should read ATPL(A)

response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 163 above.</p>
comment	<p>4829 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Flight Training Europe</i></span></p> <p><u>Page 82, Appendix 3. A. ATP Integrated Course – Aeroplanes. 10 (b)</u>  The wording of SPIC allowance (“up to a maximum of 20 hours”) significantly changes the current JAR-FCL rules, is more restrictive and contradicts other sections of Part FCL: Sub-para 10 (e) states at least 20 hours SPIC instrument time. Page 584, AMC to Appendix 3 A. ATP integrated course – aeroplanes, Phase 4 (b) states 35 hours instrument time flown as SPIC).</p> <p>Change para 10 (b) to agree with JAR-FCL and read:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(b) 70 hours as pilot-in-command, including VFR flight and instrument flight time as student pilot-in-command (SPIC). The instrument flight time as SPIC shall be at least 20 hours.</b></p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 900 above.</p>
comment	<p>4963 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Chris Gowers</i></span></p> <p>Page 83, para 10(d) Last sentence. Delete “full stop”.</p> <p>Unnecessary requirement. Touch and go landings are demanding enough to meet the training requirement and facilitate ease of completion of this requirement at training organisations.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>It is correct that touch and go landings are demanding.  It is also important to demonstrate that the pilot is able to perform full stop landings within a certain distance (e.g. on short runways).</p>
comment	<p>5556 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ECA- European Cockpit Association</i></span></p> <p>Delete and add text :  GENERAL  3 The applicant shall complete the course within <del>a maximum period of 36 months</del> a period of 12 to 36 months. Special arrangements may be made with the approval of the Authority to extend the course beyond 36 months where additional flying training or ground instruction is provided by the ATO.</p> <p>Justification:  The proposed text deviates from current JARS. The original intention of this requirement is to state that 12 months is the minimum time to complete the course, and to allow for extensive periods, if required by the amount of training. Why precluding a better training, if agreed by the two parts, ATO and the student? The previous wording in JAR. is preferred and it allows an ATO to give extra training.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 699 above.</p>

comment	<p>5727 comment by: <i>FNAM (Fédération Nationale de l'Aviation Marchande)</i></p> <p>Section A 10(b) in Appendix 3 to IR-FCL. Puts forward the condition that "<i>the instrument flight time as SPIC shall only be counted as pilot-in-command flight time up to maximum of 20 hours.</i>" This is not in Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL.</p> <p>No assessment is made demonstrating this would improve safety. An assessment should be provided or this appendix be suppressed or changed.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 900 above.</p>

comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>5913❖</p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b><u>Comment:</u></b> Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry. Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.</p> <p>Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9</li> <li>• changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.</li> <li>• As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Proposal:</u></b></p> <p>Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC. The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment and the proposal. Please see reply to comment No 1559 above. Rules may be reviewed and amended as appropriate in a future rulemaking task. The Agency appreciates your willingness to provide detailed proposals where changes or amendments might be appropriate.</p>



comment 6064 comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:** APPENDIX 3

TRAINING COURSES FOR THE ISSUE OF A CPL, AN ATPL AND AN IR  
A . ATP integrated course – aeroplanes 10 (e) (3) (ii)

**Page No\*:** 82

**Comment:** [This should include FTD level 2](#)

**Justification:** FTD level 2 is a cockpit specific device with all systems fully functional and is therefore somewhere between FNPT II and FS

**Proposed Text: (if applicable)**

40 hours may be instrument ground time in a FNPT II, FTD 2 or flight simulator, of which up to 10 hours may be conducted in a FNPT I.

response *Accepted*

The Agency follows your proposal. Paragraph A.10(e)(3)(ii), as well as B.9(e)(ii), C.9(e) and D.9 of Appendix 3 will be amended accordingly by adding FTD 2.

comment 6351 comment by: Axel Schwarz

The structure of the ATP integrated course forces students into performing some of the training on MEP-aeroplanes through the requirements for multi-engine training and the multi-engine IR skill test. Since these aeroplanes are not normally what graduates of an ATP integrated course aim for and since only little can be learned from these aeroplanes (usually DA42, PA34 etc.) which is relevant for the future career of a typical ATP-integrated student, this procedure seems somewhat outdated.

I suggest allowing candidates to perform all multi-engine training on a FSTD (FNPT II or higher), take the multi-engine IR skill test on the FSTD and only take the CPL skill test on a single-engine aeroplane. Thus candidates could obtain a multi-engine instrument rating (required for beginning the training on a multi-engine (usually multi-pilot) turbine aeroplane) while only holding a single-engine class or type rating in their licence.

response *Noted*

Thank you for your suggestion, but the Agency followed closely Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165(a)(1) and has no intention of changing those requirements in the way you are suggesting at this time, without a dedicated assessment.

comment 6357 comment by: Axel Schwarz

A. The requirement 10 (b) and (c) with 50 hours X-country PIC-time and 20 hours SPIC time for the required 70 hours total PIC time leaves no space for the initial solo flights (usually non X-country) in Phase 2 and the required 5 solo night flights (usually only traffic patterns).

The requirement for PIC X-country flying should therefore be reduced to 35 hours (see also AMC to Appendix 3 A).

B. The same applies to the CPL/IR integrated course paragraph 9 (b) and (c) (compare with AMC to Appendix 3 B).

C. In contrast to the above, there would be plenty of room in the CPL (VFR)

	integrated course for X-country flights. The requirement of paragraph 9 (c) could easily be lifted to 50 hours since there is no SPIC-time in this course.
	AMC to Appendix 3 A: Phase 4 b. should be revised to only 20 hours SPIC in accordance with Appendix 3 A
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see reply to comment No 900 above.
comment	<b>6440</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DCAA</i></span> Definition of Lower Licence needed.
response	<i>Noted</i> The Agency follows closely JAR-FCL 1 and has taken over the text from Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165(a)(1) paragraph 5 using the same expression. It means a licence with fewer privileges than the ATPL.
comment	<b>6441</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DCAA</i></span> Appendix 3 Flying Training A (d) Clarify if night time should be VFR or IFR.
response	<i>Noted</i> This is VFR night.
comment	<b>6756</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Adventia, European College of Aeronautics</i></span> Adventia, European Aviation College, Spanish certified FTO (Reg. Number E011) presents the following comments to the NPA N° 2008-17B,  - As far as Appendix 3.A, is concerned, this organization considers this regulation a minimum requirements system. Therefore, the establishment of a maximum training period (36 months), eliminating / obviating the possibility of an extension with the approval of the Authority, may work to the detriment of quality training of professional pilots.  It is commonly known that one of the main targets of the European Aviation Safety Agency is promoting the highest common standards of air transport safety. Adventia believes that the best contribution that a Training Organization can make to achieve it, is to train a versatile professional, who can offer their future employers not only their ability to fly, but also a good technical knowledge. This way these pilots will be able to attain the binomial safety-economy.  Adventia and the University of Salamanca, with the backing of the Spanish Official Association of Civil Aviation Pilots, has developed a degree which covers an increase in the number of theoretical hours of JAR subjects and other subjects that include, flight safety, mathematics, physics and business and administration studies, according to the European Space for Higher Education that establishes four-year degrees.  The elimination of the pre-entry requirement of sufficient knowledge of

response	<p>Mathematics, Physics and English therefore proves the need of including these subjects in the integrated ATPL course.</p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see replies to comments No 699 and 1062 above.</p>
comment	<p>7080 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> FCL Appendix 3 A 5 (c)  <b>Page No:</b> 82 of 647  <b>Comment:</b> The crew are required to complete training in MCC and this should be included as part of NTS training to prepare the pilot for multi-crew flying.  <b>Justification:</b> Consistency of training input.  <b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b>  Amend to read;  (c ) training in <i>NTS and in</i> multi-crew co-operation for the operation of multi-pilot aeroplanes.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.  We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.</p>
comment	<p>7081 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> FCL Appendix 3 A 11  <b>Page No:</b> 82 of 647  <b>Comment:</b> The ATP courses for helicopters require the Skill Test to have an MCC (and thus NTS) element. This should appear in the ATP (airplane) course also.  <b>Justification:</b> Consistency  <b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b>  Amend to read;  “..on a multi-engine airplane <i>and shall comply with the requirements of NTS and MCC training</i>”.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.  We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.</p>
comment	<p>7199 <span style="float: right;">comment by: OAA Oxford</span></p> <p>A.4 - Crediting under JAR was at the discretion of the FTO. This paragraph states that hours shall be credited. Recommendation: re-instate</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency considers that in this case crediting for hours flown should not be left to the discretion of the training organisation; this does not ensure enough</p>

legal certainty for the pilot.

comment 7334 comment by: ECOGAS

Current wording:

"3. The applicant shall complete the course within a maximum period of 36 months"

Issue: The option to extend the course beyond the 36 month limit currently available under Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.160 and 1.165 (a)(1)(3) has been removed.

Suggestion: Reinstate duration extension option from JAR's

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment No 699 above.

comment 7335 comment by: ECOGAS

Current wording:

"4. In the case of a PPL(A) or PPL(H) entrant, 50% of the hours flown prior to the course shall be credited, upto a maximum of 40 hours flying experience"

Issue: Under JAR, crediting for prior experience was at the discretion of the FTO.

Suggestion: Reinstate JAR accreditation discretion previously enjoyed by FTO's

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment No 7199 above.

comment 7665 comment by: CAA Finland

App 3 A para 3:

The guidance how to proceed if time limit exceeded is missing. New proposed text:

3 The applicant shall complete the course within a maximum period of 36 months **or the approved training organization shall give additional training and give a certificate specifying that training.**

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment No 699 above.

comment 7923 comment by: Atlantic Training Support

Appendix 3(A) Reinstate duration extension from RAR's

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment No 699 above.

comment 7933 comment by: Atlantic Training Support

	Appendix 3(A) Reinstate JAR accreditation previously held by FTO's
response	<i>Noted</i> The Agency cannot understand the purpose or issue behind your comment.

<b>B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 3: Training courses for the issue of a CPL, an ATPL and an IR - B. CPL/IR integrated course - aeroplanes</b>	p. 83-84
--	----------

comment	164 comment by: <i>Irish Aviation Authority</i> CPL/IR, Skill Tests It is not entirely clear that there are two separate skill tests, 1) the VFR CPL Skill Test, after the VFR training phases 2) the IR Skill Test on completion of the entire course
response	<i>Noted</i> The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please note that already under the provisions of JAR-FCL the pilot was required to make two skill tests. One for the CPL under VFR conditions and one for the IR. As the Agency closely followed the provisions of JAR-FCL, it does not consider any clarification necessary.
comment	218 comment by: <i>CAA - The Netherlands</i> Appendix 3 (B)(3) Only the maximum period is mentioned of 30 months, not the minimum of 9 months. See appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165(a)(2). It is a difference, maybe inaccurate? Point 6 of appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165(a)(2) describes the change of an applicant towards another FTO. This item is not mentioned in this appendix 3 of NPA 2008-17b. What is the general EASA-policy of changing the FTO during the training course? Is the policy "not allowed" because it is not described, or is the policy "up to the authority" with the result of all different national options?
response	<i>Noted</i> 1. The Agency's proposal was based on its understanding of what were the safety relevant requirements in the Appendices to JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165. Based on several comments received on the same issue, it seems that it is not an essential safety element that the course is completed within a certain time limit. Therefore, the Agency will delete paragraph A.3 and include in the AMC to Appendix 3 A. the related text of JAR-FCL, including the mention that the period may be extended if additional training is provided. The same change will be made in all the integrated courses, for reasons of consistency. 2. It is allowed. Text of paragraph 6 of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.160 &

1.165(a)(1) will be included in FCL.515 as a general requirement applicable for all training courses.

comment **905** comment by: *ERA*

Appendix 3 Training courses for the issue of a CPL, an ATPL and an IR

Section B 9(b) in Appendix 3 to IR-FCL. puts forward the condition that "*the instrument flight time as SPIC shall only be counted as pilot-in-command flight time up to maximum of 20 hours.*" This is not in Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL. ERA members would like to understand the reason for now including it in the IR-FCL.

response *Noted*

After carefully assessing your input, the Agency has decided to maintain the text of the proposal. The reason for it is that at least 50 hours need to be flown solo.

comment **1047** comment by: *FTO 09-157 FRENCH AIR FORCE*

The LPL is a new licence. Some of the requirements for LPL do not meet the ICAO standards. the proposals of the NPA define 20 hours of flight training for the basic LPL(A) whereas ICAO annex 1 is asking for not less than 40 hours of flight time .(for the LPL : it's the same problem).

For a CPL/IR integrated course aeroplanes : "In the case of a PPL (A) or PPL (H) entrant , 50% of the hour flown prior to the course shall be credited, up to a maximum of :

40 hours flying experience, "

Why not to introduce the same rule with the LPL?

The proposal is: "In the case of a LPL (A) or (H) entrant, 50% of the hours flown prior to the course shall be credited, up to a maximum of 30 hours flying experience".

response *Noted*

After carefully assessing your input, the Agency has decided that at this time credit should not be given in the case of LAPL holders.

A credit mechanism is established between the LAPL and the PPL. LPL holders can acquire a PPL, and then be entitled to the credit foreseen in Appendix 3 for the PPL.

comment **1053** comment by: *CAA Belgium*

B.3 Additional training must be foreseen in case the applicant has to extend the 30 months-period

B.9 in fine: why should we credit if the IR training is part on an integrated CPL/IR course ?

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment No 218 above.

comment	<p>1078 comment by: <i>Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)</i></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> It seems that the text in the "CPL integrated course - aeroplane" and in "CPL modular course - aeroplane" is missing in "CPL/IR integrated course - aeroplane".</p> <p>In Appendix 4, B, 1, "Skill test for CPL", at page 97, there is a requirement that the skill test shall be taken in an aeroplane certified for at least four persons and that the aeroplane shall have a variable pitch propeller and retractable landing gear.</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> Add "5 hours to be carried out in an aeroplane certificated for the carriage of at least four persons that has a variable pitch propeller and retractable landing gear" in "CPL/IR integrated course - aeroplane".</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text will be amended as proposed.</p>

comment	<p>3139 comment by: <i>FTO 09-157 FRENCH AIR FORCE</i></p> <p>due to the overall improvement of synthetic training devices, why not introducing VFR ground time into the flying training? The French Air Force has one over a year of experience using high-quality synthetic trainers and can guaranty the quality of its instruction as long as the "train in the simulator, practice in the air" principle is applied.</p> <p>"FLYING TRAINING" can be rewritten as follows: (a) 80 hours of dual instruction, <b>of which up to 5 hours may be VFR ground time in a FNPT II, 2 of which are to be in VFR cross-country simulated flight, and up to 40 hours may be instrument ground time;</b></p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your proposal, but it is not within the scope of this NPA to introduce new credits like this. Anyway, considering the result of the new ICAO doc. 9625 3rd edition within a future rulemaking task, your proposal will be welcomed at that time.</p>

comment	<p>4830 comment by: <i>Flight Training Europe</i></p> <p><u>Page 84, Appendix 3. B. CPL/IR Integrated Course – Aeroplanes. 9 (b)</u></p> <p>The wording of SPIC allowance ("up to a maximum of 20 hours") significantly changes the current rules, is more restrictive and contradicts other sections of Part FCL: Sub-para 9 (e) states at least 20 hours SPIC instrument time. Page 587, AMC to Appendix 3 B. CPL/IR integrated course – aeroplanes, Phase 4 (b) states 50 hours instrument time flown as SPIC)/ Change para 9 (b) to agree with JAR-FCL and read:</p> <p><b>(b) 70 hours as pilot-in-command, including VFR flight and instrument flight time as student pilot-in-command (SPIC). The instrument flight time as SPIC shall be at least 20 hours</b></p>
---------	--

response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 905 above.</p>
comment	<p>5016 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Chris Gowers</i></span></p> <p>Page 84, para 9(d) Last sentence. Delete "full stop".</p> <p>Unnecessary requirement. Touch and go landings are demanding enough to meet the training requirement and facilitate ease of completion of this requirement at training organisations.</p> <p>ICAO only specifies "landings"</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>It is correct that touch and go landings are demanding. It is also important to demonstrate that the pilot is able to perform full stop landings within a certain distance (e.g. on short runways).</p>
comment	<p>5728 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>FNAM (Fédération Nationale de l'Aviation Marchande)</i></span></p> <p>Section B 9(b) in Appendix 3 to IR-FCL. puts forward the condition that "<i>the instrument flight time as SPIC shall only be counted as pilot-in-command flight time up to maximum of 20 hours.</i>" This is not in Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL.</p> <p>No assessment is made demonstrating this would improve safety.</p> <p>An assessment should be provided or this appendix be suppressed or changed.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 905 above.</p>
comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>5913❖</p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry. Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.</p> <p>Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9</li> <li>• changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all</li> </ul>



aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.

- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response *Noted*

Thank you for your comment and the proposal.

Please see reply to your same comment on other sections of Appendix 3, and note that at this time the Agency has decided to leave the majority of this Appendix in the rule, and only pass to AMC specific points, based on the comments received.

However, this may be reviewed and amended as appropriate in a future rulemaking task. Within this NPA the Agency follows closely JAR-FCL.

The Agency appreciates your willingness to provide detailed proposals where changes or amendments might be appropriate.

comment

6075

comment by: *UK CAA*

**Paragraph:** APPENDIX 3

TRAINING COURSES FOR THE ISSUE OF A CPL, AN ATPL AND AN IR

B. CPL/IR integrated course aeroplanes 9 (e) (2) (ii)

**Page No\*:** 84

**Comment:** [This should include FTD level 2](#)

**Justification:** FTD level 2 is a cockpit specific device with all systems fully functional and is therefore somewhere between FNPT II and FS

**Proposed Text: (if applicable)**

40 hours may be instrument ground time in a FNPT II, FTD 2 or flight simulator, of which up to 10 hours may be conducted in a FNPT I.

response

*Accepted*

The Agency follows your proposal.

The sections B.9(e)(ii), C.9(e) and D.9 of Appendix 3 will be amended accordingly by adding FTD 2.

See response to comment No 6064

comment

6357❖

comment by: *Axel Schwarz*

A. The requirement 10 (b) and (c) with 50 hours X-country PIC-time and 20 hours SPIC time for the required 70 hours total PIC time leaves no space for the initial solo flights (usually non X-country) in Phase 2 and the required 5 solo night flights (usually only traffic patterns).

The requirement for PIC X-country flying should therefore be reduced to 35 hours (see also AMC to Appendix 3 A).

B. The same applies to the CPL/IR integrated course paragraph 9 (b) and (c)

(compare with AMC to Appendix 3 B).

C. In contrast to the above, there would be plenty of room in the CPL (VFR) integrated course for X-country flights. The requirement of paragraph 9 (c) could easily be lifted to 50 hours since there is no SPIC-time in this course.

AMC to Appendix 3 A: Phase 4 b. should be revised to only 20 hours SPIC in accordance with Appendix 3 A

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment.

The proposed text was taken over from Appendix 1 JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165(a)(1). Your proposal does not represent a surplus in safety and will therefore not be taken into consideration when drafting the final text.

comment

7669

comment by: CAA Finland

App 3 B para 3:

The guidance how to proceed if time limit exceeded is missing. New proposed text:

3 The applicant shall complete the course within a maximum period of 30 months **or the approved training organization shall give additional training and give a certificate specifying that training.**

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment No 218 above.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 3: Training courses for the issue of a CPL, an ATPL and an IR - C. CPL integrated course - aeroplanes**

p. 84-85

comment

907

comment by: ERA

Appendix 3 Training courses for the issue of a CPL, an ATPL and an IR

Section C 7 in Appendix 3 to IR-FCL request that the theoretical knowledge course shall comprise at least 350 hours of instruction. In Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL the requested hours are either 300 hours or 200 hours where the applicant already holds a PPL. ERA members request that this range of hours are maintained [i.e. 200 hours in case applicant already holds PPL]. There seems no justification to jump from 200 hours to 350 hours for applicants already holding a PPL . The length of instruction should be less not more than the original extended 300 hours of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL.

response *Not accepted*

As indicated in the explanatory note to this NPA, the Agency had agreed with the JAA to include the text of draft NPA FCL-34 in its proposals.

The text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165(a)(3) had been amended by this NPA from 300 to 350 hours.

The text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165(a)(4) had been amended by this NPA from 200 to 250 hours.

comment	<p>1056 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAA Belgium</span></p> <p>C.7 The number of 350 hours is different from JAR-FCL (300 hrs or 200 hrs if applicant has a PPL) although the program is similar</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 907 above.</p>
comment	<p>5017 <span style="float: right;">comment by: Chris Gowers</span></p> <p>Page 85, para 9(d) Last sentence. Delete "full stop".</p> <p>Unnecessary requirement. Touch and go landings are demanding enough to meet the training requirement and facilitate ease of completion of this requirement at training organisations.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>It is correct that touch and go landings are demanding. It is also important to demonstrate that the pilot is able to perform full stop landings within a certain distance (e.g. on short runways).</p>
comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>5913❖</p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b><u>Comment:</u></b> Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry. Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.</p> <p>Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9</li> <li>• changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.</li> <li>• As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Proposal:</u></b></p> <p>Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.</p> <p>The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for</p>

	consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment and the proposal. Please see reply to your same comment on other sections of Appendix 3, and note that at this time the Agency has decided to leave the majority of this Appendix in the rule, and only pass to AMC specific points, based on the comments received. However, this may be reviewed and amended as appropriate in a future rulemaking task. Within this NPA the Agency follows closely JAR-FCL. The Agency appreciates your willingness to provide detailed proposals where changes or amendments might be appropriate.</p>
comment	<p>6052 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Finnish Aviation Academy</i></span></p> <p>FLYING TRAINING 9</p> <p>(f) 5 hours to be carried out in an aeroplane certificated for the carriage of at least 4 persons that has a variable pitch propeller and <b>an engine 200 hp or more.</b></p> <p><i>Any new single-engine piston aeroplane does not have retractable landing gear. More important than retractable landing gear is aeroplanes performance and TOW, so the requirement of the retractable landing gear should be replaced by engine power or minimum TOW or stalling speed.</i></p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>After carefully assessing your input, the Agency has decided to keep the text of its proposal (which follows the text of JAR-FCL) unchanged.</p>
comment	<p>6076 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>UK CAA</i></span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> APPENDIX 3 TRAINING COURSES FOR THE ISSUE OF A CPL, AN ATPL AND AN IR C. CPL integrated course aeroplanes 9 (e) <b>Page No*:</b> 85 <b>Comment:</b> <i>This should include FTD level 2</i> <b>Justification:</b> FTD level 2 is a cockpit specific device with all systems fully functional and is therefore somewhere between FNPT II and FS <b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> 10 hours of instrument flight instruction, of which up to 5 hours may be instrument ground time in a FNPT I, or FNPT II, FTD 2 or flight simulator.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency follows your proposal.</p> <p>The sections B.9(e)(ii), C.9(e) and D.9 of Appendix 3 will be amended accordingly by adding FTD 2. See response to comment No 6064</p>
comment	<p>6357❖ <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Axel Schwarz</i></span></p>

A. The requirement 10 (b) and (c) with 50 hours X-country PIC-time and 20 hours SPIC time for the required 70 hours total PIC time leaves no space for the initial solo flights (usually non X-country) in Phase 2 and the required 5 solo night flights (usually only traffic patterns).  
The requirement for PIC X-country flying should therefore be reduced to 35 hours (see also AMC to Appendix 3 A).

B. The same applies to the CPL/IR integrated course paragraph 9 (b) and (c) (compare with AMC to Appendix 3 B).

C. In contrast to the above, there would be plenty of room in the CPL (VFR) integrated course for X-country flights. The requirement of paragraph 9 (c) could easily be lifted to 50 hours since there is no SPIC-time in this course.

AMC to Appendix 3 A: Phase 4 b. should be revised to only 20 hours SPIC in accordance with Appendix 3 A

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment.

The proposed text was taken over from Appendix 1 JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165(a)(1). Your proposal does not represent a surplus in safety and will therefore not be taken into consideration when drafting the final text.

comment

7391

comment by: *Finnish Aviation Academy*

### **APPENDIX 3**

#### **TRAINING COURSES FOR THE ISSUE OF A CPL, AN ATPL AND AN IR**

##### **C. CPL integrated course – aeroplanes**

###### FLYING TRAINING

9

(f) 5 hours to be carried out in an aeroplane certificated for the carriage of at least 4 persons that has a variable pitch propeller and **an engine 200 hp or more**.

*Hardly any new single-engine piston aeroplanes (especially European built) do not have retractable landing gear. More important than retractable landing gear is aeroplanes performance and TOW, so the requirement of the retractable landing gear should be replaced by engine power or minimum TOW or stalling speed.*

response *Not accepted*

Please see response to comment No 6052 above

comment

7670

comment by: *CAA Finland*

App 3 C para 3:

The guidance how to proceed if time limit exceeded is missing. New proposed text:

3 The applicant shall complete the course within a maximum period of 24 months **or the approved training organization shall give additional training and give a certificate specifying that training.**

response *Noted*

The Agency's proposal was based on its understanding of what were the safety relevant requirements in the Appendices to JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165. Based on several comments received on the same issue, it seems that it is not an essential safety element that the course is completed within a certain time limit. Therefore, the Agency will delete paragraph A.3 and include in the AMC to Appendix 3 A. the related text of JAR-FCL, including the mention that the period may be extended if additional training is provided.

The same change will be made in all the integrated courses, for reasons of consistency.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 3: Training courses for the issue of a CPL, an ATPL and an IR - D. CPL modular course - aeroplanes**

p. 85-86

comment 165

comment by: *Irish Aviation Authority*

CPL Modular Course

3(b) where a multi-engine or type rated aeroplane is to be used for the CPL Skill Test - It is not entirely clear if the prerequisites for the course include the successful completion of the multiengine or type rating skill test - i.e. before the commencement of the CPL course

response *Noted*

Only the prerequisites for the ME type rating need to have been complied with. The text of paragraph 3(b) remains unchanged, and a reference to a certain amount of flight in ME aeroplanes has been added to paragraph 12.

comment 339

comment by: *Michel Lacombe AF TRTO*

Numbering error  
Skill test should be numbered 14

**EXPERIENCE**

13 The applicant for a CPL(A) shall have completed at least 200 hours flight time, including 100 hours as pilot in command, of which 20 hours of crosscountry flight as pilot in command, which shall include a VFR crosscountry flight of at least 540 km (300 NM), in the course of which full stop landings at two aerodromes different from the aerodrome of departure shall be made.

Hours as pilot in command of other categories of aircraft may count towards the 200 hours flight time, in the following cases:

- (a) 30 hours in helicopter, if the applicant holds a PPL(H); or
- (b) 100 hours in helicopters, if the applicant holds a CPL(H); or
- (c) 30 hours in touring motor gliders or gliders.
- (d) 30 hours in airships, if the applicant holds a PPL(As);
- (e) 60 hours in airships, if the applicant holds a CPL(As);

**SKILL TEST**

	<del>13</del> <b>14</b> On completion of the flying training and relevant experience requirements the applicant shall take the CPL(A) skill test on either a single-engine or a multi-engine aeroplane
response	<i>Accepted</i> The numbering has been corrected.
comment	<b>908</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ERA</i></span> Appendix 3 Training courses for the issue of a CPL, an ATPL and an IR  Section D 7 Appendix 3 to IR-FCL requires that the theoretical knowledge course shall comprise at least 250 hours of instruction. The Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL currently request 200 hours. ERA members would like to understand the reason for the increase of 50 hours both here and in Section C 7 ? There is no reports that the current hours demanded have proved inadequate in meeting the level required.
response	<i>Noted</i> As indicated in the explanatory note to this NPA, the Agency had agreed with the JAA to include the text of draft NPA FCL-34 in its proposals. The text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165(a)(4) had been amended by this NPA from 200 to 250 hours.
comment	<b>1057</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span> D.7 The number of 250 hrs of instruction is different from JAR-FCL (200 hrs) although the program is similar.
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see reply to comment 908 above.
comment	<b>2016</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Swiss Pilot School Asociation</i></span> Proposal: 1 The aim of the CPL(A) modular course is to train PPL(A) holders to the level of proficiency necessary for the issue of a CPL(A). 2 Before commencing a CPL(A) modular course an applicant shall be the holder of a PPL(A) issued in accordance with ICAO Annex 1. 3 Before commencing the flight training the applicant shall: (a) have completed 150 hours flight time, (b) have complied with the prerequisites for the issue of a class or type rating for multiengine aeroplanes if a multiengine aeroplane is to be used on the skill test. Advantage: It is allowed to do the CPL-training on a SEP aircraft. It doesn't make sense to train all the MEP items before beginning of the CPL-training. More efficient is a parallel training to be ready with both items (MEP and CPL) before the skill test. More time and cost efficient training
response	<i>Noted</i> Thank you for your comment, but the Agency cannot identify what it is the change you are proposing. The text seems to be just a copy of the text of the

	NPA.	
comment	2614 §10 Add: Hours done in a BITD shall not be credited. Reason: is also valid for §A,B and C of this appendix.	comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i>
response	<i>Not accepted</i> After carefully reviewing the input received on this issue, the Agency has decided to keep the exclusion of credit for hours done in a BITD.	
comment	3290 Part FCL . Appendix 3 D. CPL modular course-aeroplanes  Editorial To add the title: GENERAL, after the header and before §1 ..... this will be consistent with other courses see i.e. "C. CPL integrated course Aeroplane"	comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i>
response	<i>Accepted</i> The title GENERAL will be added for consistency	
comment	3589 Proposal:  1 The aim of the CPL(A) modular course is to train PPL(A) holders to the level of proficiency necessary for the issue of a CPL(A).  2 Before commencing a CPL(A) modular course an applicant shall be the holder of a PPL(A) issued in accordance with ICAO Annex 1.  3 Before commencing the flight training the applicant shall:  (a) have completed 150 hours flight time, (b) have complied with the prerequisites for the issue of a class or type rating for multiengine aeroplanes if a multiengine aeroplane is to be used on the skill test.  Advantage: It is allowed to do the CPL-training on a SEP aircraft. It doesn't make sense to train all the MEP items before beginning of the CPL-training. More efficient is a parallel training to be ready with both items (MEP and CPL) before the skill test. More time and cost efficient training	comment by: <i>Swiss Power Flight Union</i>
response	<i>Noted</i> See response to comment No 2016 above	
comment	3692	comment by: <i>Susana Nogueira</i>



	<p>D. Paragraph 13 Transfer to Subparte D as a requirement.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency does not agree with your proposal. Items included in Appendices are requirements and have the same status as other paragraphs in Part-FCL.</p>
comment	<p><b>3882</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Luftfahrt-Bundesamt</i></span></p> <p>Appendix 3:</p> <p>In Part D, No 14 is mislabelled as No 13.</p> <p>The helicopter skill test requirements for the instrument part at the end of the ATP/IR integrated course according to APP.3, Part E, No. 11 and the CPL/IR integrated course according to APP.3, Part G, No. 10, differ. There is no explanation given for these differences. Since the aim of an ATP/IR integrated course is the ability to fly commercially on multi pilot and multiengine helicopters, how come the IR-skill test can be done on single-engine helicopters? Is this really intended?</p> <p>Furthermore, the requirement stated in APP.3, Part G, No. 10 appears to be in contradiction with FCL.720.H (c) (1), which requires the passing of a ATPL(H) theoretical knowledge examination in order to operate an multiengine helicopter. In the CPL/IR integrated helicopter course there is no requirement to have theoretical knowledge instruction ATP and to pass ATPL theoretical knowledge examination, nevertheless the IR-skill test for the CPL/IR shall be done on a multiengine helicopter.</p> <p>EASA is highly recommended to thoroughly reconsider the feasibility of higher IR requirements on a CPL/IR course compared to the requirements on a ATP/IR course.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>The paragraph-number for SKILL TEST will be corrected from 13 to 14.</p> <p>The text related to the skill test in the ATP/IR integrated and CPL/IR integrated courses has been amended taking into account your comment. It should be mentioned that the comment is right with identifying the inconsistency between the helicopter to be used for the ATP/IR and for the CPL/IR skill test. These proposals were based on the appropriate Appendices in JAR-FCL 2 (e.g. Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.160 2.165(a)(3)) where you will find exactly the same requirements. The Agency decided to align these requirements and to require also a multi-engine IFR certificated helicopter to be used for the ATP/IR skill test.</p>
comment	<p><b>5018</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Chris Gowers</i></span></p> <p>Page 86, para 11(b) Last sentence. Delete "full stop".</p> <p>Unnecessary requirement. Touch and go landings are demanding enough to meet the training requirement and facilitate ease of completion of this requirement at training organisations.</p>

response	<p>ICAO only specifies landings.</p> <p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>It is correct that touch and go landings are demanding. It is also important to demonstrate that the pilot is able to perform full stop landings within a certain distance (e.g. on short runways).</p>
comment	<p><b>5458</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p>In Part D, No 14 is mislabelled as No 13.</p> <p>The helicopter skill test requirements for the instrument part at the end of the ATP/IR integrated course according to APP.3, Part E, No. 11 and the CPL/IR integrated course according to APP.3, Part G, No. 10, differ. There is no explanation given for these differences. Since the aim of an ATP/IR integrated course is the ability to fly commercially on multi pilot and multiengine helicopters, how come the IR-skill test can be done on single-engine helicopters? Is this really intended?</p> <p>Furthermore, the requirement stated in APP.3, Part G, No. 10 appears to be in contradiction with FCL.720.H (c) (1), which requires the passing of a ATPL(H) theoretical knowledge examination in order to operate an multiengine helicopter. In the CPL/IR integrated helicopter course there is no requirement to have theoretical knowledge instruction ATP and to pass ATPL theoretical knowledge examination, nevertheless the IR-skill test for the CPL/IR shall be done on a multiengine helicopter.</p> <p>EASA is highly recommended to thoroughly reconsider the feasibility of higher IR requirements on a CPL/IR course compared to the requirements on a ATP/IR course.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see response to comment No 3882 above.</p>
comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p><b>5913</b>❖</p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b><u>Comment:</u></b> Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry. Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.</p> <p>Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation,</li> </ul>

may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9

- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**  
 Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for your comment and proposal.  
 Please see reply to your same comment on other sections of Appendix 3, and note that at this time the Agency has decided to leave the majority of this Appendix in the rule, and only pass to AMC specific points, based on the comments received.  
 However, this may be reviewed and amended as appropriate in a future rulemaking task. Within this NPA the Agency follows closely JAR-FCL.  
 The Agency appreciates your willingness to provide detailed proposals where changes or amendments might be appropriate.

comment

6057

comment by: *Finnish Aviation Academy*

**D. CPL modular course – aeroplanes**

FLYING TRAINING

12 At least 5 hours to be carried out in an aeroplane certificated for the carriage of at least 4 persons that has a variable pitch propeller and **an engine 200 hp or more.**

*Any new single-engine piston aeroplane does not have retractable landing gear. More important than retractable landing gear is aeroplanes performance and TOW, so the requirement of the retractable landing gear should be replaced by engine power or minimum TOW or stalling speed*

response

*Not accepted*

After carefully considering your input, the Agency has decided not to amend the text of the proposal, and stay with the text coming from JAR-FCL.

comment

6058

comment by: *Finnish Aviation Academy*

EXPERIENCE

13 The applicant for a CPL(A) shall have completed at least 200 hours flight time, including **maximum 35 hours instrument ground time (if the applicant has an instrument rating)**, 100 hours as pilot in command,.....

response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency has amended the text of paragraph 13 to be in line with JAR-FCL. Your proposal represents a change in relation to JAR-FCL, for which you give no justification.</p>
comment	<p>6077 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> APPENDIX 3 TRAINING COURSES FOR THE ISSUE OF A CPL, AN ATPL AND AN IR D. CPL modular course aeroplanes 9 <b>Page No*:</b> 86 <b>Comment:</b> <a href="#">This should include FTD level 2</a> <b>Justification:</b> FTD level 2 is a cockpit specific device with all systems fully functional and is therefore somewhere between FNPT II and FS <b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Applicants without an instrument rating shall be given at least 25 hours dual flight instruction, including 10 hours of instrument instruction of which up to 5 hours may be instrument ground time in a BITD or a FNPT I or II, a FTD 2 or a flight simulator.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency follows your proposal.</p> <p>The sections B.9(e)(ii), C.9(e) and D.9 of Appendix 3 will be amended accordingly by adding FTD 2.</p>
comment	<p>6078 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> Appendix 3 <b>D Paragraph13(c)</b>/I Paragraph11(c)/L Paragraph11(c) <b>Page No:</b> 86/93/96 <b>Comment:</b> The word 'gliders' is undefined in EASA.FCL <b>Justification:</b> <b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Change 'gliders' to 'sailplanes or powered sailplanes'</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>The term 'gliders' will be changed to 'sailplanes'.</p>
comment	<p>6367 <span style="float: right;">comment by: Axel Schwarz</span></p> <p>Paragraph 12: The CPL course should prepare students for commercial operations. Since the number of propeller-driven aeroplanes in commercial operations is constantly decreasing I suggest to also accept any aeroplane requiring a type-rating as a "complex aeroplane" for the CPL-training instead of allowing only "aeroplanes certificated for the carriage of at least 4 persons and having a variable pitch propeller and retractable landing gear".</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 6057 above.</p>
comment	<p>6526 <span style="float: right;">comment by: Austro Control GmbH</span></p>

	<p>Comment: Editorial Change Proposed Text: Skill Test 13 should become 14.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>The paragraph-number for SKILL TEST will be corrected from 13 to 14</p>
comment	<p>7291 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Aero-Club of Switzerland</i></span></p> <p>We propose:</p> <p>1 The aim of the CPL(A) modular course is to train PPL(A) holders to the level of proficiency necessary for the issue of a CPL(A).</p> <p>2 Before commencing a CPL(A) modular course an applicant shall be the holder of a PPL(A) issued in accordance with ICAO Annex 1.</p> <p>3 Before commencing the flight training the applicant shall:</p> <p>(a) have completed 150 hours flight time, (b) have complied with the prerequisites for the issue of a class or type rating for multiengine aeroplanes if a multiengine aeroplane is to be used on the skill test.</p> <p>Advantages:</p> <p>1) It is allowed to do the CPL-training on a SEP aircraft. It doesn't make sense to train all the MEP items before beginning of the CPL-training. More efficient is a parallel training to be ready with both items (MEP and CPL) before the skill test.</p> <p>More time and cost efficient training</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>See response to comment No 2016 above</p>
comment	<p>7395 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Finnish Aviation Academy</i></span></p> <p><b>D. CPL modular course – aeroplanes</b></p> <p>FLYING TRAINING</p> <p>12 At least 5 hours to be carried out in an aeroplane certificated for the carriage of at least 4 persons that has a variable pitch propeller and <b>an engine 200 hp or more.</b></p> <p><i>Hardly any new single-engine piston aeroplanes (especially European built) do not have retractable landing gear. More important than retractable landing gear is aeroplanes performance and TOW, so the requirement of the retractable landing gear should be replaced by engine power or minimum TOW or stalling speed.</i></p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p>

Please see response to comment No 6057 above

comment 7401 comment by: *Finnish Aviation Academy*

**EXPERIENCE**

13 The applicant for a CPL(A) shall have completed at least 200 hours flight time, including **maximum of 35 hours instrument ground time (if the applicant has an instrument rating and ground time has been part of his/her instrument training course)**, 100 hours as pilot in command,.....

If FNPT time can be used towards an IR rating, it makes no sense if it cannot be used towards a CPL license.

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment No 6058 above.

comment 7672 comment by: *CAA Finland*

App 3 D para 5:

The guidance how to proceed if time limit exceeded is missing. New proposed text:

5 The course of theoretical knowledge shall be completed within 18 months **or the approved training organization shall give additional training and give a certificate specifying that training.** The flight instruction and skill test shall be completed within the period of validity of the pass in the theoretical examinations. **An expired theoretical may be renewed by passing the examination again.**

response *Partially accepted*

The Agency's proposal was based on its understanding of what were the safety relevant requirements in the Appendices to JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165. Based on several comments received on the same issue, it seems that it is not an essential safety element that the course is completed within a certain time limit. Therefore, similarly to what has been done for the integrated course, the Agency will delete paragraph D.5 and include in the AMC to Appendix D.5., including provision for the extension fo the duration of the training, as proposed.

The same change will be made in all the modular courses, for reasons of consistency.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 3: Training courses for the issue of a CPL, an ATPL and an IR - E. ATP/IR integrated course - helicopters** p. 86-88

comment 1624 comment by: *Helikopter Air Transport GmbH / Christophorus Flugrettungsverein*

**STATEMENT**

E. General (1): The aim in this paragraph is to train pilots as a co-pilot on multi-pilot, multi-engine helicopter. This should be the aim of the CPL or MPL course.

	<p><b>PROPOSAL</b> E. General (1): replace co-pilot with pilot-in command.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>MPL does not exist for helicopter. At the end of the ATP integrated course the graduate will obtain a CPL/IR, which will allow him/her to operate in multi-pilot operation in CAT as co-pilot. Only after complying with the experience and skill test requirements for the ATPL will the pilot be able to operate as PIC in CAT. This is consistent with what was established in JAR-FCL 1 and 2.</p>
comment	<p>1776 <span style="float: right;">comment by: REGA</span></p> <p><b>STATEMENT</b> There are different numberings of the paragraphs. 1 (a) (1) (i) 1 (a) (i) (1)</p> <p><b>PROPOSAL</b> Check the appendix for a consistent numbering.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Numbering system will be changed.</p>
comment	<p>1779 <span style="float: right;">comment by: REGA</span></p> <p><b>STATEMENT</b> E. General (1): The aim in this paragraph is to train pilots as a co-pilot on multi-pilot, multi-engine helicopter. This should be the aim of the CPL or MPL course.</p> <p><b>PROPOSAL</b> E. General (1): replace co-pilot with pilot-in command.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>MPL does not exist for helicopter. See response to comment No 1624 above.</p>
comment	<p>3245 <span style="float: right;">comment by: john daly</span></p> <p>Why can't 40 hours FNPT II be included in the IR phase of the integrated CPL(H)/IR as it is for the modular IR(H)? This seems to be anomolous.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>At this time the Agency does not intend to deviate from the credits that were established in JAR-FCL. However, the Agency already has in its rulemaking programme a task that will deal with the introduction of the amendments to the ICAO manual on FSTDs. This task will also review Part-FCL for consistency and will re-assess the crediting provisions.</p>
comment	<p>3294 <span style="float: right;">comment by: DGAC FRANCE</span></p>

Part FCL .  
Appendix 3  
E. ATP/IR Integrated course –Helicopters

To be consistent with the aim of an ATPL(H)/IR. (See GENERAL (1) )

#### SKILL TESTS

11 On completion of the related flying training the applicant shall take the CPL(H) skill test on a multi-engine helicopter and the instrument rating skill test on **a IFR certificated** multi engine ~~or a single engine~~ helicopter and shall comply with the requirements for MCC training.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The provisions for the skill test were taken from JAR FCL 2 (Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.160 2.165(a)(1)). JAR-FCL required a skill test for the IR part on either a multi-engine or a single-engine helicopter. For the skill test CPL/IR the JAR requirements asked for an instrument rating skill test on an IFR-certificated multi-engine helicopter.

The Agency carefully evaluated your comment and decided to align the two requirements. Following your proposal the Agency will change the text for the ATP/IR skill test to read: ‘...the instrument rating skill test on an IFR certificated multi-engine helicopter’ in order to solve this inconsistency between the ATP/IR and the CPL/IR.

comment

5655

comment by: *Bristow Academy*

E paragraph 4  
F paragraph 4  
G Paragraph 4  
H Paragraph 4  
Delete "...or PPL(A) issued..." and "...or PPL(A) entrant..."

JAR-FCL2 allows no credit for PPL(A) holders. I suspect JAR-FCL1 allows credit for PPL(A) and (H) holders and this has been carried over to this NPA without consideration.

However, if the working group considered there should be a credit towards a ATPL(H) or CPL(H) I suggest a smaller credit should be allowed for PPL(A) holders.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency carefully reviewed the comments received on this issue of crediting for flight time in another aircraft category. You are right when stating that JAR-FCL 2 does not accept any crediting for flight time on aeroplanes but JAR-FCL 1 does so.

However, as it was decided to stay as close as possible with JAR-FCL and based on the fact that alternative requirements for crediting (‘smaller credit’ for PPL(A) holders) would need a further assessment the Agency decided to go back to JAR-FCL and to delete the possibility to receive credit for the flight time



on aeroplanes. The Agency is aware that this will lead to an inconsistency between these requirements and the requirements for the courses for the ATP/CPL aeroplanes but decided not to delete the crediting possibilities for these courses for flight time on helicopters in order to stay with the requirements in JAR-FCL 1. This issue might be reviewed again during a future rulemaking task.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as expample based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for your comment and the proposal.

Please see reply to your same comment on other sections of Appendix 3, and note that at this time the Agency has decided to leave the majority of this Appendix in the rule, and only pass to AMC specific points, based on the comments received.

However, this maybe reviewed and amended as appropriate in a future rulemaking task. Within this NPA the Agency follows closely JAR-FCL.

The Agency appreciates your willingness to provide detailed proposals where changes or amendments might be appropriate.

comment 6083 comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

APPENDIX 3

TRAINING COURSES FOR THE ISSUE OF A CPL, AN ATPL AND AN IR

E . ATP/IR integrated course – helicopters 10 (a) (2) (ii)

**Page No\*:** 87

**Comment:** Reference to FTD1 should be removed

**Justification:** FTD level 1 is a systems trainer only e.g. FMS and is not therefore suitable for teaching/ training instrument procedures or techniques.

response *Accepted*

Thank you for sending your proposal.

The Agency reviewed carefully the issue raised by you. The proposal to accept also instrument training on an FTD 1 was transferred from JAR FCL (Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.160 2.165(a)(1)).

Based on your input it was discussed again with the experts and the Agency decided to accept your proposal. The text will be amended and the reference to FTD 1 will be deleted.

comment 6963 comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:** Appendix 3 – Training Courses for the issue of a CPL, ATPL and IR

**Page No\*:** 86 to 92 of 647

**Comment:** E. ATP/IR Integrated Course – helicopters

paragraph 3 - does not state if the Authority can extend the course beyond 36 months;

F. ATP Integrated Course – helicopters

paragraph 3 - does not state if the Authority can extend the course beyond 36 months;

paragraph 7 – states 650 hours of theoretical knowledge instruction, JAR-FCL states 550 hours

G. CPL/IR Integrated Course – helicopters

10 hours dual cross-country requirement missing (App 1 to JAR-FCL 2.160 & 2.165(a) (3) paragraph 12 (c) refers

H. CPL Integrated Course – Helicopters

paragraph 7 – states 350 hours of theoretical knowledge instruction, JAR-FCL states 300 hours

**I. CPL modular course – helicopters**

paragraph 6 – states 250 hours of theoretical knowledge instruction, JAR-FCL states 200 hours

**Justification:** Consistency with current requirements.

**Proposed Text: (if applicable)**

Existing requirements as per App 1 to JAR-FCL 2.160 & 2.165(a) (1), (2), (3),

	(4) & (5).
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>3.E. paragraph 3 and 3.F, paragraph 3: The Agency's proposal was based on its understanding of what were the safety relevant requirements in the Appendices to JAR-FCL 2.160 &amp; 2.165. Based on several comments received on the same issue, it seems that it is not an essential safety element that the course is completed within a certain time limit. Therefore, the Agency will delete these paragraphs and will include in the AMC to Appendix 3 the related text of JAR-FCL, including the mention that the period may be extended if additional training is provided. The same change will be made in all the integrated courses, for reasons of consistency.</p> <p>3.F, paragraph 7, 3.H, paragraph 7, 3.I paragraph 6: As indicated in the explanatory note to this NPA, the Agency had agreed with the JAA to include the text of draft NPA FCL-34 in its proposals. The text of the Appendices to JAR-FCL 2.160 &amp; 2.165 had been amended by this NPA, and the differences in the hours that you mention were introduced.</p> <p>3.G, paragraph 9(c): The Agency when drafting the proposed requirements for the flight training for the CPL/IR course transferred the JAR requirements (see Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.150 2.165(a)(3)). The decision not to include the dual cross-country training was based on a numbering error (separate item (d) missing in the JAR Appendix). Based on your input the issue was checked again and the Agency agrees as the additional 10 hours dual cross-country training are also mentioned as one element for the CPL integrated course (mentioned as separate item in this Appendix).</p> <p>The text will be changed accordingly and 10 hours dual cross-country flying will be added.</p>
comment	<p>7674 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAA Finland</span></p> <p>App 3 E para 3: The guidance how to proceed if time limit exceeded is missing. New proposed text:</p> <p>3 The applicant shall complete the course within a maximum period of 36 months <b>or the approved training organization shall give additional training and give a certificate specifying that training.</b></p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 6963.</p>
comment	<p>7685 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAA Finland</span></p> <p>App 3 E para 10(a)(3) and (f): MCC mentioned twice. Logical place ref aeroplanes is (a)(3).</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>In 3.E and 3.F the following will be deleted: 3.E paragraph 10 (f)</p>

and 3.F paragraph 10 (f)

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 3: Training courses for the issue of a CPL, an ATPL and an IR - F. ATP integrated course - helicopters** p. 88-89

comment 1072 comment by: CAA Belgium

F.7 : number of instruction 650 hrs is different from JAR-FCL (550 hrs). Any explanation ?

F.10:  
10 hrs MCC training are mentioned under (a)(iii) as well as under(f).  
Idem for 10 hrs basic instrument: (a)(ii) as well as (e).  
This is confusing.

response *Noted*

F.7  
As indicated in the explanatory note to this NPA, the Agency had agreed with the JAA to include the text of draft NPA FCL-34 in its proposals. The text of the Appendices to JAR-FCL 2.160 & 2.165 had been amended by this NPA, and the differences in the hours that you mention were introduced.

F.10  
Paragraphs 10 (e) and (f) will be deleted.

comment 1625 comment by: Helikopter Air Transport GmbH / Christophorus Flugrettungsverein

**STATEMENT**

- F. General (1): The aim in this paragraph is to train pilots as a co-pilot on multi-pilot, multi-engine helicopter. This should be the aim of the CPL or MPL course.
- F. General (6): ...unable to complete the entire ATP(A)... seems to be a typing error.

**PROPOSAL**

- F. General (1): replace co-pilot with pilot-in command.
- F. General (6): replace ATP(A) with ATP(H).

response *Partially accepted*

1st proposal: not accepted  
MPL does not exist for helicopter.  
At the end of the ATP integrated course the graduate will obtain a CPL/IR, which will allow him/her to operate in multi-pilot operation in CAT as co-pilot. Only after complying with the experience and skill test requirements for the ATPL will the pilot be able to operate as PIC in CAT. This is consistent with what was established in JAR-FCL 1 and 2.

2nd proposal: accepted  
ATP(A) will be replaced by ATP(H)

comment 1777 comment by: REGA

	<p><b>STATEMENT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• F. General (1): The aim in this paragraph is to train pilots as a co-pilot on multi-pilot, multi-engine helicopter. This should be the aim of the CPL or MPL course.</li> <li>• F. General (6): ...unable to complete the entire ATP(A).... seems to be a typing error.</li> </ul> <p><b>PROPOSAL</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• F. General (1): replace co-pilot with pilot-in command.</li> <li>• F. General (6): replace ATP(A) with ATP(H).</li> </ul>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 1625 above.</p>
comment	<p>3293 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></span></p> <p>Part FCL . Appendix 3 F. ATP</p> <p>Editorial 6 An applicant failing or unable to complete the entire ATP (<b>H</b>) (<del>A</del>) course may apply to the Authority</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>ATP(A) will be replaced by ATP(H)</p>
comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>5913❖</p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b><u>Comment:</u></b> Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry. Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.</p> <p>Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9</li> <li>• changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.</li> <li>• As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.</p> <p>The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment and the proposal. Please see reply to your same comment on other sections of Appendix 3, and note that at this time the Agency has decided to leave the majority of this Appendix in the rule, and only pass to AMC specific points, based on the comments received. However, this maybe reviewed and amended as appropriate in a future rulemaking task. Within this NPA the Agency follows closely JAR-FCL. The Agency appreciates your willingness to provide detailed proposals where changes or amendments might be appropriate.</p>
comment	<p>6086 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> APPENDIX 3 TRAINING COURSES FOR THE ISSUE OF A CPL, AN ATPL AND AN IR F . ATP integrated course – helicopters 10 (a) (ii) <b>Page No*:</b> 89 <b>Comment:</b> Reference to FTD1 should be removed <b>Justification:</b> FTD level 1 is a systems trainer only e.g. FMS and is not therefore suitable for teaching/ training instrument procedures or techniques.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for sending your proposal.</p> <p>The Agency reviewed carefully the issue raised by you. The proposal to accept also instrument training on an FTD 1 was transferred from JAR FCL (Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.160 2.165(a)(2)).</p> <p>Based on your input it was discussed again with the experts and the Agency decided to accept your proposal. The text will be amended and the reference to FTD 1 will be deleted.</p>
comment	<p>7082 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> FCL Appendix 3 E &amp; F para 11 <b>Page No:</b> 88 &amp; 89 of 647 <b>Comment:</b> The Skill Test should have an element of NTS testing as well as MCC testing. <b>Justification:</b> Consistency <b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Amend to read; “...helicopter <i>and shall comply with the requirements of NTS and MCC training</i>”</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never</p>

solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.  
We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment 7675 comment by: CAA Finland

App 3 F para 3:  
The guidance how to proceed if time limit exceeded is missing. New proposed text:

3 The applicant shall complete the course within a maximum period of 36 months **or the approved training organization shall give additional training and give a certificate specifying that training.**

response *Noted*

The Agency's proposal was based on its understanding of what were the safety relevant requirements in the Appendices to JAR-FCL 2.160 & 2.165. Based on several comments received on the same issue, it seems that it is not an essential safety element that the course is completed within a certain time limit. Therefore, the Agency will delete these paragraphs and include in the AMC to Appendix 3 the related text of JAR-FCL, including the mention that the period may be extended if additional training is provided.  
The same change will be made in all the integrated courses, for reasons of consistency.

comment 7686 comment by: CAA Finland

App 3 F para 10(a)(iii) and (f):  
MCC mentioned twice. Logical place ref aeroplanes is (a)(iii).

Numbering system in 10(a) differs from other; normally number-letter-number-and then (i), (ii)...

response *Partially accepted*

Please see reply to comment No 1072 above.  
Numbering system will be corrected.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 3: Training courses for the issue of a CPL, an ATPL and an IR - G. CPL/IR integrated course - helicopters** p. 89-90

comment 1901 comment by: French Army AVN. FTO

***Each year*** from 2001, the French Army Aviation FTO has been rating ***more than 100 helicopter pilots***, of the 3 French services and the French Gendarmerie. ***It estimates being experienced enough to consider that the present solo / SPIC ratio and the helicopter / simulated flight ratio is completely satisfactory.***

First of all, the French Army Aviation FTO requests to maintain the solo / SPIC ratio at the same level as the present one, according to the FCL2 (15 hours of solo + 20 hours of SPIC).

Indeed, if we bring the dual instruction sessions down, we estimate to dim the

level of our pilots' skill, ***which can be directly detrimental to the flight safety.***

Second, the French Army Aviation FTO requests to maintain the simulation rate at the level of the FCL2 rate (25 hours of visual instruction + 30 hours of instrument instruction).

Having rated, from 2001, **more than 100 CPL(H) + 55 IR (H) each year**, we have inserted since 2005, on FNPT3, 35 hours of simulated flight during the CPL phase, plus 30 hours on FNPT2 / FFS during the instrument flight phase. With that expertise **(4500 hours each year, and an estimate 9600 hours for the year 2009 on FNPT3 + 4200 hours on FNPT2 and FFS)**, we are completely satisfied about our pilot's level : all the students that have taken the CPL /IR exam, have been qualified. We have invested a great amount of money to acquire 6 FNPT3 (which will be upgraded to meet the FTD standards) for the visual instruction, plus 2 FNPT2 for the IR(H) instruction, plus one FFS for the IR(H) and type rating instructions. **We firmly request that the simulation ratio is not reduced.**

Then, we suggest this ratio, of a "CPL/IR integrated", to be equal to the total of the CPL integrated and modular IR(H) ones : **70** hours on FNPT2/3 (30 hours of visual instruction + 40 of instrument instruction).

response *Noted*

Your comment refers to CPL(H) Integrated Course of JAR-FCL 2 Amendment 4. Our NPA is in line with JAR-FCL 2 Amendment 6, as it was described in the Explanatory Note.

In addition, regarding your proposals for the simulation ratio, at this time the Agency does not intend to deviate from what was established in JAR-FCL. However, the Agency already has in its rulemaking programme a task that will deal with the introduction of the amendments to the ICAO manual on FSTDs. This task will also review Part-FCL for consistency and will re-assess the crediting provisions.

comment *2411*

comment by: *French Army AVN. FTO*

For the SPIC / SOLO ratio, the French Army Aviation FTO, motivate its requests with the NPA 22F safety report ( 2.3.2 FCL safety level in Europe, page 16 to 32):

1. Unauthorized airspace penetration (page 26): "a total of almost 1500 incidents/year...of which 100 occurred with helicopters". The helicopters pilots are down numbered and this confirms our request of maintaining the present solo/spic ratio.
2. piloting skill:  
 "78% of the accidents recorded regards helicopters below 2.250 Kg MTOM" (page 18),  
 "47% of helicopter accidents occurred during recreational flights" (page 19),  
 "as a conclusion, ... four of the top categories can be linked mainly to piloting skill (loss of control in flight, loss of control on the ground, abnormal runway contact, controlled flight into terrain), at least 50% of the accidents for this group of aircraft are due to FCL causal factors" (page 23).  
 As a consequence, we request, once more, to maintain the ratio of dual flight, existing in the present CPL /IR integrated course with the objective of maintaining or increasing the level of the safety flight level.

response *Noted*



See response to comment No 1901 above

comment 2467 comment by: *Rod Wood*

The helicopter IR must be issued on a multi engine helicopter yet there is no allowance in the integrated course to cover the VFR element of a twin conversion. 5 hrs VFR conversion plus LST should be included.

response *Noted*

The Agency follows closely Subpart D of JAR-FCL 2 and has taken over the text from Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.160 & 2.165(a)(3). At this time, the Agency does not intend to change the text in this regard. This could eventually be the subject of a future rulemaking task.

comment 3244 comment by: *john daly*

Why can't 40 hours FNPT II be included in the IR phase of the integrated CPL(H)/IR as it is for the modular IR(H)? This seems to be anomolous.

response *Noted*

The Agency follows closely Subpart D of JAR-FCL 2 and has taken over the text from Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.160 & 2.165(a)(3). It agrees that there is a certain inconsistency between the requirements for the modular IR(H) course and the requirement here in Appendix 3 At this time the Agency does not intend to deviate from the credits that were established in JAR-FCL.

However, the Agency already has in its rulemaking programme a task that will deal with the introduction of the amendments to the ICAO manual on FSTDs. This task will also review Part-FCL for consistency and will re-assess the crediting provisions.

comment 3527 comment by: *Rod Wood*

Para 9(a)(ii)(1) Delete "20", insert "40"

In order to have commonality with the Flying Training allowance of the Modular IR(H), the instrument instruction allowed in a FNPT II should be 40 hours.

response *Noted*

See response to comment No 3244 above

comment 5913❖ comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response *Noted*

Thank you for your comment and the proposal.

Please see reply to your same comment on other sections of Appendix 3, and note that at this time the Agency has decided to leave the majority of this Appendix in the rule, and only pass to AMC specific points, based on the comments received.

However, this may be reviewed and amended as appropriate in a future rulemaking task. Within this NPA the Agency follows closely JAR-FCL.

The Agency appreciates your willingness to provide detailed proposals where changes or amendments might be appropriate.

comment 6087

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:** APPENDIX 3

TRAINING COURSES FOR THE ISSUE OF A CPL, AN ATPL AND AN IR  
G. CPL/IR integrated course – Helicopters 9 (a) (ii) (2)

**Page No\*:** 90

**Comment:** Reference to FTD1 should be removed

**Justification:** FTD level 1 is a systems trainer only e.g. FMS and is not therefore suitable for teaching/ training instrument procedures or techniques.

response *Accepted*

Thank you for sending your proposal.

The Agency reviewed carefully the issue raised by you. The proposal to accept also instrument training on an FTD 1 was transferred from JAR FCL (Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.160 2.165(a)(3)).

Based on your input it was discussed again with the experts and the Agency decided to accept your proposal. The text will be amended and the reference to FTD 1 deleted.

comment	<p>7467 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Bristow Academy</i></span></p> <p>1. Suggest a change to Para 2:</p> <p>(2) .....in two continuous courses of training, <b><i>which need not be concurrent</i></b>, as arranged.....</p> <p>The reason for the suggestion is it may not be possible to sequence the IR course to continuously follow the CPL course as Bristow Academy operates from more than one campus.</p> <p>2. Suggest a change to Para 3:</p> <p>(3) .....complete the course within a period of <u>30</u> <b>36</b> months</p> <p>The reason for the change is the ATPL/IR course is 36 months and the only item missing from the CPL/IR is the 15 hours of MCC.</p> <p>3. Comment: No additional flying has been included to allow for the 8 hours normally needed for the ME type rating. This is not a problem as some of the hours allocated may be used for this activity.</p> <p>4. Suggest a change to para 10</p> <p>(10) ...shall take the CPL(H) skill test either on a multi engine or a single engine helicopter, <b><i>but may be tested having flown up to 5 hours less than the required syllabus hours for that test, subject to meeting all of the other licence issue requirements</i></b> and the instrument rating .....multi engine helicopter. <b><i>The balance of hours must be flown on the course prior to licence application.</i></b></p> <p>This change is an extract from the CAA Flight Examiners Handbook.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>1. Not accepted. The integrated course must be continuous even if it is divided into two parts.</p> <p>2. Not accepted. The 30 months include 500 hrs theory + 180 hrs flying time instead of 750 hrs theory + 195 hrs flying time However, please note that as a result of the comments received, the Agency has transferred the reference to the duration of the training courses to AMC.</p> <p>3. Noted.</p> <p>4. Not accepted. The Agency intends to follow the requirements of JAR-FCL. Your proposal seems to be based on a national exemption.</p>
comment	<p>7676 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span></p> <p>App 3 G para 3: The guidance how to proceed if time limit exceeded is missing. New proposed text: 3 The applicant shall complete the course within a maximum period of 30 months <b>or the approved training organization shall give additional training and give a certificate specifying that training.</b></p>

response *Noted*

The Agency's proposal was based on its understanding of what were the safety relevant requirements in the Appendices to JAR-FCL 2.160 & 2.165. Based on several comments received on the same issue, it seems that it is not an essential safety element that the course is completed within a certain time limit. Therefore, the Agency will delete these paragraphs and include in the AMC to Appendix 3 the related text of JAR-FCL, including the mention that the period may be extended if additional training is provided.  
The same change will be made in all the integrated courses, for reasons of consistency.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 3: Training courses for the issue of a CPL, an ATPL and an IR - H. CPL integrated course - helicopters** p. 90-91

comment 1075 comment by: *CAA Belgium*

H.7 : same remark as for the other training courses: the number of hours (350) is different from JAR-FCL (300). Any explanation ?

response *Noted*

Please see replies to other comments on the same issue.  
As described in the Explanatory Note, the number of hours is based on the accepted NPA FCL 34, which changed the Appendices to JAR-FCL 2.160 & 2.165.

comment 1902 comment by: *French Army AVN. FTO*

**Each year** from 2001, the French Army Aviation FTO has been rating **more than 100 helicopter pilots**, of the 3 French services and the French Gendarmerie. ***It estimates being experienced enough to consider that the present solo / SPIC ratio and the helicopter / simulated flight ratio is completely satisfactory.***

First of all, the French Army Aviation FTO requests to maintain the solo / SPIC ratio at the same level as the present one, according to the FCL2 (15 hours of solo + 20 hours of SPIC).

Indeed, if we bring the dual instruction sessions down, we estimate to dim the level of our pilots' skill, ***which can be directly detrimental to the flight safety.***

Second, the French Army Aviation FTO requests to maintain the simulation rate at the level of the FCL2 rate (30 hours of visual instruction + 5 hours on basic instrument instruction).

Having rated, from 2001, more than 100 CPL(H) each year, we have inserted since 2005, on **FNPT3**, 35 hours of simulated flight. With that expertise ***(4500 hours each year, and an estimate 9600 hours for the year 2009)*** we are completely satisfied about our pilot's level : all the students that have taken the CPL exam, have been qualified. We have invested a great amount of money to acquire 6 FNPT3 (which will be upgraded to meet the FTD standards) for the visual instruction. ***We firmly request that the simulation ratio should not be reduced.***

response

*Noted*

Your comment refers to JAR-FCL 2 Amendment 4. The Agency's NPA is in line with JAR-FCL 2 Amendment 6, as it was described in the Explanatory Note.

In addition, regarding your proposals for the simulation ratio, at this time the Agency does not intend to deviate from what was established in JAR-FCL. However, the Agency already has in its rulemaking programme a task that will deal with the introduction of the amendments to the ICAO manual on FSTDs. This task will also review Part-FCL for consistency and will re-assess the crediting provisions.

comment

2412

comment by: *French Army AVN. FTO*

For the SPIC / SOLO ratio, the French Army Aviation FTO, motivate its requests with the NPA 22F safety report ( 2.3.2 FCL safety level in Europe, page 16 to 32):

1. Unauthorized airspace penetration (page 26): "a total of almost 1500 incidents/year...of which 100 occurred with helicopters". The helicopters pilots are down numbered and this confirms our request of maintaining the present solo/spic ratio.

2. piloting skill:

"78% of the accidents recorded regards helicopters below 2.250 Kg MTOM" (page 18),

"47% of helicopter accidents occurred during recreational flights" (page 19),

"as a conclusion, ... four of the top categories can be linked mainly to piloting skill (loss of control in flight, loss of control on the ground, abnormal runway contact, controlled flight into terrain), at least 50% of the accidents for this group of aircraft are due to FCL causal factors" (page 23).

As a consequence, we request, once more, to maintain the ratio of dual flight, existing in the present CPL integrated course with the objective of maintaining or increasing the level of the safety flight level.

response

*Noted*

See response to comment No 1902 above

comment

3291

comment by: *DGAC FRANCE*

Part FCL . Appendix 3  
H. CPL integrated course –Helicopter

Editorial

To add the title: GENERAL, after the header and before §1 ..... this will be consistent with other courses see i.e. "C. CPL integrated course Aeroplane"

response

*Accepted*

The title GENERAL will be added after the header and before paragraph 1 for the chapters D, I and L for the modular courses

comment

5664

comment by: *Bristow Academy*

1. Para 9 (a) (ii) states:

" up to 10 hours may be instrument instruction, and....."

Para 9 (f) states:

" 10 hours of instrument dual instruction time, including....."

What is the difference between "instrument instruction" and "instrument dual instruction time"? One of these two statements needs removing to make sense.

2.Suggest a change to para 10

(10) ....shall take the CPL(H) skill test ***but may be tested having flown up to 5 hours less than the required syllabus hours for that test, subject to meeting all of the other licence issue requirements. The balance of hours must be flown on the course prior to licence application.***

This change is an extract from the CAA Flight Examiners Handbook.

response

*Noted*

1. The Agency checked again the issue raised concerning the required instrument instruction. JAR-FCL 2 had the same requirements in its Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.160 2.165(a)(4) and the Agency transferred the number of hours specified into the future regulations. As both training items mentioned are partially different (the requirement in (9)(f) allowing IR dual instruction also on aeroplanes and the one in (9)(a)(ii) allowing some training on an FTD or FNPT) the Agency decided to keep the requirement as it is. You are right that a certain amount of instrument training (5 hours dual instrument training on a helicopter) can be used to fulfil both requirements.

2. Not accepted. The Agency intends to follow the requirements of JAR-FCL. Your proposal seems to be based on a national exemption.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft

type, class or generation.

- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response *Noted*

Thank you for your comment and the proposal.

Please see reply to your same comment on other sections of Appendix 3, and note that at this time the Agency has decided to leave the majority of this Appendix in the rule, and only pass to AMC specific points, based on the comments received.

However, this may be reviewed and amended as appropriate in a future rulemaking task. Within this NPA the Agency follows closely JAR-FCL.

The Agency appreciates your willingness to provide detailed proposals where changes or amendments might be appropriate.

comment *6088*

comment by: *UK CAA*

**Paragraph:** APPENDIX 3

TRAINING COURSES FOR THE ISSUE OF A CPL, AN ATPL AND AN IR  
H. CPL integrated course Helicopters 9 (a) (ii)

**Page No\*:** 90

**Comment:** Reference to FTD1 should be removed

**Justification:** FTD level 1 is a systems trainer only e.g. FMS and is not therefore suitable for teaching/ training instrument procedures or techniques.

response *Accepted*

Thank you for sending your proposal.

The Agency reviewed carefully the issue raised by you. The proposal to accept also instrument training on an FTD 1 was transferred from JAR FCL (Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.160 2.165(a)(4)).

Based on your input it was discussed again with the experts and the Agency decided to accept your proposal. The text will be amended and the reference to FTD 1 will be deleted.

comment *7678*

comment by: *CAA Finland*

App 3 H para 3:

The guidance how to proceed if time limit exceeded is missing. New proposed text:

3 The applicant shall complete the course within a maximum period of 24 months **or the approved training organization shall give additional training and give a certificate specifying that training.**

response *Noted*

The Agency's proposal was based on its understanding of what were the safety relevant requirements in the Appendices to JAR-FCL 2.160 & 2.165. Based on several comments received on the same issue, it seems that it is not an essential safety element that the course is completed within a certain time limit. Therefore, the Agency will delete these paragraphs and include in the AMC to Appendix 3 the related text of JAR-FCL, including the mention that the period may be extended if additional training is provided.  
The same change will be made in all the integrated courses, for reasons of consistency.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 3: Training courses for the issue of a CPL, an ATPL and an IR - I. CPL modular course - helicopters** p. 92-93

comment 263

comment by: *Irish Aviation Authority*

CPL(H) modular course paragraph 2(b) requires 155 hours helicopter flight time for course entry. There are no credits given for other categories. Yet paragraph 11 gives credits for other categories. These credits for other categories should be included in 2(b) otherwise the two paragraphs conflict.  
John Swan 1.9.2008

response *Noted*

The Agency sees no reason why this should be moved to Subpart D. Requirements in Appendix 3 do not lose any binding character. They still belong to Subpart D.

comment 1084

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

11. Experience should not be mentioned here but should go to subpart D.

response *Not accepted*

Please see reply to comment No 263 above.

comment 2469

comment by: *Rod Wood*

Para 5 (a) After .....level: add "The theoretical knowledge may be undertaken whilst achieving the 155 hours flight time and a pass in all subjects must be achieved before commencement of para (b);

At present para 2 reads as though 155 flight hours must be achieved before commencing the ground school.

response *Partially accepted*

Please see reply to comment No 3414 below.

comment 3209

comment by: *Susana Nogueira*

Experience should go to subpart D

response *Noted*



See response to comment No 263 above.

comment

3414

comment by: NACA

**Section I - (2)**

This paragraph should be changed i.a.w. appendix 3-section D (2 and 3) i.e. :

2(a) *Before commencing a CPL(H) modular course an applicant shall be the holder of a PPL(H) issued i.a.w. ICAO Annex1.*

(b) *Before commencing the flight training the applicant shall have completed 155 hours flight time as a pilot in helicopters, including 50 hours as PIC of which 10 hours shall be cross-croutry.*

(c) *Have complied with FCL.725 ... etc*

**Section I – (8)**

Why the 5 hour difference in required flying hours between a CPL(A) and CPL(H)? We suggest to amend this.

**Section I – (11)**

Credit towards the required 185 for a CPL(H) is 50 hours if the applicant holds a CPL(A).

In reverse however credit towards the required 200 hours for a CPL(A) is 100 hours if the applicant holds a CPL(H).

What is the reason for this extremely large difference in hours while the rest of the credits is more or less inline with each other?

response

*Partially accepted*

I (2)

The Agency agrees with your proposal and will allow that the 155 hours flight time might be completed during the 'ground school'. This is in line now with the requirements for the CPL modular course aeroplanes. The text will be aligned with the wording used for the aeroplane section.

I (8) and (11)

The reason for both the differences is that the helicopter handling characteristics are more demanding. This difference in coming from JAR-FCL.

comment

3786

comment by: DGAC FRANCE

Part FCL Appendix 3

Training courses for the issue of a CPL, an ATPL and an IR

- I. CPL modular course - helicopters

Experience requirements should not be mentioned here but should go to subpart D, as for the other licences' experience requirements.

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency sees no reason why these requirements should not be included in an Appendix. Please note that the status of Appendices is the same as for the Subparts.

comment	<p>5649 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Bristow Academy</i></span></p> <p>Para 3 Add: If the flying training course is interrupted, the approval of the Authority shall be obtained before proceeding.</p> <p>The rationale for this comment is a candidate who has to terminate the course for unexpected reasons will get no credit for time already completed. Under JAR's the Authority can give dispensation for the course to proceed "at the discretion of the HT"</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency does not see a need to consider this special case. This may be solved via the approval of the training organisation, covered by the Safety Management System (SMS) of the ATO, or even be handled through article 14 of the BR.</p>
comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>5913❖</p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b><u>Comment:</u></b> Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry. Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.</p> <p>Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9</li> <li>• changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.</li> <li>• As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Proposal:</u></b> Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.</p> <p>The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p>

Thank you for your comment and the proposal.  
 Please see reply to your same comment on other sections of Appendix 3, and note that at this time the Agency has decided to leave the majority of this Appendix in the rule, and only pass to AMC specific points, based on the comments received.  
 However, this may be reviewed and amended as appropriate in a future rulemaking task. Within this NPA the Agency follows closely JAR-FCL.  
 The Agency appreciates your willingness to provide detailed proposals where changes or amendments might be appropriate.

comment 6079 comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:** Appendix 3 D Paragraph13(c)/I Paragraph11(c)/L  
 Paragraph11(c)  
**Page No:** 86/93/96  
**Comment:** The word 'gliders' is undefined in EASA.FCL  
**Justification:**  
**Proposed Text: (if applicable)**  
 Change 'gliders' to 'sailplanes or powered sailplanes'

response *Partially accepted*

The expression 'gliders' will be changed to 'sailplanes'

comment 7679 comment by: CAA Finland

App 3 I para 4:  
 The guidance how to proceed if time limit exceeded is missing. New proposed text:  
 4The course of theoretical knowledge shall be completed within 18 months **or the approved training organization shall give additional training and give a certificate specifying that training.** The flight instruction and skill test shall be completed within the period of validity of the pass in the theoretical examinations. **An expired theoretical may be renewed by passing the examination again.**

response *Noted*

The Agency's proposal was based on its understanding of what were the safety relevant requirements in the Appendices to JAR-FCL 2.160 & 2.165. Based on several comments received on the same issue, it seems that it is not an essential safety element that the course is completed within a certain time limit. Therefore, the Agency will delete these paragraphs and include in the AMC to Appendix 3 the related text of JAR-FCL, including the mention that the period may be extended if additional training is provided.  
 The same change will be made in all the integrated courses, for reasons of consistency.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 3: Training courses for the issue of a CPL, an ATPL and an IR - J. CPL/IR integrated course – Airships**

p. 93-94

comment 1082 comment by: CAA Belgium

J.8: is there a COB for airship ?

response	<p>J.9: are there any airship FS/FTD or FNPTII certified within EU ?</p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>J.8: No, for the moment the CQB only covers aeroplanes and helicopters. This may change in the future.</p> <p>J.9: Not yet.</p>
comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b><u>Comment:</u></b> Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry. Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.</p> <p>Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9</li> <li>• changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.</li> <li>• As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Proposal:</u></b> Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.</p> <p>The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment and the proposal. Please see reply to your same comment on other sections of Appendix 3, and note that at this time the Agency has decided to leave the majority of this Appendix in the rule, and only pass to AMC specific points, based on the comments received. However, this may be reviewed and amended as appropriate in a future rulemaking task. Within this NPA the Agency follows closely JAR-FCL. The Agency appreciates your willingness to provide detailed proposals where changes or amendments might be appropriate.</p>

comment	7680 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAA Finland</span>
	<p>App 3 J para 3: The guidance how to proceed if time limit exceeded is missing. New proposed text:</p> <p>3 The applicant shall complete the course within a maximum period of 30 months <b>or the approved training organization shall give additional training and give a certificate specifying that training.</b></p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Based on several comments received on the same issue, it seems that it is not an essential safety element that the course is completed within a certain time limit. Therefore, the Agency will delete this paragraph and include it in the AMC to Appendix 3, including the mention that the period may be extended if additional training is provided.</p>

<b>B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 3: Training courses for the issue of a CPL, an ATPL and an IR - K. CPL integrated course - Airships</b>	p. 94-95
---	----------

comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>5913❖</p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b><u>Comment:</u></b> Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry. Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.</p> <p>Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9</li> <li>• changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.</li> <li>• As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Proposal:</u></b> Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.</p> <p>The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate</p>
---------	--

	so as to address the above.
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment and the proposal. Please see reply to your same comment on other sections of Appendix 3, and note that at this time the Agency has decided to leave the majority of this Appendix in the rule, and only pass to AMC specific points, based on the comments received.</p> <p>However, this may be reviewed and amended as appropriate in a future rulemaking task. Within this NPA the Agency follows closely JAR-FCL. The Agency appreciates your willingness to provide detailed proposals where changes or amendments might be appropriate.</p>

comment	<p><b>7681</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span></p> <p>App 3 K para 3: The guidance how to proceed if time limit exceeded is missing. New proposed text: 3 The applicant shall complete the course within a maximum period of 24 months <b>or the approved training organization shall give additional training and give a certificate specifying that training.</b></p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Based on several comments received on the same issue, it seems that it is not an essential safety element that the course is completed within a certain time limit. Therefore, the Agency will delete this paragraph and include it in the AMC to Appendix 3, including the mention that the period may be extended if additional training is provided.</p>

<b>B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 3: Training courses for the issue of a CPL, an ATPL and an IR - L. CPL modular course - Airships</b>	p. 95-96
--	----------

comment	<p><b>1085</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p>L.11 Experience should not be mentioned here but should go to subpart D.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency sees no reason why this should be transferred to Subpart D. Please note that an Appendix has the same binding status as the Subpart.</p>
comment	<p><b>3210</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Susana Nogueira</i></span></p> <p>Experience should go to subpart D</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>See response to comment No 1085</p>
comment	<p><b>3292</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></span></p> <p>Part FCL . Appendix 3 L. CPL modular course- Airship</p>

	<p>Editorial To add the title: GENERAL, after the header and before §1 ..... this will be consistent with other courses see i.e. "C. CPL integrated course Aeroplane"</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment. The Agency agrees and will change the text accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b><u>Comment:</u></b> Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry. Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.</p> <p>Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9</li> <li>• changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.</li> <li>• As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Proposal:</u></b> Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.</p> <p>The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment and the proposal. Please see reply to your same comment on other sections of Appendix 3, and note that at this time the Agency has decided to leave the majority of this Appendix in the rule, and only pass to AMC specific points, based on the comments received. However, this may be reviewed and amended as appropriate in a future rulemaking task. Within this NPA the Agency follows closely JAR-FCL. The Agency appreciates your willingness to provide detailed proposals where changes or amendments might be appropriate.</p>

comment	6081	comment by: UK CAA
	<p><b>Paragraph:</b> Appendix 3 D Paragraph13(c)/I Paragraph11(c)/L Paragraph11(c)  <b>Page No:</b> 86/93/96  <b>Comment:</b> The word 'gliders' is undefined in EASA.FCL  <b>Justification:</b>  <b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b>  Change 'gliders' to 'sailplanes or powered sailplanes'</p>	
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>The expression 'gliders' will be changed to 'sailplanes'.</p>	
comment	7682	comment by: CAA Finland
	<p>App 3 L para 4:  The guidance how to proceed if time limit exceeded is missing. New proposed text:</p> <p>5 The course of theoretical knowledge shall be completed within 18 months <b>or the approved training organization shall give additional training and give a certificate specifying that training.</b> The flight instruction and skill test shall be completed within the period of validity of the pass in the theoretical examinations. <b>An expired theoretical may be renewed by passing the examination again.</b></p>	
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Based on several comments received on the same issue, it seems that it is not an essential safety element that the course is completed within a certain time limit. Therefore, the Agency will delete this paragraph and include it in the AMC to Appendix 3, including the mention that the period may be extended if additional training is provided.</p>	

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 4: Skill test for the issue of a CPL**

p. 97

comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>5913❖</p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b>  Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.  Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.</p> <p>Rationale , provided as expample based on Appendix 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air</li> </ul>
---------	---



transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9

- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response

*Noted*

After careful consideration of the comments received on the Appendices, as well as the feedback received from stakeholders, the Agency has decided to leave the majority of the Appendices content in the rule, and only pass certain elements to AMC, after an individual analysis, based on concrete comments. The Agency has explained this decision in more detail in the explanatory note of the CRD.

In the case of this particular Appendix, and until such time as competency based standards may be developed for pilot licences, the Agency considers that it is necessary that the content of skill tests/proficiency checks remains in the rule.

comment

7498

comment by: *British Airways*

In order to allow the introduction of modern training methodology and take into account the use of improved training devices the contents of this Appendix should be transferred to AMC and GM for the appropriate section.

response

*Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 5913.

<b>B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 4: Skill test for the issue of a CPL - A.</b>	p. 97
<b>General</b>	

comment

1091

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

1. ...."shall have received instruction..."  
Question: how much ? All of it ? Should be clarified.

3. "Further training may be required..."  
Required by whom ? The examiner ? The competent authority ?  
How much training ? What kind of training ?

response

*Noted*

The Agency follows in Appendix 4 Skill test for the issue of a CPL, closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.170 and paragraph JAR-FCL 2.170 and their Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170 and Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 2.170.

The phrase ....'shall have received instruction...' in paragraph 1 of Appendix 4 is exactly the same as in paragraph 1 of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.170 and JAR-FCL 2.170.

The phrase .... 'Further training may be required...' in paragraph 3 of Appendix 4 is exactly the same as in paragraph 4 of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.170 and JAR-FCL 2.170.

The Agency is of the opinion that this does not need further explanation based on the fact that the examiner will suggest further training, the ATO will further evaluate the situation and define some training items and finally the competent authority will be informed through the examiner.

comment

1913

comment by: *Nigel Roche*

As appendix 4 covers both single engine and multi-engine CPL skills test requirements I would suggest that para 2 reflected this throughout. In the first line "all the relevant sections" is used subsequently "all sections" is used.

I would suggest inserting relevant as shown below

2 An applicant shall pass **all the relevant sections** of the skill test. If any item in a section is failed, that section is failed. Failure in more than one section will require the applicant to take the entire test again. An applicant failing only one section shall only repeat the failed section. Failure in any section of the retest, including those sections that have been passed on a previous attempt, will require the applicant to take the entire test again. All **relevant** sections of the skill test shall be completed within six months. Failure to achieve a pass in all **relevant** sections of the test in two attempts will require further training.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for your comment.  
The text will be changed accordingly.

comment

3211

comment by: *Susana Nogueira*

3 Further training may be required...  
By whom?  
How much training?  
What kind of training?.

response

*Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 1091.

comment

4831

comment by: *Flight Training Europe*

Page 97, Appendix 4. Skill Test for the Issue of a CPL. 5.

Para 5 infers that the applicant can repeat any part of the test even when he has failed it. Change first sentence of para 5 to read:

**5. At the discretion of the examiner any manoeuvre or procedure of the test may be repeated once by the applicant.**

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for your comment.

The text will be changed back to the JAR-FCL wording as in paragraph 7, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.170 and JAR-FCL 2.170.

comment

5315

comment by: *Chris Gowers*

Para 2. Change to, "Failure to achieve a pass in all sections of the test in two attempts will require further *mandatory* training *as directed by the flight examiner.*"

There was no indication of who decides on the further training.

response

*Not accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 1091.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response *Noted*

After careful consideration of the comments received on the Appendices, as well as the feedback received from stakeholders, the Agency has decided to leave the majority of the Appendices content in the rule, and only pass certain elements to AMC, after an individual analysis, based on concrete comments. The Agency has explained this decision in more detail in the explanatory note of the CRD.

In the case of this particular Appendix, and until such time as competency based standards may be developed for pilot licences, the Agency considers that it is necessary that the content of skill tests/proficiency checks remains in the rule.

comment 6442

comment by: DCAA

Appendix 4 A item 5 When ever that text appears for skill test the text should be replaced by the text in JAR-FCL App. 1 to JAR-FCL 1.170 ITEM 7.

response *Accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 4831.

<b>B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 4: Skill test for the issue of a CPL - B.</b> <b>Contents of the skill test for the issue of a CPL – aeroplanes</b>	p. 97-100
--	-----------

comment 91

comment by: Lauri KARJALAINEN

**APPENDIX 4**

**SKILL TEST FOR THE ISSUE OF A CPL (section 6)**

Take away from the skill test the one engine go-around with multiengine airplanes (leave it only to do with simulator). In normal life it is a procedure that I cannot see relevant. In real one engine condition after approach we are coming to land not going around. If we are going around with one engine, we are very near to damage the engine (90%). Why we do that? Only that the rules insist to do so! (I never did that with multiengine airplanes, when I was examiner more than 1000 times. I did it only with simulator, because responsible was mine, not insurance companies). For piloting the airplane correct in these situations I see that the engine failure after takeoff is enough and also the most difficult situation.

The same with IR Skill Test. The same in Appendix 9.

**TERMINOLOGY!!!**

There is PF = Pilot Flying

You use PNF = Pilot Not Flying

**It should be MP = Monitoring Pilot**

**TRY TO UNDERSTAND THIS PSYKOLOGY FAKTUM;** In the cockpit there is not pilot, who is not flying, the other pilot there is monitoring, so please call him Monitoring Pilot (MP).

response *Not accepted*

The Agency follows in Appendix 4 Skill test for the issue of a CPL, closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.170 and paragraph JAR-FCL 2.170 and their Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170 and Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 2.170.

The requirements in section 6 of Appendix 4B are exactly the same as in section 6, Appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170.

The Agency sees no reason to change this requirement.

As for the terminology issue, PNF was already used in JAR-FCL, and it widely known and accepted. Also here, the Agency sees no need to change at this time.

comment **219** comment by: *CAA - The Netherlands*

Appendix 4  
B.5 Content of the test. Section 1.c.  
Start engine, taxiing and take-off

response *Not accepted*

The Agency follows in Appendix 4 Skill test for the issue of a CPL, closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.170 and paragraph JAR-FCL 2.170 and their Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170 and Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 2.170.

The requirements in section 1 of Appendix 4B are exactly the same as in section 1, Appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170.

comment **1914** comment by: *Nigel Roche*

Height  
normal flight  $\pm 100$  feet  
with simulated engine failure  $\pm 150$  feet

I would suggest inserting (multi engine) after  $\pm 150$  feet to read:

Height  
normal flight  $\pm 100$  feet  
with simulated engine failure  $\pm 150$  feet (multi engine)

response *Not accepted*

The Agency follows in Appendix 4 Skill test for the issue of a CPL, closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.170 and paragraph JAR-FCL 2.170 and their Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170 and Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 2.170.

The requirements in paragraph 4 of Appendix 4B are exactly the same as in paragraph, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.170.

comment **1915** comment by: *Nigel Roche*

Insert (multi engine) after items b,c and d

response *Not accepted*

Please see the reply above to your comment No 1914.

comment	<p>1941</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch</i></p> <p>I) An important area of knowledge and skill to be demonstrated is missing II) too restrictive principles required</p> <p>Proof:</p> <p>1) Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations call for the knowledge of " non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors."</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>Add to B.3.</p> <p>"- Integrate non-technical skills with regard to flight safety"</p> <p>Replace in C.5</p> <p>"threat and error management"</p> <p>By "non-technical skills with regard to flight safety"</p> <p>See my comment on <b>FCL.920</b></p> <p>"non-technical skills with regard to flight safety" is to be defined in the Definitions section as: Cooperation, Leadership &amp; Managerial Skills, Situation Awareness, and Decision Making including crew resource management, the promotion of a culture of safety and the recognition and management of threats and errors</p> <p>see</p> <p>Flin, R.; Goeters, K.-M.; Hörmann, H.-J.; Martin, L. (1998): A Generic Structure of Non-Technical Skills for Training and Assessment; 23rd Conference of the European Association for Aviation Psychology, Wien, 14.-18. September 1998</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.</p> <p>We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.</p>
comment	<p>2559</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></p> <p>A) The following items of the skill test form should be followed by a "*" in order to allow them to be performed in a FS,FTD2/3 or FNPTII :</p> <p>Section 2: item c</p> <p>Section 2: item e (iv)</p> <p>Section 5: all items</p> <p>Section 6: all items</p> <p>Reason: was allowed by §14 of App 1 to JAR-FCL 1.170</p> <p>B) Should also be checked for helicopter and As skill test forms.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency follows in Appendix 4 Skill test for the issue of a CPL, closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.170 and paragraph JAR-FCL 2.170 and their Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170 and Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 2.170.</p> <p>In paragraph 5 of Appendix 4B is stated that items in Section 2 paragraphs c and e(iv), and the whole of Section 5 and 6 may be performed in an FNPT II or</p>

a flight simulator.

In paragraph 5 of Appendix 4C is stated that items in Section 4 may be performed in an FNPT(H) or a flight simulator (H).

In paragraph 5 of Appendix 4D is stated that items in Section 5 and 6 may be performed in an FNPT(As) or a flight simulator (As).

comment

3289

comment by: *DGAC FRANCE*

Part FCL Appendix 4 B 5

We think more realistic to perform the turns in a aircraft , as well as the items of section 5 notably the forced landings.

B

5 Items in section 2 paragraphs e and e(iv), and whole of sections 5 and 6 may be performed in an FNPT II or a flight simulator .

response

*Not accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 2559.

The items which may be performed in an FNPT II or a flight simulator are exactly the same items as mentioned in paragraph 14, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.170.

comment

4069

comment by: *CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority*

The Non-technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed Non-technical testing standards lack clarity and formal definition e.g. the use of terms such as 'judgement' and 'airmanship'. In addition, application of the proposed criteria is susceptible to subjectivity, bias and abuse because of a lack of common understanding and the requirement for standardised interpretation.

Proposal: Replace

3 The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

– exercise good judgement and airmanship;  
with

4. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

-operate the aircraft safely, efficiently and apply to the required standard, Non-technical Skills (NTS) such as Teamwork, Situation Awareness and Threat and Error Management etc'

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency follows in Appendix 4 Skill test for the issue of a CPL, closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.170 and paragraph JAR-FCL 2.170 and their Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170 and Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 2.170.

The text of paragraph 3 of Appendix 4B is exactly the same as in paragraph 12, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.170.

Please see also reply to comment 1941 above.

comment

5808

comment by: *ENAC TLP*

The technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed flight test tolerances (standards) need some specifications for NTS and TEM avoiding the use of terms such as 'good judgement and airmanship' that are easily prone to subjectivity, bias and abuse during assessment because of a lack of common understanding.

**Need:** more clear and unambiguous standards for the assessment of non-technical skills during skill test and proficiency checks for class/type ratings and license skill tests.

**Proposal:** to specify differently the non technical abilities to be demonstrated during test/checks to exercise good airmanship and related Flight test tolerances

#### APPENDIX 4 SKILL TEST FOR THE ISSUE OF A CPL

##### B. Contents of the skill test for the issue of a CPL – Aeroplanes

(3)

page 97

To be modified as follows (*italics*)

The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

- as it is;
- as it is;
- *apply NTS and TEM as needed to exercise good airmanship;*
- as it is;

response *Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 4069.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

#### **Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.



**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response *Noted*

After careful consideration of the comments received on the Appendices, as well as the feedback received from stakeholders, the Agency has decided to leave the majority of the Appendices content in the rule, and only pass certain elements to AMC, after an individual analysis, based on concrete comments. The Agency has explained this decision in more detail in the explanatory note of the CRD.

In the case of this particular Appendix, and until the time competency based standards may be developed for pilot licences, the Agency considers that it is necessary that the content of skill tests/proficiency checks remains in the rule.

comment

6061

comment by: *Finnish Aviation Academy*

**APPENDIX 4****SKILL TEST FOR THE ISSUE OF A CPL****B. Contents of the skill test for the issue of a CPL – aeroplanes**

1 The aeroplane used for the skill test shall meet the requirements for training aeroplanes, and shall be certificated for the carriage of at least four persons, have a variable pitch propeller and **an engine 200 hp or more.**

*Any new single-engine piston aeroplane does not have retractable landing gear. More important than retractable landing gear is aeroplanes performance and TOW, so the requirement of the retractable landing gear should be replaced by engine power or minimum TOW or stalling speed.*

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment. When drafting the text the Agency followed closely the provisions of JAR-FCL and will not change the text in the proposed way right now.

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the tables included in Appendices to Part-FCL (namely Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

- To leave the content/format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms.

- In the meantime, to develop report forms to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations), to be included as AMC to this paragraph. These report forms will be based on the content of the AMCs to Appendices 7, 9 and 12, as published in this NPA.
- To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

comment

6090

comment by: UK CAA

Appendix 4 B Paragraph 1

**Page No:** 97**Comment:** The requirement for the CPL skill test to be carried out in a propeller driven aeroplane is outdated.**Justification:** With the advent of VLJs there is no reason to exclude these from CPL training.**Proposed Text: (if applicable)**

Change 'have a variable pitch propeller' to 'have a variable pitch propeller or be turbojet powered'

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment No 6061 above.

comment

6092

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:** Appendix 4 B Paragraph 5**Page No:** 98**Comment:** The 'control of the aeroplane by external visual reference' does not apply to Section 2 Item e.**Justification:** Clarification - Section 2 Item e requires flight by reference solely to instruments.**Proposed Text: (if applicable)**

Add 'except where otherwise stated in the test schedule'

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency follows in Appendix 4 Skill test for the issue of a CPL closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.170 and paragraph JAR-FCL 2.170 and their Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170 and Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 2.170.

The requirements in section 2 of Appendix 4B are exactly the same as in section 2, Appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170.

comment

6094

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:** Appendix 4 B Paragraph 5

	<p><b>Page No:</b> 99  <b>Comment:</b> Amend test profile Item 3g to include use of DME and raw GPS  <b>Justification:</b> DME and GPS (with some constraints) should be allowed as a navigation aid  <b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b>  Amend 'NDB or VOR' to 'NDB, VOR, DME or raw GPS'</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency follows in Appendix 4 Skill test for the issue of a CPL closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.170 and paragraph JAR-FCL 2.170 and their Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170 and Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 2.170.</p> <p>The requirements in section 3 of Appendix 4B are exactly the same as in section 3, Appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170.</p>
comment	<p>6095 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> Appendix 4 B Paragraph 5  <b>Page No:</b> 99  <b>Comment:</b> A touch and go is required on the LPL and PPL skill test but not on the CPL. Consider adding 'touch and go' as a test item in Section 4.  <b>Justification:</b> Test item included in tests for lower level licences.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency follows in Appendix 4 Skill test for the issue of a CPL closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.170 and paragraph JAR-FCL 2.170 and their Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170 and Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 2.170.</p> <p>The requirements in section 4 of Appendix 4B are exactly the same as in section 4, Appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170.</p>
comment	<p>6096 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> Appendix 4 B Paragraph 5  <b>Page No:</b> 99  <b>Comment:</b> Amend test profile Item 5c to exclude ME aeroplanes  <b>Justification:</b> Forced landings not required for ME aeroplanes  <b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b>  Add '(single-engine only)' to item 5c</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency follows in Appendix 4 Skill test for the issue of a CPL closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.170 and paragraph JAR-FCL 2.170 and their Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170 and Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 2.170.</p> <p>The requirements in section 5 of Appendix 4B are exactly the same as in section 5, Appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170.</p>
comment	<p>6443 <span style="float: right;">comment by: DCAA</span></p> <p>App. 4 item B item 2    Controlled aerodrome should be deleted.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p>

The Agency follows in Appendix 4 Skill test for the issue of a CPL closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.170 and paragraph JAR-FCL 2.170 and their Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170 and Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 2.170.

The requirement concerning the controlled aerodrome in paragraph 2 of Appendix 4B is exactly the same as in paragraph 7, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.170.

comment

6576

comment by: *IAOPA Europe*

Why is an aircraft with retractable gear required for CPL courses? Most modern aircraft don't have it and are complex enough, like a Cirrus SR22, Cessna 182 or 350, etc. It will be a problem to find enough old Piper Arrows for this purpose!

It is proposed to rewrite the requirement into: "Aircraft with retractable gear OR more than 200 hp."

response

*Not accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 6061.

comment

7084

comment by: *UK CAA*

**Paragraph:** FCL Appendix 4 B3, C3 & D3

**Page No:** 97, 100 & 103 of 647

**Comment:** The competency of "exercise good judgement and airmanship" is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.

**Justification:** Consistency across licence skill tests.

**Proposed Text: (if applicable)**

Amend to read;

*"- apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test".*

response

*Not accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 4069.

comment

7405

comment by: *Finnish Aviation Academy*

#### **APPENDIX 4**

#### **SKILL TEST FOR THE ISSUE OF A CPL**

#### **B. Contents of the skill test for the issue of a CPL – aeroplanes**

1 The aeroplane used for the skill test shall meet the requirements for training aeroplanes, and shall be certificated for the carriage of at least four persons, have a variable pitch propeller and **an engine 200 hp or more.**

*Hardly any new single-engine piston aeroplanes (especially European built) do not have retractable landing gear. More important than retractable landing gear is aeroplanes performance and TOW, so the requirement of the retractable landing gear should be replaced by engine power or minimum TOW or stalling speed.*

response

*Not accepted*

Please see the reply above to your same comment No 6061.

comment

7687

comment by: *CAA Finland*

Skill test form:

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.a		
1.b		
1.c		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.a		
2.b		
2.c		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.a		
3.b		
3.c		
And		
So		
On		


Examiners signature

response *Noted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the skill test/proficiency check tables included in the Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL (e.g. Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

To leave the content/format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms.

In the meantime, to develop report forms as AMC material to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the applicable AMCs e.g. AMCs to Appendices 7, 9 and 12, as published in this NPA.

To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 4: Skill test for the issue of a CPL - p. 100-102**  
**C. Content of the skill test for the issue of the CPL - Helicopters**

comment

700

comment by: FOCA Switzerland

Appendix 4 Skill Test for the issue of a CPL

C. Content of Skill-Test

For safety reason since too high risk item:

Proposal:

**Table Section 2, lettre o:  
 Autorotative landing: to be deleted.**

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency follows in Appendix 4 Skill test for the issue of a CPL closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.170 and paragraph JAR-FCL 2.170 and their Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170 and Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 2.170.

The requirement o in section 2 of Appendix 4C is exactly the same as in section 2, Appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 2.170.

comment

1942

comment by: *Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch*

I) An important area of knowledge and skill to be demonstrated is missing  
 II) too restrictive principles required

Proof:

1) Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations call for the knowledge of " non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors."

Proposal:

Add to C.3.

"- Integrate non-technical skills with regard to flight safety"

Replace in C.5

"threat and error management"

By

"non-technical skills with regard to flight safety"

See my comment on **FCL.920**

"non-technical skills with regard to flight safety" is to be defined in the Definitions section as: Cooperation, Leadership & Managerial Skills, Situation Awareness, and Decision Making including crew resource management, the promotion of a culture of safety and the recognition and management of threats and errors

see

Flin, R.; Goeters, K.-M.; Hörmann, H.-J.; Martin, L. (1998): A Generic Structure of Non-Technical Skills for Training and Assessment; 23rd Conference of the European Association for Aviation Psychology, Wien, 14.-18. September 1998

response

*Noted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

3663

comment by: *SHA Guido Brun*

Statement: numerous helicopters have been bent and destroyed by instructors during autorotation training. The autorotative landing offers very little improvement in safety compared to the power recovered autorotation. Some manufacturers even caution: autorotative landings not recommended in their pilots manuals (e.c. Eurocopter on certain types).

Proposal: replace all "autorotative landing" requirements with "power recovered autorotation or autorotative landing"

response

*Not accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 700.

comment

4077

comment by: *CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority*

The Non-technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed Non-technical testing standards lack clarity and formal definition e.g. the use of terms such as 'judgement' and 'airmanship'. In addition, application of the proposed criteria is susceptible to subjectivity, bias and abuse because of a lack of common understanding and the requirement for standardised interpretation.

Proposal: Replace

3 The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

– exercise good judgement and airmanship;

with

4. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

(a) .....

(b) .....

(c) operate the aircraft safely, efficiently and apply to the required standard, Non-technical Skills (NTS) such as Teamwork, Situation Awareness and Threat and Error Management etc'

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency follows in Appendix 4 Skill test for the issue of a CPL closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.170 and paragraph JAR-FCL 2.170 and their Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170 and Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 2.170.

The text of paragraph 3 of Appendix 4C is exactly the same as in paragraph 12, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.170.

Please see also reply to comment 1942 above.

comment

5810

comment by: *ENAC TLP*

The technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed flight test tolerances (standards) need some specifications for NTS and TEM avoiding the use of terms such as 'good judgement and airmanship' that are easily prone to subjectivity, bias and abuse during assessment because of a lack of common understanding.

**Need:** more clear and unambiguous standards for the assessment of non-technical skills during skill test and proficiency checks for class/type ratings and license skill tests.

**Proposal:** to specify differently the non technical abilities to be demonstrated during test/checks to exercise good airmanship and related Flight test tolerances

**APPENDIX 4 SKILL TEST FOR THE ISSUE OF A CPL****C. Contents of the skill test for the issue of a CPL – Helicopters****(3)**



	<p><b>page 100</b>          To be modified as follows (<i>italics</i>)          The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:          - as it is;          - as it is;          - <i>apply NTS and TEM as needed to exercise good airmanship;</i>          - as it is;          as it is.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment No 4077.</p>
comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b><u>Comment:</u></b>          Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.          Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.</p> <p>Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9</li> <li>• changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.</li> <li>• As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Proposal:</u></b>          Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.</p> <p>The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>After careful consideration of the comments received on the Appendices, as well as the feedback received from stakeholders, the Agency has decided to leave the majority of the Appendices content in the rule, and only pass certain elements to AMC, after an individual analysis, based on concrete comments. The Agency has explained this decision in more detail in the explanatory note of the CRD.</p>

In the case of this particular Appendix, and until the time competency based standards may be developed for pilot licences, the Agency considers that it is necessary that the content of skill tests/proficiency checks remains in the rule.

comment

7085

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:** FCL Appendix 4 B3, C3 & D3

**Page No:** 97, 100 & 103 of 647

**Comment:** The competency of "exercise good judgement and airmanship" is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.

**Justification:** Consistency across licence skill tests.

**Proposed Text: (if applicable)**

Amend to read;

*"- apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test".*

response

Not accepted

Please see the reply above to comment No 4077.

comment

7690

comment by: CAA Finland

Skill test form:

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.a		
1.b		
1.c		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.a		
2.b		
2.c		
And		
So		
On		


Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.a		
3.b		
3.c		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

response *Noted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the skill test/proficiency check tables included in the Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL (e.g. Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

- To leave the content/format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms.

- In the meantime, to develop report forms as AMC material to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the applicable AMCs e.g. AMCs to Appendices 7, 9 and 12, as published in this NPA.

- To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

<b>B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 4: Skill test for the issue of a CPL - D. Content of the skill test for the issue of a CPL – airships</b>	p. 102-105
---	------------

comment 1943 comment by: *Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch*

I) An important area of knowledge and skill to be demonstrated is missing  
II) too restrictive principles required

Proof:

1) Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations  
call for the knowledge of

" non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors."

Proposal:

Add to D.3.

"- Integrate non-technical skills with regard to flight safety"

Replace in D.5

"threat and error management"

By

"non-technical skills with regard to flight safety"

See my comment on **FCL.920**

"non-technical skills with regard to flight safety" is to be defined in the Definitions section as: Cooperation, Leadership & Managerial Skills, Situation Awareness, and Decision Making including crew resource management, the promotion of a culture of safety and the recognition and management of threats and errors

see

Flin, R.; Goeters, K.-M.; Hörmann, H.-J.; Martin, L. (1998): A Generic Structure of Non-Technical Skills for Training and Assessment; 23rd Conference of the European Association for Aviation Psychology, Wien, 14.-18. September 1998

response *Noted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment 4075 comment by: *CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority*

The Non-technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed Non-technical testing standards lack clarity and formal definition e.g. the use of terms such as 'judgement' and 'airmanship'. In addition, application of the proposed criteria is susceptible to subjectivity, bias and abuse because of a lack of common understanding and the requirement for standardised interpretation.

Proposal: Replace

3 The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

– exercise good judgement and airmanship;

with

4. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

(a) .....

(b) .....

(c) operate the aircraft safely, efficiently and apply to the required standard, Non-technical Skills (NTS) such as Teamwork, Situation Awareness and Threat and Error Management etc'

response *Not accepted*

The Agency follows in Appendix 4 Skill test for the issue of a CPL closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.170 and paragraph JAR-FCL 2.170 and their Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.170 and Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 2.170.

The text of paragraph 3 of Appendix 4D is exactly the same as in paragraph 12, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.170 and JAR-FCL 2.170.

Please see also reply to comment 1943 above.

comment *5812*

comment by: *ENAC TLP*

The technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed flight test tolerances (standards) need some specifications for NTS and TEM avoiding the use of terms such as 'good judgement and airmanship' that are easily prone to subjectivity, bias and abuse during assessment because of a lack of common understanding.

**Need:** more clear and unambiguous standards for the assessment of non-technical skills during skill test and proficiency checks for class/type ratings and license skill tests.

**Proposal:** to specify differently the non technical abilities to be demonstrated during test/checks to exercise good airmanship and related Flight test tolerances

APPENDIX 4 SKILL TEST FOR THE ISSUE OF A CPL

**D. Contents of the skill test for the issue of a CPL – Airships**

**(3)**

**page 103**

To be modified as follows (*italics*)

The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

- as it is;

- as it is;

- *apply NTS and TEM as needed to exercise good airmanship;*

- as it is;

as it is.

response *Not accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 4075.

comment

*5913*❖

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International,*

*IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response *Noted*

After careful consideration of the comments received on the Appendices, as well as the feedback received from stakeholders, the Agency has decided to leave the majority of the Appendices content in the rule, and only pass certain elements to AMC, after an individual analysis, based on concrete comments. The Agency has explained this decision in more detail in the explanatory note of the CRD.

In the case of this particular Appendix, and until the time competency based standards may be developed for pilot licences, the Agency considers that it is necessary that the content of skill tests/proficiency checks remains in the rule.

comment *7086*

comment by: *UK CAA*

**Paragraph:** FCL Appendix 4 B3, C3 & D3

**Page No:** 97, 100 & 103 of 647

**Comment:** The competency of "exercise good judgement and airmanship" is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.

**Justification:** Consistency across licence skill tests.

**Proposed Text: (if applicable)**

Amend to read;  
 “- *apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test*”.

response *Not accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 4075.

comment **7691** comment by: *CAA Finland*

Skill test form:  
 The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.a		
1.b		
1.c		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.a		
2.b		
2.c		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.a		
3.b		
3.c		

So		
On		

Examiners signature

response

*Noted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the skill test/proficiency check tables included in the Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL (e.g. Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

- To leave the content/format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms.

- In the meantime, to develop report forms as AMC material to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the applicable AMCs e.g. AMCs to Appendices 7, 9 and 12, as published in this NPA.

- To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 5: Integrated MPL training course** p. 106-108

comment

446

comment by: *CityJet*

Cityjet believe that the requirement for 12 take-offs and landings is excessive. At the moment, we train pilots with very low hours to proficiency. This can be achieved within the current requirement of 6 take-offs and landings. Even allowing for the fact that the MPL candidate will have lower aircraft hours, we believe that a competent pilot will reach proficiency after 6 take offs and landings. Stipulating a minimum of 12 will mean unnecessary aircraft use with all the associated costs and emissions which the TRTO will be liable for.

response

*Noted*



The Agency follows in Appendix 5 Integrated MPL training course closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.515 and Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 & 1.525.

The requirement in paragraph 11 of Appendix 5 is the same requirement as in paragraph 14, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 & 1.525.

At this moment, while the MPL licence is still new and going through the first stages of implementation, the Agency does not intend to change any of the requirements coming from JAR-FCL 1.

comment 702 comment by: FOCA Switzerland

Appendix 5 Integrated MPL Training Course

General

Wording too restrictive; up till now, also PPL-Holders are accepted.

Proposal

**Paragraph 4: Delete: Only ab-initio applicants**

response Not accepted

This requirement is coming from paragraph 4 of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 & 1.525.

At this moment, while the MPL licence is still new and going through the first stages of implementation, the Agency does not intend to change any of the requirements coming from JAR-FCL 1.

comment 1079 comment by: Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)

**Comment:**

This text should be deleted and replaced by a reference to an approved BITD, FNPT or a FTD in accordance with FSTD definitions. What the text tries to describe is more or less just a BITD or an FTD.

**Proposal:** a) Phase 1 - Core flying skills.

E-training and part tasking devices in accordance with a FSTD as defined by Part OR and approved by the Authority.  
Delete the rest of the text.

response Not accepted

The Agency follows in Appendix 5 Integrated MPL training course closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.515 and Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 & 1.525.

The requirement concerning flying training in paragraph 8 (a) of Appendix 5 is exactly the same requirement as in paragraph 11 (a), Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 & 1.525.

However, please note that the Agency is reviewing all references to specific categories of FSTDs. For more details please see the Explanatory Note to this CRD.

comment	<p><b>1112</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p>Item 6: for which lower licence a skill test could be taken after failing an MPL training course ? Does such a training meets requirements for PPL ? CPL ? IR ?</p>
response	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>This requirement is coming from paragraph 4 of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 &amp; 1.525.</p> <p>The text was, however, slightly changed. The text will be amended to better reflect the text of JAR-FCL</p> <p>Which licence will depend on the credits, this will be given by the Authority.</p>
comment	<p><b>1560</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>IAAPS</i></span></p> <p>As the MPL holder only qualifies for multi pilot operations, the hierarchy between PPL/CPL and MPL is undetermined. FCL.405.A (b) confirms this. Lower license should be replaced by another license.</p>
response	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 702 above.</p>
comment	<p><b>1561</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>IAAPS</i></span></p> <p>page 106 - 108 Should be an AMC, for added flexibility; especially true for such a new course.</p>
response	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>After careful consideration of the comments received on the Appendices, as well as the feedback received from stakeholders, the Agency has decided to leave the majority of the Appendices content in the rule, and only pass certain elements to AMC, after an individual analysis, based on concrete comments. The Agency has explained this decision in more detail in the explanatory note of the CRD.</p> <p>In the case of this particular Appendix, while the MPL licence is still new and going through the first stages of implementation, the Agency considers that it is necessary that the text remains at Appendix level.</p>
comment	<p><b>1562</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>IAAPS</i></span></p> <p>Any license holder should be admissable toMPL but there should not be given any credits for the flying hours from previous training.</p>
response	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>Please see reply to comment No 702 above.</p>
comment	<p><b>1564</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>IAAPS</i></span></p> <p>Why to mention "that represent a generic etc...". Besides, why mentioning</p>

response

"generic"?: Can a FNPTII MCC be anything else? Is a type specific FNPT II MCC acceptable? Replace the word generic by any.

*Noted*

The Agency follows in Appendix 5 Integrated MPL training course closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.515 and Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 & 1.525.

The requirement concerning the simulated flight in paragraph 14 (b) of Appendix 5 is exactly the same requirement as in paragraph 17 (b), Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 & 1.525.

However, please note that the Agency is reviewing all references to specific categories of FSTDs. For more details please see the Explanatory Note to this CRD.

comment

1944

comment by: *Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch*

In "**COMPETENCY UNITS 13**"

- 1) Usage of undefined terms
- 2) important area of skill and knowledge missing

Proof

Ad1 ) there is no definition of "human performance principles" throughout the NPA

Ad2) TEM is a special technique not accepted by all. More modern and general accepted techniques exist (see my comments on TEM, error and error management)

- Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations

call for the knowledge of " non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors."

- §(16) of the Basic Regulations principles claim for a "promotion of a "culture of safety""

Proposal: Exchange

"13 The applicant shall demonstrate competency in the following 9 competency units:

1. apply human performance principles, including principles of threat and error management;"

By

13 The applicant shall demonstrate competency in the following 10 competency units:

1. apply knowledge of human performance and limitations
2. apply non-technical skills with regard to flight safety
3. renumber the rest of the competency units...

Where

"non-technical skills with regard to flight safety" is to be defined in the Definitions section as: Cooperation, Leadership & Managerial Skills, Situation Awareness, and Decision Making including crew resource management, the promotion of a culture of safety and the recognition and management of threats and errors

see

Flin, R.; Goeters, K.-M.; Hörmann, H.-J.; Martin, L. (1998): A Generic Structure of Non-Technical Skills for Training and Assessment; 23rd

Conference of the European Association for Aviation Psychology, Wien, 14.-18. September 1998

response

*Noted*

The Agency follows in Appendix 5 Integrated MPL training course closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.515 and Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 & 1.525.

The competency requirements concerning the competency units in paragraph 13 (b) of Appendix 5 are exactly the same requirements as in paragraph 16, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 & 1.525.

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

2298

comment by: *Henk van den Berg*

in paragraph 2 it says:

*"Approval for an MPL training course shall only be given to an approved training organisation that is part of a commercial air transport operator certificated in accordance with Part-MS and Part-OPS or having a specific arrangement with such an operator. The licence shall be restricted to that specific operator until completion of the airline operator's conversion course."*

This requirement to do MPL training with a specific airline operator, including the line training may well prove to be too steep a hurdle. Airlines do not normally plan two years ahead with their pilot requirements. At best a small portion of the airline community may consider MPL attractive enough to adapt their planning, but many will not be able to. This means there will always be a relatively large number of pilots who still are training along the lines of ATPL – MCC – Type Rating – OCC. Also an airline may disappear, e.g. due to bankruptcy or merger, in the period a candidate is going through the MPL course. In our opinion this all makes it less attractive for candidates and airlines to embark on the MPL training method. This again may well lead to a lost opportunity as we consider MPL a well founded professional method to educate and train a person to become an airline pilot, rather than a "glorified private pilot" who goes through bridge training to divert to the profession of air transport pilot.

We suggest to conduct the MPL course, up to and including the type rating by means of aeroplane operational procedures laid down in an Operations Manual (OM-B) by the ATO and approved by the authority for this purpose. This can be any airline standard to be considered generic. The final steps are the OCC and line flying under supervision. For this a difference course can be developed familiarising the candidate with the procedures of the airline, which may involve an extended briefing and one simulator session. The big advantage is that now any airline flying the specific aeroplane type for which the type rating course has been completed can in principle accommodate the candidate.

This approach would make it much easier and more attractive for airlines to accommodate candidates and in our expectation will quickly lead to a much wider spread of application of the MPL course. And this in turn will give the training community a much quicker way to develop, evaluate and mature the

	<p>MPL curriculum to the stage where it far exceeds the effectivity of the present ATPL route.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency follows in Appendix 5 Integrated MPL training course closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.515 and Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 &amp; 1.525.</p> <p>The approval for a MPL(A) training course in paragraph 2 of Appendix 5 is the same as in paragraph 2 of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 &amp; 1.525, with that difference that the reference to the approved training organisation is brought in line with the new structure of rulemaking of the Agency.</p>
comment	<p><b>3883</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Luftfahrt-Bundesamt</i></span></p> <p>APP5:</p> <p>Integrated MPL Training Course Number 14 (c): The meaning of "equivalent standard to level B" should be clarified by the example (e.g. FNPT II + MCC + FTD 2)</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency follows in Appendix 5 Integrated MPL training course closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.515 and Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 &amp; 1.525.</p> <p>The requirement concerning the simulated flight in paragraph 14 (c) of Appendix 5 is exactly the same requirement as in paragraph 17 (c), Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 &amp; 1.525.</p> <p>However, please note that the Agency is reviewing all references to specific categories of FSTDs. For more details please see the Explanatory Note to this CRD.</p>
comment	<p><b>3983</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></span></p> <p>Appendix 5 §2</p> <p>Go back to the previous wording as set in Appendix to JAR-FCL 1.520 &amp; 1.525 §2. The arrangement has to be approved also, it is more than a simple arrangement, because the operator is involved in the training process through the feed back of information on training objectives.</p> <p>2. Approval for an MPL training course shall only be given to an approved training organisation that is part of a commercial air transport operator certificated in accordance with Part MS and Part OPS or having a specific <b><u>approved</u></b> arrangement with such an operator. The licence shall be restricted to that specific operator until completion of the airline operator's conversion course,</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment. The Agency does not consider the proposed change in the text to be necessary as such a specific arrangement would be approved through the management system of the ATO and this will be enough. Please also refer to the reply to comment No 2298 above.</p>

comment	4357	comment by: <i>DCA Malta</i>
	Delete paragraph 4	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	Please see the reply above to comment No 702.	
comment	4784	comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i>
	Delete paragraph 4	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	Please see the reply above to comment No 702.	
comment	4834	comment by: <i>Flight Training Europe</i>
	<u>Page 106, Appendix 5. Integrated MPL Training Course. 3.</u>	
	Wording infers ALL training must be conducted at ONE approved training organisation. This does not cater for an FTO and an airline's TRTO conducting the training at 2 establishments. Change para 3 to read:	
	<b>3. An applicant wishing to undertake an MPL integrated course shall complete all the instructional stages in one continuous course of training under the supervision of the organisation approved to conduct the training.</b>	
response	<i>Not accepted</i>	
	The Agency follows in Appendix 5 Integrated MPL training course closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.515 and Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 & 1.525.	
	The requirement in paragraph 3 of Appendix 5 is the same as in paragraph 3 of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 & 1.525, with the difference that the reference to the approved training organisation is brought in line with the new structure of rulemaking of the Agency.	
	This means: to complete all the instructional stages in one continuous course of training.	
	This does not mean that the training organisation cannot subcontract part of the training, in accordance with the general requirements in Part-OR.GEN.	
comment	4837	comment by: <i>Flight Training Europe</i>
	<u>Page 107, Appendix 5. Integrated MPL Training Course. 11.</u>	
	By stating "at least 12 take-offs and landings to ensure competency" we are moving away from competency philosophy. The MPL course training should be equal to or better than the training in current use. And, currently, airlines generally use between 6 and 8 landings to ensure the pilot can safely operate the aircraft and they are then signed off. By placing a figure of at least 12 the Agency is potentially burdening airlines with an unrealistic figure which will in	

the future be difficult to reduce and therefore become a significant financial restriction for airlines wishing to go down the MPL route.

Furthermore, PANS-TRNG, Chapter 3, para 3.3.5 states:

3.3.5 The Licensing Authority may accept a reduction, from twelve to six, of the number of take-offs and landings required for the advanced phase of training, provided that.

- a) the approved training organisation has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Licensing Authority that it does not negatively affect the acquisition of the required skill by the student; and
- b) a process is in place to ensure that corrective action can be made if in-training or post-training evaluation indicates a need to do so.

Change would be to add a paragraph after paragraph 11 to read:

**12. The Licensing Authority may accept a reduction, from twelve to six, of the number of take-offs and landings required for the advanced phase of training, provided that.**

- a) the approved training organisation has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Licensing Authority that it does not negatively affect the acquisition of the required skill by the student; and**
- b) a process is in place to ensure that corrective action can be made if in-training or post-training evaluation indicates a need to do so.**

response *Not accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 446.

comment *5005*

comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

Comment: add at the end of paragraph 7, the following:

7 An approved MPL theoretical knowledge course shall comprise at least 750 hours of instruction. Additionally to the 750 hours, the theoretical knowledge instruction for the type rating shall be in accordance with Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.261(a) or new reference AMC 1 and 2 to FCL.725 (a).

Justification:

The type rating training is not included in the 750 hours, so the text must reflect that this type rating theoretical knowledge is in addition to the 750 hours (as in JAR). ECA recommends to include the underlined text, as stated in the old point 9 of the appendix.

response *Partially accepted*

This paragraph will be changed to the following:

'An approved MPL theoretical knowledge course shall comprise at least 750

hours of instruction for the ATPL(A) knowledge level, as well as the hours required for theoretical knowledge instruction for the relevant type rating, in accordance with Subpart H.'

comment **5166** comment by: *CAE*

Appendix 5 "Integrated MPL Training Course" 14 (c) "Phase 3 - Intermediate" (page 107)

The common understanding of the ICAO FSTD standard for MPL phase 3 – Intermediate is that a level B device could be one way to meet the minimum requirement. We believe the intent from ICAO is that a lower level device (lower than level B) could also satisfy the requirement.

As work on the training programs for MPL are still in the beta test phase, defining the training device required for MPL phase 3 seems premature, specifically when that definition conflicts with ICAO. Several MPL training programs currently use a device for MPL phase 3 not at the level B qualification standard. These programs are not substandard as they augment phase 3 with additional in-aircraft training time.

Change: "qualified to an equivalent standard to level B,...." to "qualified to an equivalent standard acceptable to the authority, ...."

response *Not accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 3883.

comment **5343** comment by: *Chris Gowers*

para 11. delet "12" insert "6"

12 take offs and landings more than necessary. Competency means just that and if the pilot is competent after 6, which is all that is required on a current type rating course, what is the need to complete more?

Six landings should be adequate for the pilot to be able to demonstrate unassisted safe approaches and landings, as that is the current requirement for a type rating.

response *Not accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 446.

comment **5348** comment by: *Flybe Ltd*

Para 11 of Appx 5: Integrated MPL training course quotes a requirement from ICAO Doc 9868, PANS TRG, 3.3.4 to require 12 take-offs and landings.

PANS TRG 3.3.5 allows a licensing authority to accept a reduction in that figure if, based on satisfactory training data, sufficient levels of skill can be demonstrated. This was never incorporated into JAR-OPS, EU-OPS and therefore not the EASA NPA.

It is crucial that, if MPL is to survive, that the costs can be maintained at present levels. There should be a mechanism to accommodate the correct use



of clear data to support the original ICAO guidelines.

Propose amended Para 11 as follows:

11

The training course shall include at least 12 takeoffs and landings to ensure competency. These takeoffs and landings shall be performed under the supervision of an instructor in an aeroplane for which the type rating shall be issued.

The Licensing Authority may accept a reduction, from twelve to six, of the number of take-offs and landings required for the advanced phase of training, provided that:

- a) the approved training organisation has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Licensing Authority that it does not negatively affect the acquisition of the required skill by the student; and
- b) a process is in place to ensure that corrective action can be made if in-training or post-training evaluation indicates a need to do so.

response *Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 446.

comment

5460

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

Integrated MPL Training Course Number 14 (c):  
The meaning of "equivalent standard to level B" should be clarified by the example  
(e.g. FNPT II + MCC + FTD 2)

response *Not accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 3883.

comment

5562

comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

Add paragraphs:

**(3)The general approach is to use the existing ATP(A) integrated training course as a reference and to implement progressively the MPL integrated training course and specifically the transfer from actual flight to simulated flight.**

**(4)This transfer should be organised in a way that is similar to the approach used for ETOPS. Successive evolutions of the training syllabus introduce progressively a higher level of simulated flight and a reduction of actual flight. Change from one version to the next should only take place after enough experience has been gained and once its results, including those of airline operator conversion courses, have been analysed and taken into account.**

**Renumber rest of paragraphs and delete from page 602 GM to Appendix 5**

Justification: point 1. c and d of the JAR regulation should be kept **in the rule**. This is a fundamental point in the MPL implementation. It is ICAO wording, and reflects something the NAA's must take into account prior to the

response	<p>approval of any MPL program.</p> <p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>In the Agency's view, the text is clearly not rulemaking material: it provides general guidance on the course; it does not contain any essential safety elements; it does not create any rights or obligations for applicants, authorities or ATOs.</p> <p>Therefore, the Agency considers that the text should remain in guidance material.</p>
comment	<p>5814 <span style="float: right;">comment by: ENAC TLP</span></p> <p>The technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed flight test tolerances (standards) need some specifications for NTS avoiding the use of terms such as 'good judgement and airmanship' that are easily prone to subjectivity, bias and abuse during assessment because of a lack of common understanding.</p> <p><b>Need:</b> more clear and unambiguous standards for the assessment of non-technical skills during skill test and proficiency checks for class/type ratings and license skill tests.</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> to specify differently the non technical abilities to be demonstrated during test/checks to exercise good airmanship and related Flight test tolerances</p> <p><b>APPENDIX 5 INTEGRATED MPL TRAINING COURSE COMPETENCY UNITS page 107</b></p> <p>To be modified as follows (<i>italics</i>)</p> <p>13. The applicant shall demonstrate competency in the following 9 competency units:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1. apply human performance principles including <i>TEM, CRM and NTS</i></li> <li>- 2. to 9. as it is</li> </ul>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment No 1944.</p>
comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>5913❖</p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p>Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.</p> <p>Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.</p> <p>Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different</li> </ul>

challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9

- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response *Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 1561.

This is also our reply to your same comment No 5913 on all the different appendices.

comment 6949

comment by: CAA CZ

Item 4 should be cancelled. Integrated course MPL can enter everyone who fulfills other entrance requirements and just previous experience was not accepted.

response *Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 702.

comment 7087

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:** FCL Appendix 5 para 13

**Page No:** 107 of 647

**Comment:** The competency of "apply human performance principles, including threat and error management" is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.

**Justification:** Standardisation

**Proposed Text: (if applicable)**

Amend to read;

" – 1. apply human performance *and non-technical skills* principles (*which will include TEM*)"

response *Not accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 1944.

comment 7499

comment by: British Airways

In order to allow the introduction of modern training methodology and take into account the use of improved training devices the contents of this Appendix should be transferred to AMC and GM for the appropriate section.

response

*Not accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment No 1561.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 6: Modular training courses for the instrument rating**

p. 109

comment

925

comment by: *Rory OCONOR*

There should be a section on training for cloud flying in sailplanes and powered sailplanes.

The instructional training elements should be very limited and only cover some of the basic safety issues.

Becoming a competent cloud-flying glider pilot requires

- a) an understanding of these basic safety issues
- b) many hours of practice mainly solo.

Cloud flying /IMC practice in gliders does not have to be dual to be safe. It is analogous to basic glider training.

Basic glider training:

- learn handling techniques, safety and landing
- go solo [FCL limit]
- develop experience
- initial cross-country training
- start cross-country experience
- silver badge
- initial competition experience ...

Cloud flying:

- understand basic issues
- develop experience stepwise

It is relatively easy in a glider with lots of fluffy cumulus to:

- thermal up to cloud base
- fly on instruments
- enter cloud (for 5 sec, 10 secs, 30secs, 2mins, 5mins+)
- decide to quit
- fly straight
- exit cloud
- repeat

Most cloud flying in gliders is done at an angle of bank of 30-45 degrees rather than 0 degrees, and is a very different issue to flying IMC in SEP.

As both a cloud-flying glider pilot and having an IMC rating, I think that these are very different skills.

Most sailplane cloudflying development will be gained when flying solo and there should not be a requirement for complete proficiency demonstrable to an instructor before being allowed to attempt cloud-flying.

Conclusion: Glider pilots should be able to fly in cloud.

response *Noted*

It was already indicated in the Explanatory memorandum to Part-FCL, under Subpart I, number 48 (page 29), of NPA 2008-17a, that the issue of qualifications for flying in Instrument Meteorological Conditions (IMC) is currently being discussed in a separate Rulemaking task, FCL.008.

The comments received on A-NPA 14-2006 and on this NPA dealing with the issue of the qualifications to fly in IMC/cloud flying will be taken into account by this working group. The task FCL.008 will result in an NPA which will be submitted to public consultation, and on which you will be able to make your comments.

comment *1407*

comment by: *Bristow Helicopters*

Recommend that the Syllabus for the Modular IR are in the form of an AMC rather than an Appendix to the rule.

Justification:

With changes in aircraft technology, training device technology and teaching methods, it is likely that this material will require change. This can be managed more effectively via the AMC and Alternative AMC procedure, rather than the full legal EU process of change associated with the Rules and Appendices. Common standards and transparency across all EU Member States should still be ensured by the Alternative AMC process, which requires National Authority approval, EASA acceptance and publication of alternative AMC's throughout the Community.

response *Noted*

After careful consideration of the comments received on the Appendices, as well as feedback received from stakeholders, the Agency has decided to leave the majority of the Appendices content in the rule, and only pass certain elements to AMC, after an individual analysis, based on concrete comments. The Agency has explained this decision in more detail in the explanatory note of the CRD.

In the case of this particular Appendix, and until such time as competency based standards may be developed for the IR, the Agency considers that the number of training hours and the content of skill tests/proficiency checks needs to remain in the rule.

comment *2053*

comment by: *Edward Bellamy*

1. (a) The Basic Instrument Flight Module seems pointless considering it has no privileges attached it.

6. 150 hours of compulsory ground instruction may not be necessary for all students, some of which may already be familiar with some of the material; students should be allowed to attempt the exams with less ground instruction

if their instructor certifies that their knowledge meets the required level.

7 & 8. It may be possible that some students come to training with previous experience of instrument flying above that in the PPL(A) syllabus (for example holders of the UK IMC Rating) and therefore may not need a full 50 or 55 hours to achieve the required competence level for the IR(A). In view of this students should be given credit for previous instrument flying experience and not need to complete the full course before attempting the IR(A) skills test.

response *Noted*

The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.

The Basic Instrument Flight Module in paragraph 1 (a), A. IR(A) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6, is exactly the same as under paragraph 1 (a), Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205.

The 150 hours of theoretical knowledge instructions under paragraph 6, A. IR(A) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6 is already 50 hours less than the 200 hours under the JAA system in paragraph 6, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. In NPA FCL-34 it was already proposed to reduce the hours from 200 to 150 hours.

Concerning your comments on paragraph 7 and paragraph 8, A. IR(A) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6: the requirements are exactly the same as under paragraph 9 and paragraph 10, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205.

comment 3076

comment by: *Peter SCHMAUTZER*

The requirements for an IR licence are too stringent compared with the FAR's insofar as 150 hours of theoretical knowledge instructions in an FTO is required. The main objective should be, that a student shows his knowledge at the examination and not how long and where he has received instruction.

response *Noted*

The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.

The 150 hours of theoretical knowledge instructions under paragraph 6, A. IR(A) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6 is already 50 hours less than the 200 hours under the JAA system in paragraph 6, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. In NPA FCL 34 it was already proposed to reduce the hours from 200 to 150 hours.

comment 4425

comment by: *Bond Offshore Helicopters*

Recommend that the Syllabus for the Modular IR are in the form of an AMC rather than an Appendix to the rule.

Justification:

With changes in aircraft technology, training device technology and teaching methods, it is likely that this material will require change. This can be

managed more effectively via the AMC and Alternative AMC procedure, rather than the full legal EU process of change associated with the Rules and Appendices. Common standards and transparency across all EU Member States should still be ensured by the Alternative AMC process, which requires National Authority approval, EASA acceptance and publication of alternative AMC's throughout the Community.

response *Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1407.

comment

4667

comment by: *Héli-Union*

Recommend that the Syllabus for the Modular IR are in the form of an AMC rather than an Appendix to the rule.

Justification:

With changes in aircraft technology, training device technology and teaching methods, it is likely that this material will require change. This can be managed more effectively via the AMC and Alternative AMC procedure, rather than the full legal EU process of change associated with the Rules and Appendices. Common standards and transparency across all EU Member States should still be ensured by the Alternative AMC process, which requires National Authority approval, EASA acceptance and publication of alternative AMC's throughout the Community.

response *Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1407.

comment

4886

comment by: *HUTC*

Recommend that the Syllabus for the Modular IR are in the form of an AMC rather than an Appendix to the rule.

Justification:

With changes in aircraft technology, training device technology and teaching methods, it is likely that this material will require change. This can be managed more effectively via the AMC and Alternative AMC procedure, rather than the full legal EU process of change associated with the Rules and Appendices. Common standards and transparency across all EU Member States should still be ensured by the Alternative AMC process, which requires National Authority approval, EASA acceptance and publication of alternative AMC's throughout the Community.

response *Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1407.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913 ❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response *Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1407.

comment *6089*

comment by: *Finnish Aviation Academy*

If the IR(A)-course is performed combined it should be possible to perform all those items included in Basic Instrument Flight Module in FSTD. It is useless to spend aeroplane hours to practis basic instrument flight and radio navigation, those items are better to perform in FSTD and reserve aircraft hour for real IFR teraining (for practising approaches and airway flying). We have done this way before and it woks fine.

That possibility should be stated in the text.

response *Noted*

The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.

The Basic Instrument Flight Module in paragraph 1 (a), A. IR(A) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6, is exactly the same as under paragraph 1 (a), Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. This means 5 hours of the total 10 hours of instrument time under instruction can be instrument ground time in a BITD, FNPT I or II, or a flight simulator.

The Agency sees no reason at this time to change the requirements that were included in JAR-FCL.



comment	<p>6994</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>AOPA Germany</i></p> <p>Appendix 6, A. IR(A) General 1 (a) Basic Instrument Flight Module Taking into account the high realism and training effect of these devices we recommend to allow also the use of FTDs for building instrument ground time.</p> <p>Appendix 6, A. IR(A) Flying Training 7 Taking into account the high realism and training effect of these devices we recommend that 20 hours of FNPT I or flight simulator instrument ground time may be replaced by 30 hours in a BITD.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see the replies above to comment 2053 and comment 6089.</p>
comment	<p>7500</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>British Airways</i></p> <p>In order to allow the introduction of modern training methodology and take into account the use of improved training devices the contents of this Appendix should be transferred to AMC and GM for the appropriate section.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 1407.</p>
comment	<p>7875</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>Ulrich Ablassmeier</i></p> <p>Theoretical knowledge: A theoretical course should not be mandatory. It is not important how a student gets the knowledge but that he has the knowledge. This is tested in the examination. At many flight schools there are no courses. They sell special and very expensive books which are acknowledged as courses for self study. If the course is not mandatory cheaper books would do for self study. This would reduce cost and the student is free to learn as he likes.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency has the opinion that the theoretical knowledge course should be mandatory.</p> <p>The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.</p>
comment	<p>8215</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>Klagenfurter Flugsport Club</i></p> <p>Die Erfordernisse für eine IR Lizenz wäre nach unserer Meinung nicht in einer streng vorgegebenen Stundenanzahl in einer FTO zu erbringen, sondern das Erreichen des Ausbildungszieles für einen Schüler sollte anhand der abgelegten Prüfung nachzuweisen sein.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 7875.</p>

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 6: Modular training courses for the instrument rating - A. IR(A) – Modular flying training course**

p. 109-110

comment	<p>352</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>Colm Farrell</i></p> <p>The minimum hours requirement is not appropriate in a modern world, and is out of step with modern professional best practice.</p> <p>A candidate should be able to take the skill test and pass, whenever they can demonstrate that they have reached the required standard. Each person learns at different speeds, and some may be competent well before these minimum hours, while others may never be competent despite many further hours training.</p> <p>If a candidate is capable of passing the test, then they should not be required to meet a minimum hour requirement. This is particularly important for the Private Pilot where costs may be a significant barrier to obtaining an IR.</p> <p>Pilots holding a Leisure Pilots licence should also be able to apply for an IR(A) course. If the pilot can meet the skills and knowledge required, then they should be awarded the IR/</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating. The minimum requirements are taken over from the JAA system.</p> <p>Concerning your last comment. After discussions with the MDM.032 licensing subgroup and the FCL.001 group, it was agreed that the holder of an LPL should not fly in IFR. The group that is currently dealing with task FCL.008, on conditions to fly in IMC, also agrees with this conclusion. Therefore, it will not be possible to include an IR in an LPL. The text of paragraph FCL.600 will be changed to better reflect this. This is also our reply to your comment 350 on paragraph FCL.600.</p>
comment	<p>861</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>OAA Oxford</i></p> <p>Correction: Paragraph 10 - Should refer to paragraphs 7 &amp; 8 above.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment.  Paragraph 10, A. IR(A) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6 should indeed refer to paragraph 7 and paragraph 8. The paragraph will be changed accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>1127</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></p> <p>1 (a): question. May the instrument training hours in a BIPT-aeroplanes during PPL(A) training be taken into account for the (a) Basic Instrument Flight Module for IR(A) ? If so, is there a maximum ?</p>

response

2. Is the holder of an ATPL(H)-VFR not allowed to start a modular IR(A) course?

*Noted*

The Agency assumes that your comment refers to a BITD instead of a BIPT-aeroplanes (we do not know what this is).  
The instrument training hours in a BITD during PPL(A) training cannot be taken into account for the (a) Basic Instrument Flight Module for IR(A).

The holder of an ATPL(H)-VFR is allowed to start a modular IR(A) course. See B. 2, in this Appendix.

comment

1269

comment by: *PPL/IR Europe*

Prior to JAR-FCL, competency-based routes to an IR where available, for example in the UK for candidates with over 700hrs of flight time. This permitted them to undertake training "as required" by an FTO. JAR-FCL abolished this method. There was no safety case for this and it should be reintroduced.

Additionally, prior to JAR FCL, the requirement for an IR course was more typically ~40hrs of training. JAR FCL increased this to 50-55hrs. We are not aware of any case for this increase, however, anecdotally, we have heard that it was merely the result of an exercise to determine how the 195hr training requirement for the JAR Integrated ATPL course should be broken down, in which it was convenient to allocate 50-55hrs to the IR.

Since JAR-FCL was introduced, training methods and tools have advanced considerably. Competency-based training is increasingly recognised as a superior method. Various computer based tools and aids have become available. Many VFR pilots fly light aircraft with avionics far in advance of traditional IFR training aircraft, and are familiar with their use. Although some, perhaps many, candidates will require 40-45hrs for the PIFM, some will not, and therefore the minimum training hours should be reduced to permit flexibility based on a candidate's competency.

Our proposed wording is

*1...The course consists of two modules, which may be taken separately or combined:*

*(a) Basic Instrument Flight Module.*

*This comprises 10 hours of instrument time under instruction, of which up to 5 hours can be instrument ground time in a BITD, FNPT I or II, or a flight simulator. Upon completion of the Basic Instrument Flight Module, the candidate shall be issued a Course Completion Certificate.*

*(b) Procedural Instrument Flight Module.*

*This comprises the remainder of the training syllabus for the IR(A), a minimum of 20 hours single engine or 25 hours multiengine instrument time under instruction (although most candidates should expect the course to require 40-45hrs), and the theoretical knowledge course for the IR(A).*

*(c) Candidates with over 700hrs of flight time in Aeroplanes may complete training as judged necessary by an approved training organisation in lieu of the BIFM and PIFM*

response

*Noted*

The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.

The JAR-FCL was developed as harmonised requirements, while European aviation systems had developed in the past with great variations in structures and details. The Civil Aviation Authorities of certain European States have agreed common comprehensive and detailed aviation requirements. Joint Aviation Requirements for Flight Crew Licensing (JAR-FCL) are being developed for all categories of pilot licences so as to permit use of licences and ratings without further formality in any of the participating States. Your request to reintroduce the system before the introduction of JAR-FCL, is not an option.

comment

1547

comment by: *IAN*

Requiring a night rating unnecessarily excludes pilots with daytime only limitations on their licences.

The training requirement in terms of flight hours is in excess of that required for other ICAO compliant Instrument ratings and the difference is not justified. Most of that falls upon PPL's.

Requiring Procedural module to be undertaken in one continuous course is unnecessary, even though it may be better in terms of progress

There is no credit given for holders of the UK IMC qualification.

Direct grant of IR privileges to holders of ICAO Instrument ratings should be given subject to a limited amount of ground based differences training.

response

*Noted*

It was already indicated in the Explanatory memorandum to Part-FCL, under Subpart I, number 48 (page 29), of NPA 2008-17a, that the issue of qualifications for flying in Instrument Meteorological Conditions (IMC) is currently being discussed in a separate Rulemaking task, FCL.008.

The comments received on A-NPA 14-2006 and on this NPA dealing with the issue of the qualifications to fly in IMC/cloud flying will be taken into account by this working group. The task FCL.008 will result in an NPA which will be submitted to public consultation, and on which you will be able to make your comments.

comment

1565

comment by: *IAAPS*

Should be an AMC, for added flexibility.

response

*Noted*

After careful consideration of the comments received on the Appendices, as well as feedback received from stakeholders, the Agency has decided to leave the majority of the Appendices content in the rule, and only pass certain elements to AMC, after an individual analysis, based on concrete comments. The Agency has explained this decision in more detail in the explanatory note of the CRD.

In the case of this particular Appendix, and until such time as competency based standards may be developed for the IR, the Agency considers that the number of training hours and the content of skill tests/proficiency checks needs to remain in the rule.

comment **1986** comment by: *Nigel Roche*

THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE

6 An approved modular IR(A) course shall comprise at least 150 hours of theoretical knowledge instruction.

response *Noted*

Your text proposal is exactly the same as the text in paragraph 6.

comment **2017** comment by: *Swiss Pilot School Asociation*

Proposal:  
GENERAL

1 The aim of the IR(A) modular flying training course is to train pilots to the level of proficiency necessary to operate aeroplanes under IFR and in IMC. The course consists of two modules, which may be taken separately or combined:

(a) Basic Instrument Flight Module. This comprises 10 hours of instrument time under instruction, of which up to 10 (+) hours can be instrument ground time in a BITD, FNPT I or II, or a flight simulator. Upon completion of the Basic Instrument Flight Module, the candidate shall be issued a Course Completion Certificate.

(b) Procedural Instrument Flight Module. This comprises the remainder of the training syllabus for the IR(A), 40 hours single engine or 45 hours multiengine instrument time under instruction, and the theoretical knowledge course for the IR(A).

2 An applicant for a modular IR(A) course shall be the holder of a PPL(A) excluding the privileges to fly at night (++) or a CPL(A), including the privileges to fly at night. An applicant for the Procedural Instrument Flight Module, who does not hold a CPL(A), shall be holder of a Course Completion Certificate for the Basic Instrument Flight Module. The training organisation shall ensure that the applicant for a multiengine IR(A) course who has not held a multiengine aeroplane class or type rating has received the multiengine training specified in Subpart H prior to commencing the flight training for the IR(A) course. (+++)

3 An applicant wishing to undertake the Procedural Instrument Flight Module of a modular IR(A) course shall be required to complete all the instructional stages in one continuous approved course of training. Prior to commencing the Procedural Instrument Flight Module, the training organisation shall ensure the competence of the applicant in basic Instrument flying skills. Refresher training shall be given as required.

4 The course of theoretical instruction shall be completed within 18 months. The Procedural Instrument Flight Module and the skill test shall be completed within the period of validity of the pass in theoretical examinations.

5 The course shall comprise:

- (a) theoretical knowledge instruction to the instrument rating knowledge level;
- (b) instrument flight instruction.

Advantage:

(+)

Basic training can be instructed more efficient in a BITD, FNPT I or II, or a flight simulator than in an aircraft

Flying skills (scanning) in the aircraft are trained at the end of the training under real IFR which is more realistic.

environmental consciousness

(+ +)

Increase in training flexibility: A part of the night training could be integrated in the IR-training. See proposal for FCL.810

(+ + +)

The type rating can be combined with the IR-training which has the following advantages:

- less costs (more efficient)
- less exhaust gas pollution
- better training structure: learning everything in the FNPT first, then application in the aircraft
- The practice to do 40h FNPT then 15h MEP-aircraft was successful over years. The proposed role brings no gain in safety and training quality. But a more complex syllabus and more costs.

response

*Not accepted*

1. Concerning your first proposal:

The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.

The Basic Instrument Flight Module in paragraph 1 (a), A. IR(A) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6, is exactly the same as under paragraph 1 (a), Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. This means 5 hours of the total 10 hours of instrument time under instruction can be instrument ground time in a BITD, FNPT I or II, or a flight simulator.

2. Concerning your second proposal:

See our reply to your comment 2018 under FCL.810.

3. Concerning your third proposal:

The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205. The text of paragraph 2 of Appendix 6.A is exactly the same as the text of JAR-FCL. At this point, the Agency does not intend to change the text coming from JAR-FCL. This could, however, be subject to a future rulemaking task.

comment

3237

comment by: *Gérard VOLAN*

appendix 6 : "Modular training.. ( p109-110)

In addition to the comment concerning FCL 615, the followings reflect the same kind of concern for the consideration of private IR:

- item 6 requires *150 hours* of technical knowledge, i.e one month full time or 2 hours per week during *18 months* (as being the upper limit set in item 4) . There are no current safety data which could induce such requirement, therefore it is found by far excessive.

- Item 7: requires *50 hours* of instrument instruction. there were at least 200 european Private Pilots who got their IR training in USA, within a recent period of 18 months ( March 2007 to sept. 2008). Most of them were already qualified there, within 40 hours. Does this item mean they have to reassess everything to show thier proficiency, while they ( plus their multiple predecessors) had a nil impact on aerial safetywhen flying IMC within European skies on November registered airplanes ?; Does EASA appraise their background as equal to zero just by lack of bilateral agreement ?

response

*Noted*

The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.

The 150 hours of theoretical knowledge instructions under paragraph 6, A. IR(A) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6 is already 50 hours less than the 200 hours under the JAA system in paragraph 6, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. In NPA FCL 34 it was already proposed to reduce the hours from 200 to 150 hours.

The 50 hours under paragraph 7, A. IR(A) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6, is an exact copy of paragraph 9, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205.

comment

**3340**

comment by: *DGAC FRANCE*

paragraph 9 of the appendix 6 part A

Justification :

In order to have the same structure of the next between aeroplane and helicopter and (b) requirements il missing because, in JAR FCL 1 it is required to pass the IR skill test on a multi-engine aeroplane to obtain an IR ME

This comment is link to the comment in section 5 of the subpart G and the proposition of a new paragraph (FCL 630 As IR(A)).

Modification :

**Delete the paragraph 9 of the appendix 6 part A**

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.

The requirements under paragraph 9, A. IR(A) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6 are exactly the same as in paragraph 11, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205.

After discussing this issue and proposal with the airship experts, it seems not to be necessary for the category of airship to distinguish between single-engine and multiengine instrument qualifications.

Therefore, the Agency does not agree to the proposal adding a specific paragraph defining a specific course for instrument training in multi-engine airships.

The proposal to delete also paragraph 9 of the Appendix 6 part A. IR(A) seems to refer to the aeroplane category only. The Agency does not agree that the appropriate paragraph in the section for airships should be changed.

See also our same reply to your comment 3338 on paragraph FCL 630 As IR(As).

comment

3591

comment by: *Swiss Power Flight Union*

Proposal:

GENERAL

1 The aim of the IR(A) modular flying training course is to train pilots to the level of proficiency necessary to operate aeroplanes under IFR and in IMC. The course consists of two modules, which may be taken separately or combined:

(a) Basic Instrument Flight Module.

This comprises 10 hours of instrument time under instruction, of which up to 10 (+) hours can be instrument ground time in a BITD, FNPT I or II, or a flight simulator. Upon completion of the Basic Instrument Flight Module, the candidate shall be issued a Course Completion Certificate.

(b) Procedural Instrument Flight Module.

This comprises the remainder of the training syllabus for the IR(A), 40 hours single engine or 45 hours multiengine instrument time under instruction, and the theoretical knowledge course for the IR(A)

2 An applicant for a modular IR(A) course shall be the holder of a PPL(A) excluding the privileges to fly at night (++) or a CPL(A), including the privileges to fly at night. An applicant for the Procedural Instrument Flight Module, who does not hold a CPL(A), shall be holder of a Course Completion Certificate for the Basic Instrument Flight Module.

The training organisation shall ensure that the applicant for a multiengine IR(A) course who has not held a multiengine aeroplane class or type rating has received the multiengine training specified in Subpart H prior to commencing the flight training for the IR(A) course (+++)

3 An applicant wishing to undertake the Procedural Instrument Flight Module of a modular IR(A) course shall be required to complete all the instructional stages in one continuous approved course of training. Prior to commencing the Procedural Instrument Flight Module, the training organisation shall ensure the competence of the applicant in basic Instrument flying skills, Refresher training shall be given as required.

4 The course or theoretical instruction shall be completed within 18 months. The Procedural Instrument Flight Module and the skill test shall be completed within the period of validity of the pass in theoretical examinations.

5 The course shall comprise:



- (a) theoretical knowledge instruction to the instrument rating knowledge level;  
 (b) instrument flight instruction

Advantage:

(+)

Basic training can be instructed more efficient in a BITD, FNPT I or II, or a flight simulator then in an aircraft.

Flying skills (scanning) in the aircraft are trained at the end of the training under real IFR which is more realistic.

Environmental consciousness

(++)

Increase in the training flexibility: A part of the night training could be integrated in the IR-training. See proposal for FCL.810

(+++)

The type rating can be combined with the IR-training which has the following advantages:

- less costs (more efficient)
- less exhaust gas pollution
- better training structure: learning everything in the FNPT first, then application in the aircraft
- 

The practice to do 40h FNPT then 15h MEP-aircraft was successful over years. The proposed role brings no gain in safety and training quality. But a more complex syllabus and more costs

response *Not accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment 2017.

comment

3884

comment by: *Luftfahrt-Bundesamt*

APP6-A. IR(A) – Modular flying training course:

The reference to paragraphs 9 and 10 is not correct. Apparently it is referred to paragraphs 7 and 8.

response

*Accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment 861.

comment

5009

comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

Comment: change text in paragraph 10 as follows (editorial change):

10

10.1 The holder of a CPL(A) or of a Course Completion certificate for the Basic Instrument Flight Module may have the total amount of training required in paragraphs 9 7 or ~~40~~ 8 above reduced by 10 hours.

10.2 The holder of an IR(H) may have the total amount of training required in paragraphs 9 7 or ~~40~~ 8 above reduced to 10 hours.

10.3 The total instrument flight instruction in aeroplane shall comply with paragraph 9 7 or ~~40~~ 8, as appropriate.

response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 861.</p>
comment	<p>5461 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p>The reference to paragraphs 9 and 10 is not correct. Apparently it is referred to paragraphs 7 and 8.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 861.</p>
comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>5913 ❖</p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b><u>Comment:</u></b> Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry. Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.</p> <p>Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9</li> <li>• changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.</li> <li>• As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Proposal:</u></b></p> <p>Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.</p> <p>The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 1565.</p> <p>This is also our reply to your same comment 5913 on all the different</p>

appendices.

comment 6098 comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

Appendix 6 – Modular Training Courses for the Instrument Rating

**Page No\*:**

109 of 647

**Comment:**

IR(A) – Paragraph 2 makes no mention of PPL(A),CPL(A) or ATPL(A) issued in accordance with ICAO Annex 1.

Paragraph 6 states 150 hours of theoretical knowledge JAR-FCL states 200 hours

**Justification:**

Clarification of existing requirements in Appendices 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205

response *Noted*

There is no reference to ATPL (A) because in the case of (A) the ATPL always includes the IR privileges. See Appendix 3. This is the same under JAR-FCL, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205, under 2.

In the new system in Part FCL, it does not make any sense to refer to 'a PPL issued in accordance with ICAO'. It has to be a PPL issued in accordance with Part-FCL, or accepted in accordance with Annex III.

The 150 hours of theoretical knowledge instructions under paragraph 6, A. IR(A) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6 is indeed 50 hours less than the 200 hours under the JAA system in paragraph 7, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205. In NPA FCL 34 it was already proposed to reduce the hours from 200 to 150 hours.

Concerning the hours of theoretical knowledge instructions see our reply to your same comment 6105 and 6114 for helicopters.

comment 6101 comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

Appendix 6 A 10

**Page No:**

110

**Comment:**

Paragraph references incorrect throughout.

**Justification:**

Typographical error

**Proposed Text:**

**(if applicable)**

Change references to 'paragraphs 9 or 10 above' to 'paragraphs 7 or 8 above'.

response *Accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment 861.

comment 6104 comment by: UK CAA

	<p><b>Paragraph:</b> Appendix 6 A 10</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 110</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Paras 10.2 and 10.3 appear to be contradictory. An IR(H) holder only needs a total of 10 hours training but 10.3 requires him to comply with the minimum aeroplane hours in paras 7 and 8 which are 15 hrs.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Requirements for IR(H) holders unclear.</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Clarify requirements for IR(H) holders.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 861.</p> <p>Next to that in subparagraph 10.2 the phrase 'reduced <b>to</b> 10 hours' should be: 'reduced <b>by</b> 10 hours'. This will be redrafted as well.</p>
comment	<p>6961 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Austrian Aero Club</i></span></p> <p><b>FCL APPENDIX 6</b> Die Erfordernisse für eine IR Lizenz wären nach Meinung des Österreichischen Aero Clubs nicht in einer streng vorgegebenen Stundenanzahl in einer FTO zu erbringen, sondern das Erreichen des Ausbildungszieles für einen Schüler sollte anhand der abgelegten Prüfung nachzuweisen sein.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency has the opinion that the theoretical knowledge course should be mandatory.</p> <p>The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.</p>
comment	<p>7292 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Aero-Club of Switzerland</i></span></p> <p>We propose:</p> <p>GENERAL</p> <p>1 The aim of the IR(A) modular flying training course is to train pilots to the level of proficiency necessary to operate aeroplanes under IFR and in IMC. The course consists of two modules, which may be taken separately or combined:</p> <p>(a) Basic Instrument Flight Module.</p> <p>This comprises 10 hours of instrument time under instruction, of which up to 10 (+) hours can be instrument ground time in a BITD, FNPT I or II, or a flight simulator. Upon completion of the Basic Instrument Flight Module, the candidate shall be issued a Course Completion Certificate.</p> <p>(b) Procedural Instrument Flight Module.</p>

This comprises the remainder of the training syllabus for the IR(A), 40 hours single engine or 45 hours multiengine instrument time under instruction, and the theoretical knowledge course for the IR(A)

2 An applicant for a modular IR(A) course shall be the holder of a PPL(A) excluding the privileges to fly at night (++) or a CPL(A), including the privileges to fly at night. An applicant for the Procedural Instrument Flight Module, who does not hold a CPL(A), shall be holder of a Course Completion Certificate for the Basic Instrument Flight Module.

The training organisation shall ensure that the applicant for a multiengine IR(A) course who has not held a multiengine aeroplane class or type rating has received the multiengine training specified in Subpart H prior to commencing the flight training for the IR(A) course (+++)

3 An applicant wishing to undertake the Procedural Instrument Flight Module of a modular IR(A) course shall be required to complete all the instructional stages in one continuous approved course of training. Prior to commencing the Procedural Instrument Flight Module, the training organisation shall ensure the competence of the applicant in basic Instrument flying skills, Refresher training shall be given as required.

4 The course or theoretical instruction shall be completed within 18 months. The Procedural Instrument Flight Module and the skill test shall be completed within the period of validity of the pass in theoretical examinations.

5 The course shall comprise:

- (a) theoretical knowledge instruction to the instrument rating knowledge level;
- (b) instrument flight instruction

Advantages:

(+)

Basic training can be instructed more efficient in a BITD, FNPT I or II, or a flight simulator than in an aircraft.

Flying skills (scanning) in the aircraft are trained at the end of the training under real IFR which is more realistic.

Environmental consciousness

(++)

Increase in the training flexibility: A part of the night training could be integrated in the IR-training. See proposal for FCL.810

(+++)

The type rating can be combined with the IR-training which has the following advantages:

- less costs (more efficient)
- less exhaust gas pollution
- better training structure: learning everything in the FNPT first, then application in the aircraft

The practice to do 40h FNPT then 15h MEP-aircraft was successful over years. The proposed rule brings no gain in safety and training quality, only a more

	complex syllabus and more costs
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 2017.</p>
comment	<p>7470 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Prof. Dr. Alexander Bubenik</i></span></p> <p>Appendix 6 A. 6: A minimum requirement concerning the time consumed for knowledge instruction should not be defined. It should be sufficient, when an IRI recommends an applicant for the knowledge test.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see the first part of the reply above to comment 3237.</p>
comment	<p>7708 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span></p> <p>App 6 A para 4: The guidance how to proceed if time limit exceeded is missing. New proposed text:</p> <p>The course of theoretical instruction shall be completed within 18 months <b>or the approved training organization shall give additional training and give a certificate specifying that training.</b></p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.</p> <p>The requirements under paragraph 4, A. IR(A) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6, are exactly the same as in paragraph 4, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205.</p> <p>This is also our reply to your same comment 7709 on IR(H) and comment 7710 on IR(As), Appendix 6.</p>
comment	<p>7845 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Otto Fahsig</i></span></p> <p>I recommend that 20 hours of FNPT I or flight simulator instrument ground time may be replaced by 30 hours in a BITD. In this type of part-task training devices students can learn the basic procedures same as in an FNPT I, but practice them cost effectively as many times as needed.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency assumes that you are referring to paragraph 7, Appendix 6.</p> <p>The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.</p> <p>The requirements under paragraph 7, A. IR(A) – Modular flying training course,</p>

Appendix 6, are exactly the same as in paragraph 9, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205.

Therefore, the 20 hours of FNPT I or flight simulator instrument ground time cannot be replaced by 30 hours in a BITD.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 6: Modular training courses for the instrument rating - B. IR(H) – Modular flying training course**

p. 111-112

comment	<p>107 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Karsten Preuss</i></span></p> <p>9 (A)The Holder of an IR(A) may have the total amount of training required in paragraphs 7 and 8 above reduced to 10 hours of which 7 hours may be in a helicopter FNPT II/III or FS.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.</p> <p>The reduction of 5 hours mentioned in paragraph 6, B. IR(H) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6 is exactly the same as under the JAA system in paragraph 11, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.205.</p>
comment	<p>370 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>REGA</i></span></p> <p><b>STATEMENT</b>          Flying Training: The regulation demands IFR certified helicopters. Most of the IFR certified helicopters are very expensive multi-engine helicopters. In the U.S.A under FAA regulation, IFR training with an IFR equipped (not certified) helicopter is possible (i.e. IFR equipped Robinson 44).</p> <p><b>PROPOSAL</b>          Training and skill test shall be possible to complete and graduate on a only <u>IFR equipped</u> helicopter (=generic IFR-Rating). To act as pilot in IFR operations, the holder of an IFR-rating shall be IFR rated for that IFR certified helicopter he/she operates under IFR.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.</p> <p>The requirement of an IFR-certified helicopter mentioned in paragraph 7, B. IR(H) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6 is exactly the same as under the JAA system in paragraph 10, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.205.</p>
comment	<p>407 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Rod Wood</i></span></p> <p>9. Delete the first sentence of this sub para. It is unnecessary as sub para 2 has the entry requirements for all pilots to the IR(H) course already having the night rating.</p>

response

*Not accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment 107.

comment

1098

comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department  
(Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

**Comment:** With this suggested separated training of 20 hours in an FNPT I and 15 hours in a helicopter FNPT II/III or FS you can have a good development and an increased level of training to a lower cost.

There is no need for having all 35 hours of ground training in an advanced FNPTII/III or FS.

Regarding multi-engine the IR(H) course, you can have the same principle for training as for single-engine IR(H) course: 20 hours in FNPT I and 20 hours in an FNPT II/III or FS.

**Proposal:** 7 (b) up to 35 hours may be instrument ground time in a helicopter FNPT II/III or FS

of which up to 20 hours may be in accordance with (a) above

8 (b) up to 40 hours may be instrument ground time in a helicopter FNPTII/III or FS. of which up to 20 hours may be in accordance with (a) above

response

*Noted*

The Agency will conduct a revision of all the references to the different kind of simulators in Part-FCL to ensure correctness and consistency.

comment

1408

comment by: *Bristow Helicopters*

7 (b) up to 35 hours may be instrument ground time in a helicopter **FTD 2/3**, FNPT II/III or FS.

8 (b) up to 40 hours may be instrument ground time in a helicopter **FTD 2/3**, FNPT II/III or FS.

Justification:

An FTD 2/3 is a suitable device for instrument training and should not be excluded.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for your comment.

The text will be changed accordingly.

comment

1409

comment by: *Bristow Helicopters*

(d) .... (the latter exercise to be carried out in a flight simulator, FNPT II **or FTD 2/3**

Justification:

The FTD 2/3 is a suitable device for instrument training and checking.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for your comment.



The text will be changed accordingly.

comment 1626 comment by: *Helikopter Air Transport GmbH / Christophorus Flugrettungsverein*

**STATEMENT**

Flying Training: The regulation demands IFR certified helicopters. Most of the IFR certified helicopters are very expensive multi-engine helicopters. In the U.S.A under FAA regulation, IFR training with an IFR equipped (not certified) helicopter is possible (i.e. IFR equipped Robinson 44).

**PROPOSAL**

Training and skill test shall be possible to complete and graduate on a only IFR equipped helicopter (=generic IFR-Rating). To act as pilot in IFR operations, the holder of an IFR-rating shall be IFR rated for that IFR certified helicopter he/she operates under IFR.

response *Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment 370.

comment 2347 comment by: *AECA(SPAIN)*

7 (b) up to 35 hours may be instrument ground time in a helicopter **FTD 2/3**, FNPT II/III or FS.

8 (b) up to 40 hours may be instrument ground time in a helicopter **FTD 2/3**, FNPT II/III or FS.

Justification:

An FTD 2/3 is a suitable device for instrument training and should not be excluded.

response *Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1408.

comment 2348 comment by: *AECA(SPAIN)*

(d) .... (the latter exercise to be carried out in a flight simulator, FNPT II **or FTD 2/3**

Justification:

The FTD 2/3 is a suitable device for instrument training.

response *Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1408.

comment 2349 comment by: *AECA(SPAIN)*

IR(H) Modular flying training course has no hours reduction for IR(A) holder. Amend to

**The holder of an IR(A) may have the amount of training required reduced to 10 hours.**

	<p>Justification: IR(A) 10.2 and IR AS has reduction for IR(H) holders , so requirement should be the same.</p>
response	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The text will be changed accordingly in paragraph 9 of Appendix 6, under B.</p>
comment	<p><b>2468</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Rod Wood</i></span></p> <p>Para 2 line three. After ".....holder of the" add "ME".</p> <p>The paragraph is too vague not relating to the fact that the test will be taken on a ME Helicopter and therefore should be a pre-requisite for entry.</p>
response	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.</p> <p>The phrase 'the holder of the helicopter type rating' in paragraph 2, B. IR(H) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6 is exactly the same phrase as under the JAA system in paragraph 2, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.205.</p> <p>The Agency had not the opinion that this paragraph is too vague and therefore your proposal to add 'ME' is not accepted.</p>
comment	<p><b>3242</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>john daly</i></span></p> <p>Is it implied that engine shutdown and restart in flight should be part of a multi-engine IR test if a simulator is not available or suitable? In IMC, this would not be safe.</p>
response	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>The content of paragraph 10(d) of Appendix 6, under B, is exactly the same as the content of paragraph 12 (d) of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.205.</p>
comment	<p><b>3243</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>john daly</i></span></p> <p>It is assumed that in the case where part of an IR(H) course is conducted in a synthetic training device, it will not be necessary to obtain a type rating prior to that phase, only for the final phase on the actual aircraft itself. Could this be clarified?</p>
response	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.</p>
comment	<p><b>3330</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>john daly</i></span></p>

At paragraph 2, it is stated that "An applicant [...] shall be the holder of a PPL(H) with night rating...." . Paragraph 8 states that the ME IR(H) course "...shall comprise at least 55 hours instrument time under instruction...". Paragraph 9 then states "The holder of a PPL(H) with a night rating or a CPL(H) shall have the total amount required[.....]reduced by 5 hours". What, then, is the point of stating the course is a minimum of 55 hours if you at least have to have a night rating to commence the course? This is potentially confusing and the affected paragraphs should be simplified.

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.

The requirements in paragraphs 2, 8 and 9, B. IR(H) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6 are the same as under the JAA system in paragraph 2, 10 and 11, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.205.

Because nothing really changed the Agency do not think that the affected paragraphs are confusing and should be simplified.

The Agency changed however paragraph 9, Appendix 6, under B. See for this our reply to comment 2349.

comment

3415

comment by: NACA

**Section B: (7) - last line**

1. At least 10 hours of a single-engine IR(H) training course must be completed on a IFR certified helicopter. For a single-engine IR(A) course however there is no requirement for hours to be flown on a IFR certified aeroplane.

This situation already exists in JAR-FCL but despite numeral requests it has never been sufficiently explained by the authorities. The possibility to fly in IMC is sometimes given as the main reason but for an IR course there is neither a specific need nor a requirement to fly in IMC. In practice most flights are carried out in VMC (sometimes under IFR) but hardly ever in IMC.

Those circumstances can be perfectly imitated with a helicopter which is sufficiently equipped for instrument flying instruction (without being IFR certified). Of course, not being permitted to fly in IMC may pose a slight restriction but in practise this causes hardly any delays in training nor problems with ATC. The actual weather has to be watched closely but filing an IFR Flight Plan with the additional remark "in VMC only" is generally accepted by ATC without any problems.

A night rating is a pre-requisite for an IR course giving a credit of 5 hours.

If 20 hours (out of the remaining 45) may be flown in a FNPT1(A/ H) or even in an aeroplane and if 15 hours (of the remaining 25) may be flown on a helicopter which is not IFR certified then there is no additional advantage in flying 10 hours in an IFR certified helicopter. Especially bearing in mind that flying in IMC hardly ever happens and is **no official requirement!**

	<p>Suggest to reconsider this helicopter specific requirement and to amend it i.a.w. IR course for aeroplanes.</p> <p>2. Apart from the above, it is not stated during which part of the course (and/or the skill test) the IFR certified helicopter must be used.</p>
response	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 370 concerning the IFR-certificated helicopter.</p> <p>You indicate already that this requirement already exists in JAR-FCL and also write what is the main reason for this requirement.</p> <p>Concerning your comment to fly in IMC:</p> <p>It was already indicated in the Explanatory memorandum to Part-FCL, under Subpart I, number 48 (page 29), of NPA 2008-17a, that the issue of qualifications for flying in Instrument Meteorological Conditions (IMC) is currently being discussed in a separate Rulemaking task, FCL.008.</p> <p>The comments received on A-NPA 14-2006 and on this NPA dealing with the issue of the qualifications to fly in IMC/cloud flying will be taken into account by this working group. The task FCL.008 will result in an NPA which will be submitted to public consultation, and on which you will be able to make your comments.</p> <p>Concerning your comment 2, in which part or the course the IFR certified helicopter must be used. The answer is in the paragraph itself: when the instrument flight instruction takes place.</p>
comment	<p><b>3885</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Luftfahrt-Bundesamt</i></span></p> <p>APP6-B. IR(H) – Modular flying training course: According to Appendix 6, Part B, No 2 an applicant for a modular IR(H) course shall be the holder of a PPL(H) with night rating, or a CPL(H) or an ATPL(H), whereas according to Appendix 6, Part B, No 9 the holder of a PPL(H) with a night rating or a CPL(H) shall have the total amount of training required in paragraphs 7 or 8 above reduced by 5 hours. Who has to perform the 50 hours flying training required in item 7 or 55 hours required in item 8?</p> <p>Also, the MCC requirements stated in Part B, No 2 are incomprehensible since they do not appear in the analogous requirements with regard to aeroplaens (see APPendix 6, Part A, No 6). The MCC requirement should be applicable to all categories of aircraft or to no category of aircraft at all.</p>
response	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.</p> <p>The requirements in paragraphs 2, 7, 8 and 9, B. IR(H) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6 are the same as under the JAA system in paragraph 2, 9, 10 and 11, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.205.</p> <p>The 50 hours flying training required in paragraph 7 and the 55 hours flying training required in paragraph 8 are the minimum. If you look at the subparagraphs a and b of those paragraphs, you see that the total amount is</p>

55 hours in paragraph 7 and 60 hours in paragraph 8. From this total amount the holders mentioned in paragraph 9 have a reduction of 5 hours.

Concerning your comment on the MCC requirement. See the comment above. This is the same under the JAA system. Nothing has changed.

comment 4426 comment by: *Bond Offshore Helicopters*

7 (b) up to 35 hours may be instrument ground time in a helicopter **FTD 2/3**, FNPT II/III or FS.

8 (b) up to 40 hours may be instrument ground time in a helicopter **FTD 2/3**, FNPT II/III or FS.

Justification:

An FTD 2/3 is a suitable device for instrument training and should not be excluded.

response *Accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1408.

comment 4427 comment by: *Bond Offshore Helicopters*

(d) .... (the latter exercise to be carried out in a flight simulator, FNPT II **or FTD 2/3**

Justification:

The FTD 2/3 is a suitable device for instrument training and checking.

response *Accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1408.

comment 4428 comment by: *Bond Offshore Helicopters*

IR(H) Modular flying training course has no hours reduction for IR(A) holder.

Amend to

**The holder of an IR(A) may have the amount of training required reduced to 10 hours.**

Justification:

IR(A) 10.2 and IR AS has reduction for IR(H) holders , so requirement should be the same.

response *Accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment 2349.

comment 4668 comment by: *Héli-Union*

7 (b) up to 35 hours may be instrument ground time in a helicopter **FTD 2/3**, FNPT II/III or FS.

8 (b) up to 40 hours may be instrument ground time in a helicopter **FTD 2/3**, FNPT II/III or FS.

	<p>Justification: An FTD 2/3 is a suitable device for instrument training and should not be excluded.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 1408.</p>
comment	<p>4669 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Héli-Union</i></span></p> <p>(d) .... (the latter exercise to be carried out in a flight simulator, FNPT II <b>or FTD 2/3</b>)</p> <p>Justification: The FTD 2/3 is a suitable device for instrument training and checking.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 1408.</p>
comment	<p>4670 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Héli-Union</i></span></p> <p>IR(H) Modular flying training course has no hours reduction for IR(A) holder. Amend to <b>The holder of an IR(A) may have the amount of training required reduced to 10 hours.</b></p> <p>Justification: IR(A) 10.2 and IR AS has reduction for IR(H) holders , so requirement should be the same.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 2349.</p>
comment	<p>4887 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>HUTC</i></span></p> <p>7 (b) up to 35 hours may be instrument ground time in a helicopter <b>FTD 2/3</b>, FNPT II/III or FS.</p> <p>8 (b) up to 40 hours may be instrument ground time in a helicopter <b>FTD 2/3</b>, FNPT II/III or FS.</p> <p>Justification: An FTD 2/3 is a suitable device for instrument training and should not be excluded.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 1408.</p>
comment	<p>4888 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>HUTC</i></span></p> <p>(d) .... (the latter exercise to be carried out in a flight simulator, FNPT II <b>or FTD 2/3</b>)</p> <p>Justification: The FTD 2/3 is a suitable device for instrument training and checking.</p>

response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 1408.</p>
comment	<p>4889 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>HUTC</i></span></p> <p>IR(H) Modular flying training course has no hours reduction for IR(A) holder. Amend to <b>The holder of an IR(A) may have the amount of training required reduced to 10 hours.</b></p> <p>Justification: IR(A) 10.2 and IR AS has reduction for IR(H) holders , so requirement should be the same.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 2349.</p>
comment	<p>5462 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p>According to Appendix 6, Part B, No 2 an applicant for a modular IR(H) course shall be the holder of a PPL(H) with night rating, or a CPL(H) or an ATPL(H), whereas according to Appendix 6, Part B, No 9 the holder of a PPL(H) with a night rating or a CPL(H) shall have the total amount of training required in paragraphs 7 or 8 above reduced by 5 hours. Who has to perform the 50 hours flying training required in item 7 or 55 hours required in item 8?</p> <p>Also, the MCC requirements stated in Part B, No 2 are incomprehensible since they do not appear in the analogous requirements with regard to aeroplans (see APPendix 6, Part A, No 6). The MCC requirement should be applicable to all categories of aircraft or to no category of aircraft at all.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 3885.</p>
comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913 ❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry. Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.</p> <p>Rationale , provided as expample based on Appendix 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and</li> </ul>

based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9

- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response

*Noted*

After careful consideration of the comments received on the Appendices, as well as feedback received from stakeholders, the Agency has decided to leave the majority of the Appendices content in the rule, and only pass certain elements to AMC, after an individual analysis, based on concrete comments. The Agency has explained this decision in more detail in the explanatory note of the CRD.

In the case of this particular Appendix, and until such time as competency based standards may be developed for the IR, the Agency considers that the number of training hours and the content of skill tests/proficiency checks needs to remain in the rule.

This is also our reply to your same comment 5913 on all the different appendices.

comment

6105

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

Appendix 6 B IR(H) 6

**Page No:**

111 of 647

**Comment:**

Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.205 paragraph 7 requires that the IR(H) course comprises at least 200 hours of theoretical knowledge instruction (the aeroplane IR course is the same number of hours of instruction). A cut of 25% in the amount of time learning theoretical knowledge is a significant amount of time cut from the course and is likely to lead to a reduction in standards and therefore a reduction in flight safety.

**Justification:**

Comparison of the JAR-FCL documents shows the massive change which will be detrimental to the levels of future pilots theoretical knowledge for IFR flight procedures.

**Proposed Text:**

**(if applicable)**

Change to read "...at least 200 hours of instruction."

response

*Not accepted*



The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.

The 150 hours of theoretical knowledge instructions under paragraph 6, B. IR(H) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6 is indeed 50 hours less than the 200 hours under the JAA system in paragraph 7, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.205. In NPA FCL 34 it was already proposed to reduce the hours from 200 to 150 hours.

comment

6112

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

Appendix 6 B IR(H) 7 &amp; 8

**Page No:**

111 of 647

**Comment:**

In this paragraph, the 20 hours instrument ground time may be in an FNPT I(H) or (A). There is no reason why this shouldn't include the use of an FTD and therefore the FTD should be written into this paragraph.

The next part of the IR course training is limited to FNPT or FS. There is no reason why an FTD shouldn't be used since it is a higher level device than the FNPT and therefore is obviously as suitable for this training as is the FNPT.

**Justification:**

Use of higher level devices should not be excluded from the methods of training for this qualification.

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

(a) Change to read "...ground time in an FNPT I(H) or (A) or in a FTD 2/3. These 20 hours instruction time in FNPT I(H) or (A) or in a FTD 2/3 may be substituted....."

(b) Change to read "...in a helicopter FNPT II/III, FTD 2/3 or FS"

response

Accepted

Please see the reply above to comment 1408.

comment

6114

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

Appendix 6 – Modular Training Courses for the Instrument Rating

**Page No\*:**

111 of 647

**Comment:**

IR(H) - Para Paragraph 2 makes no mention of PPL(H),CPL(H) or ATPL(H) issued in accordance with ICAO Annex 1.

Para Paragraph 6 states 150 hours of theoretical knowledge JAR-FCL states 200 hours

Para Paragraph 9 - makes no mention of PPL(H),CPL(H) or ATPL(H) issued in accordance with ICAO Annex 1.

Paragraph 9 – states ATPL(H) holder has TK instruction reduced by 50 hours. This would be better placed in paragraph 6 rather than under flying training.

	<p><b>Justification:</b> Clarification of existing requirements in Appendices 1 to JAR-FCL 2.205</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>In the new system in Part FCL, it does not make any sense to refer to 'a PPL issued in accordance with ICAO'. It has to be a PPL issued in accordance with Part-FCL, or accepted in accordance with Annex III.</p> <p>Concerning the hours of theoretical knowledge instructions, see our reply to your same comment 6098 and also see our reply to your same comment 6105 for aeroplanes.</p>
comment	<p><b>6115</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> Appendix 6 B IR(H) paragraph 10(d) <b>Page No:</b> 112 of 647 <b>Comment:</b> The phrase inside the brackets at the end of the sentence restricts the exercise to be carried out in only an FNPT II or FS. There is no reason why an FTD shouldn't be used for this exercise since it is a higher level device than an FNPT and therefore suitably qualified. <b>Justification:</b> Exclusion of higher level devices is nugatory. <b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Change to read ".....carried out in a flight simulator, <i>FTD 2/3</i> or FNPT II)"</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 1408.</p>
comment	<p><b>7158</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: CHC Europe EASA Ops Team - representing 550 pilots across Europe</span></p> <p>7 (b) up to 35 hours may be instrument ground time in a helicopter <b>FTD 2/3</b>, FNPT II/III or FS.</p> <p>8 (b) up to 40 hours may be instrument ground time in a helicopter <b>FTD 2/3</b>, FNPT II/III or FS.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> An FTD 2/3 is a suitable device for instrument training and should not be excluded.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 1408.</p>
comment	<p><b>7159</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: CHC Europe EASA Ops Team - representing 550 pilots across Europe</span></p> <p>(d) .... (the latter exercise to be carried out in a flight simulator, FNPT II <b>or FTD 2/3</b>)</p>

response	<p>Justification: The FTD 2/3 is a suitable device for instrument training and checking.</p> <p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 1408.</p>
comment	<p>7162 comment by: <i>CHC Europe EASA Ops Team - representing 550 pilots across Europe</i></p> <p>IR(H) Modular flying training course has no hours reduction for IR(A) holder. Amend to <b>The holder of an IR(A) may have the amount of training required reduced to 10 hours.</b></p> <p>Justification: IR(A) 10.2 and IR AS has reduction for IR(H) holders , so requirement should be the same.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 2349.</p>
comment	<p>7709 comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></p> <p>App 6 B para 4: The guidance how to proceed if time limit exceeded is missing. New proposed text:</p> <p>The course of theoretical instruction shall be completed within 18 months <b>or the approved training organization shall give additional training and give a certificate specifying that training.</b></p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.</p> <p>The requirements under paragraph 4, B. IR(H) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6, are exactly the same as in paragraph 4, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.205. This is also our reply to your same comment 7708 on IR(A) and comment 7710 on IR(As), Appendix 6.</p>
comment	<p>7909 comment by: <i>DHV</i></p> <p>Please change the wording FS to FFS throughtout the document. [Justification: Consistency with current JAR rules, according to JAR FSTD(H) and NPA 2008-22e CS FSTD(H).200 (b) the correct wording is <u>F</u>ull <u>f</u>light <u>s</u>imulator = FFS. &gt; e.g. in FCL.905.FI (h) (1) the phrase FFS has been used already!]</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 1098.</p>

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 6: Modular training courses for the instrument rating - C. IR(As) – Modular flying training course**

p. 112-113

comment

1270

comment by: PPL/IR Europe

Comment on Para 3

*An applicant wishing to undertake the Procedural Instrument Flight Module of a modular IR(A) course shall be required to complete all the instructional stages in one continuous approved course of training.*

We believe there is no justification for the absolute inflexibility in requiring a continuous single course of training. A candidate may be forced to interrupt and defer the completion of training for any number of benign reasons, and recommence training at a later date or different location. We do not see what purpose is served by forcing a candidate to duplicate 100% of their prior training, if the candidate is able to reach the required standard in the judgement of the training organisation and the IR Examiner without such duplication.

Our proposed wording is

*3 An applicant wishing to undertake the Procedural Instrument Flight Module of a modular IR(A) course shall be required to complete all the instructional stages in one continuous approved course of training or may receive credit for prior approved training at the discretion of the Head of Training of the training organisation at which the course is completed*

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.

The requirements under paragraph 3, C. IR(As) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6, are based on the same requirements in paragraph 3, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205.

The text here in this paragraph is the same as it is for IR(A) and IR(H).

comment

3253

comment by: Jürgen Böttcher

THEORETICAL

KNOWLEDGE

6 An approved modular IR(As) course shall comprise at least 150 hours of theoretical knowledge instruction.

Need for IR(A) for the private pilot.

The current regulations for an IR(A) are geared towards air carrier personnel driving jets. There is an acute need to provide private pilots with the opportunity to acquire an IR(A) appropriate to their needs. This would greatly increase flight safety by eliminating the current temptation to scud run or even illegally fly in IMC. Current theoretical knowledge required is often inappropriate to the private pilot flying a modern piston aircraft, e.g. knowledge of turbine powerplants, jet aircraft systems, etc. 150 hours of ground instruction are an entire month - amounting to time and costs that discourage private pilots from acquiring an IR. There should not be a minimum of hours of instruction - the knowledge test should suffice. 50 hours of flight instruction is also on the high side for a private pilot. Again, the skill test

should be the defining criteria.  
Therefore I greatly welcome the FCL.008 and hope it achieves its goal of providing an IR(A) appropriate for private pilots.

response *Noted*

Thank you for welcoming the FCL.008 working group.

It was already indicated in the Explanatory memorandum to Part-FCL, under Subpart I, number 48 (page 29), of NPA 2008-17a, a separate Rulemaking task, FCL.008, will review the existing instrument rating requirements.

The comments received on A-NPA 14-2006 and on this NPA dealing with the issue of the qualifications to fly in IMC/cloud flying will be taken into account by this working group. The task FCL.008 will result in an NPA which will be submitted to public consultation, and on which you will be able to make your comments.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913 ❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response

*Noted*

After careful consideration of the comments received on the Appendices, as well as feedback received from stakeholders, the Agency has decided to leave the majority of the Appendices content in the rule, and only pass certain elements to AMC, after an individual analysis, based on concrete comments. The Agency has explained this decision in more detail in the explanatory note of the CRD.

In the case of this particular Appendix, and until such time as competency based standards may be developed for the IR, the Agency considers that the number of training hours and the content of skill tests/proficiency checks needs to remain in the rule.

This is also our reply to your same comment 5913 on all the different appendices.

comment

7710

comment by: *CAA Finland*

App 6 C para 4:

The guidance how to proceed if time limit exceeded is missing. New proposed text:

The course of theoretical instruction shall be completed within 18 months **or the approved training organization shall give additional training and give a certificate specifying that training.**

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency follows closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205. These appendices are transformed to Appendix 6 Modular Training Courses For The Instrument Rating.

The requirements under paragraph 4, C. IR(As) – Modular flying training course, Appendix 6, are based on the requirements in paragraph 4, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205.

This is also our reply to your same comment 7708 on IR(A) and comment 7709 on IR(H), Appendix 6.

## B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 7: IR skill test

p. 114-115

comment

2019

comment by: *Swiss Pilot School Association*

Proposal:

SECTION 6 (multiengine aeroplanes only)

Flight with one engine inoperative

a Simulated engine failure after takeoff or on go-around (**at a safe altitude unless carried out in a flight simulator or FNPT II/III, FTD 2,3**)

b\* approach and procedural go-around with **simulated** one engine inoperative

c approach and landing, missed approach procedure, with **simulated** one engine inoperative

	<p>* May be performed in a Flight Simulator, FTD 2/3 or FNPT II  + May be performed in either Section 4 or Section 5  Advantage:  Increase of safety  Less stress for aircraft</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency follows in Appendix 7 IR Skill Test closely Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.210 and JAR-FCL 2.210.</p> <p>The content of the skill test in Section 6 is the same as in Section 6, Appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 1.210. There is also not the possibility to perform this test in a flight simulator.</p>
comment	<p>3592 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Swiss Power Flight Union</i></span></p> <p>SECTION 6 (multiengine aeroplanes only)  Flight with one engine inoperative</p> <p>a Simulated engine failure after takeoff or on go-around (<b>at a safe altitude unless carried out in a flight simulator or FNPT II/III, FTD 2,2</b>)</p> <p>b* approach and procedural go-around with <b>simulated</b> one engine inoperative</p> <p>c approach and landing, missed approach procedure, with <b>simulated</b> one engine inoperative</p> <p>* May be performed in a Flight Simulator, FTD 2/3 or FNPT II  + May be performed in either Section 4 or Section 5</p> <p>Advantage:  Increase of safety  Less stress for aircraft</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 2019.</p>
comment	<p>4078 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority</i></span></p> <p>The Non-technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed Non-technical testing standards lack clarity and formal definition e.g. the use of terms such as 'judgement' and 'airmanship'. In addition, application of the proposed criteria is susceptible to subjectivity, bias and abuse because of a lack of common understanding and the requirement for standardised interpretation.</p> <p>Proposal: Replace  3 The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:</p> <p>– exercise good judgement and airmanship;</p>

	with	
		<p>4. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:</p> <p>(a) .....</p> <p>(b) .....</p> <p>(c) <u>operate the aircraft safely, efficiently and apply to the required standard, Non-technical Skills (NTS) such as Teamwork, Situation Awareness and Threat and Error Management etc'</u></p>
response	<i>Not accepted</i>	<p>The Agency follows in Appendix 7 IR Skill Test closely Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.210 and JAR-FCL 2.210.</p> <p>The text of the flight test tolerance in paragraph 10 is exactly the same as in paragraph 12, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.210 and JAR-FCL 2.210. The Agency does not agree that the non-technical testing standards lack clarity and formal definition.</p> <p>The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.</p> <p>We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.</p>
comment	4838	comment by: <i>Flight Training Europe</i>
		<p><u>Page 114, Appendix 7, IR Skill Test</u></p> <p>Para 6 infers that the applicant can repeat any part of the test even when he has failed it. Change first sentence of para 6 to read:</p> <p><b>6. At the discretion of the examiner any manoeuvre or procedure of the test may be repeated once by the applicant.</b></p>
response	<i>Accepted</i>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The text will be changed back to the JAR-FCL wording as in paragraph 8, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.210 and JAR-FCL 2.210.</p>
comment	5816	comment by: <i>ENAC TLP</i>
		<p>The technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed flight test tolerances (standards) need some specifications for NTS and TEM avoiding the use of terms such as 'good judgement and airmanship' that are easily prone to subjectivity, bias and abuse during assessment because of a lack of common understanding.</p> <p>Need: more clear and unambiguous standards for the assessment of non-technical skills during skill test and proficiency checks for class/type ratings and license skill tests.</p> <p><b>Proposal: to specify differently the non technical abilities to be demonstrated during test/checks to exercise good airmanship and related Flight test tolerances</b></p>



**APPENDIX 7 IR SKILL TEST  
FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES**

**page 114**

To be modified as follows (*italics*)

10 The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

- as it is;
- as it is;
- *apply NTS and TEM as needed to exercise good airmanship;*
- as it is;
- as it is.

response *Not accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment 4078.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913 ❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response *Noted*

After careful consideration of the comments received on the Appendices, as

well as feedback received from stakeholders, the Agency has decided to leave the majority of the Appendices content in the rule, and only pass certain elements to AMC, after an individual analysis, based on concrete comments. The Agency has explained this decision in more detail in the explanatory note of the CRD.

In the case of this particular Appendix, and until such time as competency based standards may be developed for the IR, the Agency considers that the number the content of skill tests/proficiency checks needs to remain in the rule.

This is also our reply to your same comment 5913 on all the different appendices.

comment

6116

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

Paragraph 4 to Appendix 7 to FCL620 IR Skill Test

**Page No\*:**

114 of 647

**Comment:**

IRT must be conducted without external visual reference

**Justification:**

IRT must demonstrate Instrument flying skills: this cannot be done if the applicant can see external visual references

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

The test is intended to simulate a practical IFR flight in Instrument Meteorological Conditions (IMC). A suitable method of screening shall be used to prevent the applicant's use of external visual reference during the test except for take-off and landing.

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency follows in Appendix 7 IR Skill Test closely Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.210 and JAR-FCL 2.210.

The text of paragraph 4 is exactly the same as in paragraph 5, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.210 and JAR-FCL 2.210.

It was already indicated in the Explanatory memorandum to Part-FCL, under Subpart I, number 48 (page 29), of NPA 2008-17a, that the issue of qualifications for flying in Instrument Meteorological Conditions (IMC) is currently being discussed in a separate Rulemaking task, FCL.008.

The comments received on A-NPA 14-2006 and on this NPA dealing with the issue of the qualifications to fly in IMC / cloud flying will be taken into account by this working group. The task FCL.008 will result in an NPA which will be submitted to public consultation, and on which you will be able to make your comments.

comment

6411

comment by: Volker Müller

I suggest an addition to "Flight test tolerances": Communicate with ATC in professional manner.

The radio procedures of pilots often lack professionalism and it should be

response	<p>emphasised that besides operating the airplane, it is crucial to maintain professional radio procedures.</p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 4078.</p> <p>Your addition is already covered under the 5 requirements listed in paragraph 10.</p>
comment	<p>6738 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAA CZ</span></p> <p>See corresponding comment No: 6737</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply to your comment 6737 on FCL.625.H.</p>
comment	<p>7088 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> FCL Appendix 7 para 10</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 114 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The competency of "exercise good judgement and airmanship" is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Consistency across licence skill tests.</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Amend to read; "- <del>exercise good judgement and airmanship</del> apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test".</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 4078.</p>
comment	<p>7295 <span style="float: right;">comment by: Aero-Club of Switzerland</span></p> <p>SECTION 6 (multiengine aeroplanes only) Flight with one engine inoperative</p> <p>a) Simulated engine failure after takeoff or on go-around (<b>at a safe altitude unless carried out in a flight simulator or FNPT II/III, FTD 2,2</b>)</p> <p>b)* approach and procedural go-around with <b>simulated</b> one engine inoperative</p> <p>c)+ approach and landing, missed approach procedure, with <b>simulated</b> one engine inoperative</p> <p>* May be performed in a Flight Simulator, FTD 2/3 or FNPT II + May be performed in either Section 4 or Section 5</p>

	Advantages: 1) Increase of relative safety 2) Less wear and tear for the aircraft
response	<i>Not accepted</i> Please see the reply above to comment 2019.
comment	<b>7501</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>British Airways</i></span> In order to allow the introduction of modern training methodology and take into account the use of improved training devices the contents of this Appendix should be transferred to AMC and GM for the appropriate section.
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see the reply above to comment 5913.

<b>B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 7: IR skill test - A. Aeroplanes</b>
--

p. 115-117
------------

comment	<b>220</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA - The Netherlands</i></span> Appendix 7 Content of the test. C Airships. Section 4.h+ and 5.h+. Proposal: remove the line "h+ Go-around".  Explanation: The logical action for an airplane or helicopter to do a go-around action is different from the action to do by an airship. An airship can switch-off its engine to repeat the approach and landing. The wind will push the airship back and if there is no wind the engine can be rotated in the opposite direction
response	<i>Not accepted</i> The Go-around action is a general approach procedure and should stay in the content of the test for airships. Your proposed action by an airship could be a Go-around action.
comment	<b>1211</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>IAAPS</i></span> section 1 f: typing error taxing should be taxiing
response	<i>Accepted</i> Thank you for your comment. The text will be changed accordingly.
comment	<b>1305</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Vincent Lambercy</i></span> When flying IFR in a single pilot airplane, autopilot plays critical, safety relevant role. The point is not to fly all the time with or without autopilot, but I think it is important that the applicant demonstrates sufficient knowledge of

	the autopilot use and capabilities.
response	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>The Agency follows in Appendix 7 IR Skill Test closely Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.210 and JAR-FCL 2.210. The 'Contest of the test' A. Aeroplanes, is a copy of Appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 1.210 and therefore contains the same requirement.</p> <p>The Agency agrees that it is important that the applicant demonstrates sufficient knowledge of the autopilot use and capabilities. This is covered under section 3 'En-route IFR procedures'</p>
comment	<p><b>2486</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p>A) Section 6 of the tests (Aeroplane/helicopter/As) may be performed in a FS,FTD2/3,or FNPTII. Therefore all items (a,b,c,...) under section 6 should be followed by the mark "*". Reason: 1) this was foreseen in JAR-FCL (e.g. §14 of App.1 to JAR-FCL 1.210) 2) In the helicopter Section 6 it is already foreseen that this is the case under item (a).</p> <p>B) For harmonization purposes we propose to replace the mark "*" in the helicopter skill test form by the mark "+" as used in the Aeroplane and As skill test form.</p>
response	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>The Agency follows in Appendix 7 IR Skill Test closely Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.210 and JAR-FCL 2.210.</p> <p>The requirements in section 6 of Appendix 7A are the same as under section 6 of Appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 1.210.</p> <p>After carefully considering your proposal, the Agency has decided not to change the text coming from JAR-FCL at this time.</p>
comment	<p><b>5010</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ECA- European Cockpit Association</i></span></p> <p>Comment: Table Section 1 contains a spelling mistake at row f: f) Taxiing</p>
response	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 1211.</p>
comment	<p><b>5015</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ECA- European Cockpit Association</i></span></p> <p>Comment on Appendix 7, Section 5 related to FCL.620 (a): ECA recommends to add requirements for circling approaches.</p> <p>Justification: This requirement exists in other regulations. This is a very complex and risky manoeuvre. Therefore a rating cannot allow the pilot to perform such a manoeuvre when it has never been tested the competency to do so. This was a lack of JAR regulation and need to be fixed.</p>

response

*Partially accepted*

The Agency follows in Appendix 7 IR Skill Test closely Appendix 1 and 2 to JAR-FCL 1.210 and JAR-FCL 2.210.

The requirements in section 5 are exactly the same as under section 5 of Appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 1.210 and JAR-FCL 2.210.

After carefully considering your proposal, and taking into account that circling approaches can be considered as a part of the non-precise approach procedures as mentioned in section 5, the Agency has decided not to add a specific point on circling approaches to Appendix 7, but to make specific references to it in AMC material.

Therefore, the Agency will add a new AMC to Appendix 9 specifying that Section 3.b - Instrument, in Appendix 9.B.1 should include training on a circling approach, after an IFR approach.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913 ❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response

*Noted*

After careful consideration of the comments received on the Appendices, as well as feedback received from stakeholders, the Agency has decided to leave the majority of the Appendices content in the rule, and only pass certain

elements to AMC, after an individual analysis, based on concrete comments. The Agency has explained this decision in more detail in the explanatory note of the CRD.

In the case of this particular Appendix, and until such time as competency based standards may be developed for the IR, the Agency considers that the content of skill tests/proficiency checks needs to remain in the rule.

This is also our reply to your same comment 5913 on all the different appendices.

comment

6118

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

Appendix 7 A

**Page No:**

116

**Comment:**

Item 2 e is unclear and does not require reference to aeroplanes. Current text is 'Limited panel, stabilised climb or descent at Rate 1 turn onto given headings, recovery from unusual attitudes. – only applicable to aeroplanes'. Does this mean that Rate 1 turns are only tested in a stabilized climb or descent, or is this a typo? NB Same text appears in App 2 to JAR-FCL 1.210; UK interpretation has always been level turns.

**Justification:**

Typographical error?

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Amend to read: 'Limited panel: stabilised climb or descent, level turns at Rate 1 onto given headings, recovery from unusual attitudes.'

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for your comment

The text will be changed accordingly.

comment

6119

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

Appendix 7 A

**Page No:**

117

**Comment:**

Item 6b 'procedural go around' is undefined. The use of the word 'procedural' is inappropriate in this context.

**Justification:**

A 'go around' is the initial action of converting a descent or level flight into a clean climb. There is no procedural aspect to it. However, a missed approach can be procedural rather than vectored.

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Amend to read: 'approach, go around and procedural missed approach with one engine inoperative'.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for your comment  
The text will be changed accordingly.

comment 6120 comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**  
Appendix 7 A  
**Page No:**  
117  
**Comment:**  
Item 6c 'approach and landing, missed approach procedure, with one engine inoperative' is contradictory.  
**Justification:**  
A missed approach procedure is appropriate to a go around, not a landing  
**Proposed Text:  
(if applicable)**  
Delete 'missed approach procedure' and, as above, amend 6b to read: 'approach, go around and procedural missed approach with one engine inoperative'.

response *Accepted*  
Thank you for your comment  
The text will be changed accordingly.

comment 6121 comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**  
Appendix 7 A  
**Page No:**  
117  
**Comment:**  
Item 6b and 6c. It should be made clear whether 2 instrument approaches are required to satisfy these requirements or whether one of the approaches can be from a visual circuit.  
**Justification:**  
In the UK we accept one approach and one visual circuit but other Authorities require 2 approaches.  
**Proposed Text:  
(if applicable)**  
Clarification of EASA requirement.

response *Accepted*  
Please see the replies above to comment 6119 and 6120.

comment 6444 comment by: DCAA  
App. 7 A Editorials in the numbering.

response *Noted*  
The Agency has checked the numbering but does not see editorials in the numbering.



comment

6883

comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

**MOVE JAR-FCL 1.520 AND 1.525 TO APPENDIX 5 TO FCL**

Justification

Appendix I JAR FCL 1.520 & 1.525 was moved to GM to Appendix 5 is now downgraded. This is not acceptable.

response

*Noted*

Please see reply to your comment on the same issue in Appendix 5.

comment

7711

comment by: *CAA Finland*

Skill test form:

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.a		
1.b		
1.c		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.a		
2.b		
2.c		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.a		
3.b		
3.c		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

response *Noted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial / formatting changes to the skill test/proficiency check tables included in the Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL (e.g. Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

To leave the content/format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms.

In the meantime, to develop report forms as AMC material to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the applicable AMCs e.g. AMCs to Appendices 7, 9 and 12, as published in this NPA.

To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913 ❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response

*Noted*

After careful consideration of the comments received on the Appendices, as well as feedback received from stakeholders, the Agency has decided to leave the majority of the Appendices content in the rule, and only pass certain elements to AMC, after an individual analysis, based on concrete comments. The Agency has explained this decision in more detail in the explanatory note of the CRD.

In the case of this particular Appendix, and until such time as competency based standards may be developed for the IR, the Agency considers that the content of skill tests/proficiency checks needs to remain in the rule.

This is also our reply to your same comment 5913 on all the different appendices.

comment

7714

comment by: *CAA Finland*

Skill test form:

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.a		
1.b		
1.c		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.a		
2.b		
2.c		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.a		
3.b		
3.c		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

response *Noted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the skill test/proficiency check tables included in the Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL (e.g. Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

To leave the content / format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms.

In the meantime, to develop report forms as AMC material to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the applicable AMCs e.g. AMCs to Appendices 7, 9 and 12, as published in this NPA.

To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

## B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 7: IR skill test - C. Airships

p. 119-120

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913 ❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

### **Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation,

- may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response

**Noted**

After careful consideration of the comments received on the Appendices, as well as feedback received from stakeholders, the Agency has decided to leave the majority of the Appendices content in the rule, and only pass certain elements to AMC, after an individual analysis, based on concrete comments. The Agency has explained this decision in more detail in the explanatory note of the CRD.

In the case of this particular Appendix, and until such time as competency based standards may be developed for the IR, the Agency considers that the content of skill tests/proficiency checks needs to remain in the rule.

This is also our reply to your same comment 5913 on all the different appendices.

comment

7715

comment by: CAA Finland

Skill test form:

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.a		
1.b		
1.c		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK

2.a		
2.b		
2.c		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.a		
3.b		
3.c		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

response **Noted**

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the skill test/proficiency check tables included in the Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL (e.g. Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

To leave the content/format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms.

In the meantime, to develop report forms as AMC material to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the applicable AMCs e.g. AMCs to Appendices 7, 9 and 12, as published in this NPA.

To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is

already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 8: Cross-crediting of the IR part of a type or class rating proficiency check**

p. 121

comment

5464

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

From a logic point of view it seems to be very questionable that according to Part A of Appendix 8 the IR-part of a type rating proficiency check for one CS-25- MPA—type revalidation is not credited towards another revalidation of a CS-25- MPA—type, whereas it will be credited towards IR-privileges on CS-23 turbine or turbo-prop driven types, that might be required to be operated with a co-pilot under ops-requirements.

We do not support the idea of cross crediting from SP SE class rating towards SE type rating without further restrictions because the IR part of a prof. check might have been conducted on a C172 would allow for granting IR credit towards HPA types like TBM 700, TBM 850 or PC. Due to the difference in performance this kind of crediting is considered as unsafe and thus to be counterproductive to EASA's approach on safety enhancement. For the same reason, cross crediting from SP SE type rating towards other SP SE type ratings without further differentiation at least appears to be questionable.

It is requested to delete Part B because it is in contradiction to FCL.625.H (a) (1), in contradiction to Appendix 6, Part B, No 2 and in contradiction to Appendix 9 (see bottom of NPA 2008-17b, page 135, and the relevant part of the table referring to section 5 on pages 138 and 139). Due to safety considerations, FCL.625.H (a) (1), Appendix 6 and Appendix 9 consider all IR privileges to be specific to a helicopter type for which the licence holder is qualified, rated and proficient, whereas according to Appendix 8 EASA apparently intends to grant IR privileges regardless of the helicopter type. This intention is not supported.

But if it is nevertheless still intended to let Part B of Appendix 8 become applicable, it should be applied to holders of IR privileges of multi pilot helicopter types as well, because a generic "multi-pilot-helicopter type" is basically a single-pilot, multi-engine helicopter type, which might be required to be operated with a co-pilot. To exercise IR(H) privileges on a multi-engine helicopter type in a single pilot role is almost more demanding and of a higher pilot workload than on the same type in a multi-pilot role, supported by a second qualified pilot.

response

*Noted*

The Agency follows in Appendix 8 Cross-crediting of the IR part of a type or class rating proficiency check closely Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.246. The credits for A. Aeroplanes are the same as under de JAA system. For B.



Helicopters this is new and modelled after de Aeroplanes section

After carefully considering your proposal, the Agency has decided not to change the text from JAR-FCL at this time.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913 ❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response

***Noted***

After careful consideration of the comments received on the Appendices, as well as feedback received from stakeholders, the Agency has decided to leave the majority of the Appendices content in the rule, and only pass certain elements to AMC, after an individual analysis, based on concrete comments. The Agency has explained this decision in more detail in the explanatory note of the CRD.

This particular Appendix establishes credits that are applicable to requirements contained in the rule. It needs to remain an Appendix, since an AMC cannot establish deviations from a rule.

This is also our reply to your same comment 5913 on all the different

appendices.

comment	7502	comment by: <i>British Airways</i>
	In order to allow the introduction of modern training methodology and take into account the use of improved training devices the contents of this Appendix should be transferred to AMC and GM for the appropriate section.	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	Please see the reply above to comment 5913.	

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 8: Cross-crediting of the IR part of a type or class rating proficiency check - A. Aeroplanes**

p. 121

comment	3487	comment by: <i>FOCA Switzerland</i>
	Appendix 8; B. Helicopters	
	Add star " * " in table "credit is valid towards.." in lines 2, 5 and 6	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	
	Text has been amended accordingly.	
comment	3887	comment by: <i>Luftfahrt-Bundesamt</i>
	Appendix 8 - Part A: From a logic point of view it seems to be very questionable that according to Part A of Appendix 8 the IR-part of a type rating proficiency check for one CS-25- MPA—type revalidation is not credited towards another revalidation of a CS-25- MPA—type, whereas it will be credited towards IR-privileges on CS-23 turbine or turbo-prop driven types, that might be required to be operated with a co-pilot under ops-requirements.	
	We do not support the idea of cross crediting from SP SE class rating towards SE type rating without further restrictions because the IR part of a prof. check might have been conducted on a C172 would allows for granting IR credit towards HPA types like TBM 700, TBM 850 or PC. Due to the difference in performance this kind of crediting is considered as unsafe and thus to be counterproductive to EASA's approach on safety enhancement. For the same reason, cross crediting from SP SE type rating towards other SP SE type ratings without further differentiation at least appears to be questionable.	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	The Agency follows in Appendix 8 Cross-crediting of the IR part of a type or class rating proficiency check closely Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.246. The credits for A. Aeroplanes are the same as under de JAA system. The Agency sees no reason to change these requirements at this time.	
comment	3984	comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i>
	Appendix 8	

	Remove the right column from the table which is empty, and "(1)" and "(2)" from the 2 <sup>nd</sup> row which does not mean anything
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The lay-out will be changed accordingly for A. Aeroplanes and B. Helicopters.</p>
comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913 ❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b><u>Comment:</u></b> Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry. Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.</p> <p>Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9</li> <li>• changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.</li> <li>• As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Proposal:</u></b></p> <p>Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.</p> <p>The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>After careful consideration of the comments received on the Appendices, as well as feedback received from stakeholders, the Agency has decided to leave the majority of the Appendices content in the rule, and only pass certain elements to AMC, after an individual analysis, based on concrete comments. The Agency has explained this decision in more detail in the explanatory note of the CRD.</p> <p>This particular Appendix establishes credits that are applicable to requirements</p>

contained in the rule. It needs to remain an Appendix, since an AMC cannot establish deviations from a rule.

This is also our reply to your same comment 5913 on all the different appendices.

comment

7720

comment by: CAA Finland

App 8 A:

There is no need to limit cross-crediting only for revalidation but also renewing. A pilot may have several class and type ratings just 1 month ago expired, but a lot of experience during last 12 months. Amended text proposal:

Credits shall be granted only when the holder is revalidating **or renewing** IR privileges for single-engine and singlepilot multi-engine aeroplanes, as appropriate.

\* Provided within the preceding 12 months **counted from the date of this proficiency check** the applicant has flown at least 3 IFR departures and approaches on an SP class or type of aeroplane in single pilot operations, or, for multiengine aeroplanes, the applicant has passed Section 6 of the skill test for singlepilot aeroplanes flown solely by reference to instruments in singlepilot operation.

response

Noted

Please see the reply above to comment 3887.

Under the JAA system the credit shall be granted only when the holder is revalidating IR and not when the holder is renewing IR. This cross-crediting will stay the same.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 8: Cross-crediting of the IR part of a type or class rating proficiency check - B. Helicopters**

p. 122

comment

373

comment by: REGA

**STATEMENT**

The limitation of crediting towards the IR part of the proficiency check is insufficient.

**PROPOSAL**

Crediting shall be an option for the IFR and the VFR part of proficiency checks.

response

Noted

The Agency follows in Appendix 8 Cross-crediting of the IR part of a type or class rating proficiency check closely Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.246. The credits for A. Aeroplanes are the same as under de JAA system. For B. Helicopters this is new and modelled after de Aeroplanes section. There is no crediting in both categories for the VFR part.

comment

1385

comment by: Bristow Helicopters

Column 2 row 1 b. (SP ME type rating) should also have an asterix to indicate

	<p>at least 3 IFR departures and approaches have been performed within the preceeding 12 months on a SP type in an SP operation. Same applies to Column 2 row 3 where a. and b. should have an asterix because they both apply to single pilot IR. Justification: Consistency of the rule. MP IR or SP ME restricted to MP IR should only be credited against the SP IR (SE or ME) if the pilot is recent in SP IR departures and approaches.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The text will be changed accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>1627 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Helikopter Air Transport GmbH / Christophorus Flugrettungsverein</i></span></p> <p><b>STATEMENT</b> The limitation of crediting towards the IR part of the proficiency check is insufficient.</p> <p><b>PROPOSAL</b> Crediting shall be an option for the IFR <u>and the VFR</u> part of proficiency checks.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 373.</p>
comment	<p>2137 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>British International Helicopters</i></span></p> <p>Column 2 row 1 b. (SP ME type rating) should also have an asterix to indicate at least 3 IFR departures and approaches have been performed within the preceeding 12 months on a SP type in an SP operation. Same applies to Column 2 row 3 where a. and b. should have an asterix because they both apply to single pilot IR. Justification: Consistency of the rule. MP IR or SP ME restricted to MP IR should only be credited against the SP IR (SE or ME) if the pilot is recent in SP IR departures and approaches.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 1385.</p>
comment	<p>2350 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>AECA(SPAIN)</i></span></p> <p>Column 2 row 1 b. (SP ME type rating) should also have an asterix to indicate at least 3 IFR departures and approaches have been performed within the preceding 12 months on a SP type in an SP operation. Same applies to Column 2 row 3 where a. and b. should have an asterix because they both apply to single pilot IR. Justification: Consistency of the rule. MP IR or SP ME restricted to MP IR should only be credited against the SP IR (SE or ME) if the pilot is recent in SP IR departures and approaches.</p>

response

*Accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1385.

comment

3288

comment by: *DGAC FRANCE*

Part FCL

Appendix 8

B. Helicopters.

Consistency, IR in single pilot operations is more demanding than IR in multi pilot operations even with a multi engine helicopter.

The third line is not applicable for helicopter category.

To add (\*) in the column 2 of the Table like :

	a. SE type rating*, and <b>b. SP ME type rating*</b>
	a. SE type rating b. SP ME type rating
<del>SP ME type rating, restricted to multi-pilot operation</del>	<del>a. SE type rating, and b. SP ME type rating</del>

response

*Accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1385.

comment

3693

comment by: *Susana Nogueira*

Insert \* in column 2/rows 2, 5 and 6.

response

*Accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1385.

comment

3888

comment by: *Luftfahrt-Bundesamt*

Appendix 8 Part B

It is requested to delete Part B because it is in contradiction to FCL.625.H (a) (1), in contradiction to Appendix 6, Part B, No 2 and in contradiction to Appendix 9 (see bottom of NPA 2008-17b, page 135, and the relevant part of the table referring to section 5 on pages 138 and 139). Due to safety considerations, FCL.625.H (a) (1), Appendix 6 and Appendix 9 consider all IR privileges to be specific to a helicopter type for which the licence holder is qualified, rated and proficient, whereas according to Appendix 8 EASA apparently intends to grant IR privileges regardless of the helicopter type. This intention is not supported.

But if it is nevertheless still intended to let Part B of Appendix 8 become applicable, it should be applied to holders of IR privileges of multi pilot helicopter types as well, because a generic "multi-pilot-helicopter type" is basically a single-pilot, multi-engine helicopter type, which might be required to be operated with a co-pilot. To exercise IR(H) privileges on a multi-engine helicopter type in a single pilot role is almost more demanding and of a higher pilot workload than on the same type in a multi-pilot role, supported by a second qualified pilot.

response *Noted*

The Agency follows in Appendix 8 Cross-crediting of the IR part of a type or class rating proficiency check closely Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.246. The credits for A. Aeroplanes are the same as under de JAA system. For B. Helicopters this is new and modelled after de Aeroplanes section.

The proposal was discussed in the Review group and there it has been decided to keep the text as it is.

comment 4429

comment by: *Bond Offshore Helicopters*

Column 2 row 1 b. (SP ME type rating) should also have an asterix to indicate at least 3 IFR departures and approaches have been performed within the preceding 12 months on a SP type in an SP operation.

Same applies to Column 2 row 3 where a. and b. should have an asterix because they both apply to single pilot IR.

Justification:

Consistency of the rule. MP IR or SP ME restricted to MP IR should only be credited against the SP IR (SE or ME) if the pilot is recent in SP IR departures and approaches.

response *Accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1385.

comment 4671

comment by: *Héli-Union*

Column 2 row 1 b. (SP ME type rating) should also have an asterix to indicate at least 3 IFR departures and approaches have been performed within the preceding 12 months on a SP type in an SP operation.

Same applies to Column 2 row 3 where a. and b. should have an asterix because they both apply to single pilot IR.

Justification:

Consistency of the rule. MP IR or SP ME restricted to MP IR should only be credited against the SP IR (SE or ME) if the pilot is recent in SP IR departures and approaches.

response *Accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1385.

comment 4890

comment by: *HUTC*

Column 2 row 1 b. (SP ME type rating) should also have an asterix to indicate at least 3 IFR departures and approaches have been performed within the

preceding 12 months on a SP type in an SP operation.  
Same applies to Column 2 row 3 where a. and b. should have an asterisk because they both apply to single pilot IR.

Justification:

Consistency of the rule. MP IR or SP ME restricted to MP IR should only be credited against the SP IR (SE or ME) if the pilot is recent in SP IR departures and approaches.

response *Accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1385.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913 ❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response *Noted*

After careful consideration of the comments received on the Appendices, as well as feedback received from stakeholders, the Agency has decided to leave the majority of the Appendices content in the rule, and only pass certain elements to AMC, after an individual analysis, based on concrete comments. The Agency has explained this decision in more detail in the explanatory note of the CRD.



This particular Appendix establishes credits that are applicable to requirements contained in the rule. It needs to remain an Appendix, since an AMC cannot establish deviations from a rule.

This is also our reply to your same comment 5913 on all the different appendices.

comment 6953 comment by: CAA CZ

The table with credits should be completed with the stars relating to required experience on single pilot helicopter operations:

In the line MPH type rating letter b. SP ME type rating \*

In the line SP-ME type rating, restricted to multipilot operation  
letter a. SE type rating \*

letter b. SP ME type rating \*

response *Accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1385.

comment 7723 comment by: CAA Finland

App 8 B:

Line MPH column (2): SP ME type rating: star is missing

Line SP ME, MP-OPS column (2): SP ME type rating: star is missing

response *Accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1385.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 9: Skill test and proficiency check for ATPL, Type and class ratings and proficiency check for instrument ratings**

p. 123

comment 1128 comment by: CAA Belgium

General remark for all skill test/prof check report forms. We propose to amend all forms in order to allow the examiner

1) to sign "pass-fail" for each item/sector of the test

2) to allow at the end a final conclusion for the test/check.

response *Noted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the skill test/proficiency check tables included in the Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL (e.g. Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

To leave the content/format of the tables unchanged from what was

included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms.

In the meantime, to develop report forms as AMC material to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the applicable AMCs e.g. AMCs to Appendices 7, 9 and 12, as published in this NPA.

To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

comment

1417

comment by: *Bristow Helicopters*

This Appendix would be better as an AMC.

Justification:

The training and testing/checking schedules have been amended on several occasions under JAR to accommodate changes in aircraft technology, training device technology and training/testing/checking philosophy. Such changes will be difficult in future under the full Community law process and could be better accommodated through the AMC and alternative AMC process whilst still maintaining control of standards throughout the Community.

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the multiple comments asking for the content of this Appendix to be transferred into AMC.

However, and until such time as competency based standards for assessing pilot competencies are developed, the Agency considers that it is essential that the flight training and skill test contents for professional licences remains in the rule.

Therefore, the text of Appendix 9 will not be transferred to AMC.

comment

2426

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The forms will be replicated in member states. As tests allow for the retesting of items it will be beneficial to applicants and organisations alike to provide an extra column to reflect "attempt 1" or "attempt 2" In this way, a partial retest can more easily be completed by a subsequent examiner

response

*Noted*

Please see reply to comment 1128 above.

comment **2604** comment by: *CAA Belgium*

P 123 and following  
Appendix 9  
All headings of the skill test/prof check forms are different from those in JAR-FCL and are incomplete.

response *Accepted*

Editorial accepted.  
The Agency will conduct an editorial review of this Appendix, and text will be amended accordingly.

comment **3212** comment by: *Susana Nogueira*

All headings of the skill test form are different from JAR-FCL and are incomplete.

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 2604 above.

comment **3287** comment by: *DGAC FRANCE*

Part FCL Appendix 9  
Consistency and clarification.  
Add **MPL** in the title  
B. Specific requirements for aeroplane category  
3 .....Section 6 is not part of the ATPL or MPL skill test. **To extend the type rating privileges to CATII or CAT III, the applicant shall pass the section 6 on the appropriate type of aircraft.**

response *Accepted*

Text will be amended accordingly.

comment **3476** comment by: *Susana Nogueira*

Modify the headline to read:  
Skill test and proficiency check por ATPL, **MPL**, Type and Class rating...

response *Accepted*

See reply to comment 3287 above.

comment **3694** comment by: *Susana Nogueira*

Skill test form for single-pilot helicopters is not included.

response *Noted*

The two skill tests in Appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 2.240 and 2.295 and Appendix 3

to JAR-FCL 2.240 have been merged.

The reason why these two skill tests have been merged is because their content is exactly the same excepted item 4.6 of section 4 (incapacitation of crew member).

comment 4430 comment by: *Bond Offshore Helicopters*

This Appendix would be better as an AMC.

Justification:

The training and testing/checking schedules have been amended on several occasions under JAR to accommodate changes in aircraft technology, training device technology and training/testing/checking philosophy. Such changes will be difficult in future under the full Community law process and could be better accommodated through the AMC and alternative AMC process whilst still maintaining control of standards throughout the Community.

response *Not accepted*

Please see reply to comment 1417 above.

comment 4672 comment by: *Héli-Union*

This Appendix would be better as an AMC.

Justification:

The training and testing/checking schedules have been amended on several occasions under JAR to accommodate changes in aircraft technology, training device technology and training/testing/checking philosophy. Such changes will be difficult in future under the full Community law process and could be better accommodated through the AMC and alternative AMC process whilst still maintaining control of standards throughout the Community.

response *Not accepted*

Please see reply to comment 1417 above.

comment 4752 comment by: *CAA Belgium*

In general, proof reading is needed. Some examples:

- SPA skill test form misses headings "FS/A" etc
- - MPA skill test, 3 last simulator qualifications missing, also headings & sections 4, 5 & 6
- AS & Powered Lift skill test also lacks 3 last sim qualifications

response *Accepted*

Editorial accepted.

The Agency will conduct an editorial review of this Appendix, and titles will be amended accordingly.

comment 4785 comment by: *CAA Belgium*

Titel: MPL is missing

response *Accepted*

See reply to comment 3287 above.

comment **4786** comment by: *CAA Belgium*

Exam forms need to be in conformity with the ones of JAR-FCL

response *Noted*

The Agency will conduct an editorial review of this Appendix to ensure consistency with JAR-FCL

comment **4891** comment by: *HUTC*

This Appendix would be better as an AMC.

Justification:

The training and testing/checking schedules have been amended on several occasions under JAR to accommodate changes in aircraft technology, training device technology and training/testing/checking philosophy. Such changes will be difficult in future under the full Community law process and could be better accommodated through the AMC and alternative AMC process whilst still maintaining control of standards throughout the Community.

response *Not accepted*

Please see reply to comment 1417 above.

comment **5366** comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

Comment on Appendix 9, points 14-18, change title as follows:

SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SKILL TEST FOR MULTIPILOT AIRCRAFT TYPE RATINGS, MPL AND FOR ATPL

Justification:

This should apply also to MPL

response *Accepted*

See reply to comment 3287 above.

comment **5465** comment by: *CAA Belgium*

The headline of the Appendix (as well as the small headline between items 13 and 14 of Part A) should contain a reference to the MPL because FCL.415.A (b) refers to this Appendix.

response *Accepted*

See reply to comment 3287 above.

comment **5608** comment by: *CAE*

Appendix 9

Currently there is much confusion in Europe on multi-pilot training in a single-pilot aircraft. The majority of VLJ's entering the market in Europe will be with AOC operators who desire to operate the type with a crew. These operators will

employ two pilots to fly their VLJ's, and in the interest in training as you fly it would be beneficial to have a sanctioned way to conduct multi-pilot training/checking in a single-pilot aircraft.

Suggestion:

Under Appendix 9 change all reference to "single-pilot aeroplane" to "single-pilot operation" and "multi-pilot aeroplane" to "multi-pilot operation" when referencing the skill test/proficiency check.

Reference comment 4296 and 5526

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency understands the purpose of your comment, and agrees that some changes are needed to take into account the specificities related to VLJs. However, after careful review of the comments received, and input from experts, the Agency has decided on a different solution than that you propose.

For more details, please see the explanatory note to the CRD as well as the amended text of Appendix 9.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913 ❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for

	consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.
response	<i>Not accepted</i> Please see reply to comment 1417 above.
comment	6592 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Austro Control GmbH</i></span> General remark:  The proposed skill test form is inappropriate for high performance single pilot aeroplanes.
response	<i>Noted</i> The Agency takes note of your comment.  Even though some improvement may be needed in the requirements applicable to HPA, the Agency considers that this issue needs to be considered in a dedicated rulemaking task before any changes are made.  Please note also that the Agency has suggested some changes to try to address some specific needs related to the introduction of VLJ.  For more details, please see the explanatory note to the CRD as well as the amended text of Appendix 9.
comment	6955 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA CZ</i></span> It should be stated that this Appendix is also applicable for skill test for MPL (see FCL.415.A(b)).
response	<i>Accepted</i> See reply to comment 3287 above.
comment	7069 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Norway</i></span> Appendix 9 In general, proof reading is needed. Some examples: - SPA skill test form misses headings "FS/A" etc - MPA skill test, 3 last simulator qualifications missing, also headings & sections 4, 5 & 6 - AS & Powered Lift skill test also lacks 3 last sim qualifications
response	<i>Accepted</i> Please see reply to comment 5752 above.
comment	7503 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>British Airways</i></span> In order to allow the introduction of modern training methodology and take into account the use of improved training devices the contents of this Appendix should be transferred to AMC and GM for the appropriate section.
response	<i>Not accepted</i>

Please see reply to comment 1417 above.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 9: Skill test and proficiency check for ATPL, Type and class ratings and proficiency check for instrument ratings - A. General**

p. 123-124

comment

703

comment by: FOCA Switzerland

Appendix 9 Skill Test and Proficiency Check

Clarification:

Since the check scenarios are not a task to develop by the authority, clarification is needed.

Proposal:

**# 6:**

**Change into: ".. developed by the operator and approved by the competent authority."**

**# 9:**

**Text should be written as in paragraph27 of AMC 2 to 1015.**

**# 10:**

**delete the words: "as if there is no other crew member"**

response

*Partially accepted*

#6

Not accepted

The Agency considers that the text should remain unchanged. The Examiner proposes a scenario before the examination (Met conditions, traffic, A to B diverting to C...). The Authority is responsible for these scenarios. This should be included in the arrangements for the standardisation of examiners.

#9

Accepted.

Text will be amended accordingly.

#10

Partially accepted.

Text will be amended to include at the end of the sentence *'if taking the test/check under single-pilot conditions.'*

comment

1080

comment by: Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department  
(Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)

**Comment:**

**Item 10 and 15**

Our experience is that this text confuses applicants and flight examiners. Therefore, the text should be clearer and not repeated.

**Proposal:**

**Item 10** An applicant shall be required to fly the aircraft from a position where all items can be executed and for single pilot aeroplane, carry out the test as if



	<p>there is no other crew member. Responsibility for the flight shall be allocated in accordance with national regulations</p> <p><b>Item 15.</b> Delete the last sentence in item 15. "The applicant may choose either the left hand or the right hand seat for the skill test if all items can be executed from the selected seat."</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Item 10 Noted. Please see reply to comment 703 above.</p> <p>Item 15 : Not accepted. This text is coming from JAR-FCL, and the Agency considers that it should be kept.</p>
comment	<p>1081      comment by: <i>Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)</i></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> There is a need to clarify what we mean with "a qualified pilot" during the skill test.</p> <p>Must this pilot have a valid type-rating?</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> 14 The skill test for a multi-pilot aircraft shall be performed in a multi-crew environment. Another applicant or another qualified type-rated pilot may function as second pilot. If an aircraft is used, the second pilot shall be the instructor.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text will be amended accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>1083      comment by: <i>Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)</i></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The text in Item 14 and Item 17 should be the same and there is a need for clarification regarding what "a simulated commercial air transport environment" is. Today, it is interpreted differently in the European authorities.</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> 17 The test/check should be accomplished under IFR, if the IR-rating is included, and be accomplished in a multi crew environment. An essential element to be checked is the ability to plan and conduct the flight from routine briefing material.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>This text is coming from JAR-FCL, and the Agency considers that it should be kept.</p>
comment	<p>1287      comment by: <i>Ryanair</i></p> <p>Paragraph 9 contains a very important change to existing regulation. As</p>

written, the TRE does not have any discretion over whether to allow a repeat of a manoeuvre or procedure. It can be interpreted from the proposed text that a repeat is the right of an applicant and not at the discretion of the TRE.

This undermines the TRE's authority and lays the ground for disputes between the applicant and the TRE.

Proposal: -

(9) At the discretion of the TRE, any manoeuvre or procedure of the test may be repeated once by the applicant.

Although this proposed text exists in AMC 2 to FCL.1015 it is not in the Rule. This needs to be clarified.

response

*Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 703 above.

comment

1413

comment by: *Bristow Helicopters*

10. .... performed and to carry out the test as if there is no other crew member **if taking the test/check under single-pilot conditions.** Responsibility for the flight.....

Justification:

Clarity of meaning. Acting as if there is no other crew member is only applicable to the single-pilot test/check. Multi-pilot conditions are stated in paragraphs 14, 15 and 16, but the statement in paragraph 10 is a general statement and conflicts with 14, 15 and 16.

response

*Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 703 above.

comment

1415

comment by: *Bristow Helicopters*

CONDUCT of the TEST/**CHECK**

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SKILL TEST/**PROFICIENCY CHECK** FOR MULTI-PILOT AIRCRAFT TYPE RATINGS AND FOR THE ATPL

Justification:

This entire section applies to the recurrent proficiency check as well as the initial skill test, and the section headings above should reflect this. For consistency, wherever skill test is mentioned, it should be replaced with **skill test/proficiency check**

response

*Accepted*

Text will be amended accordingly.

comment

1416

comment by: *Bristow Helicopters*

There is no longer a recommendation or requirement in the NPA to use FS or other FSTD during skill tests or proficiency checks. Both JAR-FCL 1 and JAR FCL 2 strongly recommended the use of FSTD's for testing/checking. In fact, it

	<p>is a mandatory requirement since the statement used in Appendix 1 to 2.240 &amp; 2.295 is "Flight simulators, if available and other training devices as approved shall be used." With modern complex aircraft, testing and checking in the aircraft rather than FSTD leads to a reduction in standards and increased safety risk, since many malfunctions and manoeuvres cannot be safely or effectively performed.</p> <p>Unless there is a similar strong recommendation for the use of FSTD elsewhere in the other EASA NPA's, I suggest that it should be included here with a similar statement to that contained in JAR-FCL. There must still be an option to use the aircraft where suitable FSTD's are not available, which is a particular problem in the helicopter industry.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text will be amended, and wording from JAR-FCL introduced in paragraph 6.</p>
comment	<p><b>1549</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>IAN</i></span></p> <p>No costs are given and which should be limited in order to reduce the excessive charges levied by some examiners or training organisations</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>It should be noted that the Agency is only responsible for regulating safety aspects.</p>
comment	<p><b>2020</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Swiss Pilot School Association</i></span></p> <p>APPENDIX 9 B. Specific requirements for the aeroplane category</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>5.5 Engine shutdown and restart (ME skill test only) (at a safe altitude unless carried out in FS or FNPT II)</p> <p>Advantage:</p> <p>Increase of safety</p> <p>Less stress for aircraft</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Text will be amended to include 'at a safe altitude if performed in the aircraft'</p>
comment	<p><b>2138</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>British International Helicopters</i></span></p> <p>CONDUCT of the TEST/<b>CHECK</b></p> <p>SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SKILL TEST/<b>PROFICIENCY CHECK</b> FOR MULTI-PILOT AIRCRAFT TYPE RATINGS AND FOR THE ATPL</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>This entire section applies to the recurrent proficiency check as well as the initial skill test, and the section headings above should reflect this. For consistency, wherever skill test is mentioned, it should be replaced with <b>skill test/proficiency check</b></p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p>

Please see reply to comment 1415 above.

comment 2139 comment by: *British International Helicopters*

There is no longer a recommendation or requirement in the NPA to use FS or other FSTD during skill tests or proficiency checks. Both JAR-FCL 1 and JAR FCL 2 strongly recommended the use of FSTD's for testing/checking. In fact, it is a mandatory requirement since the statement used in Appendix 1 to 2.240 & 2.295 is "Flight simulators, if available and other training devices as approved shall be used." With modern complex aircraft, testing and checking in the aircraft rather than FSTD leads to a reduction in standards and increased safety risk, since many malfunctions and manoeuvres cannot be safely or effectively performed.

Unless there is a similar strong recommendation for the use of FSTD elsewhere in the other EASA NPA's, it is suggested that it should be included here with a similar statement to that contained in JAR-FCL. The option to use the aircraft where suitable FSTD's are not available, which is a particular problem in the helicopter industry, must be maintained.

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 1416 above.

comment 2351 comment by: *AECA(SPAIN)*

10. .... performed and to carry out the test as if there is no other crew member **if taking the test/check under single-pilot conditions.** Responsibility for the flight.....

Justification:

Clarity of meaning. Acting as if there is no other crew member is only applicable to the single-pilot test/check. Multi-pilot conditions are stated in paragraphs 14, 15 and 16, but the statement in paragraph 10 is a general statement and conflicts with 14, 15 and 16.

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 703 above.

comment 2352 comment by: *AECA(SPAIN)*

CONDUCT of the TEST/**CHECK**

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SKILL TEST/**PROFICIENCY CHECK** FOR MULTI-PILOT AIRCRAFT TYPE RATINGS AND FOR THE ATPL

Justification:

This entire section applies to the recurrent proficiency check as well as the initial skill test, and the section headings above should reflect this. For consistency, wherever skill test is mentioned, it should be replaced with **skill test/proficiency check**

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 1415 above.

comment	2353	comment by: <i>AECA(SPAIN)</i>
	There is no longer a recommendation or requirement in the NPA to use FS or other FSTD during skill tests or proficiency checks. Both JAR-FCL 1 and JAR FCL 2 strongly recommended the use of FSTD's for testing/checking. In fact, it is a mandatory requirement since the statement used in Appendix 1 to 2.240 & 2.295 is "Flight simulators, if available and other training devices as approved shall be used." With modern complex aircraft, testing and checking in the aircraft rather than FSTD leads to a reduction in standards and increased safety risk, since many malfunctions and manoeuvres cannot be safely or effectively performed.	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	
	Please see reply to comment 1416 above.	
comment	2354	comment by: <i>AECA(SPAIN)</i>
	18 - the skill test may be conducted in a flight simulator <del>only</del> and may...	
	Justification:	
	Confusing statement, 'only' and 'may' in same statement	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	
	Text will be amended accordingly.	
comment	3286	comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i>
	Part FCL Appendix 9 A. GENERAL	
	Paragraph 10	
	This paragraph is not appropriate for Multi Pilot aircraft skill tests and proficiency checks.	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	Please see reply to comment 703 above.	
comment	3478	comment by: <i>Susana Nogueira</i>
	Paragraph 9	
	Text should be written as in paragraph 27 of AMC 2 to 1015.	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	
	Text will be amended accordingly.	
comment	3479	comment by: <i>Susana Nogueira</i>
	Delete words 'as if there is no other crew member'.	
response	<i>Noted</i>	

Please see reply to comment 703 above.

comment 3488 comment by: *FOCA Switzerland*

Appendix 9  
General

- Titel: MPL is missing
- Exam forms need to be in conformity with the ones in JAR-FCL

response *Accepted*

MPL will be included in the title.

The Agency will conduct an editorial review of this Appendix to ensure consistency with JAR-FCL.

comment 3593 comment by: *Swiss Power Flight Union*

APPENDIX 9

B. Specific requirements for the aeroplane category

Proposal:

5.5 Engine shutdown and restart (ME skill test only) (at a safe altitude unless carried out in FS or FNPT II)

Advantage:

Increase of safety  
Less stress for aircraft

response *Partially accepted*

Please see reply to comment 2020 above.

comment 3695 comment by: *Susana Nogueira*

Paragraph 16:

At the end of paragraph add:

**'In case that the matters indicates are not checked by the examiner, a co-pilot limitation shall be included in the licence. To remove this limitation the applicant shall be checked of this matters by an examiner'.**

Justification: This is the only one opportunity to issue this co-pilot limitation described in other parts of this rule (e.gr. page 630: Application and report form). If this proposal is not accepted, delete the reference to co-pilot functions in other rules.

response *Not accepted*

Paragraph 16 is a copy of JAR-FCL1. This text should remain unchanged.

comment 3889 comment by: *Luftfahrt-Bundesamt*

	Appendix 9, Part A:  The headline of the Appendix (as well as the small headline between items 13 and 14 of Part A) should contain a reference to the MPL because FCL.415.A (b) refers to this Appendix.
response	<i>Accepted</i>  Text will be changed accordingly.

comment	4000 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Airbus</i></span>  <b><u>Page 123 Appendix 9, A - GENERAL, Sub§4</u></b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Comment:</b> adjust the text so that the link with the Operational Suitability Certificate is clearer. Today credit can only be granted when recommended by the JOEB, so tomorrow this will be defined in the OSC. The words "When relevant" are not explicit enough.</li> <li>• <b>Proposal:</b> Amend sub§4 to read: The syllabus of flight instruction shall comply with the syllabus <u>defined in the Operational Suitability Certificate established in accordance with Part 21. The syllabus may be reduced to give credit for previous experience on similar type, as defined in the Operational Suitability Certificate established in accordance with Part 21.</u></li> </ul>
response	<i>Accepted</i>  Text will be amended accordingly.

comment	4001 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Airbus</i></span>  <b><u>Page 123 Appendix 9, A - GENERAL, Sub§5</u></b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Comment:</b> adjust the text so that the link with the Operational Suitability Certificate is clearer. In fact the skill test is separate from the syllabus; so text should be amended. Need not include the term variants, as no skill test is required between variants, only between different type ratings.</li> <li>• <b>Proposal:</b> Amend sub§5 to read: <u>Except in the case off skill tests for the issue of an ATPL, when defined in the Operational Suitability Certificate established in accordance with Part 21, credit may be given for skill test items common to other types where the pilot is qualified.</u></li> </ul>
response	<i>Accepted</i>  Text will be amended accordingly.

comment	4003 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Airbus</i></span>  <b><u>Page 123 Appendix 9, A - GENERAL, Sub§12</u></b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Comment:</b> text from § 12 is mostly already written under § 11.</li> </ul>
---------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Proposal:</b> either simplify §11 in removing the equivalent text and keep §12, or delete § 12.</li> </ul>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Text of both paragraphs will be merged.</p>
comment	<p>4296 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAE</span></p> <p>Appendix 9 Section A paragraph 16 (page 124)</p> <p>There is no provision to qualify a crew as multi-pilot in a single-pilot certified aircraft. VLJ's will be used in this capacity. Suggest wording added to paragraph as follows:</p> <p>"The following matters shall be specifically checked when testing/checking applicants for the ATPL(A), for a type rating for multi-pilot aeroplanes <b><u>or for multi-pilot operation in a single-pilot aeroplane</u></b> extending to the duties of a pilot-in-command, irrespective of whether the applicant acts as PF or PNF:"</p> <p>Reference comment 5526 and 5608</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Text will be amended as suggested.</p>
comment	<p>4376 <span style="float: right;">comment by: DCA Malta</span></p> <p>Item 9 After 'repeated once by the applicant' add 'at the discretion of the examiner'</p> <p>Item 10 'as if there is no other crew member' is not correct for a multipilot type rating or ATPL.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Item 9 Text will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Item 10 Please see reply to comment 703 above.</p>
comment	<p>4431 <span style="float: right;">comment by: Bond Offshore Helicopters</span></p> <p>10. .... performed and to carry out the test as if there is no other crew member <b>if taking the test/check under single-pilot conditions.</b> Responsibility for the flight.....</p> <p>Justification: Clarity of meaning. Acting as if there is no other crew member is only applicable to the single-pilot test/check. Multi-pilot conditions are stated in paragraphs 14, 15 and 16, but the statement in paragraph 10 is a general statement and conflicts with 14, 15 and 16.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p>



Please see reply to comment 703 above.

comment 4432 comment by: *Bond Offshore Helicopters*

CONDUCT of the TEST/**CHECK**

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SKILL TEST/**PROFICIENCY CHECK** FOR MULTI-PILOT AIRCRAFT TYPE RATINGS AND FOR THE ATPL

Justification:

This entire section applies to the recurrent proficiency check as well as the initial skill test, and the section headings above should reflect this. For consistency, wherever skill test is mentioned, it should be replaced with **skill test/proficiency check**

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 1415 above.

comment 4433 comment by: *Bond Offshore Helicopters*

There is no longer a recommendation or requirement in the NPA to use FS or other FSTD during skill tests or proficiency checks. Both JAR-FCL 1 and JAR FCL 2 strongly recommended the use of FSTD's for testing/checking. In fact, it is a mandatory requirement since the statement used in Appendix 1 to 2.240 & 2.295 is "Flight simulators, if available and other training devices as approved shall be used." With modern complex aircraft, testing and checking in the aircraft rather than FSTD leads to a reduction in standards and increased safety risk, since many malfunctions and manoeuvres cannot be safely or effectively performed.

Unless there is a similar strong recommendation for the use of FSTD elsewhere in the other EASA NPA's, we suggest that it should be included here with a similar statement to that contained in JAR-FCL. There must still be an option to use the aircraft where suitable FSTD's are not available, which is a particular problem in the helicopter industry.

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 1416 above.

comment 4434 comment by: *Bond Offshore Helicopters*

18 - the skill test may be conducted in a flight simulator ~~only~~ and may...

Justification:

Confusing statement, 'only' and 'may' in same statement

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 2354 above.

comment 4637 comment by: *Irish Aviation Authority*

Paragraph 9 should say: "At the discretion of the Examiner, any manoeuvre...", otherwise the candidate could demand any number of repeats. See the

response	<p>wording in AMC 2 to FCL.1015 on p 580.</p> <p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text will be amended accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>4673 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Héli-Union</i></span></p> <p>10. .... performed and to carry out the test as if there is no other crew member <b>if taking the test/check under single-pilot conditions.</b> Responsibility for the flight.....</p> <p>Justification: Clarity of meaning. Acting as if there is no other crew member is only applicable to the single-pilot test/check. Multi-pilot conditions are stated in paragraphs 14, 15 and 16, but the statement in paragraph 10 is a general statement and conflicts with 14, 15 and 16.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 703 above.</p>
comment	<p>4674 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Héli-Union</i></span></p> <p>CONDUCT of the TEST/<b>CHECK</b></p> <p>SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SKILL TEST/<b>PROFICIENCY CHECK</b> FOR MULTI-PILOT AIRCRAFT TYPE RATINGS AND FOR THE ATPL</p> <p>Justification: This entire section applies to the recurrent proficiency check as well as the initial skill test, and the section headings above should reflect this. For consistency, wherever skill test is mentioned, it should be replaced with <b>skill test/proficiency check</b></p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 1415 above.</p>
comment	<p>4675 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Héli-Union</i></span></p> <p>There is no longer a recommendation or requirement in the NPA to use FS or other FSTD during skill tests or proficiency checks. Both JAR-FCL 1 and JAR FCL 2 strongly recommended the use of FSTD's for testing/checking. In fact, it is a mandatory requirement since the statement used in Appendix 1 to 2.240 &amp; 2.295 is "Flight simulators, if available and other training devices as approved shall be used." With modern complex aircraft, testing and checking in the aircraft rather than FSTD leads to a reduction in standards and increased safety risk, since many malfunctions and manoeuvres cannot be safely or effectively performed.</p> <p>Unless there is a similar strong recommendation for the use of FSTD elsewhere in the other EASA NPA's, we suggest that it should be included here with a similar statement to that contained in JAR-FCL. There must still be an option to use the aircraft where suitable FSTD's are not available, which is a particular problem in the helicopter industry.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p>

Please see reply to comment 1416 above.

comment	4676	comment by: <i>Héli-Union</i>
	18 - the skill test may be conducted in a flight simulator <del>only</del> and may...	
	Justification: Confusing statement, 'only' and 'may' in same statement	
response	<i>Accepted</i> Please see reply to comment 2354 above	

comment	4787	comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i>
	Paragraph 9 Text should be written as in paragraph 27 of AMC 2 to 1015 Paragraph 10 Delete the words "as if there is no other crew member"	
response	<i>Partially accepted</i> Please see reply to comment 703 above.	

comment	4839	comment by: <i>Flight Training Europe</i>
	<u>Page 123, Appendix 9</u> Para 9 infers that the applicant can repeat any part of the test even when he has failed it. Change first sentence of para 9 to read:  <b>9. At the discretion of the examiner any manoeuvre or procedure of the test may be repeated once by the applicant.</b>	
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see reply to comment 703 above.	

comment	4893	comment by: <i>HUTC</i>
	10. .... performed and to carry out the test as if there is no other crew member <b>if taking the test/check under single-pilot conditions.</b> Responsibility for the flight.....  Justification: Clarity of meaning. Acting as if there is no other crew member is only applicable to the single-pilot test/check. Multi-pilot conditions are stated in paragraphs 14, 15 and 16, but the statement in paragraph 10 is a general statement and conflicts with 14, 15 and 16.	
response	<i>Accepted</i> Please see reply to comment 703 above.	

comment	4894	comment by: <i>HUTC</i>
	CONDUCT of the TEST/ <b>CHECK</b>	

**SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SKILL TEST/PROFICIENCY CHECK FOR MULTI-PILOT AIRCRAFT TYPE RATINGS AND FOR THE ATPL**

Justification:

This entire section applies to the recurrent proficiency check as well as the initial skill test, and the section headings above should reflect this. For consistency, wherever skill test is mentioned, it should be replaced with **skill test/proficiency check**

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 1415 above.

comment **4895**

comment by: *HUTC*

There is no longer a recommendation or requirement in the NPA to use FS or other FSTD during skill tests or proficiency checks. Both JAR-FCL 1 and JAR FCL 2 strongly recommended the use of FSTD's for testing/checking. In fact, it is a mandatory requirement since the statement used in Appendix 1 to 2.240 & 2.295 is "Flight simulators, if available and other training devices as approved shall be used." With modern complex aircraft, testing and checking in the aircraft rather than FSTD leads to a reduction in standards and increased safety risk, since many malfunctions and manoeuvres cannot be safely or effectively performed.

Unless there is a similar strong recommendation for the use of FSTD elsewhere in the other EASA NPA's, we suggest that it should be included here with a similar statement to that contained in JAR-FCL. There must still be an option to use the aircraft where suitable FSTD's are not available, which is a particular problem in the helicopter industry.

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 1416 above.

comment **4896**

comment by: *HUTC*

18 - the skill test may be conducted in a flight simulator ~~only~~ and may...

Justification:

Confusing statement, 'only' and 'may' in same statement

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 2354 above.

comment **5020**

comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

Comment on paragraph 4:

ECA recommends to be more specific on "similar aircraft types", i.e. B757/B767, Airbus FBW, etc.

Justification:

Current terminology uses "types", "variants", but not "similar". Clarification must be in the wording, to avoid any mis-interpretation. This text must be

	made very clear, as it will be used for cross-crediting among aircraft that may have similarities, like two wings, two engines, three wheels, etc.
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency considers that the text does not need to be changed, since the 'similarity' depends on the operational suitability data evaluation. The operational suitability data determines whether it is a new type, a variant within the same type or whether credits between two types can be granted. However, text has been amended to improve clarity in the link to the operational suitability data.</p>
comment	<p><b>5052</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ECA- European Cockpit Association</i></span></p> <p>Comment on point 6: change text as follows:  6 The examiner may choose between different skill test/proficiency check scenarios containing simulated <u>relevant</u> <del>line</del> operations developed and approved by the competent authority.</p> <p>Justification:  This requirement applies also to non-commercial operations. It is therefore not necessary to apply "<i>line operations scenarios</i>"?  It is not appropriate to ask the Authority to develop line operations scenarios. The operator should develop them and have them approved by the Authority; if developed by the Authority (e.g non-commercial ratings), there is no requirement for approval.  In case of commercial ratings, scenarios should be developed by the operator and then approved by the Authority.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text will be changed accordingly.</p>
comment	<p><b>5286</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p>Part FCL Appendix 9 A. GENERAL  Paragraph 10  This paragraph is not appropriate for Multi Pilot aircraft skill tests and proficiency checks.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 703 above.</p>
comment	<p><b>5375</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p><b>Comment:</b>  The text in Item 14 and Item 17 should be the same and there is a need for clarification regarding what "a simulated commercial air transport environment" is. Today, it is interpreted differently in the European authorities.</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b>  <b>17</b> The test/check should be accomplished under IFR, if the IR-rating is included, and be accomplished in a multi crew environment. An essential element to be checked is the ability to plan and conduct the flight from routine briefing material.</p>

response

*Not accepted*

Please see reply to comment 1083 above.

comment

5526

comment by: CAE

Appendix 9 Section A Paragraph 14 and title to it. (Page 123)

Currently there is much confusion in Europe on multi-pilot training in a single-pilot aircraft. The majority of VLJ's entering the market in Europe will be with AOC operators who desire to operate the type with a crew. These operators will employ two pilots to fly their VLJ's, and in the interest in training as you fly it would be beneficial to have a sanctioned way to conduct multi-pilot training/checking in a single-pilot aircraft.

Suggestion is to reword Paragraph 14 and its title as follows:

**"SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SKILL TEST FOR MULTI-PILOT RATINGS, ATPL AND MULTI-PILOT TRAINING/CHECKING ON A SINGLE PILOT AIRCRAFT."**

**"14 The skill test for a multi-pilot aircraft, or multi-pilot operation of a single-pilot aircraft, shall be performed in a multi-crew environment. Another...."**

Other issues affected by this request would be approval for a multi-pilot course for single-pilot aircraft and a lower level of rating for the co-pilot of a single pilot aircraft operating under a multi-pilot environment.

Reference comments 4296 and 5608

response

*Noted*

The Agency understands the purpose of your comment, and agrees that some changes are needed to take into account the specificities related to VLJs. However, after careful review of the comments received, and input from experts, the Agency has decided on a different solution than that you propose.

For more details, please see the explanatory note to the CRD as well as the amended text of Appendix 9.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913 ❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the multiple comments asking for the content of this Appendix to be transferred into AMC.

However, and until such time as competency based standards for assessing pilot competencies are developed, the Agency considers that it is essential that the flight training and skill test contents for professional licences remains in the rule.

Therefore, the text of Appendix 9 will not be transferred to AMC.

comment

6122

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

Appendix 9 A. General, paragraph 14

**Page No:**

123 of 647

**Comment:**

Last sentence, in the aircraft, the other pilot cannot be an instructor because only an examiner may conduct the test or check.

**Justification:**

Instructors do not have the privilege to test pilots, only train them.

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Change to read, "If an aircraft is used, the second pilot shall be the *examiner*."

response

*Partially accepted*

It is also possible that an instructor is on the right-hand seat and the examiner is sitting behind on a jump seat.

Text will be amended to allow both possibilities.

comment

6124

comment by: UK CAA

	<p><b>Paragraph:</b> Appendix 9 A 4</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 123 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The reference to Part-21 is confusing in this context</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> There is no flight training syllabus approved in accordance with Part-21, which refers to the certification of aircraft types.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Article 5 of EC 216/2008 mandates the Agency to define the minimum training syllabus. This will be done in the operational suitability data, as defined in accordance with Part-21.</p>
comment	<p>6372 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Axel Schwarz</i></span></p> <p>Paragraph 10 must not be applicable for multi-pilot aeroplanes. Furthermore it should also not apply for single-pilot aeroplanes usually operated in a multi-pilot operation (such as C525, Be200, PA31T, ...). The requirement to perform skill test and proficiency checks in the single-pilot role only also conflicts with the provisions for "Content of the skill test/proficiency check" under B. and would render combining the Operator proficiency check required by part OPS and the licence proficiency check required by part FCL impossible. Therefore amend the first sentence of paragraph 10 with: "otherwise the rating will be restricted to multi-pilot".</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 703 above.</p>
comment	<p>6445 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DCAA</i></span></p> <p>App. 9 A item 14. Text "another qualified pilot" should be changed to "another pilot type-rated on the applicable type"</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 1081 above.</p>
comment	<p>6812 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA CZ</i></span></p> <p>Information about the minimum length of ATPL examination is missing. In JAR-FCL, article 8 of AMC FCL 1.425 states duration of ATPL, CPL, IR examinations... and NPA Part-FCL states duration of examinations for CPL (Appendix 4 B/C para 2) and for IR (Appendix 7 para 4), but there is no information for ATPL (should be 120 minutes).</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>The indication that the minimum duration is 120 minutes has been added to paragraph 6.</p>
comment	<p>6959 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA CZ</i></span></p>



	para 9 The wording of the same requirement as AMC 2 to FCL.1015, para 27, it should be harmonized.
response	<i>Accepted</i>  Please see reply to comment 703 above.

comment	<p>6968 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> Appendix 9 <b>Page No*:</b> 123</p> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p>1. Many of the modern single-pilot certified high performance aeroplanes (HPA) have been developed since the inception of JAR-FCL. With recent advances in technology it is now commonplace to find some or all of the following systems in such aircraft:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pressurisation</li> <li>Complex hydraulic and electrical systems</li> <li>Digital engine management</li> <li>Sophisticated flight director and autopilot</li> <li>Electronic Flight Instruments EFIS</li> <li>Flight Managements systems FMS</li> <li>Traffic and terrain alerting and warning systems</li> <li>GPS derived area and precision navigation</li> </ul> <p>2. In terms of complexity, performance and sphere of operation, most single-pilot HPA types are now equivalent to aeroplanes traditionally certified for multi-pilot operation and utilised for commercial air transport. For the multi-engine single-pilot types, the performance also enables continued, scheduled take-off performance after V1 with one engine inoperative.</p> <p>3. Notwithstanding the above, the test/check schedule required for a single-pilot single-engine HPA type rating (e.g. PC12) is the same as that required for simple single-engine aeroplanes (e.g. Cessna 152). Similarly the test/check schedule required for simple multi-engine piston aeroplanes (e.g. Beechcraft 76 Duchess) is the same as that required for a single-pilot multi-engine turbojet type rating (e.g. Beechcraft 390 Premier). UK CAA senior flight examiners are concerned that this is not an adequate measure of a pilot's competence to operate HPA safely. Specifically, the SPA test/check schedule fails to assess a pilot's knowledge, understanding and management of the complex systems, his skill in operating high performance aircraft in the airspace and weather likely to be encountered during a typical IFR flight in Europe, his management of systems failures and abnormal or emergency situations, and his aeronautical decision making.</p> <p>4. The flight test schedule at Appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 1.240 (Appendix 9 B.2. to EASA Part FCL), despite being designated for multi-pilot aeroplanes, is a far more appropriate schedule for assessing pilot competence to operate SP HPA safety. As it is highly likely that the pace of technological development will continue, it is vital that any test schedule enshrined in EU law is appropriate for the task. This proposal recommends an amendment to EASA Part-FCL to adapt the multi-pilot type rating test schedule for application to single-pilot</p>
---------	---

	<p>certified types additionally listed as HPA.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Perceived safety benefit by ensuring complex system and high performance are adequately tested.</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> See UK CAA comments on FCL.App 9.B.1, Page 126 and FCL.App 9.B 1, Page 128.</p>	
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency understands the purpose of your comment, and agrees that some changes are needed to take into account the specificities related to VLJs.</p> <p>After careful review of the comments received, and input from experts, the Agency has decided, similarly to what you propose, to apply the content of the skill test for multi-pilot aeroplanes also to single-pilot high performance aeroplanes, with some adaptations.</p> <p>For more details, please see the explanatory note to the CRD as well as the amended text of Appendix 9.</p>	
comment	<p>6978</p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> Appendix 9 A 10</p> <p><b>Page No.</b> 123 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> This is incompatible with other requirements for the test/check.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> If the candidate is to carry out the test as if there is no other crew member, it will not be possible to perform the test in a multi-crew environment (paragraph 14) or to manage crew co-operation (paragraph 16a)</p> <p><b>Proposed Text:</b> An applicant shall be required to fly the aircraft from a position where the pilot-in-command functions can be performed and, in the case of single pilot aeroplanes, to carry out the test as if there is no other crew member. Responsibility for the flight shall be allocated in accordance with national regulations.</p>	comment by: UK CAA
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 703 above.</p>	
comment	<p>7090</p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> FCL Appendix 9 A para 16 (a) &amp; (c)</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 124 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The training and knowledge required for each category of licence or rating are well defined. However, they lack clarity and formal definition e.g. in the use of 'judgement' and 'airmanship'. In addition the application is susceptible to subjectivity, bias and abuse due to the lack of understanding. This has the potential to undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment</p>	comment by: UK CAA

	<p>processes.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Consistency</p> <p><b>Proposed Text:</b> <b>(if applicable)</b> Amend to read; " (a) <del>management of crew co-operation</del> <i>application of non-technical skills</i>".</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task. We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.</p>
comment	<p>7165      comment by: <i>CHC Europe EASA Ops Team - representing 550 pilots across Europe</i></p> <p><b>CONDUCT of the TEST/CHECK</b></p> <p><b>SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SKILL TEST/PROFICIENCY CHECK FOR MULTI-PILOT AIRCRAFT TYPE RATINGS AND FOR THE ATPL</b></p> <p><b>Justification:</b> This entire section applies to the recurrent proficiency check as well as the initial skill test, and the section headings above should reflect this. For consistency, wherever skill test is mentioned, it should be replaced with <b>skill test/proficiency check</b></p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 1415 above.</p>
comment	<p>7166      comment by: <i>CHC Europe EASA Ops Team - representing 550 pilots across Europe</i></p> <p>There is no longer a recommendation or requirement in the NPA to use FS or other FSTD during skill tests or proficiency checks. Both JAR-FCL 1 and JAR FCL 2 strongly recommended the use of FSTD's for testing/checking. In fact, it is a mandatory requirement since the statement used in Appendix 1 to 2.240 &amp; 2.295 is "Flight simulators, if available and other training devices as approved shall be used." With modern complex aircraft, testing and checking in the aircraft rather than FSTD leads to a reduction in standards and increased safety risk, since many malfunctions and manoeuvres cannot be safely or effectively performed.</p> <p>Unless there is a similar strong recommendation for the use of FSTD elsewhere in the other EASA NPA's, we suggest that it should be included here with a similar statement to that contained in JAR-FCL. There must still be an option to use the aircraft where suitable FSTD's are not available, which is a particular problem in the helicopter industry.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 1416 above.</p>

comment	<p>7171 comment by: <i>CHC Europe EASA Ops Team - representing 550 pilots across Europe</i></p> <p>18 - the skill test may be conducted in a flight simulator <del>only</del> and may...</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>Confusing statement, 'only' and 'may' in same statement</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 2354 above.</p>
comment	<p>7300 comment by: <i>Aero-Club of Switzerland</i></p> <p>APPENDIX 9</p> <p>B. Specific requirements for the aeroplane category</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>5.5 Engine shutdown and restart (ME skill test only) (at a safe altitude unless carried out in FS or FNPT II)</p> <p>Advantages:</p> <p>1) Increase in relative safety 2) Less wear and tear for the aircraft</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Text will be changed accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>7549 comment by: <i>FlightSafety International</i></p> <p>There should be provision for copilot skill tests and proficiency checks to restrict the type rating based on experience. Point 16 in this section already differentiates between PF and PNF with the duties of the pilot in command.</p> <p>Under Conduct of the Test Point 10 add PIC applicant. Add another point to state a copilot applicant shall be required to fly the aircraft from a position where the copilot functions can be performed and to carry out the test with a PIC present.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Regarding your first point, the Agency does not really understand your purpose. We do not consider that the skill test should be reduced based on previous experience of the applicant.</p> <p>Regarding your second point, please see reply to comment 703 above.</p>

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

2252  
Comment: B.3 Section 6 doesn't apply for LVP in most of the skill test contents as described in the following pages. This section is about asymmetric flight. This section must be passed for ATPL and MPL skill test. This is an OPS SPA issue.

Proposal: Delete B3

response

*Partially accepted*

The text of paragraphs 1 and 2 has been amended, and paragraph 3 deleted, in order to clarify this issue.

comment

4233  
comment by: *CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority*

The proposed Non-technical testing standards lack clarity and formal definition e.g. the use of terms such as 'judgement' and 'airmanship'. In addition, application of the proposed criteria is susceptible to subjectivity, bias and abuse because of a lack of common understanding and the requirement for standardised interpretation. This will undermine confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.

There are also currently no standards for pilot test/check applicants to follow regarding their requirement to comply with the competency of non-technical skills. This needs to be added to the detailed FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES .

**Proposal:**

FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES para 4 should be ammended to read

4. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

(a) .....

(b) .....

(c) operate the aircraft safely, efficiently and apply to the required standard, Non-technical Skills (NTS) such as Teamwork, Situation Awareness and Threat and Error Management etc'

(d) .....

(e) .....

(f) .....

Licensed Flightcrew, Examiners and Instructors should be trained in the concepts, use and application of an agreed and validated set of non-technical skills competence standards appropriate to their role (a behavioural marker system) that is acceptable to the competent authority for the purpose of non-technical skills assessment. Insert the following into the flight test standards after para 5.

FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES

6 Non-technical Skills Assessment

The specific requirement for the assessment of non-technical skills during

initial and recurrent testing is not intended to create additional opportunities to fail flightcrew members, but to help diagnose and correctly define any underlying deficiency in non-technical competence in relation to any observed technical failures. The assessment must be made against agreed non-technical skills standards (a behavioural marker system) using a methodology that is acceptable to the competent authority. Only observable behaviour is to be assessed. Non-technical skills cannot provoke an unacceptable assessment in the absence of a related technical failure such as a failure to follow standard operating procedures, and there must be a clear and unambiguous link between the technical failure observed and the unacceptable non-technical skill(s).

response *Not accepted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

4532

comment by: AEA

Relevant Text:

**B. Specific requirements for the aeroplane category**

**PASS MARKS**

- (1) 1 In the case of single pilot aeroplanes, the applicant shall pass all sections of the skill test/proficiency check. If any item in a section is failed, that section is failed. Failure in more than one section will require the applicant to take the entire test/check again. Any applicant failing only one section shall take the failed section again. Failure in any section of the retest/ recheck including those sections that have been passed at a previous attempt will require the applicant to take the entire test/check again.
- (2) 2 In the case of multi-pilot aeroplanes, the applicant shall pass all sections of the skill test/proficiency check. Failure of more than five items will require the applicant to take the entire test/check again. Any applicant failing 5 or less items shall take the failed items again. Failure in any item on the retest/ check including those items that have been passed at a previous attempt will require the applicant to take the entire check/test again.

3 If the applicant only fails or does not take Section 6, the type rating will be issued without Cat II or III privileges. Section 6 is not part of the ATPL or MPL skill test.

**Comment:** B.3

Section 6 doesn't apply for LVP in most of the skill test contents as described in the following pages. This section is about asymmetric flight. This section must be passed for ATPL and MPL skill test

**Proposal:**

Delete B3

response

*Noted*

Please see reply to comment 2252 above.

comment	<p>5022 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ECA- European Cockpit Association</i></span></p> <p>Comment on paragraph (e):  (e) maintain control of the aeroplane at all times in such a manner that the successful outcome of a procedure or manoeuvre is <u>always assured</u> <del>never in doubt</del>;</p> <p>Justification:  Text should be written in a positive way, rather than in a negative way.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text will be amended accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>5468 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p>According item 1. Single-pilot aeroplanes the type/class rating will be restricted to multi-pilot if a proficiency check on a single-pilot aeroplane is performed in a multi-pilot operation in accordance with PartOPS.</p> <p>For the time being it is not possible for pilots to get an initial type rating for single-pilot aeroplane with this restriction.</p> <p>We suggest to add the sequences "skill test or" and "an approved training course or" in the following sentence:</p> <p>When a skill test or proficiency check on a single-pilot aeroplane is performed in a multi-pilot operation in accordance with an approved training course or PartOPS, the type/class rating will be restricted to multi-pilot.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>A similar sentence to what you propose was already included later in the text for single-pilot aeroplanes. The Agency has slightly amended the text, and included it in paragraph 1, to improve clarity.</p>
comment	<p>5817 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ENAC TLP</i></span></p> <p>The technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed flight test tolerances (standards) need some specifications for NTS and TEM avoiding the use of terms such as 'good judgement and airmanship' that are easily prone to subjectivity, bias and abuse during assessment because of a lack of common understanding.</p> <p><b>Need:</b> more clear and unambiguous standards for the assessment of non-technical skills during skill test and proficiency checks for class/type ratings and license skill tests.</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> to specify differently the non technical abilities to be demonstrated during test/checks to exercise good airmanship and related Flight test tolerances</p> <p><b>APPENDIX 9 SKILL TEST AND PROF CHECK FOR ATPL.....</b>  <b>B. Specific requirements for the aeroplane category</b>  <b>FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES</b>  <b>page 124</b>  To be modified as follows (italics)  4. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:</p>

	<p>(a) as it is  (b) as it is  (c) <i>apply NTS and TEM as needed to exercise good airmanship;</i>  (d) as it is;  (e) as it is  (f) as it is;  (g) <i>deleted ( already included in NTS, see GM to FCL.010 Definitions)</i></p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency does not intend to amend the text of JAR-FCL in this respect. Please see also reply to comment 4233 above.</p>
comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913 ❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b><u>Comment:</u></b>  Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.  Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.</p> <p>Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9</li> <li>• changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.</li> <li>• As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Proposal:</u></b></p> <p>Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.</p> <p>The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency has carefully reviewed the multiple comments asking for the content of this Appendix to be transferred into AMC.</p> <p>However, and until such time as competency based standards for assessing pilot competencies are developed, the Agency considers that it is essential that</p>



the flight training and skill test contents for professional licences remains in the rule.

Therefore, the text of Appendix 9 will not be transferred to AMC.

comment 6375 comment by: *Axel Schwarz*

1. Single-pilot aeroplanes:

For Flight Simulator the abbreviation "FFS" instead of "FS" should be used, as is the case in the rest of the document.

FTD should include FNPTs not only for the MEP class rating, but for any type or class rating, when the training device forms part of an approved course. The current line

"FTD = Flight Training Device (including FNPT II for ME class rating)"

contradicts the last paragraph before the checkflight form sample and differs from the requirements for multi-pilot aeroplanes where even "OTDs" are accepted for training.

response *Accepted*

FS has been replaced by FFS.

The last paragraph of this section has been changed back to the text of JAR-FCL.

comment 6381 comment by: *Axel Schwarz*

The meaning of the columns "Practical training" in the skill test / proficiency check forms remains unclear. Since practical training is performed in an ATO the documentation of this training will always be in the form approved for the training organisation and not normally on the skill test / proficiency check form.

The only cases where these columns would be useful could be some training which may be performed by a single FI outside an ATO (as is currently the case for single-engine single-pilot class ratings, JAR-FCL 1.261 (c)(3)) or for training for the renewal of a rating if no ATO is required.

Since both possibilities no longer exist in the proposed text for part FCL the columns "Practical Training" should be omitted.

Furthermore Sections 4-6 are missing on the multi-pilot check form sample.

response *Noted*

The tables in this Appendix contain not only the content of the skill test/proficiency check, but also the content of the flight training. Therefore, the column on practical training is still relevant.

In relation to your second comment, in fact the Agency has realized that when transferring the content of JAR-FCL an editorial mistake was made and items 3.9 to 6.4 are missing. They will be reintroduced.

comment 6446 comment by: *DCAA*

App. 9 B item 3 The licence will not be issued with CAT II III endorsements.

response	<i>Noted</i> Text has been amended to clarify this issue.
comment	6448 <span style="float: right;">comment by: DCAA</span> App. 9 item 14. App. 9 item 14Add. If the applicant is not checked as PIC in accordance as Part OPS and Annex 1, there shall be a licence endorsement stating "co-pilot only".
response	<i>Partially accepted</i> Text has been amended to clarify this issue. Please see also reply to comment 5468 above.
comment	7091 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span> <b>Paragraph:</b> FCL Appendix 9 B para 4 (c) <b>Page No:</b> 124 of 647 <b>Comment:</b> The competency of "exercise good judgement and airmanship" is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process. <b>Justification:</b> Consistency across licence skill tests. <b>Proposed Text:</b> <b>(if applicable)</b> Amend to read; " <del>(c ) exercise good judgement and airmanship</del> operate the aircraft safely, efficiently and apply to the correct standard, non-technical skills such as Teamwork, Situation Awareness and Threat and Error Management etc.
response	<i>Not accepted</i> The Agency does not intend to amend the text of JAR-FCL in this respect. Please see also reply to comment 4233 above.
comment	7092 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span> <b>Paragraph:</b> FCL Appendix 9 B New para 6 <b>Page No:</b> 125 of 647 <b>Comment:</b> There are currently no standards for pilot test/check applicants to follow regarding their requirement to comply with the competency of non-technical skills. This needs to be added here. The text of JAA FCL-27 AMC to JAR-FCL 1.240 should be included as an AMC to FCL Appendix 9B new para 6. <b>Justification:</b> Consistency <b>Proposed Text:</b> <b>(if applicable)</b>

Add a new para 6 before the content of the Skill Test/Proficiency Check, as follows;

*6. Non-Technical Skills Assessment. The specific requirement for the assessment of non-technical skills during initial and recurrent testing is not intended to create additional opportunities to fail flight crewmembers, but to help to diagnose and correctly define any underlying deficiency in non-technical competence in relation to any observed technical failures. The assessment must be made against agreed NTS standards (a behavioural marker system) using a methodology that is acceptable to the competent authority. Only observable behaviour is to be assessed. Non-Technical Skills cannot provoke an unacceptable assessment in the absence of a related technical failure such as a failure to follow standard operating procedures and there must be a clear and unambiguous link between the technical failure observed and the unacceptable non-technical skill.*

response *Noted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

7550

comment by: *FlightSafety International*

1. Due to the minimum experience of current candidates and that many operations are operating single pilot aeroplane in a multi-pilot environment, there should be provisions for a copilot only position in single pilot aeroplanes.

Under Content of the Skill Test/Proficiency Check Single Pilot Aeroplanes, change P= Trained as Pilot in Command or Copilot for the issue.....

2. Editorial, should be the same as MPA

Under the following symbols mean: add P# the training should be complemented by a supervised aeroplane inspection

response

*Accepted*

1. Text has been amended as proposed.

2. Text has been amended accordingly.

comment

7729

comment by: *CAA Finland*

App 8 B para 5:

There should be some difference in acceptance level depending on licence. New text proposal:

5 The following limits shall apply, corrected to make allowance for turbulent conditions and the handling qualities and performance of the aeroplane used

**For CPL or ATPL holders**

Height

Generally  $\pm 100$  feet

Starting a go-around at decision height + 50 feet/ - 0 feet  
 Minimum descent height/ altitude + 50 feet/ - 0 feet  
 Tracking on radio aids  $\pm 5^\circ$   
 Precision approach half scale deflection, azimuth and glide path  
 Heading  
 all engines operating  $\pm 5^\circ$   
 with simulated engine failure  $\pm 10^\circ$   
 Speed  
 all engines operating  $\pm 5$  knots  
 with simulated engine failure +10 knots/ 5 knots

**For up to PPL holders**

**Height**

**Generally  $\pm 150$  feet**

**Starting a go-around at decision height + 100 feet/-0 feet**

**Minimum descent height/ altitude + 100 feet/-50 feet**

**Tracking on radio aids  $\pm 10^\circ$**

**Precision approach half scale deflection, azimuth and glide path**

**Heading**

**all engines operating  $\pm 10^\circ$**

**with simulated engine failure  $\pm 20^\circ$**

**Speed**

**all engines operating +10 / - 5 knots**

**with simulated engine failure +20 knots/ - 5 knots**

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency does not intend to change the content of JAR-FCL in this respect.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 9: Skill test and proficiency check for ATPL,. Type and class ratings and proficiency check for instrument ratings - B. Specific requirements for the aeroplane category - 1. Single-pilot aeroplanes**

p. 125-128

comment

1084

comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

**Comment:** Every authority has their own interpretation of the wording "if available". We need a clarification or a definition.

**Proposal:**

Add a definition of "when available" or a clarification of the meaning.

response

*Partially accepted*

This text is a direct copy from JAR-FCL. Please refer to the amended text.

comment

1086

comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

**Comment:**

Editorial. The text of approved training equipment is missing in the tables.

**Proposal:**

Add text in the tables.

response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text will be amended accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>3707 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></span></p> <p>APPENDIX 9 B. 1. Single-pilot aeroplane</p> <p>Justification :</p> <p>Some new aircrafts (ie RA 390) are trained on FFS in multi crew environment. This should be possible through part 21 and OSC!</p> <p>This new figure of training is not taken into account in regulation ! Part FCL should reflect this one in licence endorsement procedures.</p> <p>In addition the fact that the MCC is not required to work in multi-crew on single pilot aeroplane, is nonsense, as far as there is no differences of way of working in that case between multi-pilot and single-pilot aeroplane.</p> <p>Modification :</p> <p>Amend APPENDIX 9 B. 1. Single-pilot aeroplane as follow :</p> <p>When a proficiency check <b><i>or skill test</i></b> on a single-pilot aeroplane is performed in a multi-pilot operation in accordance with Part-OPS, the type/class rating will be restricted to multi-pilot.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text has been amended as proposed. However, please note that as a result of previous comments it has been transferred to paragraph B.1.</p>
comment	<p>3891 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Luftfahrt-Bundesamt</i></span></p> <p>APP9-B. Specific requirements for the aeroplane category- 1. Single pilot aeroplane:</p> <p>According item 1. Single-pilot aeroplanes the type/class rating will be restricted to multi-pilot if a proficiency check on a single-pilot aeroplane is performed in a multi-pilot operation in accordance with PartOPS.</p> <p>For the time being it is not possible for pilots to get an initial type rating for single-pilot aeroplane with this restriction.</p> <p>We suggest to add the sequences "skill test or" and "an approved training course or" in the following sentence (in the second to last paragraph):</p> <p>When a skill test or proficiency check on a single-pilot aeroplane is performed in a multi-pilot operation in accordance with an approved training course or PartOPS, the type/class rating will be restricted to multi-pilot.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 3707 above.</p>
comment	<p>3985 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></span></p> <p>Appendix 9 B. 1.</p>

Information from the top of table disappeared ! see appendix 3 to JAR FCL 1.240

<b>Manoeuvres/Procedures</b>				Instructors initials	Chkd in	Examiners initials
------------------------------	--	--	--	-------------------------	------------	-----------------------

response *Accepted*

Text will be amended accordingly.

comment 4320

comment by: CAE

Appendix 9 Section B paragraph 1 on Single Pilot Skill Test Form

Recommend the single-pilot training/checking form be rewritten to more closely match the multi-pilot training/checking form in as many areas as possible. This would include adding the OTD column, but splitting task 1.2 into two separate tasks, i.e. external pre-flight and internal inspection as separate events. The OTD & above columns could be used for the external preflight task - via a video tape of the walk around - as it is with the multi-pilot LST form. The FTD & above columns could be used for the internal cockpit inspection, again mirroring the multi-pilot LST form.

Currently, for the single-pilot course, both these tasks are combined and only allowed to be trained in an aircraft.

The push from CAE is for consistency in the two type rating training/checking forms, with the multi-pilot form used as the standard. This is important specifically for the single-pilot multi-engine turbojet type rated aircraft that will be required to use this form for single-pilot checkrides. We anticipate a large number of this type aircraft entering European airspace in the near future.

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 3707 above.

comment 4378

comment by: DCA Malta

Replace 'when a proficiency check on a single-pilot aeroplane is performed in a multi-pilot operation .... by 'when a proficiency check or a skill test on a .....

Pilots trained multi-pilot and who will have the rating restricted to multi-pilot operations do not need to take a single pilot test.

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 3707 above.

comment 4788

comment by: CAA Belgium

A multipilot skill-test on SP-aeroplane should be foreseen (expect comment from Germany)

response	<i>Noted</i> Please see reply to comment 3707 above.
comment	4789 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span> actual skill-test is not convenient for SP-HPA aeroplanes (expect comment from UK)
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see reply to comment 3707 above.
comment	4841 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Flight Training Europe</i></span> <u>Pages 126 to 128</u> The 3 sub columns under " <b>PRACTICAL TRAINING</b> " need titles adding. They should read " <b>FTD</b> ", " <b>FFS</b> " and " <b>PL</b> ".
response	<i>Accepted</i> Text will be amended accordingly.
comment	5024 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ECA- European Cockpit Association</i></span> Comment: change paragraphe as follows: An <del>FSTD</del> <u>flight simulator</u> or <u>FNPT II</u> shall be used for practical training for type or multiengine class ratings if the <del>FSTD</del> <u>flight simulator</u> or <u>FNPT II</u> forms part of an approved type or class rating course. The following considerations will apply to the approval of the course: (a) the qualification of the <del>FSTD</del> <u>flight simulator</u> or <u>FNPT II</u> as set out in Part-MS; (b) the qualifications of the instructors; (c) the amount of <del>FSTD</del> <u>flight simulator</u> or <u>FNPT II</u> training provided on the course; and (d) the qualifications and previous experience on similar types of the pilot under training.  Justification: This should go back to the JAR requirement. The use of other FSTDs than FNPT II or flight simulators for training on types of aeroplanes will jeopardize safety. In principle, the training is based on the goodness of the instructor and the tools used. In Aviation, the tools are the aeroplanes or FSTDs. When giving general skills training, other lower devises may be sufficient, but not when trying to teach the performances and specifics of a particular type of aircraft.
response	<i>Accepted</i> Text will be amended accordingly.
comment	5377 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span> <b>Comment:</b> Every authority has their own interpretation of the wording "if available". We need a clarification or a definition.

response	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Add a definition of "when available" or a clarification of the meaning.</p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 1084 above.</p>
comment	<p>5378 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Editorial. The text of approved training equipment is missing in the tables.</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> Add text in the tables.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text will be amended accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>5500 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Irv Lee (Higherplane Aviation Training Ltd)</i></span></p> <p>Section 1 of the content of the practical training and skills test / proficiency check for a type/class rating is missing the 'NOTAM' checking / briefing. NOTAM checking is vital in today's environment and should be a compulsory part of the test. Weather, documentation, mass and balance are all included, NOTAM checking is missing, it needs to be added. Suggest Section 1.1 of the test schedule is amended to include 'NOTAM briefing' in the same way as 'Weather Briefing' exists now</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency considers adding NOTAM briefing as a change to the text of JAR-FCL. Please refer to the amended text.</p>
comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>5913 ❖</p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry. Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.</p> <p>Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9</li> <li>• changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all</li> </ul>



aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.

- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the multiple comments asking for the content of this Appendix to be transferred into AMC.

However, and until such time as competency based standards for assessing pilot competencies are developed, the Agency considers that it is essential that the flight training and skill test contents for professional licences remains in the rule.

Therefore, the text of Appendix 9 will not be transferred to AMC.

comment

6071

comment by: *Finnish Aviation Academy*

Also the section 2 should be starred item (\*) and shall be flown solely by reference to instruments if revalidatio/renewal of instrument rating is included in the check.

Same requirements are in IR-skil test. I think it will help to prevet loss of controll situations in IMC.

Section 5 item 5.1 rejected take-off should be only for multiengine aeroplanes. In practical there is no reson to check that foe SEP-aeroplanes.

response

*Noted*

In relation to your first proposals, this was not the case in JAR-FCL, and the Agency does not intend to change it at this point, without a dedicated assessment. It is also considered that your concerns are sufficiently covered by the items in Section 3B.

In relation to your proposal for item 5.1, the Agency's proposal follows JAR-FCL, and the Agency does not intend to change it at this point, without a dedicated assessment.

comment

6125

comment by: *UK CAA*

**Paragraph:**

Appendix 9 B

**Page No:**

126 of 647

**Comment:**

This precludes the conduct of all parts of the skill test/proficiency check in a

	FSTD <b>Justification:</b> In item 1.2 external checks are a mandatory item but cannot be completed in a FSTD. For this very reason, external checks are not a mandatory item in the MPA skill test/proficiency check.
response	<i>Noted</i>  Text has been amended to clarify this issue. See also comment 7751 below.
comment	6126 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span>  <b>Paragraph:</b> Appendix 9 B <b>Page No:</b> 126 of 647 <b>Comment:</b> Practical Training column sub-headings (A, FS, FTD) are missing.
response	<i>Accepted</i>  Text will be amended accordingly.
comment	6128 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span>  <b>Paragraph:</b> Appendix 9 B <b>Page No:</b> 126 of 647 <b>Comment:</b> This precludes the conduct of all parts of the skill test/proficiency check in a FSTD <b>Justification:</b> In item 1.1 external checks are a mandatory item but cannot be completed in a FSTD. For this very reason, external checks are not a mandatory item in the MPA skill test/proficiency check.
response	<i>Noted</i>  Please see reply to comment 6125 above.
comment	6449 <span style="float: right;">comment by: DCAA</span>  App. 9 B item 1. Add to the form Training equipment used (A, FS or FTD).
response	<i>Accepted</i>  Text will be amended accordingly.
comment	6452 <span style="float: right;">comment by: DCAA</span>  App. 9 B. Multi-pilot add to the form Training equipment used (A, FS , FTD or OTD).  A, FS , FTD or OTDA, FS , A, FS, FTD or OTD are missing on the top of the form

response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text will be amended accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>6597 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Austro Control GmbH</i></span></p> <p>Comment: A skill test can also be combined with a prof check acc. PartOPS</p> <p>Proposed Text: When a <b>skill test</b> / proficiency check on a singlepilot aeroplane is performed in a multipilot operation in accordance with PartOPS, the type/class rating will be restricted to multipilot.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 3707 above.</p>
comment	<p>6960 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA CZ</i></span></p> <p>Skill test for single pilot aeroplanes does not correspond to requirements for multipilot operation on HPA aeroplanes.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 3707 above.</p>
comment	<p>6992 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>UK CAA</i></span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> FCL.Appendix 9.B.1. <b>Page No*:</b> 128 <b>Comment:</b> See UK CAA comment on Appendix 9, Page 123 <b>Justification:</b> The flight test schedule at Appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 1.240 (Appendix 9 B.2. to EASA Part FCL), despite being designated for multi-pilot aeroplanes, is a far more appropriate schedule for assessing pilot competence to operate SP HPA safely. As it is highly likely that the pace of technological development will continue, it is vital that any test schedule enshrined in EU law is appropriate for the task. This proposal recommends an amendment to EASA Part-FCL to adapt the multi-pilot type rating test schedule for application to single-pilot certified types additionally listed as HPA. <b>Proposed Text:</b> <b>(if applicable)</b> Re-title Type Ratings for multi-pilot aeroplanes and single-pilot aeroplanes designated as High Performance Aeroplanes (HPA)</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency understands the purpose of your comment, and agrees that some changes are needed to take into account the specificities related to VLJs. However, after careful review of the comments received, and input from experts, the Agency has decided on a different solution than the one you propose.</p>

For more details, please see the explanatory note to the CRD as well as the amended text of Appendix 9.

comment

7098

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

FCL.Appendix 9.B.1.

**Page No\*:**

126

**Comment:**

See UK CAA comment on Appendix 9, Page 123

**Justification:**

The flight test schedule at Appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 1.240 (Appendix 9 B.2. to EASA Part FCL), despite being designated for multi-pilot aeroplanes, is a far more appropriate schedule for assessing pilot competence to operate SP HPA safely. As it is highly likely that the pace of technological development will continue, it is vital that any test schedule enshrined in EU law is appropriate for the task. This proposal recommends an amendment to EASA Part-FCL to adapt the multi-pilot type rating test schedule for application to single-pilot certified types additionally listed as HPA.

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Add sub-title note:

This schedule is not to be used for aeroplanes certificated as High Performance Aeroplanes (HPA) under Part 21 aeroplanes. For HPA aeroplanes the schedule at Appendix 9.B.2. must be used, as applicable.

response

*Noted*

Please see reply to comment 6992 above.

comment

7551

comment by: *FlightSafety International*

Editorial, should be the same as MPA

Add P# in the first column of 1.2

response

*Accepted*

1. Text has been amended as proposed.

2. Text has been amended accordingly.

comment

7731

comment by: *CAA Finland*

Skill test form:

The form should not be used as training program. The structure is not suitable for that. Instructors initials should be removed and the training organization shall produce a syllabi where instructors signature is required.

The numbering system differs from CPL or IR skill test forms and should be harmonized. I support the structure of CR/TR form as there is clearly easy to add subparts like 2.4 > 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.1		
1.2		
1.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.1		
2.2		
2.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.1		
3.2		
3.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

response *Noted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the skill test/proficiency check tables included in the Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL (e.g. Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

To leave the content/format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms.

In the meantime, to develop report forms as AMC material to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the applicable AMCs e.g. AMCs to Appendices 7, 9 and 12, as published in this NPA.

To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 9: Skill test and proficiency check for ATPL,. Type and class ratings and proficiency check for instrument ratings - B. Specific requirements for the aeroplane category - 2. Multi pilot aeroplanes**

p. 128-131

comment 77 comment by: *Michel Lacombe AF TRTO*  
 Sections 4, 5, and 6 are missing, so it is difficult to make a real complete comment.

response *Accepted*  
 During the transfer of the text from JAR-FCL to this NPA, an editorial mistake was made, and items 3.9 to 6.4 are indeed missing.  
 The Agency has added them to the text.

comment 155 comment by: *Michel Lacombe AF TRTO*  
 Sections 4 - 5 - 6 are missing ????? from the tables

response *Accepted*  
 Please see reply to comment 77 above.

comment 265 comment by: *Michel Lacombe AF TRTO*

response	<p><b>Content of the skill test / proficiency check in Appendix 9 :</b> In the first line of the table for the single pilot aeroplanes as than for The Multi pilot aeroplanes, the type of devices used to train (OTD - FTD - FFS - Aeroplane) or to check (FFS ) are missing and have, for the comprehension, to be added.</p> <p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text will be amended accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>705 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>FOCA Switzerland</i></span></p> <p>Appendix 9 2. Multi pilot aeroplanes Section 3 (after last figure 3.8.1)</p> <p>Clarification</p> <p><b>To add: Missing sections 4, 5 and 6</b></p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 77 above.</p>
comment	<p>901 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ERA</i></span></p> <p>Appendix 9 Skill test and proficiency check for ATPL, type and class ratings, and proficiency check for instrument ratings</p> <p>Multi pilot aeroplanes table [B 2] in Appendix 9 to IR-FCL seems incomplete as there is no section 3.9 "<i>flight instrument procedure</i>", 4 "<i>go around procedure</i>" nor 5 "<i>Landing</i>". Please confirm that this is just an error.</p> <p>Point 2.6 "<i>rejected take off</i>" may have an error. In the Appendix to the JAR-FCL, this exercise can be done on simulator (there is an X in the column) ; However it is not in this Appendix 9 table IR-FCL. ERA members would like to point out that this part of the table should read similar to the layout to point 2.5.2 "<i>between V1 and V2</i>". Please confirm if this observation is correct.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 77 above.</p> <p>Your comment in relation to Point 2.6 is also accepted, and text will be changed accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>1223 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Ryanair</i></span></p> <p>Attachments <a href="#">#62</a> <a href="#">#63</a></p> <p><b>Comment</b> We have the following questions and supply sample documents as examples of LST/OPC and LPC/OPC records that have been developed in conjuncton with the Irish Aviation Authority (IAA) and which have proved effective for both the Authority and Ryanair: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can an Operator or ATO adapt the basic LST form that is pesented in</li> </ol>

the NPA to include such things as Comment fields and administration instructions? See LST-OPC-MPA attached.

2. Can an Operator or ATO design a combined LPC/OPC, based on the LST presented in the NPA, to be used during Recurrent Checking? See LPC-OPC-MPA.
3. Can the IAA approve an Operator specific form?
4. Is it expected that **ALL** Operators must use the specific example of the LST form presented in the NPA?

#### Justification

The attached records have evolved over many years and represent the most effective means of: -

- Recording the outcome of the test.
- Recording an assessment comment by the TRE which the Operator uses to track the pilot's progress throughout his career
- Administrating the record by the Operator and the IAA

response *Noted*

The answer to your questions 1 to 3 is affirmative: operators and ATOs can develop their own forms.

The table in this Appendix should be understood as a content list. This may change in the future, since the Agency intends to review these tables to try to reach more harmonisation in relation to skill test/proficiency check forms.

Please see also reply to comment 7733 below.

comment *1224*

comment by: *Ryanair*

Attachment [#64](#)

#### Comment

The LST form presented in the NPA does not contain an integrated Course Completion Certificate. Attached is the IAA approved Ryanair LST form which has the Course Completion Certificate integrated into Section 4 of the Record.

1. Can an Operator design a combined LST/OPC document from the LST document shown in Appendix 9?
2. If so may the Operator combine a course completion certificate into this document to cover the requirements of AMC to APPENDIX 9 A?

#### Justification

We have been using this method of recording and presenting the Course Completion Certificate to various Authorities and it has been working well for all concerned.

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 1223 above.

comment *1225*

comment by: *Ryanair*

Attachment [#65](#)

#### Comment



The example LST from presented in the NPA showing content of the Skills Test in Appendix 9 (2) appears to be incomplete. This document ends at the manoeuvre 3.8.1. Is this intentional? Attached is the IAA approved Ryanair LST form for reference.

**Justification**

The presented LST form in the NPA is incomplete.

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 77 above.

comment

1226

comment by: *Ryanair*

Attachment [#66](#)

**Comment**

The ATPL /MPL/SKILLS TEST/PROF CHECK column does not offer any opportunity to enter a record of Attempt 2. This is as per previous JAR LST form. However this does not conform to our present recording procedures approved by the IAA and does not lend itself to efficient administration of all possible outcomes of the Test.

Attached please find the IAA approved Ryanair LST form which presents TRES with Attempt 1 and Attempt 2 in the same document.

**Justification**

Not having Attempt 2 in the LST form will complicate the administration of the LST process and will generate unnecessary paperwork if a new LST form has to be used for Attempt 2

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 7733 below.

comment

1292

comment by: *Ryanair*

As stated elsewhere, the LST form in the NPA terminates on page 131 at section 3.8.1. Accordingly it is not possible to see if the raw data approach is a mandatory item. It would be expected to be a mandatory item for the LST, as it is now. But will it be a mandatory item for the proficiency check, which is not the case now. LPCs do not require the execution of a raw data approach.

Proposal:

As per existing practice, the raw data approach is not required as a mandatory item for LPCs in MPA operations .

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 7733 below.

comment

2394

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters,*

*Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

Comment: The definition of P# is too restrictive

Proposal: P# = the training shall be complemented by supervised aeroplane inspection or suitable distance learning package

response *Not accepted*

The Agency considers that even if software has been used a walk around at the aircraft is still necessary. At that step (SKT) it must have been completed. This was already a requirement in JAR-FCL and the Agency considers that it should not be changed.

comment

2567

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

Multi-pilot ATPL/prof check.  
Sections 3.9, 4, 5 and 6 of the JAR skill test form are not reproduced. This should be done as the ATPL skill test and MP prof checks also include the IR competency.

response

*Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 77 above.

comment

3213

comment by: *Susana Nogueira*

Sections 3.9, 4, 5 and 6 of the JAR-FCL skill test form are not included. Need to include the IR competence.

response

*Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 77 above.

comment

3708

comment by: *DGAC FRANCE*

Bad copy and paste from JAR-FCL, some items from the table are missing

In the part

2. Multi pilot aeroplane

Add the **items 3.9 to 6.4 coming from appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 1.240 & 1.295**

response

*Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 77 above.

comment

3986

comment by: *DGAC FRANCE*

Appendix 9 B. 2.

Information from top of table disappeared! see appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 1.240

<b>Manoeuvres /Procedures</b> (including Multi-Crew Cooperation)					Instructor's initials when training completed	Chkd in	Examiner's initials when test completed	
	<b>OTD</b>	<b>FTD</b>	<b>FS</b>	<b>A</b>				

response

*Accepted*  
Please see reply to comment 265 above.

comment

4032 comment by: CAE  
Appendix 9 Section B paragraph 2 on Multi Pilot Skill Test Form  
Extend practical training to "FS" and "A" for "1.3 Cockpit inspection". Typo in JAR-FCL appears to be captured in NPA.

response

*Accepted*  
Text has been amended accordingly.

comment

4379 comment by: DCA Malta  
Sections 4,5,6 missing

response

*Accepted*  
Please see reply to comment 77 above.

comment

4646 comment by: Irish Aviation Authority  
This form is incomplete. It finishes at 3.8.1.  
There are no headings on the Practical Training columns.  
There is no provision for Attempt 2.

response

*Partially accepted*  
Please see reply to comments 77, 265 and 7733.

comment

4828 comment by: Irish Aviation Authority  
Will it be possible to modify this form by addition, or must it remain unchanged?  
Many AOC's and TRTO's like to add comment boxes and rating scales to track performance, CRM skills etc., so that the information is kept in one location.

response

*Noted*  
Please see replies to comments 1223 and 7733.

comment	<p>4842 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Flight Training Europe</i></span></p> <p><u>Pages 129 to 131</u></p> <p>The 4 sub columns under “<b>PRACTICAL TRAINING</b>” need titles adding. They should read “<b>OTD</b>”, “<b>FTD</b>”, “<b>FFS</b>” and “<b>PL</b>”.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 265 above. But the correct heading would be 'A', not 'PL'</p>
comment	<p>5169 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAE</i></span></p> <p>Appendix 9 LST form (page 131)</p> <p>The Multi-Pilot form is truncated. Items after 3.8.1 omitted and need to be added.</p> <p>Also, the equipment columns on all forms apparently inadvertently omit the descriptive titles “OTD, FTD, FS &amp; A”.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comments 77 and 265 above.</p>
comment	<p>5306 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>AEA</i></span></p> <p><b>Relevant Text:</b> The following symbols mean: P = Trained as Pilot in command or Copilot and as Pilot Flying (PF) and Pilot Not Flying (PNF) for the issue of a type rating as applicable. X = Simulators shall be used for this exercise, if available; otherwise an aircraft shall be used if appropriate for the manoeuvre or procedure. <b>P# = the training shall be complemented by supervised aeroplane inspection</b></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The definition of P# is too restrictive.</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> P# = the training shall be complemented by supervised aeroplane inspection or suitable distance learning package</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The text that was proposed in the NPA is coming from JAR-FCL. The Agency considers that at this point it should remain unchanged.</p>
comment	<p><span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913 ❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></span></p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices</p>

1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the multiple comments asking for the content of this Appendix to be transferred into AMC.

However, and until such time as competency based standards for assessing pilot competencies are developed, the Agency considers that it is essential that the flight training and skill test contents for professional licences remains in the rule.

Therefore, the text of Appendix 9 will not be transferred to AMC.

comment

6131

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**  
Appendix 9 B  
**Page No:**  
129 of 647

**Comment:**  
Practical Training column sub-headings (A, FS, FTD, OTD) are missing.

response

*Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 265 above.

comment

6132

comment by: UK CAA

	<p><b>Paragraph:</b> Appendix 9 B 2</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 131 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The manoeuvres/procedures stop at item 3.8.1. Items 3.9 to 3.9.5 plus Section 4, 5 &amp; 6 are missing from the document.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Incomplete skill test &amp; proficiency check list of items.</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Incorporate these items from Appendix 2 to JAR-FCL1.240 &amp; 1.295 (pages 1-F-18 to 1-F-21)</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 77 above.</p>
comment	<p>6219 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Icelandic CAA</i></span></p> <p>Sections 4, 5 and 6 are missing. Compare form with App.2. to JAR-FCL 1.240 &amp; 1.295.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 77 above.</p>
comment	<p>6454 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DCAA</i></span></p> <p>App. 9 B Multi-pilot aeroplane skill test form add. "M" to item 1.1. and item 1.3.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency does not intend to change the text in relation to what was established in JAR-FCL.</p>
comment	<p>7122 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>UK CAA</i></span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> FCL Appendix 9 B 2 (MPA) Column 1 of table on page 129</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 129 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The use of the expression multi-crew cooperation is inappropriate here. The pilots should be tested against the requirements of NTS rather than MCC.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Consistency of testing</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Amend Column 1 to read; "Manoeuvres/Procedures (including <i>Non-Technical Skills</i>)"</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never</p>

solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.  
We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

7507

comment by: *British Airways*

In order to allow the introduction of modern training methodology and take into account the use of improved training devices the contents of this Appendix should be transferred to AMC and GM for the appropriate section.

This section remains incomplete with the omissions of section 6 LVOPS and section 3.8.1 onwards.

response

*Partially accepted*

Please see replies to comments 77 and 5913 above.

comment

7733

comment by: *CAA Finland*

Skill test form:

The form should not be used as training program. The structure is not suitable for that. Instructors initials should be removed and the training organization shall produce a syllabi where instructors signature is required.

The numbering system differs from CPL or IR skill test forms and should be harmonized. I support the structure of CR/TR form as there is clearly easy to add subparts like 2.4 > 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.1		
1.2		
1.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.1		
2.2		
2.3		

And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.1		
3.2		
3.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

response

**Noted**

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the skill test/proficiency check tables included in the Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL (e.g. Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

To leave the content / format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms.

In the meantime, to develop report forms as AMC material to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the applicable AMCs e.g. AMCs to Appendices 7, 9 and 12, as published in this NPA.

To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look



into the several Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 9: Skill test and proficiency check for ATPL, Type and class ratings and proficiency check for instrument ratings - B. Specific requirements for the aeroplane category - 3. Class ratings - sea**

p. 132-134

comment	<p>193 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Aero-Club of Switzerland</i></span></p> <p>This Section 1 apart, the Class Rating Sea is not mentioned, but there should be possibilities to acquire such a rating. We propose:</p> <p>Pre-requisites: Valid LPL(A) or higher  Theoretical knowledge: 2 days course containing all relevant elements.  Practical training: About 7 hours flight time, during which the candidate has to proof the gained competence.  Test: 5 solo landings, demonstrated to a FI or CRI.</p> <p>Justification: By inserting our proposal the Agency will clarify the necessary details with regards to such a rating.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see replies to comments on FCL.725.A, where the details on the training course for sea ratings are included.</p>
comment	<p>5504 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Irv Lee (Higherplane Aviation Training Ltd)</i></span></p> <p>Section 1 of the content of the practical training and skills test/proficiency check for sea class rating is missing the 'NOTAM' checking/briefing. NOTAM checking is vital in today's environment and should be a compulsory part of the test. Weather, documentation, mass and balance are all included, NOTAM checking is missing, it needs to be added.  Suggest Section 1.1 of the test schedule is amended to include 'NOTAM briefing' in the same way as 'Weather Briefing' exists now</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the amended text.</p>
comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913 ❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b>  Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.</p>

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the multiple comments asking for the content of this Appendix to be transferred into AMC.

However, and until such time as competency based standards for assessing pilot competencies are developed, the Agency considers that it is essential that the flight training and skill test contents for professional licences remains in the rule.

Therefore, the text of Appendix 9 will not be transferred to AMC.

comment

7735

comment by: *CAA Finland*

Skill test form:

The form should not be used as training program. The structure is not suitable for that. Instructors initials should be removed and the training organization shall produce a syllabi where instructors signature is required.

The numbering system differs from CPL or IR skill test forms and should be harmonized. I support the structure of CR/TR form as there is clearly easy to add subparts like 2.4 > 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.1		

1.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.1		
2.2		
2.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.1		
3.2		
3.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

response *Noted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the skill test/proficiency check tables included in the Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL (e.g. Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very

difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

To leave the content/format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms.

In the meantime, to develop report forms as AMC material to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the applicable AMCs e.g. AMCs to Appendices 7, 9 and 12, as published in this NPA.

To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

comment

7738

comment by: CAA Finland

App 9 B 3 Section 4:  
4.1 is suitable for amphibians only. For floats: Simulated

response

*Accepted*

Text will be amended to mention '(amphibians only)' in 4.1.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 9: Skill test and proficiency check for ATPL,. Type and class ratings and proficiency check for instrument ratings - C. Specific requirements for the helicopter category**

p. 134-139

comment

1126

comment by: CAA Belgium

Proposal to amend the skill test form in such a way that all items/sectors can be signed "pass-fail" by the examiner.

- 1) by adding two columns at the right side
- 2) by adding at the end a place for the final conclusion for the entire test.

response

*Noted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the skill test/proficiency check tables included in the Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL (e.g. Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.  
Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

To leave the content/format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms.

In the meantime, to develop report forms as AMC material to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the applicable AMCs e.g. AMCs to Appendices 7, 9 and 12, as published in this NPA.

To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

comment

1411

comment by: *Bristow Helicopters*2.6.1 (~~SHE~~~~SEH~~only) - typographical error5.4.2 **Precision approach** manually with **or without** flight director **M\***

Justification:

Item 5.4.1 (ILS Manually without flight director) is a Mandatory item for the skill test only. During the recurrent Proficiency Check there is no longer a mandatory requirement to fly any ILS approach according to the NPA schedule. I believe this has come about as a result of the change to allow the one engine simulated inoperative to be included in either the ILS or non precision approach, which I fully support. However, in my opinion, the ILS should still be examined at the recurrent proficiency check and one way of achieving this would be the amendment proposed above. During the recurrent check of the ILS as proposed, there is no reason why it can not be flown with or without reference to the flight director. During the skill test, completion of item 5.4.1 will also satisfy the requirements of the M\* item 5.4.2.

Furthermore, to allow for alternative precision approach procedures (eg RNAV or Ground Controlled Approach), I propose that the term ILS approach be replaced by **precision approach**, at least for the the recurrent item 5.4.2.

response

*Accepted*

2.6.1 Accepted

SHE must be written SEH

5. 4.1 Accepted

"(" Skill test only)" in the column Chkd. in is deleted

5.4.2 Accepted

Text amended to 'precision approach manually with or without flight director' and M\* has been added in the column Chkd. in

comment

1971

comment by: *Bristow Helicopters*

Item 2.2 Sloping ground take-off and landing. Propose change to:  
2.2 Sloping ground **or crosswind** take-off and landing.

**Justification:**

Although this is a training item only and not a mandatory test or check item in the type rating course and test/check, it is difficult or impossible to achieve at many aerodromes during a type rating course on medium/large helicopters. This is due to lack of sloping ground areas suitable for medium/large helicopters, or restrictions on use of areas due to fixed wing movements. The manoeuvre cannot be effectively trained in many helicopter flight simulators, since it requires high graphic fidelity and good close in visual references and hover cues, which are lacking in many helicopter level D simulators. Sloping ground techniques are part of the initial helicopter licence course and are therefore core rather than type specific skills. The technique for crosswind take-off and landing is similar to the sloping ground technique, and could therefore be a suitable alternative during the type rating course, if suitable sloping ground areas are not available. Many helicopter Commercial Air Transport Operations such as offshore oil and gas support do not require sloping ground operations, since flights with medium/large helicopters are conducted to prepared heliports. Where sloping ground take-off and landings are required as part of the operation, they will be included in the operator training programme.

response

*Accepted*

2.2

Text has been amended to 'sloping ground or cross-wind take off and landing'

comment

2140

comment by: *British International Helicopters*

5.4.2 **Precision approach manually with or without** flight director **M\***

Justification:

Item 5.4.1 (ILS Manually without flight director) is a Mandatory item for the skill test only. During the recurrent Proficiency Check there is no longer a mandatory requirement to fly any ILS approach according to the NPA schedule. I believe this has come about as a result of the change to allow the one engine simulated inoperative to be included in either the ILS or non precision approach, which I fully support. However, in my opinion, the ILS should still be examined at the recurrent proficiency check and one way of achieving this would be the amendment proposed above. During the recurrent check of the ILS as proposed, there is no reason why it can not be flown with or without reference to the flight director. During the skill test, completion of item 5.4.1 will also satisfy the requirements of the M\* item 5.4.2.

Furthermore, to allow for alternative precision approach procedures (eg RNAV or Ground Controlled Approach), I propose that the term ILS approach be replaced by **precision approach**, at least for the the recurrent item 5.4.2.

response

*Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 1411.

comment

2355

comment by: *AECA(SPAIN)*

5.4.2 **Precision approach manually with or without** flight director **M\***

Justification:

Item 5.4.1 (ILS Manually without flight director) is a Mandatory item for the

skill test only. During the recurrent Proficiency Check there is no longer a mandatory requirement to fly any ILS approach according to the NPA schedule. We believe this has come about as a result of the change to allow the one engine simulated inoperative to be included in either the ILS or non precision approach, which we fully support. However, in our opinion, the ILS should still be examined at the recurrent proficiency check and one way of achieving this would be the amendment proposed above. During the recurrent check of the ILS as proposed, there is no reason why it can not be flown with or without reference to the flight director. During the skill test, completion of item 5.4.1 will also satisfy the requirements of the M\* item 5.4.2. Furthermore, to allow for alternative precision approach procedures (eg RNAV or Ground Controlled Approach), we propose that the term ILS approach be replaced by **precision approach**, at least for the recurrent item 5.4.2.

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 1411.

comment

2356

comment by: *AECA(SPAIN)*

4 – Amend as follows:

P = Trained as pilot-in command or Co-pilot and as Pilot Flying (PF) and Pilot Not Flying (PNF) for the issue of a type rating as applicable.

Justification:

This statement should be the same as for multi-pilot aeroplanes

response

*Accepted*

Text has been changed to: 'Trained as pilot-in command for the issue of a type rating for SPH or trained as pilot-in-command or Co-pilot and as Pilot Flying (PF) and Pilot Not Flying (PNF) for the issue of a type rating for MPH'

comment

2568

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

Text under the heading Multi pilot Helicopters.

Question: when is section 5 to be taken ?

response

*Noted*

For ATPL/IR and for any Type rating proficiency check with associated IR

comment

3296

comment by: *DGAC FRANCE*

Appendice 9 – C  
Remarque 2

Missing part.

Appendix 9 does not give information about "Contents of the type rating/training/skill test and proficiency check for single-engine and multi-engine single-pilot helicopters

Registered as Appendix 3 to JAR–FCL 2.240 in JAR

Appendix 9 – C Specific requirements for the helicopter category

	Add the content of Appendix 3 to JAR-FCL 2.240: <b>SINGLE-PILOT HELICOPTERS</b>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Appendix 9 already contains the skill test in Appendix 3 to JAR-FCL 2.240. The two skill tests in Appendix 2 to JAR FCL 2.240 and 2.295 and Appendix 3 to JAR FCL 2.240 have been merged.</p> <p>The reason why these two skill tests have been merged is because the contents of the two skill tests are exactly the same excepted item 4.6 of section 4 (incapacitation of crew member).</p>
comment	<p>3297 <span style="float: right;">comment by: DGAC FRANCE</span></p> <p>Appendice 9 – C Remarque 1</p> <p>This remark has been done for helicopter but remains true for aeroplane. This item must be mandatory only if the test is perform in helicopter, because an exterior visual inspection with Synthetic Devices won't give any objective information to the examiner.</p> <p>Appendix 9 – C Specific requirements for the helicopter category Board MULTI-PILOT HELICOPTER Section 1</p> <p>\$ 1.1, add (*) close to the Mandatory and the legend following : * Mandatory if the test is perform in helicopter.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Text has been changed to indicate the item 1.1 is only mandatory if performed in the helicopter.</p>
comment	<p>3378 <span style="float: right;">comment by: DGAC FRANCE</span></p> <p>Appendice 9 – C Remarque 1</p> <p>This remark has been done for helicopter but remains true for aeroplane. An exterior visual inspection with Synthetic Devices won't give any objective information to the examiner.</p> <p>Appendix 9 – C Specific requirements for the helicopter category</p> <p>In the Board Multi pilots helicopter skill test</p> <p>Section 1 paragraph 1.1. Add <b>H only</b> close to the M of mandatory</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 3297 above. Your two comments seem to be contradicting each other.</p>



comment	<p>3890 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Luftfahrt-Bundesamt</i></span></p> <p>Appendix 9, Part C:</p> <p>Just for clarification, in Appendix 9, Part C, No 2, in the second line the words 'the entire check' should be replaced by 'the whole section 5' because it is not the whole type rating proficiency check that has to be conducted. Also, in the fourth sentence, insert 'of section 5' between the words 'items' and 'already'.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text has been amended accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>4236 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority</i></span></p> <p>The proposed Non-technical testing standards lack clarity and formal definition e.g. the use of terms such as 'judgement' and 'airmanship'. In addition, application of the proposed criteria is susceptible to subjectivity, bias and abuse because of a lack of common understanding and the requirement for standardised interpretation. This will undermine confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.</p> <p>There are also currently no standards for pilot test/check applicants to follow regarding their requirement to comply with the competency of non-technical skills. This needs to be added to the detailed FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES .</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b></p> <p>FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES para 4 should be ammended to read</p> <p>4. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:</p> <p>(a) .....</p> <p>(b) .....</p> <p>(c) <u>operate the aircraft safely, efficiently and apply to the required standard, Non-technical Skills (NTS) such as Teamwork, Situation Awareness and Threat and Error Management etc'</u></p> <p>(d) .....</p> <p>(e) .....</p> <p>(f) .....</p> <p>Licensed Flightcrew, Examiners and Instructors should be trained in the concepts, use and application of an agreed and validated set of non-technical skills competence standards appropriate to their role (a behavioural marker system) that is acceptable to the competent authority for the purpose of non-technical skills assessment. Insert the following into the flight test standards after para 5.</p> <p>FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES</p> <p><u>6 Non-technical Skills Assessment</u></p> <p><u>The specific requirement for the assessment of non-technical skills during initial and recurrent testing is not intended to create additional opportunities to fail flightcrew members, but to help diagnose and correctly define any underlying deficiency in non-technical competence in relation to any observed technical failures. The assessment must be made against agreed non-technical</u></p>

skills standards (a behavioural marker system) using a methodology that is acceptable to the competent authority. Only observable behaviour is to be assessed. Non-technical skills cannot provoke an unacceptable assessment in the absence of a related technical failure such as a failure to follow standard operating procedures, and there must be a clear and unambiguous link between the technical failure observed and the unacceptable non-technical skill(s).

FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES

### 6 Non-technical Skills Assessment

The specific requirement for the assessment of non-technical skills during initial and recurrent testing is not intended to create additional opportunities to fail flightcrew members, but to help diagnose and correctly define any underlying deficiency in non-technical competence in relation to any observed technical failures. The assessment must be made against agreed non-technical skills standards (a behavioural marker system) using a methodology that is acceptable to the competent authority. Only observable behaviour is to be assessed. Non-technical skills cannot provoke an unacceptable assessment in the absence of a related technical failure such as a failure to follow standard operating procedures, and there must be a clear and unambiguous link between the technical failure observed and the unacceptable non-technical skill(s).

response

*Not accepted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

4435

comment by: *Bond Offshore Helicopters*

2.6.1 (~~SHE~~-SEHonly) - typographical error

5.4.2 **Precision approach** manually with **or without** flight director **M\***

Justification:

Item 5.4.1 (ILS Manually without flight director) is a Mandatory item for the skill test only. During the recurrent Proficiency Check there is no longer a mandatory requirement to fly any ILS approach according to the NPA schedule. We believe this has come about as a result of the change to allow the one engine simulated inoperative to be included in either the ILS or non precision approach, which we fully support. However, in our opinion, the ILS should still be examined at the recurrent proficiency check and one way of achieving this would be the amendment proposed above. During the recurrent check of the ILS as proposed, there is no reason why it can not be flown with or without reference to the flight director. During the skill test, completion of item 5.4.1 will also satisfy the requirements of the M\* item 5.4.2.

Furthermore, to allow for alternative precision approach procedures (eg RNAV or Ground Controlled Approach), we propose that the term ILS approach be replaced by **precision approach**, at least for the recurrent item 5.4.2.

response

*Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 1411.

comment	<p>4436 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Bond Offshore Helicopters</i></span></p> <p>4 – Amend as follows: P = Trained as pilot-in command or Co-pilot and as Pilot Flying (PF) and Pilot Not Flying (PNF) for the issue of a type rating as applicable.</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>This statement should be the same as for multi-pilot aeroplanes</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 2356 above.</p>

comment	<p>4677 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Héli-Union</i></span></p> <p>2.6.1 (<del>SHE-SEH</del>only) - typographical error 5.4.2 <b>Precision approach</b> manually with <b>or without</b> flight director <b>M*</b></p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>Item 5.4.1 (ILS Manually without flight director) is a Mandatory item for the skill test only. During the recurrent Proficiency Check there is no longer a mandatory requirement to fly any ILS approach according to the NPA schedule. We believe this has come about as a result of the change to allow the one engine simulated inoperative to be included in either the ILS or non precision approach, which we fully support. However, in our opinion, the ILS should still be examined at the recurrent proficiency check and one way of achieving this would be the amendment proposed above. During the recurrent check of the ILS as proposed, there is no reason why it can not be flown with or without reference to the flight director. During the skill test, completion of item 5.4.1 will also satisfy the requirements of the M* item 5.4.2.</p> <p>Furthermore, to allow for alternative precision approach procedures (eg RNAV or Ground Controlled Approach), we propose that the term ILS approach be replaced by <b>precision approach</b>, at least for the recurrent item 5.4.2.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 1411 above.</p>

comment	<p>4678 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Héli-Union</i></span></p> <p>4 – Amend as follows: P = Trained as pilot-in command or Co-pilot and as Pilot Flying (PF) and Pilot Not Flying (PNF) for the issue of a type rating as applicable.</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>This statement should be the same as for multi-pilot aeroplanes</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 2356 above.</p>

comment	<p>4897 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>HUTC</i></span></p> <p>2.6.1 (<del>SHE-SEH</del>only) - typographical error</p>
---------	--

5.4.2 **Precision approach manually with or without** flight director **M\***

Justification:

Item 5.4.1 (ILS Manually without flight director) is a Mandatory item for the skill test only. During the recurrent Proficiency Check there is no longer a mandatory requirement to fly any ILS approach according to the NPA schedule. We believe this has come about as a result of the change to allow the one engine simulated inoperative to be included in either the ILS or non precision approach, which we fully support. However, in our opinion, the ILS should still be examined at the recurrent proficiency check and one way of achieving this would be the amendment proposed above. During the recurrent check of the ILS as proposed, there is no reason why it can not be flown with or without reference to the flight director. During the skill test, completion of item 5.4.1 will also satisfy the requirements of the M\* item 5.4.2.

Furthermore, to allow for alternative precision approach procedures (eg RNAV or Ground Controlled Approach), we propose that the term ILS approach be replaced by **precision approach**, at least for the recurrent item 5.4.2.

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 1411 above.

comment **4898**

comment by: *HUTC*

4 – Amend as follows:

P = Trained as pilot-in command or Co-pilot and as Pilot Flying (PF) and Pilot Not Flying (PNF) for the issue of a type rating as applicable.

Justification:

This statement should be the same as for multi-pilot aeroplanes

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 2356 above.

comment **5025**

comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

Comment: change paragraph on page 136 as follows:

~~An FSTD~~ A flight simulator or FNPT II shall be used for practical training and testing if the ~~FSTD~~ flight simulator or FNPT II forms part of an approved type-rating course. The following considerations will apply to the approval of the course:

(a) the qualification of the ~~FSTD~~ flight simulator or FNPT II as set out in Part-MS;

(b) the qualifications of the instructors and examiners;

(c) the amount of ~~FSTD~~ flight simulator or FNPT II training provided on the course;

(d) the qualifications and previous experience on similar types of the pilot under training; and

(e) the amount of supervised flying experience provided after the issue of the new type rating.

Justification:

This should go back to the JAR requirement. The use of other FSTDs than FNPT II or flight simulators for training on types of aeroplanes will jeopardize safety.

In principle, the training is based on the goodness of the instructor and the tools used. In Aviation, the tools are the aeroplanes or FSTDs. When giving general skills training, other lower devices may be sufficient, but not when trying to teach the performances and specifics of a particular type of aircraft.

response *Not accepted*

We believe that your comment refers to the aeroplane section, where it was accepted.  
However for the helicopters section it cannot be accepted: FNPT II is not part of type rating training.

comment

5466

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

Just for clarification, in Appendix 9, Part C, No 2, in the second line the words 'the entire check' should be replaced by 'the whole section 5' because it is not the whole type rating proficiency check that has to be conducted. Also, in the fourth sentence, insert 'of section 5' between the words 'items' and 'already'.

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 3890 above.

comment

5819

comment by: *ENAC TLP*

The technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed flight test tolerances (standards) need some specifications for NTS and TEM avoiding the use of terms such as 'good judgement and airmanship' that are easily prone to subjectivity, bias and abuse during assessment because of a lack of common understanding.

**Need:** more clear and unambiguous standards for the assessment of non-technical skills during skill test and proficiency checks for class/type ratings and license skill tests.

**Proposal:** to specify differently the non technical abilities to be demonstrated during test/checks to exercise good airmanship and related Flight test tolerances

#### **APPENDIX 9 SKILL TEST AND PROF CHECK FOR ATPL.....**

##### **C. Specific requirements for the helicopter category**

##### **FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES**

##### **page 134**

To be modified as follows (*italics*)

4. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

(a) as it is

(b) as it is

(c) *apply NTS and TEM as needed to exercise good airmanship;*

(d) as it is;

(e) as it is

(f) as it is;

(g) *deleted ( already included in NTS, see GM to FCL.010 Definitions)*

response

*Noted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further

work, in a separate rulemaking task.  
We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913 ❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the multiple comments asking for the content of this Appendix to be transferred into AMC.

However, and until such time as competency based standards for assessing pilot competencies are developed, the Agency considers that it is essential that the flight training and skill test contents for professional licences remains in the rule.

Therefore, the text of Appendix 9 will not be transferred to AMC.

comment

6133

comment by: *UK CAA*

**Paragraph:**

Appendix 9 C Helicopter category CONTENT OF THE SKILL TEST/PROFICIENCY

CHECK

**Page No:**

135-139 of 647

**Comment:**

The last sentence on page 135 permits the use of an FS or FTD 2/3 for the purpose of the skill test or proficiency check for Section 5, indeed the second paragraph on page 136 permits the use of any FSTD for all practical training and testing given the conditions laid down in sub-paras a-e. The table starting on page 136 through to 139 (all sections of the skill test or proficiency check) only permits a FS or H to be used. This should be changed to agree with the statements on page 135 and 136.

**Justification:**

There cannot be two standards applied for the check and since qualified FTDs are in existence today, they should be permitted to be used for skill tests and proficiency checks.

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Change the Skill Test/Proficiency Check "Chkd. In" column to include FTD i.e. make it read "FS, FTD, H"

response

*Not accepted*

FTDs are only accepted for training, not for skill test. This was also the system in JAR-FCL, and the Agency does not intend to change it without a dedicated assessment.

The sentence you mention in page 136 has also been changed as a result of comments received.

comment

6135

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

Appendix 9 C Section 2 of skill test table

**Page No:**

137 of 647

**Comment:**

Editorial. Item 2.6.1 the expression inside brackets should be SEH only.

**Justification:**

SEH stands for single engine helicopter and is therefore correct for this item.

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

"landing (SEH only)..."

response

*Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 1411 above.

comment

6145

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

Appendix 9 C Section 5 of skill test table

**Page No:**

139 of 647

**Comment:**

The item numbering system in section 5 has been changed from that contained in JAR-FCL 2 and causes confusion. For example, item 5.6 (Manually flown

	<p>approach...) should actually be item 5.4.4 to associate it with the ILS approach (item 5.4). This would mean that all items after 5.5 (non-precision...) should be re-numbered.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Editorial</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> N/A</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text has been amended accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>7125 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> FCL Appendix 9 C para 3</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 134 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The competency of “exercise good judgement and airmanship” is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Consistency across licence skill tests.</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Amend to read; “<del>exercise good judgement and airmanship</del> - <i>apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test</i>”.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.</p> <p>We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.</p>
comment	<p>7130 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> FCL Appendix 9 C Column 1 of table on page 136</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 136 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The use of the expression MCC is inappropriate here. The pilots should be tested against the requirements of NTS rather than MCC.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Consistency of testing</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Amend Column 1 to read; “Manoeuvres/Procedures</p>



	(including <i>Non-Technical Skills</i> )"
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 7125 above.</p>
comment	<p>7174 comment by: <i>CHC Europe EASA Ops Team - representing 550 pilots across Europe</i></p> <p>4 – Amend as follows:  P = Trained as pilot-in command or Co-pilot and as Pilot Flying (PF) and Pilot Not Flying (PNF) for the issue of a type rating as applicable.</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>This statement should be the same as for multi-pilot aeroplanes</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 3256.</p>
comment	<p>7739 comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></p> <p>App 9 C:  There should be some difference in acceptance level depending on licence. New text proposal:</p> <p><b>VFR flight limits (CPL or ATPL);</b>  <b>Height</b>  generally <math>\pm</math> 100 feet  <b>Heading</b>  normal operations <math>\pm</math> 5°  abnormal operations/emergencies <math>\pm</math> 10°  <b>Speed</b>  generally <math>\pm</math> 10 knots  with simulated engine failure +10 knots/5 knots  <b>Ground drift</b>  T.O. hover I.G.E. <math>\pm</math> 3 feet  Landing <math>\pm</math> 2 feet (with 0 feet rearward or lateral flight)</p> <p><b>VFR flight limits (up to PPL);</b>  <b>Height</b>  generally <math>\pm</math> 150 feet  <b>Heading</b>  normal operations <math>\pm</math> 10°  abnormal operations/emergencies <math>\pm</math> 20°  <b>Speed</b>  generally +15 / - 10 knots  with simulated engine failure <math>\pm</math> 15 knots  <b>Ground drift</b>  T.O. hover I.G.E. <math>\pm</math> 3 feet  Landing <math>\pm</math> 2 feet (with 0 feet rearward or lateral flight)</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>At this point the Agency does not intend to change the flight test tolerances from what was established in JAR-FCL.</p>

comment

7741

comment by: CAA Finland

Skill test form:

The form should not be used as training program. The structure is not suitable for that. Instructors initials should be removed and the training organization shall produce a syllabi where instructors signature is required.

The numbering system differs from CPL or IR skill test forms and should be harmonized. I support the structure of TR form as there is clearly easy to add subparts like 2.4 > 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.1		
1.2		
1.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.1		
2.2		
2.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.1		
3.2		
3.3		

And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 1126 above.

comment **8136** comment by: *Konrad Polreich*

Since the check is normally done in a simulator, item 1.1 should be eliminated as mandatory, as it is in airplanes.

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 3297 above.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 9: Skill test and proficiency check for ATPL,. Type and class ratings and proficiency check for instrument ratings - D. Specific requirements for the powered-lift category** p. 140-146

comment **221** comment by: *CAA - The Netherlands*

Appendix 9

D.3 In this part several lines are printed twice: height, heading, speed. Because there is no blanc line above the word "VFR flight limits", it looks like that all aspects are part of the IFR flight limits.

If ground drift is only an aspect of "VFR flight limits", not part of "IFR flight limits", than the blanc line is not missing.

response *Accepted*

Text has been amended to improve clarity.

comment **4237** comment by: *CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority*

The proposed Non-technical testing standards lack clarity and formal definition e.g. the use of terms such as 'judgement' and 'airmanship'. In addition, application of the proposed criteria is susceptible to subjectivity, bias and abuse because of a lack of common understanding and the requirement for standardised interpretation. This will undermine confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.

There are also currently no standards for pilot test/check applicants to follow regarding their requirement to comply with the competency of non-technical

skills. This needs to be added to the detailed FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES .

**Proposal:**

FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES para 4 should be ammended to read

4. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

- (a) .....
- (b) .....
- (c) operate the aircraft safely, efficiently and apply to the required standard, Non-technical Skills (NTS) such as Teamwork, Situation Awareness and Threat and Error Management etc'
- (d) .....
- (e) .....
- (f) .....

Licensed Flightcrew, Examiners and Instructors should be trained in the concepts, use and application of an agreed and validated set of non-technical skills competence standards appropriate to their role (a behavioural marker system) that is acceptable to the competent authority for the purpose of non-technical skills assessment. Insert the following into the flight test standards after para 5.

FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES

6 Non-technical Skills Assessment

The specific requirement for the assessment of non-technical skills during initial and recurrent testing is not intended to create additional opportunities to fail flightcrew members, but to help diagnose and correctly define any underlying deficiency in non-technical competence in relation to any observed technical failures. The assessment must be made against agreed non-technical skills standards (a behavioural marker system) using a methodology that is acceptable to the competent authority. Only observable behaviour is to be assessed. Non-technical skills cannot provoke an unacceptable assessment in t he absence of a related technical failure such as a failure to follow standard operating procedures, and there must be a clear and unambiguous link between the technical failure observed and the unacceptable non-technical skill(s).

FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES

6 Non-technical Skills Assessment

The specific requirement for the assessment of non-technical skills during initial and recurrent testing is not intended to create additional opportunities to fail flightcrew members, but to help diagnose and correctly define any underlying deficiency in non-technical competence in relation to any observed technical failures. The assessment must be made against agreed non-technical skills standards (a behavioural marker system) using a methodology that is acceptable to the competent authority. Only observable behaviour is to be assessed. Non-technical skills cannot provoke an unacceptable assessment in t he absence of a related technical failure such as a failure to follow standard operating procedures, and there must be a clear and unambiguous link between the technical failure observed and the unacceptable non-technical skill(s).

response

*Noted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.  
We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

5046

comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

Comment on paragraph 8:

8 ~~Flight Simulation Training Devices~~ Flight simulator of FNTP II shall be used for practical training and testing if they form part of an approved typerating course. The following considerations will apply to the approval of the course:

- a) the qualification of the flight simulation training devices as set out in Part ~~FSTD~~ flight simulator of FNTP II;
- b) the qualifications of the instructor;

Justification:

This should go back to the JAR requirement. The use of other FSTDs than FNTP II or flight simulators for training on types of aeroplanes will jeopardize safety. In principle, the training is based on the goodness of the instructor and the tools used. In Aviation, the tools are the aeroplanes or FSTDs. when giving general skills training, other lower devises may be sufficient, but not when trying to teach the performances and specifics of a particular type of aircraft.

response

*Not accepted*

Your comment seems to refer to the aeroplane section, where it has been accepted. In the case of powered-lift, the Agency does not consider that the change is adequate.

comment

5821

comment by: *ENAC TLP*

The technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed flight test tolerances (standards) need some specifications for NTS and TEM avoiding the use of terms such as 'good judgement and airmanship' that are easily prone to subjectivity, bias and abuse during assessment because of a lack of common understanding.

**Need:** more clear and unambiguous standards for the assessment of non-technical skills during skill test and proficiency checks for class/type ratings and license skill tests.

**Proposal:** Specify differently the non technical abilities to be demonstrated during test/checks to exercise good airmanship and related Flight test tolerances

#### **APPENDIX 9 SKILL TEST AND PROF CHECK FOR ATPL.....**

##### **D. Specific requirements for powered lift category**

##### **FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES**

##### **page 140**

To be modified as follows (italics)

4. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

(a) as it is

(b) as it is

(c) *apply NTS and TEM as needed to exercise good airmanship;*

(d) as it is;  
 (e) as it is  
 (f) as it is;  
 (g) *deleted (already included in NTS, see GM to FCL.010 Definitions)*

response *Noted*  
 Please see reply to comment 4237 above.

comment **5823** comment by: *ENAC TLP*

The technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed flight test tolerances (standards) need some specifications for NTS and TEM avoiding the use of terms such as 'good judgement and airmanship' that are easily prone to subjectivity, bias and abuse during assessment because of a lack of common understanding.

**Need:** more clear and unambiguous standards for the assessment of non-technical skills during skill test and proficiency checks for class/type ratings and license skill tests.

**Proposal:** specify differently the non technical abilities to be demonstrated during test/checks to exercise good airmanship and related Flight test tolerances

**APPENDIX 9 SKILL TEST AND PROF CHECK FOR ATPL.....**  
**E. Specific requirements for the airship category**  
**FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES**  
**page 146**  
 To be modified as follows (italics)

4. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

(a) as it is  
 (b) as it is  
 (c) *apply NTS and TEM as needed to exercise good airmanship;*  
 (d) as it is;  
 (e) as it is  
 (f) as it is;  
 (g) *deleted ( already included in NTS, see GM to FCL.010 Definitions)*

response *Noted*  
 Please see reply to comment 4237 above.

comment comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

**5913** ❖

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**  
 Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.  
 Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response *Not accepted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the multiple comments asking for the content of this Appendix to be transferred into AMC.

However, and until such time as competency based standards for assessing pilot competencies are developed, the Agency considers that it is essential that the flight training and skill test contents for professional licences remains in the rule.

Therefore, the text of Appendix 9 will not be transferred to AMC.

comment

7134

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

FCL Appendix 9 D para 2 (c)

**Page No:**

140 of 647

**Comment:**

The competency of "exercise good judgement and airmanship" is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.

**Justification:**

Consistency across licence skill tests.

**Proposed Text:**

**(if applicable)**

Amend to read;

~~"exercise good judgement and airmanship~~ - *apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test*".

response

*Noted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never

solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.  
We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

7137

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

FCL Appendix 9 D Column 1 of table on page 141

**Page No:**

141 of 647

**Comment:**

The column should require the pilots to be tested in accordance with the principles of NTS.

**Justification:**

Consistency

**Proposed Text:**

**(if applicable)**

Add as follows;

Manoeuvres/Procedures

"(including Non-Technical Skills)"

response

Noted

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

7742

comment by: CAA Finland

Skill test form:

The form should not be used as training program. The structure is not suitable for that. Instructors initials should be removed and the training organization shall produce a syllabi where instructors signature is required.

The numbering system differs from CPL or IR skill test forms and should be harmonized. I support the structure of TR form as there is clearly easy to add subparts like 2.4 > 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.1		
1.2		
1.3		
And		
So		
On		




Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.1		
2.2		
2.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.1		
3.2		
3.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

response

**Noted**

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the skill test/proficiency check tables included in the Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL (e.g. Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality. Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

To leave the content / format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training

organisations to develop their own check lists for forms.

In the meantime, to develop report forms as AMC material to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the applicable AMCs e.g. AMCs to Appendices 7, 9 and 12, as published in this NPA.

To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 9: Skill test and proficiency check for ATPL,. Type and class ratings and proficiency check for instrument ratings - E. Specific requirements for the airship category**

p. 146-152

comment	<p>222 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAA - The Netherlands</span></p> <p>E practical training, section 3</p> <p>The place of "3.13 APU" is in sequence of the normal procedures before the engine. The APU is necessary for the engine start.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency considers that the numbering is correct and does not need to be changed.</p>
comment	<p>4238 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority</span></p> <p>The proposed Non-technical testing standards lack clarity and formal definition e.g. the use of terms such as 'judgement' and 'airmanship'. In addition, application of the proposed criteria is susceptible to subjectivity, bias and abuse because of a lack of common understanding and the requirement for standardised interpretation. This will undermine confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.</p> <p>There are also currently no standards for pilot test/check applicants to follow regarding their requirement to comply with the competency of non-technical skills. This needs to be added to the detailed FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES .</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b></p> <p>FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES para 4 should be ammended to read</p> <p>4. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:</p> <p>(a) .....</p> <p>(b) .....</p> <p>(c) <u>operate the aircraft safely, efficiently and apply to the required standard,</u></p>

Non-technical Skills (NTS) such as Teamwork, Situation Awareness and Threat and Error Management etc'

- (d) .....  
 (e) .....  
 (f) .....

Licensed Flightcrew, Examiners and Instructors should be trained in the concepts, use and application of an agreed and validated set of non-technical skills competence standards appropriate to their role (a behavioural marker system) that is acceptable to the competent authority for the purpose of non-technical skills assessment. Insert the following into the flight test standards after para 5.

FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES

6 Non-technical Skills Assessment

The specific requirement for the assessment of non-technical skills during initial and recurrent testing is not intended to create additional opportunities to fail flightcrew members, but to help diagnose and correctly define any underlying deficiency in non-technical competence in relation to any observed technical failures. The assessment must be made against agreed non-technical skills standards (a behavioural marker system) using a methodology that is acceptable to the competent authority. Only observable behaviour is to be assessed. Non-technical skills cannot provoke an unacceptable assessment in the absence of a related technical failure such as a failure to follow standard operating procedures, and there must be a clear and unambiguous link between the technical failure observed and the unacceptable non-technical skill(s).

FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES

6 Non-technical Skills Assessment

The specific requirement for the assessment of non-technical skills during initial and recurrent testing is not intended to create additional opportunities to fail flightcrew members, but to help diagnose and correctly define any underlying deficiency in non-technical competence in relation to any observed technical failures. The assessment must be made against agreed non-technical skills standards (a behavioural marker system) using a methodology that is acceptable to the competent authority. Only observable behaviour is to be assessed. Non-technical skills cannot provoke an unacceptable assessment in the absence of a related technical failure such as a failure to follow standard operating procedures, and there must be a clear and unambiguous link between the technical failure observed and the unacceptable non-technical skill(s).

response *Noted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment	<p>5048 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ECA- European Cockpit Association</i></span></p> <p>Comment on paragraph 5, page 148: text should be changed as follows:  <del>Flight Simulation Training Devices</del> <u>Flight simulator or FNPT II</u> shall be used for practical training and testing if they form part of an approved typerating course. The following considerations will apply to the approval of the course:  a) the qualification of the flight simulation training devices as set out in Part <del>FSTD</del> <u>Flight simulator or FNPT II</u>;  b) the qualifications of the instructor;</p> <p>Justification:  This should go back to the JAR requirement. The use of other FSTDs than FNPT II or flight simulators for training on types of aeroplanes will jeopardize safety. In principle, the training is based on the goodness of the instructor and the tools used. In Aviation, the tools are the aeroplanes or FSTDs. when giving general skills training, other lower devises may be sufficient, but not when trying to teach the performances and specifics of a particular type of aircraft.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Your comment seems to refer to the aeroplane section, where it was accepted. The Agency believes that in relation to airships it does not make sense.</p>
comment	<p><span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></span></p> <p>5913 ❖</p> <p>The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&amp;10.</p> <p><b><u>Comment:</u></b>  Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.  Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.</p> <p>Rationale , provided as expample based on Appendix 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9</li> <li>• changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.</li> <li>• As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Proposal:</u></b></p> <p>Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.</p> <p>The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for</p>

consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate so as to address the above.

response *Not accepted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the multiple comments asking for the content of this Appendix to be transferred into AMC.

However, and until such time as competency based standards for assessing pilot competencies are developed, the Agency considers that it is essential that the flight training and skill test contents for professional licences remains in the rule.

Therefore, the text of Appendix 9 will not be transferred to AMC.

comment 7138 comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**  
FCL Appendix 9 D para 2 (c)

**Page No:**  
147 of 647

**Comment:**  
The competency of "exercise good judgement and airmanship" is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.

**Justification:**  
Consistency across licence skill tests.

**Proposed Text:  
(if applicable)**  
Amend to read;  
~~"exercise good judgement and airmanship~~ - *apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test*".

response *Not accepted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment 7743 comment by: CAA Finland

Skill test form:

The form should not be used as training program. The structure is not suitable for that. Instructors initials should be removed and the training organization shall produce a syllabi where instructors signature is required.

The numbering system differs from CPL or IR skill test forms and should be harmonized. I support the structure of TR form as there is clearly easy to add subparts like 2.4 > 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
--	--------	----

1.1		
1.2		
1.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.1		
2.2		
2.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.1		
3.2		
3.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

response *Noted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the skill test/proficiency check tables included in the

Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL (e.g. Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

To leave the content/format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms.

In the meantime, to develop report forms as AMC material to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the applicable AMCs e.g. AMCs to Appendices 7, 9 and 12, as published in this NPA.

To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 10: Course of additional theoretical knowledge for a class or type rating for high performance single-pilot aeroplanes**

p. 153-154

comment

1129

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

1) The subjects do not match with the Learning Objectives JAR-FCL. Has to be examined.  
2) EASA-FCL does not have an oversight of the relevant Learning Objectives. Should be added.

Reason: FTO's has to know more in details what the students have to know.

response

*Noted*

The text is a copy of JAR-FCL.  
The Agency will review issues like the subject numbers and relationship with the Learning Objectives within rulemaking task FCL.002, which has been included in the rulemaking programme of the Agency precisely for these issues.  
Please see also replies to comments in Appendix 2 and comment 5913 below.

comment

2569

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

The subject references given in this appendix can NOT be found in the "aeroplane syllabus" for the ATPL (see appendix 2)

response

*Noted*

Please see reply to comment 1129 above.

comment

5381

comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

Comment on point 2, page 154, change text as follows:

2 The holder of an ICAO ATPL(A) or a pass in the theoretical knowledge examinations at ATPL(A) level is credited with meeting the requirement of this appendix. A pass in any theoretical knowledge subjects as part of the HPA course will not be credited against meeting future theoretical examination requirements for issue of a CPL(A), IR(A) or ATPL(A).

Justification:

This was old crediting from JAR and there is no safety justification to delete them. Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the old JAR appendix should be kept.

response

*Not accepted*

This is already included in the rule, in FCL.720.A (b)(2)(iii).

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 5913 ❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

The following is a general comment that is valid for Appendices 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9&10.

**Comment:**

Text is prescriptive and does not necessarily meet the demands of a changing industry.

Detailed syllabus material should be transferred to AMC Syllabus.

Rationale , provided as example based on Appendix 9:

- To facilitate the potential for change and flexibility for training and checking according to evidence based concepts and the different challenges facing various generations of aircraft, Commercial air transport operators, with the approval of the competent authority and based on accident and incident data and/or special kind of operation, may deviate from the proficiency check prescribed in Appendix 9
- changes in technology: it is erroneous to create lists applicable to all aircraft types; the presence of this list in rule material does not allow the development of testing standards and items appropriate to aircraft type, class or generation.
- As a step prior to making Appendix 9 AMC material, the possibility to deviate based on accredited evidence should be made available.

**Proposal:**

Re write of listed appendices placing all syllabus material in appropriate related AMC.

The Industry group commenting is willing to provide detailed proposals for consideration during comment review and for incorporation as felt appropriate



	so as to address the above.
response	<i>Accepted</i> Text will be transferred to AMC as proposed.
comment	<i>7504</i> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>British Airways</i></span> In order to allow the introduction of modern training methodology and take into account the use of improved training devices the contents of this Appendix should be transferred to AMC and GM for the appropriate section.
response	<i>Accepted</i> Text will be transferred to AMC as proposed.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 11: Cross-crediting of proficiency checks for revalidation of type ratings - Helicopters**

p. 155

comment	<i>100</i> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Norbert Bönig</i></span> Appendix 11: The spelling of the helicopter type Hughes/Schweizer is wrong. The Hughes helicopter HU 269 is now produced by the Schweizer Aircraft Corporation. There is no "t" in the company name!
response	<i>Accepted</i> Editorial corrected.
comment	<i>1738</i> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Bram W. Schrijver</i></span> please add a second table to allow cross-crediting of R44 and R22 helicopters
response	<i>Not accepted</i> At the moment, and taking into account the safety concerns that have been raised for these helicopters, the Agency does not intend to create a new list for cross-crediting between them. This could eventually be subject to a future rulemaking task.
comment	<i>2601</i> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span> Should be an AMC. Reason: amending this list has to be flexible.
response	<i>Accepted</i> Text has been transferred to AMC, and the necessary changes to FCL.740.H (a)(3) and the AMC to FCL.060 have been made.
comment	<i>3214</i> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Susana Nogueira</i></span> Transfer to an AMC.  Justification: More flexibility to amend.

response

*Accepted*

Text has been transferred to AMC, and the necessary changes to FCL.740.H (a)(3) and the AMC to FCL.060 have been made.

comment

3285

comment by: *DGAC FRANCE*

Part FCL . Appendix 11

Light Single engine piston , already certificated by EASA in December 14<sup>th</sup> 2007 (TCDS.R.145) and already in the JIP Helicopter list (Table 9)

To add , in the table :

Manufacturer	Helicopter Type and Licence Endorsement
WESTLAND	
-SE piston	Bell 47
<b>GUIMBAL</b>	
<b>-SE piston</b>	<b>G2</b>

response

*Accepted*

Text has been amended accordingly.

comment

3295

comment by: *DGAC FRANCE*

Part FCL appendix 11

To deal more rapidly with the necessary changes (add new helicopters).

Change this appendix for an AMC.

response

*Accepted*

Text has been transferred to AMC, and the necessary changes to FCL.740.H (a)(3) and the AMC to FCL.060 have been made.

comment

3489

comment by: *FOCA Switzerland*

Appendix 11  
Cross-credit Table

Proposal

Wouldn't it better to become an AMC?

response

*Accepted*

Text has been transferred to AMC, and the necessary changes to FCL.740.H (a)(3) and the AMC to FCL.060 have been made.

comment

3715

comment by: *DGAC FRANCE*

## APPENDIX 11

- 1) It must not be an appendix because update process of that cross-crediting list must be flexible and done as necessary.
- 2) Cross-reference from FCL .740.H (a)(3), and from AMC to FCL.060 (b)(4) shall be update accordingly
- 1) This cross crediting list must be an AMC !

The following helicopter must be in that list (new entry in the type rating list) and brings same credit

1 Manufacturer	2 Helicopter	3	4 Licence endorsement
Guimbal			
- SE Piston -	Cabri G2		G2

response

*Accepted*

Text has been transferred to AMC, and the necessary changes to FCL.740.H (a)(3) and the AMC to FCL.060 have been made.

comment

7505

comment by: *British Airways*

In order to allow the introduction of modern training methodology and take into account the use of improved training devices the contents of this Appendix should be transferred to AMC and GM for the appropriate section.

response

*Accepted*

Text has been transferred to AMC, and the necessary changes to FCL.740.H (a)(3) and the AMC to FCL.060 have been made.

**B. Draft Opinion Part-FCL - Appendix 12: Skill test, proficiency check and verbal theoretical knowledge examination for the instructor certificate**

p. 156-158

comment

156

comment by: *Michel Lacombe AF TRTO*

In the paragraph GENERAL numbering is false (N° 3 appears twice).

**New text :****GENERAL**

**1** The format and application form for the skill test shall be determined by the Authority.

**2** The instructor skill test shall comprise oral theoretical examinations on the ground, preflight and post flight briefings and in flight demonstrations during skill tests in the appropriate aircraft category.

**3** An applicant for the skill test shall have received instruction on the same type or class as of the aircraft used for the test. The aircraft used for the test shall meet the requirements set out in Appendix 4, B.1, C.1 and D.1.

**4** Before taking the skill test an applicant shall have completed the required training. The approved training organization shall produce the applicant's training records when required by the examiner.

**5** The examiner shall be the pilot in command, except in circumstances agreed upon by the examiner when another instructor is designated as pilot in command for the flight.

**6** During the skill test the applicant shall occupy the seat normally occupied by the instructor, except in the case of balloons. The examiner or another instructor shall function as the 'student'. The applicant shall be required to explain the relevant exercises and to demonstrate their conduct to the 'student', where appropriate. Thereafter, the 'student' shall execute the same manoeuvres including typical mistakes of inexperienced students. The applicant is expected to correct mistakes orally or, if necessary, by intervening.

#### **CONTENT**

**7** The content of the skill test shall, in addition to the competencies described in FCL.920, include the following:

Page 158 confers to items a-i of section 1.

These items should have been labeled in this table on the left column.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for your comment.

The numbering will be changed accordingly.

comment

157

comment by: *Michel Lacombe AF TRTO*

This test seems built to check the ability of a flight instructor in pilot seat , and that's normal for LAFI-FI-CRI-TRI-IRI.

But I am not sure that it is adequate to check the quality of instructors working only in synthetic devices as TRI restraint to FFS and SFI.

**An assessment in the same spirit than defined for the MMCI should be more adequate** or why the MMCI have not to demonstrate the same ability as they could be working in the same surrounding than a TRI restraint or a SFI ???

For our types of aircraft doing this skill test on a plane is rather dangerous, so we should be allowed to pass it on simulator.

#### ***New text :***

##### **GENERAL**

1 The format and application form for the skill test shall be determined by the Authority.

2 The instructor skill test shall comprise oral theoretical examinations on the ground, preflight and post flight briefings and in-flight demonstrations during skill tests in the appropriate aircraft category.

3 An applicant for the skill test shall have received instruction on the same type or class as of the aircraft **or simulator** used for the test. The aircraft **when** used for the test shall meet the requirements set out in Appendix 4, B.1,

C.1 and D.1.

3 Before taking the skill test an applicant shall have completed the required training. The approved training organization shall produce the applicant's training records when required by the examiner.

4 **When on a aircraft**, the examiner shall be the pilot in command, except in circumstances agreed upon by the examiner when another instructor is designated as pilot in command for the flight.

5 During the skill test the applicant shall occupy the seat normally occupied by the instructor, **instructor's seat if in a simulator, or pilot seat if in an aircraft**, except in the case of balloons. The examiner or another instructor shall function as the 'student'. The applicant shall be required to explain the relevant exercises and to demonstrate (**if on an aircraft**) their conduct to the 'student', where appropriate. Thereafter, the 'student' shall execute the same maneuvers including typical mistakes of inexperienced students. The applicant is expected to correct mistakes orally or, if necessary, by intervening.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for your comment.

It was not the intention of the Agency to exclude the possibility of having the skill test taken in an FSTD representing the aircraft.

The text will be changed to indicate that the skill test can be taken either in the aircraft or in an adequately qualified FSTD representing the aircraft, and to include the other items you mention.

comment

302

comment by: *Michel Lacombe AF TRTO*

8 All relevant Sections shall be completed within a period of 6 months. However, all Sections should, where possible, be completed on the same day. **Failure in any exercise requires a retest covering all exercises**, with the exception of those in Sections 1 and 5, which, if failed, may be retaken separately. The examiner shall terminate the test at any stage if they consider that a retest is

required

**PROFICIENCY CHECK**

9 An applicant who fails to achieve a pass in all sections of a proficiency check before the expiry date of an instructor certificate shall not exercise the privileges of that certificate until the proficiency check has successfully been completed.

I understand in paragraph 8 (which should be 9) that any failure requires to retest all exercises, that means the test is failed. So the consequence should induced to be banned to exercise the privileges of the certificate. Paragraph 9 (10) wording is ambiguous.

**It will be clearer if writing :**

**PROFICIENCY CHECK**

10 An applicant who fails to achieve a pass **in even one section** of a proficiency check before the expiry date of an instructor certificate shall not exercise the privileges of that certificate until the proficiency check has successfully been completed.

response

*Partially accepted*

Thank you for your comment.

The first comment is agreed and the text will be changed accordingly. For your comment on the proficiency check it should be highlighted that the term was changed to read "assessment of competence". As some of the text was moved to the Implementing Rules (FCL.935 Assessment of competence) you will find the more general issues like the mentioned procedure for the revalidation in this paragraph.

comment **340** comment by: *Michel Lacombe AF TRTO*

Numbering error :  
item 3 appears twice

response *Accepted*

Please see the reply above to comment 156.

comment **1272** comment by: *Ryanair*

Attachment [#67](#)

Please see the attached document which contains a discussion about the SFI/TRI skills test and two proposals in relation to this. Please note that elsewhere in the CRT in the context of SFI Skills Test, reference will be made to this proposal.

response *Noted*

Thank you for your comment.

After having reviewed your proposals, as well as other comments on this Appendix, the Agency has concluded that there is a need to change the initial proposal related to Appendix 12. The main reason for this is the fact that this Appendix was indeed based on a JAR-FCL Appendix that was meant just for the FI. The comments received clearly indicate that it is not adequate to all types of instructors, and also does not reflect correctly the difference in content between skill tests and proficiency checks.

Therefore, the Agency has decided to pass part of the content of Appendix 12 to AMC. Some of the paragraphs will be transferred to a general paragraph in Subpart J (see new paragraph FCL.935) on the assessment of competence dealing with the former skill tests/proficiency checks for instructors (ex. paragraphs 1 to 4), but the content of the skill test as determined in the table will be part of an AMC applicable to the FI only.

Your proposals cannot be included at this stage as additional AMCs for the TRI/SFI but it is possible that in the future further AMC material for other categories of instructors (e.g. TRI/SFI) will be developed or will be accepted as alternative AMC by the competent authority of a certain Member State.

comment **1418** comment by: *Bristow Helicopters*

6. (b) .... flight instructor and de-briefing. **The exercises and demonstration of instructor ability for instructor certificates other than the FI, shall be those relevant to the applicable instructor certificate.**

	<p>Justification: Clarity of meaning. 6(b) applies to all instructor certificates, but the detail is related only to the FI.</p> <p>6. (c) ... or a simulator, FNPT II <b>or FTD 2/3</b> simulating a multi-engine aircraft.</p> <p>Justification: An FTD 2/3 is an acceptable device for this purpose.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>In relation to your first comment, please see the reply already provided to comment No. 1272 in the same segment above.</p> <p>In relation to your second comment it should be highlighted that the wording used is the same as used in JAR-FCL. The Agency has re-discussed the issue and came to the conclusion to stay with the JAR wording and not to include FTD 2/3 as this device is more or less only a system trainer which will not allow to check all the test items sufficiently.</p>
comment	<p>2141 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>British International Helicopters</i></span></p> <p>6. (b) .... flight instructor and de-briefing. <b>The exercises and demonstration of instructor ability for instructor certificates other than the FI, shall be those relevant to the applicable instructor certificate.</b></p> <p>Justification: Clarity of meaning. 6(b) applies to all instructor certificates, but the detail is related only to the FI.</p> <p>6. (c) ... or a simulator, FNPT II <b>or FTD 2/3</b> simulating a multi-engine aircraft.</p> <p>Justification: An FTD 2/3 is an acceptable device for this purpose.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 1418.</p>
comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>2240</p> <p>Comment: The title refers to Instructor proficiency check but there is nothing in the text about proficiency check.</p> <p>Proposal: Change the title to Instructor Competency Assessment and/or oral theoretical knowledge examination and use text from current EASA AMC FCL 920</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The reference to the proficiency check can be found in paragraph 9 of the proposed Appendix. However, as it was decided to use only the term</p>

"assessment of competence" the wording "proficiency check" will be deleted and the mentioned items transferred to a new requirement in the Implementing Rules (and related AMCs).

Please see also the reply to comment No. 1272 above.

comment 2357 comment by: *AECA(SPAIN)*

6. (b) .... flight instructor and de-briefing. **The exercises and demonstration of instructor ability for instructor certificates other than the FI, shall be those relevant to the applicable instructor certificate.**

Justification: Clarity of meaning. 6(b) applies to all instructor certificates, but the detail is related only to the FI.

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 1272 above.

comment 2358 comment by: *AECA(SPAIN)*

6. (c) ... or a simulator, FNPT II **or FTD 2/3** simulating a multi-engine aircraft.

Justification:  
An FTD 2/3 is an acceptable device for this purpose.

response *Not accepted*

Please see the second part of the reply provided to comment No. 1418 in the same segment above.

comment 2824 comment by: *Dr. Horst Schomann*

Problem: The difference between a skill test and a proficiency check is unclear.

Proposed solution: Define the proficiency check as a part of a skill test.

Justification: The proficiency check cannot cover the full amount of a skill test if it is intended to support license owners during their time of application with acceptable effort. Therefore it should cover some basics and actual items which result from the latest findings regarding handling or knowledge problems (e.g. out of accident investigations).

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 1272 above.

comment 3284 comment by: *DGAC FRANCE*

Part FCL Appendix 12

This appendix comes from the JAR FCL, where it was about instructor skill tests and proficiency checks for FI, CRI, IRI. It is not adapted for TRI (MP) and SFI assessment in a FFS. See notably GENERAL paragraph 3 and 5.

Another appendix should be developed for TRI (MP) and SFI assessment in a FFS. This new appendix should describe the JAR system for TRI (MP) and SFI



assessment, notably maintain the possibility of an assessment in a real training situation when possible.

Moreover the numbering of the items are lacking.

response

*Partially accepted*

Concerning your first comment:  
Please see reply to comment 1272 above.

Concerning your second comment:  
See also our reply to your comment 3987: The numbering in the left column will be changed accordingly.

comment

**3805**

comment by: *Klaus HARTMANN*

In GENERAL Nr. 5 vom Appendix 12 soll beim skill test der Prüfer oder ein Lehrer den Schüler darstellen/simulieren. Im Falle des Ballons, wo jede im Korb befindliche Person auf alle Steuerungseinrichtungen Zugriff hat, sollte unbedingt auch ein student pilot eingesetzt werden können. Das Verhalten von realen student pilots ist von erfahrenen Piloten kaum zu simulieren, da bei ihnen alle Handlungen automatisiert ablaufen und dadurch absichtlich gemachte Fehler sich von student pilots gemachten Fehlern deutlich unterscheiden. Das kann beim skill test des Anwärters auch zu Mißverständnissen führen wenn ihm nicht klar ist, ob der Schüler-Darsteller gerade einen Fehler simulieren wollte oder ob es der persönliche Fahrstil des Schüler-Darstellers war, den er besser nicht korrigieren sollte. Daher ist der Einsatz eines student pilot, wenn verfügbar, beim skill test vor anderen Lösungen im Ballon vorzuziehen.

Weder in der Überschrift noch im Text ist der LAFI erwähnt, für den der Appendix auch verwendet werden soll. Zur Klarstellung sollte das geändert werden.

Im gesamten Text wird als Prüfer der examiner genannt. Wahrscheinlich ist aber gemeint, dass diese Prüfungen vom instructor examiner durchgeführt werden sollen. Zur Klarstellung sollte das geändert werden.

Während die Überschrift wie auch die Verweise von z.B. FCL.940.FI ein identisches Prüfungsverfahren bei skill test und proficiency check vermuten lassen, ist im gesamten Text nur noch der skill test erwähnt. Nur bei Nr. 9 erscheint wieder im Text und die Überschrift 'proficiency check'.

Lehrer müssen alle 3 Jahre zur Verlängerung der Lehrberechtigung nachweisen, dass sie praktisch ausgebildet haben bzw. einen proficiency check gemacht haben und einen Fortbildungslehrgang besucht haben. Daher erscheint es nicht sinnvoll, die gleiche Prüfung wie ein Neuling zu durchlaufen. Für den proficiency check sollte daher ein eigenständiger Appendix (z.B. 12a oder 13) mit geringeren Anforderungen erstellt werden.

Überprüft werden sollten speziell Sicherheitsrelevante Themen z.B.:

Wie kommuniziert der Lehrer mit einem Schüler (wie werden Erklärungen gegeben, wird das vorhandene Wissen des Schülers berücksichtigt) bei folgenden Themen:

Fahrtvorbereitung einer gedachten Ballonfahrt mit vorgegebenen Daten:

Navigations (Airspace, Notam, erreichbares Landegelande, Beladung)

Meteorologisch

Aufrüsten des Korbes

Crew-/Passenger briefing

crowd control

Während einer Fahrt oder simulierten Fahrt im Korb am Boden :

	Notverfahren im Korb
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see also the reply to comment 1272 above.</p> <p>The Agency agrees that in the case of balloons there are some advantages in allowing also a "real" student pilot to function as the student. This will be possible since item 5 will be part of an AMC.</p> <p>Regarding your second issue it should be highlighted that the term "instructor certificate" is a general term including also the LAFI. As this Appendix (which will be transferred into AMC) is mentioned in FCL.935.LAFI the Agency cannot see a need to mention the LAFI specifically. But it should be mentioned that item 6 (b) mentions the FI. This will be part of the AMC related to the FI skill test. For other instructor categories there might be a need to develop a specific additional AMC at a later stage.</p> <p>A similar issue is the mentioned wording for the examiner. The skill test or proficiency check described in this Appendix has to be conducted clearly by an FIE and not by an FE only. As the privileges for each examiner are contained in each section in subpart K (e.g. FCL.1005.FE) the Agency does not see a need to mention explicitly the FIE here.</p> <p>The comment is right when stating that the term "proficiency check" must be added when the term "skill test" is mentioned. However, as it was decided to use the term "assessment of competence" this differentiation is not any longer necessary.</p>
comment	<p>3987 <span style="float: right;">comment by: DGAC FRANCE</span></p> <p>Appendix 12</p> <p>The left column as to numbered a.b.c.d.e..... or to be removed ! (see Appendix 2 to JAR-FCL 1.330 &amp; 1.345, and some sections disappears .... At least the header should be kept!</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The numbering in the left column will be changed accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>4437 <span style="float: right;">comment by: Bond Offshore Helicopters</span></p> <p>6. (b) .... flight instructor and de-briefing. <b>The exercises and demonstration of instructor ability for instructor certificates other than the FI, shall be those relevant to the applicable instructor certificate.</b> Justification: Clarity of meaning. 6(b) applies to all instructor certificates, but the detail is related only to the FI.</p> <p>6. (c) ... or a simulator, FNPT II <b>or FTD 2/3</b> simulating a multi-engine aircraft. Justification:</p>

	An FTD 2/3 is an acceptable device for this purpose.
response	Noted
	Please see the reply above to comment 1418.

comment	<p>4496 <span style="float: right;">comment by: Irish Aviation Authority</span></p> <p><b>[APPENDIX 12</b></p> <p><i>Appendix 12 appears to be designed with particular emphasis on the requirements for Instructors who are required to instruct in an aircraft. Other aspects give the perception that it is designed to cater for FIs and not for TRI MPA's, SFI's or MCCI's. The emphasis clearly indicates that these aspects of Appendix 12 are not directed at instructors in highly automated MPAs operating to strict Standard Operating Procedures. In its current format, the appendix cannot be complied with by pilots wishing to obtain TRI or SFI Certificate on Multi Pilot Jet Aircraft restricted to Simulators. For example, paragraph 3 (the first one – there are two paragraphs 3) says "The aircraft used for the test shall meet the requirements set out in Appendix 4, B.1" which says "The aeroplane used for the...test...shall...have a variable pitch propeller..."</i></p> <p><i>Restricted Privilege TRI (or SFI) currently form the great majority of instructors in a large TRTO or Airline. The vast majority of such Instructors will never become unrestricted and will spend all their careers instructing in simulators.</i></p> <p><i>What happens currently, and produces excellent quality Instructors is the following, which appears to have been omitted from this appendix and also Subpart J and its AMC's:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. The Airline or TRTO interviews for prospective new TRI's and SFI's and selects suitable candidates.</i></li> <li><i>2. Selected candidates attend a Core Course of Teaching and Learning skills (this can be waived if the candidate has previous Instructional experience).</i></li> <li><i>3. The candidates are then supervised, by a suitably qualified TRI or SFI, conducting a complete Type Rating course. The length of this Technical Course depends on the complexity of the Type involved, but in any case <u>all</u> of the elements of the Type Rating course are either conducted or seen conducted or demonstrated by each candidate. This may involve as many as 10 simulator sessions. It is not sufficient just to <u>hold</u> a Type Rating to be able to <u>teach</u> all the Normal, Non-normal and Emergency Procedures on a Transport Category Aircraft.</i></li> <li><i>4. Towards the end of the course, the candidate's performance is checked during a full briefing, simulator session and debrief, by a Flight Inspector or a suitably qualified TRI or more usually a TRE(S) acceptable to the Authority.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>AMC No 1 to FCL.930.TRI 8 does not give any indication of what format this test should take.</i></p> <p><i>The proposal below would allow this to happen. The details of a skills test which will qualify and revalidate Restricted and Unrestricted TRI's and SFI's should be specified in more detail in an AMC. This will give the ATO or Airline the option of conducting the test with a real crew or with a simulated crew as</i></p>
---------	--

*happens under JAR FCL. This proposal is based closely on the processes developed between Training Organisations and Authorities which have been in use for many years very successfully.*

**PROPOSAL:**

*Appendix 12 should be made accessible to all applicants for the Instructor Certificate and have the following format.]*

**APPENDIX 12**

**SKILL TEST, PROFICIENCY CHECK AND VERBAL THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE FOR THE INSTRUCTOR CERTIFICATE**

GENERAL

1. The format and application form for the skill test and proficiency check shall be determined by the Authority.
2. The instructor skill test shall comprise oral theoretical examinations as appropriate to the class or type, pre-flight and post flight briefings and in-flight demonstrations during the skill test in the appropriate aircraft class, type or simulator. If relevant, the aircraft used for the test shall meet the requirements set out in Appendix 4, B.1, C.1 and D.1
3. An applicant for the skill test shall have received instruction in the same type or class as the aircraft or simulator used for the test.
4. Before taking the skill test for initial issue of an instructor certificate or renewal of a lapsed certificate or the proficiency check for revalidation of a current certificate an applicant shall have completed the required training. The approved training organisation shall produce the applicant's training records when required by the examiner.
5. If an aircraft is used for the test, the examiner shall be the pilot-in-command, except in circumstances agreed upon by the examiner when another instructor is designated as pilot-in-command for the flight.
6. During the skills test the applicant shall occupy the seat normally occupied by the instructor, including the IOS in a FSTD. The examiner or another instructor, or, for MPA in a simulator, a real crew under instruction, shall function as the 'student(s)'. The applicant shall be required to explain the relevant exercises and to demonstrate their conduct to the 'student(s)', where appropriate. Thereafter the 'student(s)' shall execute the same manoeuvres (if the 'student' is the examiner or another instructor, this can include deliberate mistakes typical of inexperienced students). The applicant is expected to correct mistakes orally or, if necessary, by intervening physically.

**Content:**

7. The candidate shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of an examiner the competencies described in FCL.920(a) and in addition the following, except as noted below.

**SECTION 1 THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE ORAL**

**(i) Lecture**

**(ii) Oral Test including:**

- a Air Law
- b Aircraft General Knowledge
- c Flight Performance and Planning
- d Human Performance and Limitations
- e Meteorology
- f Navigation
- g Operational Procedures
- h Principles of Flight
- i Training Administration

## **SECTION 2 PRE-FLIGHT BRIEFING**

- a Visual Presentation
- b Technical Accuracy
- c Clarity of Explanation
- d Clarity of Speech
- e Instructional Technique
- f Use of Models and Aids
- g Student Participation

## **SECTION 3 – THE FLIGHT OR SIMULATOR SESSION**

- a Arrangement of Demonstration
- b Synchronisation of speech with Demonstration
- c Correction of Faults
- d Aircraft or Simulator Handling.
- e Instructional Technique
- f General Airmanship / Safety
- g Positioning, use of Airspace

## **SECTION 4 – MULTI-ENGINE EXERCISES**

- a <sup>1</sup> Actions following an Engine failure shortly after takeoff, or for aeroplanes if a simulator is used, between  $V_1$  and  $V_2$
- b <sup>1</sup> A single-engine approach and go around flown manually
- c <sup>1</sup> A single-engine approach and manual landing
- d For multi-engine classes or types having more than two engines, a two engine inoperative approach and landing

<sup>1</sup> These exercises shall be demonstrated at the skill test for the single-pilot multi-engine CRI rating and for any airship instructor certificate.

## **SECTION 5 – POST FLIGHT DEBRIEFING**

- a Visual Presentation
- b Technical Accuracy
- c Clarity of Explanation
- d Clarity of Speech
- e Instructional Technique
- f Use of Models and Aids
- g Student Participation

(a) Section 1, the oral theoretical knowledge examination part of the skill test, is for all instructor certificates and shall be subdivided into two parts:

(i) the applicant is required to give a lecture under test conditions to other

'student(s)', one of whom will be the examiner. The test lecture is to be selected from items a-i of Section 1. The amount of time for preparation of the test lecture shall be agreed upon beforehand with the examiner. Appropriate literature may be used by the applicant. The test lecture should not exceed 45 minutes. For TRI MPA, SFI and MCCI this lecture can be included in Section 2, Pre Flight Briefing.

*[Justification: a 45 min lecture on top of what is already more than 6 hours Instruction in a simulator session for MPA is overload for all concerned.]*

(ii) the applicant is tested orally by an examiner for knowledge of items a–i of Section 1.

*[Delete: "...and the 'core instructor competencies teaching and learning' content given in the instructor courses." Justification: If the student has satisfactorily completed the prescribed training this will be self evident during the course of the Test or Check.]*

(b) Section 2, 3 and 5 are for all instructor certificates. These sections comprise exercises to demonstrate the ability to be a FI, CRI, IRI, TRI, SFI, STI or MCCI (i.e. instructor demonstration exercises) chosen by or agreed by the examiner from the flight syllabus of the relevant training courses. The applicant will be required to demonstrate Instructor abilities, including briefing, flight instruction and debriefing.

(c) Section 4 comprises additional instructor demonstration exercises for a FI or CRI certificate for multiengine aircraft. This section, if required, shall use a multi-engine aircraft, or a simulator or FNPT II simulating a multi-engine aircraft. This section shall be completed in addition to Section 2, 3 and 5.

(d) For the addition of another Class or Type, the Skill Test shall include Sections 2, 3 and 5. If there are specific training implications regarding flight with one or more engines inoperative, Section 4 shall also be included.

(e) For upgrade from TRI MPA(Restricted) to TRI MPA (Unrestricted), all training for normal and non-normal exercises shall be completed in a Full Flight Simulator Qualified for Zero Flight Time Training before the Skill Test is attempted. The Skill Test shall include Sections 2, 3 and 5. The exercises in the aircraft shall include only normal manoeuvres.

***[COMMENT AND JUSTIFICATION***

***Unrestricted TRI MPA***

*Continuing from the above, the structure and content of Appendix 12 does not recognize the process for training or checking an unrestricted TRI MPA in an Airline or TRTO. These unrestricted TRIs will only be required to train type rating students in the required six take-offs and landings.*

*a. The emphasis in Appendix 12 does not take into account that the TRI's students will have been trained and tested in a ZFT Qualified simulator and will have recently successfully completed:*

- i. The theoretical exams associated with the ATPL*
- ii. Multi-engine Instrument Rating*
- iii. MCC*
- iv. Human Factors training.*

*They will also have received training in all the manoeuvres required to operate the aircraft in normal and non-normal circumstances.*

*b. The requirement for a TRI who is to conduct aircraft training in, for example a B737 or A320, to lecture on Aircraft General Knowledge, Meteorology, and Operational Procedures etc to pilots who have just completed a MPA type rating course is superfluous.*

*In this case, where a TRI in an Airline or TRTO is about to take a pilot into the circuit to complete the six required take-offs and landings, (s)he will need to give a detailed brief on, and therefore be tested on:*

- a. The transit to and entry into the circuit pattern*
- b. Landing techniques*
- c. Touch and go procedures*
- d. Rotation techniques*
- e. Attitude flying*
- f. The effects of thrust and primary/secondary flight controls*
- g. Speed control*
- h. Full stop landing techniques.*

*Appendix 12 should allow this. ]*

8 The skill test shall also include additional demonstration exercises, as decided by the examiner and agreed upon with the applicant before the skill test. For an instructor certificate for instrument ratings (IRI), these additional exercises shall be related to the training requirements for the initial issue of an IR.

9 All relevant Sections shall be completed within a period of 6 months. However, all Sections should, where possible, be completed on the same day. Failure in any exercise requires a retest covering all exercises, with the exception of those in Sections 1 and 5, which, if failed, may be retaken separately. The examiner shall terminate the test at any stage if they consider that a retest is required.

#### PROFICIENCY CHECK

10 An applicant who fails to achieve a pass in all sections of a proficiency check before the expiry date of an instructor certificate shall not exercise the privileges of that certificate until the proficiency check has successfully been completed.

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for your detailed proposal.

After having reviewed your input, as well as other comments on this Appendix, the Agency has concluded that there is a need to change the initial proposal related to Appendix 12. The main reason for this is the fact that this Appendix was indeed based on a JAR-FCL Appendix that was meant just for the FI. The comments received clearly indicate that it is not adequate to all types of instructors, and also does not reflect correctly the difference in content between skill tests and proficiency checks.

Therefore, the Agency has decided to pass part of the content of Appendix 12 to AMC. Some of the paragraphs will be transferred to a general paragraph in Subpart J (see new paragraph FCL.935) on the assessment of competence dealing with the former skill tests/proficiency checks for instructors (ex. paragraphs 1 to 4), but the content of the skill test as determined in the table

will be part of an AMC applicable to the FI only.

Your proposals cannot be included at this stage as an additional AMC for the TRI assessment of competence but it is possible that in the future further AMC material for other categories of instructors (e.g. TRI/SFI) will be developed or will be accepted as alternative AMC by the competent authority of a certain Member State.

comment

4545

comment by: AEA

**Comment:**

The title refers to Instructor proficiency check but there is nothing in the text about proficiency check.

**Proposal:**

Change the title to **Instructor rating skill test and oral theoretical knowledge examination**

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees in general with your statement that the proposed document was not consistent with the use of the term "proficiency check" but it should be highlighted that some specific issues regarding the proficiency check were mentioned in the initial proposal under item 9.

However, in order to clarify this and to leave more flexibility for the development of further AMCs for the different instructor categories or the different contents for skill tests and proficiency checks it was decided to use the term "assessment of competence" (for both: the skill test and the proficiency check). Therefore, the proposed change of the wording is not longer necessary. Please see also the reply provided to comment No. 1272 in the same segment above.

comment

4679

comment by: Héli-Union

6. (b) .... flight instructor and de-briefing. **The exercises and demonstration of instructor ability for instructor certificates other than the FI, shall be those relevant to the applicable instructor certificate.**

Justification: Clarity of meaning. 6(b) applies to all instructor certificates, but the detail is related only to the FI.

6. (c) ... or a simulator, FNPT II **or FTD 2/3** simulating a multi-engine aircraft.

Justification:

An FTD 2/3 is an acceptable device for this purpose.

response

*Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1418.

comment

4782

comment by: OAA Oxford

General, add 6. The Skill Test for an IRI(A) may be taken in a simulator or FNPTII



	<b>please cross refer with notes 4618 and 4605</b>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency does not see a need to include such an additional sentence in the Appendix (this Appendix 12 will be published as an AMC to FCL.935) due to the fact that the additional requirement in FCL.935 which is dealing with the assessment of competence will contain all the requirements about the skill test and the proficiency checks. It is the opinion of the Agency that the IRI candidate should show the ability to instruct in the relevant aircraft which means that the initial skill test for the IRI should be completed aircraft. If certain manoeuvres have to be demonstrated which would make it necessary to use in addition an FSTD there is a provision to use an FSTD for that particular part of the skill test.</p> <p>Please see the resulting text for FCL.935 and the AMC material.</p>
comment	<p>4843 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Flight Training Europe</i></span></p> <p><u>Pages 156 &amp; 157 Appendix 12, Table of Content at para 6</u></p> <p>In the table each item in each Section needs to be identified by alphabetic letters (<b>a, b, c</b> etc) in the left hand column.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 3987.</p>
comment	<p>4899 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>HUTC</i></span></p> <p>6. (b) .... flight instructor and de-briefing. <b>The exercises and demonstration of instructor ability for instructor certificates other than the FI, shall be those relevant to the applicable instructor certificate.</b> Justification: Clarity of meaning. 6(b) applies to all instructor certificates, but the detail is related only to the FI.</p> <p>6. (c) ... or a simulator, FNPT II <b>or FTD 2/3</b> simulating a multi-engine aircraft. Justification: An FTD 2/3 is an acceptable device for this purpose.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 1418.</p>
comment	<p>5307 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>AEA</i></span></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The title of the appendix 12 should be <b>SKILL TEST, PROFICIENCY CHECK AND VERBAL THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE EXAMINATION FOR THE FLIGHT INSTRUCTOR (FI) CERTIFICATE</b></p> <p>This appendix is a copy and paste of the <b>Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.330 &amp; 1.345</b></p>

**“Arrangements for the flight instructor rating (FI (A)) skill test, proficiency check and oral theoretical knowledge examination” and Appendix 2 to JAR–FCL 1.330 & 1.345 “Contents of the flight instructor rating (FI (A)) skill test, oral theoretical knowledge examination and proficiency check”.**

It applies only for FI as only FI deals with inexperienced student pilots. This appendix is not applicable to other instructor certificate skill tests.

For CRI, IRI, TRI and SFI a continuous assessment during the instruction course is enough.

**Proposal:**

Change the title of appendix 12.

Delete all references to appendix 12 in the CRI, IRI, TRI, SFI skill test articles

**Change FCL.920 Instructor competencies and assessment as follow**

(a) *General*.

(b) *Assessment*. Except for the flight instructor (FI), during the course for the issue of an instructor certificate, a continuous assessment shall include the applicant’s competences as described in (a).

The skill test for the issue of a flight instructor (FI) certificate shall include the assessment of the applicant’s competences as described in (a).

response *Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1272.

comment 5384

comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

Comment:

There needs to be clarification on the "Authority", whether it is the National Authority or EASA.

Justification:

ECA guesses it will be the national authority, but there is a need to include more text for clarification. ECA suggests to change text as follows: by the competent authority.

response *Accepted*

Thank you for you comment.

It is indeed the competent authority who shall determine the format and application form for the skill test. The text will be changed accordingly.

comment 5772

comment by: *Christoph Talle*

First at all: why are the formulars placed in the appendix and not in AMC. Practise show`s, that the formulars often must be changed in, maybe little, details. This is difficult, when not a AMC.

For example: Appendix 12

For me as an FI(E) and senior examiner, this formular is OK for the skill test of an FI, but it is not practicable for a "profcheck"

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 1272 above.

comment 6103

comment by: *Finnish Aviation Academy*

response

In chapter 3 is set out a requirement for the airplane used in FI skill test (same as CPL-skill test). If that requirement is necessary it should be stated also in FCL.930.FI and AMC to FCL.930.FI. Now it is unclear what part of IR(A)-course should be performed with "CPL-aeroplane".

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

You are right with your statement that the requirement under 3 requires to use an aircraft for the skill test which is certificated for the carriage of at least 4 persons, have a variable pitch propeller and retractable landing gear. This was taken over from JAR-FCL (Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.330 & 1.345).

The issue was reviewed and the Agency came to the conclusion that this requirement would exclude a lot of training aircraft nowadays used for the instructor training courses and proficiency checks. In order to address this, the Agency has slightly changed the text. You will find the new wording in the AMC to FCL.930 containing the requirements for the assessment of competence. The AMC is asking for an aircraft meeting the requirements for training aircraft but not specifying the details as it was done in the proposal.

comment

6146

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

Appendix 12 Paragraph 3

**Page No:**

156

**Comment:**

This refers to Appendix 4 B.1 which describes the aeroplane required for a CPL skills test: have 4 seats, VP prop and retractable landing gear.

**Justification:**

Such an aeroplane is not required for FI testing.

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Remove these requirements for FI skills test and substitute the words used for helicopters and airships ie 'shall meet the requirements for training aeroplanes'.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for your comment.

Please see also the response provided to comment No. 6103 in the same segment above. The Agency agrees and is going to change the text accordingly.

comment

6151

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

Appendix 12 Section 4

**Page No:**

157 of 647

**Comment:**

These exercises are just as valid for multi pilot TRI & SFI certificates as they are for single pilot multi engine certificates.

	<p><b>Justification:</b> All instructors need to know how to demonstrate these exercises not just single pilot instructors.</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Note 1 change to read "...at the skill test <i>for all instructor certificates for multi engine aircraft.</i>"</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text will be changed accordingly.</p> <p>Please see also reply to comment 1272 above.</p>

comment	<p>6152 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> Appendix 12 Paragraph 8</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 158</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> 'Failure in any exercise requires a retest covering all exercises, with the exception of those in Sections 1 and 5 which may be retaken separately'. This raises 2 questions: it appears that failing the airwork requires a retest of Section 1 even though this is effectively a 'standalone' section. Section 5 is the 'Debrief'.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> It's difficult to see how a debrief could be tested as a stand-alone item.</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Amend to '...Section 1 which may...'. Consider allowing a retest of Sections 2 through 5 if Section 1 was satisfactory.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The text will be changed accordingly.</p>

comment	<p>6270 <span style="float: right;">comment by: Jonathan Coote</span></p> <p>The British Gliding Association already has in place a vastly superior system for training instructors to a range of grades. The training requirements are best managed by the Association; it is inappropriate for requirements with this level of detail to be in the NPA, and cannot possibly address the specific needs of glider pilots.</p> <p>In particular, there appears to be no recognition of the role of 'Basic Instructors' as in the current BGA system. Basic Instructors perform a crucial role for clubs, allowing them to attract new participants into the sport and give a great experience to the general public. Basic Instructors have limited authorisation to perform basic training, but as they consequently require less instruction, the number of such instructors is much higher than it would be if more extensive training was prescribed, thus crippling one of the main activities of gliding clubs. The effect of Appendix 12 appears to apply the same requirements to Basic Instructors as to more advanced instructors, thereby</p>
---------	--

	<p>needlessly increasing their training requirements and reducing the ability of clubs to provide effective training at a range of levels to members.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency is aware that different national systems for instructor ratings are actually in place for providing flight training in sailplanes.</p> <p>The Agency has evaluated some of these national requirements and based on the outcome a new category of instructors, the LAFI(S), was developed.</p> <p>The Agency cannot see a specific need for an additional instructor category with a limited privilege (e.g. allowing him/her to provide only parts of the training syllabus like basic training only). The prerequisites and the content of the training course defined in subpart J for the LAFI (S) as well as the content of the skill test (will be called "assessment of competence") will ensure the required level of competence and experience required to provide the flight training for the SPL or the LPL(S). No justification is provided why the main task of the "Basic Instructor" which seems to be the task to "attract new participants into the sport and give a great experience to the general public" cannot be conducted by an experienced sailplane pilot. As during this kind of flights no flight instruction will be provided (clearly passenger flights), no instructor rating/certificate or even specific training is needed. The Agency cannot see any reason for another instructor category.</p>
comment	<p>6455 <span style="float: right;">comment by: DCAA</span></p> <p>App. 12 App. 12The content form shall be in accordance with the JAR- FCL form to include a section for other exercises.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>You are right with the statement that the Appendix in JAR-FCL had a section for additional exercises (section 4: other exercises) to be chosen by the examiner. As this list in Appendix 12 (which will be transferred into AMC material) is not a skill test form but only a list of contents this additional "empty box" seems not to be needed. The additional exercises are mentioned in the text of the AMC and it is also mentioned that the competent authority may decide on the format and application form of the skill test forms (but based on this AMC).</p>
comment	<p>7142 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> FCL Appendix 12 para 6 SECTION 5</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 157 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The instructor should be tested with regard to his knowledge of NTS.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Consistency</p> <p><b>Proposed Text:</b> <b>(if applicable)</b> Amend to read by adding an extra line;</p>

	"Use of Non-Technical Skills"
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>FCL.920 already includes the requirement for the instructor to be checked on integration of threat and error management.</p> <p>The issue of non-technical skills and their assessment has never been greed at JAA level, and will require further discussion, as part of a dedicated rulemaking task.</p>
comment	<p>7176                      comment by: <i>CHC Europe EASA Ops Team - representing 550 pilots across Europe</i></p> <p>6. (b) .... flight instructor and de-briefing. <b>The exercises and demonstration of instructor ability for instructor certificates other than the FI, shall be those relevant to the applicable instructor certificate.</b> Justification: Clarity of meaning. 6(b) applies to all instructor certificates, but the detail is related only to the FI.</p> <p>6. (c) ... or a simulator, FNPT II <b>or FTD 2/3</b> simulating a multi-engine aircraft.</p> <p>Justification: An FTD 2/3 is an acceptable device for this purpose.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply above to comment 1418.</p>
comment	<p>7488    comment by: <i>Prof. Dr. Alexander Bubenik</i></p> <p>According to the provisions dealing with the revalidation (e.g. FCL.940.LAFI, FCL.940.FI) of instructor licences, if the full scope of appendix 12 is to be performed during proficiency checks, my worst apprehensions are about to come true.</p> <p>I'm deeply concerned that instructors providing training on a non-profit basis in aero-clubs will surrender their instructor licences (probably at a rate that will dry up private aviation), because</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- some sort of frustration will spread regarding an other check added (Inaguage, medical, security (ZÜP) ....)</li> <li>- one is confronted with an additional bureaucratic peculiarity (our lives are becoming more and more slalom races arround poles made out of paper).</li> </ul> <p>It's definitely beyond me what that kind of measure is expected to achieve? Safety? Was there are real lack, gap somebody believes to close .... - I have to appologize for the emtional statement, but it need to be said.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your response.</p> <p>The Agency would like to highlight that the required mandatory proficiency checks for the LAFI instructors have been discussed again with the experts during the review phase. As this kind of mandatory proficiency checks were already introduced with JAR-FCL, the experts supported the Agency in keeping them as a standardisation tool for the category FI. This means that for the</p>

FI(A) and FI(H) every alternate revalidation such a check will be needed. For the FI(S) and FI(B) it the proposal to require it for every third revalidation will be kept.

It should be pointed out that the Agency believes that the quality and standardisation of the instructors is seen as one of the main elements for a high safety standard in aviation. Such a proficiency check for FIs will help to reach this goal.

In order to address the comments received stressing the administrative and economical burden related to this kind of checks for instructors, it was decided to delete the mandatory checks for the LAFI category although the Agency believes that also for this category of instructor such a check would be a suitable standardisation tool.

Please see also the responses and the resulting text for paragraph FCL.940.LAFI and FCL.940.FI.

Nevertheless, an instructor can choose to undergo a proficiency check (now called "assessment of competence") in order to fulfil the revalidation requirement. In such a case the current text of Appendix 12 (will be moved to AMC material) will provide the basis for this assessment. As for the adequacy of this content, please see reply to comment 1272 above.

comment

7506

comment by: *British Airways*

In order to allow the introduction of modern training methodology and take into account the use of improved training devices the contents of this Appendix should be transferred to AMC and GM for the appropriate section.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for your input.

The Agency agrees and will transfer the content of this Appendix to AMC. For further details please see reply to comment No. 1272 above.

comment

7744

comment by: *CAA Finland*

Skill test form:

The numbering system is missing and should be harmonized. I support the structure of TR form as there is clearly easy to add subparts like 2.4 > 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.1		
1.2		
1.3		

So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.1		
2.2		
2.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.1		
3.2		
3.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

response *Noted*

Thank you for your comment.

The numbering will be changed and see for this our reply to comment 156 and 3987.

Concerning your proposal:

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the skill test/proficiency check tables included in the



Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL (e.g. Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

To leave the content / format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms.

In the meantime, to develop report forms as AMC material to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the applicable AMCs e.g. AMCs to Appendices 7, 9 and 12, as published in this NPA.

To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

comment

7749

comment by: CAA Finland

App 12, General an after section 5:

The headline in JAR-FCL was skill test and proficiency check for instructors. It was referred for revalidation / renewal as well (JAR-FCL 1.355 for example). In the form the wording that was used after headline was only skill test. Proficiency check is missing by mistake. Amende text proposal:

#### GENERAL

1 The format and application form for the skill test **and proficiency check** shall be determined by the Authority.

2 The instructor skill test **and proficiency check** shall comprise oral theoretical examinations on the ground, preflight and post flight briefings and in-flight demonstrations during skill tests/**proficiency checks** in the appropriate aircraft category.

3 An applicant for the skill test **and proficiency check** shall have received instruction on the same type or class as of the aircraft used for the test. The aircraft used for the test shall meet the requirements set out in Appendix 4, B.1, C.1 and D.1.

3 Before taking the skill test an applicant shall have completed the required training. The approved training organisation shall produce the applicant's training records when required by the examiner. (OBS! Here only skill test is correct!)

4 The examiner shall be the pilot-in-command, except in circumstances agreed upon by the examiner when another instructor is designated as pilot-in-command for the flight.

5 During the skill test **and proficiency check** the applicant shall occupy the seat normally occupied by the instructor, except in the case of balloons. The examiner or another instructor shall function as the 'student'. The applicant

shall be required to explain the relevant exercises and to demonstrate their conduct to the 'student', where appropriate. Thereafter, the 'student' shall execute the same manoeuvres including typical mistakes of inexperienced students. The applicant is expected to correct mistakes orally or, if necessary, by intervening.

#### CONTENT

6 The content of the skill test **and proficiency check** shall, in addition to the competencies described in FCL.920, include the following:

1

These exercises shall be demonstrated at the skill test **and proficiency check** for the single-pilot multi-engine CRI rating and for any airship instructor certificate.

(a) Section 1, the oral theoretical knowledge examination part of the skill test **and proficiency check**, is for all instructor certificates and shall be subdivided into two parts:

(i) the applicant is required to give a lecture under test conditions to other 'student(s)', one of whom will be the examiner **or, if not applicable, the examiner alone**. The test lecture is to be selected from items a-i of Section 1. The amount of time for preparation of the test lecture shall be agreed upon beforehand with the examiner. Appropriate literature may be used by the applicant. The test lecture should not exceed 45 minutes.

(ii) the applicant is tested orally by an examiner for knowledge of items a-i of Section 1 and the 'core instructor competencies teaching and learning' content given in the instructor courses.

(b) Section 2, 3 and 5 are for all instructor certificates. These sections comprise exercises to demonstrate the ability to be an **instructor F+** (i.e. instructor demonstration exercises) chosen by the examiner from the flight syllabus of the **instructor F+** training courses. The applicant will be required to demonstrate **instructor F+** abilities, including briefing, flight instruction and debriefing.

(c) Section 4 comprises additional instructor demonstration exercises for an instructor certificate for multi-engine aircraft. This section, if required, shall use a multi-engine aircraft, or a simulator or FNPT II simulating a multi-engine aircraft. This section shall be completed in addition to Section 2, 3 and 5.

7 The skill test **and proficiency check** shall also include additional demonstration exercises, as decided by the examiner and agreed upon with the applicant before the skill test **or proficiency check**. ~~For an instructor certificate for instrument ratings (IR),~~ these additional exercises shall be related to the training requirements for the ~~initial issue of an IR.~~ **applicable instructor certificate.**

8 All relevant Sections shall be completed within a period of 6 months. However, all Sections should, where possible, be completed on the same day. Failure in any exercise requires a retest covering all exercises, with the exception of those in Sections 1 and 5, which, if failed, may be retaken separately. The examiner shall terminate the test at any stage if they consider that a retest is required.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for your comment.

The Agency decided to use only the term "assessment of competence" (for both: the skill test and the proficiency check). Therefore, the wording "proficiency check" is not used any longer. The text will be changed

accordingly.

comment **8** comment by: *Dirk Wenzig*

Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren,  
 wie wird bei der Conversion ein ICAO ATPL (A) D eingestuft?  
 Mit freundlichen Grüßen,  
 D. Wenzig

response **Noted**

Thank you for providing your comment.  
 As described in the explanatory note to this NPA, national aeroplane and helicopter licences compliant with ICAO Annex I will be converted according to Annex IV to the Implementing Regulation.  
 For other categories of aircraft, the licences will be converted on the basis of a conversion report developed by the competent authority.

comment **307** comment by: *rod little*

Why does a ppl(A) need to be able to use radio nav aids or does this include the use of GPS

response **Noted**

Thank you for providing this comment. This part of the table was already mentioned in JAR-FCL and the use of radio-navigation aids is part of the training syllabus for PPL(A), therefore it was taken into consideration for Annex IV as well.

comment **431** comment by: *E.I.S. Aircraft*

There are no provisions for conversion of other national licences than the ones mentioned in the tables, which would leave out e.g. military licences.  
 This does not seem to fulfill the intention stated in NPA 2008-17a #47, whereas Annex IV shall also "...apply after the end of the transition period for the conversion of pilot licences issued by Member States in accordance with national rules for aircraft that are currently in Annex II to the Basic Regulation."

response **Noted**

Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no. 8 in this segment.

comment **556** comment by: *Thomas Endriss*

Comment with respects to conversion of national licenses:

The implementation of JAR-FCL has proven that not all countries apply the same methods, conversion requirements, etc. This has created a lot of uncertainty amongst the Pilot population concerning which way to follow and therefore as a consequence led many Private Pilots (PPL) to the decision to

stay with the status quo, i.e. the ICAO License.

A common EASA-wide license will certainly be highly appreciated in the pilot community. However there should be a focus on a conversion procedure without too much administrative efforts and costs involved. Individual countries' peculiarities, like the german CVFR licence should be regarded as fulfilled when the pilot can demonstrate the proper techniques involved with those peculiarities. Any requirement for a further checkride, additional training, etc. would rather preclude pilots to convert their licenses into an EASA one.

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.

556.1 Please refer to the response given to comment no. 8 in this segment.

556.2 The CVFR module in Germany apparently covers the delta that was identified between the former national regulations and JAR-FCL 1. The competent authority will have to define how this will be dealt with in the future. Please refer also to Subpart B, Leisure Pilot Licence.

556.3 Concerning the part of your comment dealing with pilots who eventually would not convert their licences, please mind that at the latest after the 8<sup>th</sup> April 2012 (Article 70) every pilot who wants to fly an aircraft in the EU has to comply with the provisions given in the Regulation (EC) No 216/2008. So there will be no circumnavigating of a conversion of national licences.

comment 706

comment by: *FOCA Switzerland*

Annex IV to the implementing regulation

Clarification:

In the table reference is made to the requirements for the conversion of national licences and ratings.

**Since there is no distinction between "National ICAO-licences" and JAR-FCL-licences, it is not clear if there will be a different procedure for the replacement of such licences.**

**Secondly, as Glider and Balloon licences will be replaced in future by EASA-licences, there is also the need to have procedures and tables indicating the respective requirements.**

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no. 8 in this segment.

comment 720

comment by: *Lothar KRINGS*

To whom it may concern

I refer to ANNEX III and ANNEX IV TO THE IMPLEMENTING REGULATION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ACCEPTANCE OF LICENCES ISSUED BY OR ON BEHALF OF THIRD COUNTRIES

I have received my US PPL and Instrument Rating many years ago when I

worked in the USA for some years. When I returned I continued flying US registered airplanes in many European countries. In these 16 years I have accumulated 1100+ hours as pilot in command including almost 300 hours of actual instrument flying. I landed at 70 different airports, and I made 400 safe takeoffs and landings at major IFR airports including Zurich, Berlin, to name a few. I have always been current with respect to flight experience and medical certification. I have passed all biennial flight reviews without any problem and I was never involved in any incident or accident. I have always made myself familiar with national flying regulations before flying to a new country or even airport.

I appreciate very much that the EASA is coming up a common set of rules for all flying in Europe and tries to get rid of the national specifics.

I can understand that the EASA may be concerned whether pilots with a US license fully live up to the requirements of the FAA, because the FAA is far away and is therefore likely unable to verify compliance with the regulations. Therefore I would accept that the **EASA require pilots with a FAA license to demonstrate that they comply with all FAA regulations** (e.g. by mailing in a copy of the logbook including the relevant entries).

I would also accept to have to **demonstrate to the EASA that I have acquired knowledge of the relevant parts of PartOPS** (although also the FAA requires pilots to familiarize themselves with all local/national regulations).

However I **totally disagree with the concept of forcing me to get a EASA license and medical**.

I firmly believe that the US pilot certification system is NOT inferior to the European one. Moreover statistics prove that flight under FAA-conditions is not less safe. So why would the EASA not honor my certification if I demonstrate that I meet all the conditions set out by the FAA?

And what would the EASA say if the FAA (and other countries) required pilots with European licenses to obtain their licenses (because the European system is supposedly unsafe?).

I kindly ask you to reconsider your proposal in the light of my line or argumentation above

Best regards  
Lothar Krings

response

*Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment and thanks you for your positive feedback. Your comment seems to refer solely to Annex III to the Implementing Regulation which deals with the requirements for the acceptance of licences issued by or on behalf of third countries. Therefore, please refer to the responses to the comments to this part and to the amended text.

comment

**1131**

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

(c) should be "demonstrate language proficiency ENGLISH".

Total flight experience is lacking on row (d) of the table.

response

*Not accepted*

1131.1 The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please note that according to ICAO Annex 1 it is only necessary to prove language proficiency in the language used for air traffic control and as the table is also valid for PPL the reference to FCL.055 will be kept.

1131.2 The total flight experience in line (d) was kept out on purpose. A CPL/IR holder who passed his exams right before the 8<sup>th</sup> April 2012, which will be the case in certain countries such as Hungary and Slovak Republic, will have just 200 hours and no possibility to fly 500 MP hours before the conversion. This will be different from JAR-FCL where such a pilot was not obliged to convert his or her licence and could continue to fly on the national licence until the relevant number of flight hours were obtained.

comment

2282

comment by: *CAA Finland*

Conversion table box (3)(g) and (i)  
Wording "demonstrate knowledge" has been interpreted in very large scale. More definite text would be:

pass from CPL theoretical knowledge examination subjects:

- flight planning; and
- flight performance

as required....

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment. This was already the text of JAR-FCL, and if the need to pass theoretical knowledge examinations was not mentioned, it was to give the possibility for the applicant to demonstrate knowledge in other ways.

The addition to the text you propose would be a significant change to the common practise in many JAA countries and will therefore not be taken into consideration when drafting the final text.

The Agency does not intend to change this at this time, without a dedicated assessment.

comment

2284

comment by: *CAA Finland*

Ann IV A 1 line 1(b):

Wording "demonstrate knowledge" has been interpreted in very large scale. More definite text would be:

(b) Pass a written open book exam conducted by the Authority on Part-OPS and Part-FCL. The number of questions shall be:

- 50 questions for ATPL
- 40 questions for CPL
- 30 questions for PPL
- If a licence holder has licences for several categories of aircraft on different levels, he/she shall take the highest exam.
- If a licence holder has licences for several categories of aircraft on same level, he/she may choose on which category to have.

response

*Not accepted*

Please see reply to comment 2282 above.

comment **3136** comment by: *Jim Ellis*

Existing National 'lifetime' licences should be converted to EASA licences also on a lifetime basis. It would be unreasonable for those presently having lifetime licences to lose that benefit upon conversion.

response **Noted**

The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no. 8 in this segment. Please note that there will be no exemptions on the provisions of the Regulation (EC) 216/2008 due to grandfather rights. All pilots will have to stick to the same rules, those ones having their licences since a long time and those ones who got them under the provisions of Part-FCL for the first time.

comment **5008** comment by: *George Knight*

This annex makes no provision for the conversion of UK sailplane, SLMG and TMG pilots and instructors to EASA Part-FCL licences. There are several thousand pilots who will be impacted. There will not be, when the regulations come into force, any qualified resources to examine all the existing pilots; indeed there will be no examiners.

There should be provision to convert the bulk of the experienced sailplane pilots and instructors to EASA licences without them needing to undergo further training and examinations.

response **Noted**

Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no. 8 in this segment.

comment **5878** comment by: *EFLEVA*

NPA 2008-17a Part A.IV paragraphs 47 & 48 notes that a national recreational pilots license could be translated to the LPL. However EFLEVA notes that no details of this provision are given here.

response **Noted**

Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no. 8 in this segment.

comment **5881** comment by: *EFLEVA*

EFLEVA do not understand the requirement for a PPL holder with more than 70 flight hours to demonstrate the use of radio navigation aids.

response **Noted**

Thank you for providing this comment. This part of the table was already mentioned in JAR-FCL and the use of radio-navigation aids is part of the training syllabus for PPL(A), therefore it was taken into consideration for Annex IV as well.

comment 6229 comment by: *French Fédération Française Aéronautique groups the 580 French powered flying aer-clubs and their 43 000 private pilots*

Annex IV A, 1, PPL(A) conversion.

FFA disagrees with the requirement applicable to PPL holders with more than 70 flight hours who should demonstrate the use of radio-navigation aids.

In France, as in many European countries, use of radio-navigation aids is included in PPL(A) flight training for decades, so, FFA considers this requirement useless and proposes to replace, if really necessary, this requirement by a self declaration of the PPL(A).

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing this comment. This part of the table was already mentioned in JAR-FCL and the use of radio-navigation aids is part of the training syllabus for PPL(A), therefore it was taken into consideration for Annex IV as well. Please note that the table states "demonstrate the use of radio navigation aids" so the pilot will have to provide evidence that he or she fulfils this further requirement in a way that satisfies the competent authority.

comment 6623 comment by: *Light Aircraft Association UK*

No description is given as to the route by which a national recreational pilots' licence (e.g. UK NPPL) could be translated to the LPL, as discussed in NPA 2008-17a Part A.IV paras 47 & 48.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to NPA 2008-17a paragraph 48, which describes the procedures NAAs would apply to convert licences for other categories of licences as defined in paragraphs 46 and 47. Such a conversion could be made on the basis of a conversion report developed by the national authorities.

Please see also the proposed text of the cover regulation, as published with this CRD.

comment 6815 comment by: *CAA CZ*

para A(1)(b)

"...demonstrate knowledge of the relevant parts of Part OPS and Part FCL..."

Relevant parts of FCL and parts of OPS should be specified, as in JAR-FCL in AMC FCL 1/2.005 & 1/2.015.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Actually the Agency understands the necessity of the proposed amendment. It will be taken into account by a future rule-making task.

comment 7112 comment by: *Finnish Aeronautical Association - Kai Mönkkönen*

We propose that National licenses valid for operating a TMG are converted into LPL(S) licenses with TMG extension, or LPL(A) licenses, by the same requirements as national PPL licenses are converted to EASA PPL licences.



	<p>Justification: TMG is for practical purposes similar to LPL.</p> <p>Proposed text: Add a table row for conversion of National TMG : <math>\geq 70h</math> on TMG and demonstrate the use of radio navigation aids</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no. 8 in this segment.</p>

comment	<p>7336 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ECOGAS</i></span></p> <p>Issue: There is no provision to convert ATPL(A) &lt; 500hrs at the time of transition to EASA FCL, to EASA license in order to continue employment. Such a situation will not be common, but it will affect some pilots' employment.</p> <p>Suggestion: Add a provision to convert ATPL(A) &lt; 500hrs at the time of transition to EASA FCL to appropriate EASA license.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment. Please note that Annex IV to the Implementing Regulation was drafted on the basis of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.005 and Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.005 where no such provisions existed. The reason behind was that a pilot was considered to always get the licence he or she <b>needed</b> to fulfil the duties of a member of a flight crew. In the case of a pilot having less than 500 hrs on MPA, this would mean that he or she only needed a CPL/IR with an ATP theory. Therefore, the Agency does not agree with your proposal.</p>

comment	<p>7767 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span></p> <p>Box (3)(c) and (3)(d)(i): This requirement has been interpreted during JAR-time very differently. For harmonisation new text proposal:</p> <p>Pass the following subjects of an ATPL theoretical knowledge examination: - flight planning and flight monitoring - performance aeroplanes as required by Appendix 2 to Part-FCL</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion. Please refer to comment no. 2282 in this segment.</p>

comment	<p>7769 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span></p> <p>Ann IV 1 PPL box (3)(k): "demonstrate" is unclear wording alone. Amended text proposal:</p>
---------	--

	demonstrate <b>during a skill test or proficiency check</b> the use of radio navigation aids.
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion. Please refer to comment no. 2282 in this segment.</p>
comment	<p>7771 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span></p> <p>Ann IV A 1 (a): All pilots should have a proficiency check (or skill test) with an examiner certified by this regulation. Harmonization with helicopters B 1. Amended text proposal:</p> <p>(a) <del>for ATPL(A) and CPL(A)</del>, complete as a proficiency check the revalidation requirements of Part-FCL for type/class and instrument rating, relevant to the privileges of the licence held;</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment. When drafting the text, the Agency followed closely the provisions of JAR-FCL. The addition to the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.005 you proposed would be a significant change to the common practice in many JAA countries, which would mean an unjustifiable burden for both the NAAs and the pilots.</p> <p>The Agency does not intend to change the text of JAR-FCL at this time, without a dedicated assessment.</p>
comment	<p>7773 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span></p> <p>Conversion tables: Conversion from national privileges towards MCCI, STI, LPL, SPL and BPL are missing.</p> <p>For helicopters STI(H) conversion table exists &gt; make a copy of that.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please mind that when drafting the text of NPA 2008-17, the Agency closely followed the provisions of JAR-FCL. For this part of the text Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.005 and Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.005 were taken over. In those provisions MCCI, LPL and SPL were not covered and it is not the intention of the Agency to add such provisions. However, there is a gap for the STI (A) which will be covered in the amended text.</p>
comment	<p>7970 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Europe Air Sports, VP</i></span></p> <p>It is understood that any valid PPL A in a Member State which was issued in accordance with JAR FCL will be converted into an EASA FCL PPL A.</p> <p>The table covers the conversion of licenses which were issued not in compliance with JAR FCL.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p>

Thank you for providing your comment. The Agency confirms your assumptions. For further details please refer also to the response given to comment no. 8 in this segment.

comment 8294

comment by: *Paul Mc G*

No description is given as to the route by which a national recreational pilots' licence (e.g. UK NPPL) could be translated to the LPL, as discussed in NPA 2008-17a Part A.IV paragraphs 47 - 48.  
Please clarify the routes of change?? If you know this? Or is this a work in progress?

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no. 6623 in this segment.

**B. DRAFT DECISION PART-FCL**

p. 169

comment

4247

comment by: *CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority**B. Definitions**Airmanship*

*The consistent use of good judgement and well developed knowledge, skills and attitudes to accomplish flight objectives.*

To be effective, the implementing rules must convey a clear and unambiguous understanding of the required Non-technical Skills (NTS) training and competence standards for all Licence holders, Instructors and Examiners. However, the NPA contains and applies a plethora of different terms to describe the non-technical knowledge, skills and attitudes required. While some terms such as 'threat and error management' are well defined, others such as 'judgement' and 'airmanship' are not and are open to misinterpretation and subjectivity.

**Proposal:**

1. Adopt and define the single term '**Non-technical Skills (NTS)**', to describe the non-technical knowledge, skills and behaviours required for pilot licensing.
2. Refer to that term consistently within the Implementing Rules.
3. Introduce new definitions where required and remove references to 'Airmanship,' and other ill-defined Non-technical skills terminology.

**Proposed New Definitions:**

1. Non-technical skills - Non-technical skills (NTS) refers to the skills and behaviours required for the safe, effective and efficient operation of the flight that are by definition not technical in nature, such as Teamwork, Decision Making and Threat and Error Management.

response *Noted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL or its AMC, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.  
We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM**

p. 169

comment 1088 comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

**Comment:**

There is a need for editorial improvements in most of the AMCs

**Proposal:**

Editorial improvements

response *Noted*

The Agency will conduct an editorial review of the AMC material before publication.

comment 5771 comment by: *Susana Nogueira*

To include a new AMC as

**AMC FCL 810 H. Night rating**

File annexed

response *Noted*

There is no file attached to your comment.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart A: General Requirements - GM to FCL.010 Definitions and Abbreviations**

p. 169-173

comment 225 comment by: *CAA - The Netherlands*

C. Abbreviations

Missing abbreviations:

- APU (Auxiliary power unit),
- ATS (air traffic service)
- CG (center of gravity)
- CS (See page 75)
- dd/mm/yy (two digits per day/month/year)
- DR (dead reckoning navigation),
- FMS (flight management system),
- MP (multi pilot),
- NDB (non directional beacon),

- RNAV (radio navigation)
- SP (single pilot),
- V<sub>1</sub> (speed for take-off),
- VHF (very high frequency),
- VOR (VHF omnidirectional range)
- 

response *Partially accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please refer to the amended text. All new abbreviations were included, with the exception of dd/mm/yy, which the Agency does not consider to be aviation specific.

comment

1945

comment by: *Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch*

**The following definition is erroneous**

**Error**

An action or inaction by the flight crew that leads to deviations from organizational or flight intentions or expectations.

**Proof**

- i) Errors that jeopardize a flight might also be conducted by other persons important to the aims of a flight e.g. ramp agents, ATC, manufacturers etc
- ii) "organizational or flight intentions or expectations" is too broad, this includes, for example, commercial aims of an airline
- iii) This is taken directly from TEM, a special technique not accepted by all.
- iv) Errors are not separated from violations, therefore non punitive environments can not be established (§(16) of the Basic Regulations principles)

Proposal: replace above definition by:

**Error**

Intentional human actions or inactions aiming at a safe and accident free flight, which have, however, a negative impact on these aims. A prerequisite for an error is the knowledge and skill for the right action instead of the erroneous action. Violations are not subsumed under errors.

This definition is in concordance with modern Human Factors knowledge and practice, see for example Badke-Schaub et al 2008: Human Factors, Springer.

**The following definition is erroneous**

***Error management***

The process of detecting and responding to errors with countermeasures that reduce or eliminate the consequences of errors, and mitigate the probability of errors or undesired aircraft states.

**Proof:**

Modern error management starts from the fact, that errors are unavoidable.

What can be done is to prevent the development of accidents out of single error or small error chains. The techniques require the promotion of a "culture of safety" and use appropriate non technical skills.

See EC Regulations 216/2008 on common rules in civil aviation (Basic Regulations)

- Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations

call for the knowledge of " non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors."

- §(16) of the Basic Regulations principles claim for a "promotion of a "culture of safety""

Proposal: replace above definition by:

### **Error management**

The probability of human errors may be reduced by suitable measures, however never to zero. Error management accepts the unavoidability of errors and aims therefore at systems that prevent errors to have undesired consequences (safe aviation systems).

### **Safe aviation system**

A system participating in civil aviation is aiming at safety if it

- searches continuously for errors
- rewards the detection of errors
- regards errors as chances for improvement of the system
- evaluates the errors and communicates the results of the evaluation
- derives measures to deal with errors such that undesired consequences of errors are prevented
- controls the effectiveness of such measures

Improper measures to obtain safe aviation systems are:

- punitive actions with regard to errors
- non confidential error treatment and reporting

See Basic Regulations (16)

This definition is in concordance with modern Human Factors knowledge and practice see Badke-Schaub et al 2008: Human Factors, Springer.

Important systems participating in civil aviation are among others

- pilots
- crews
- flight schools
- airport personnel
- maintenance personnel
- ATC
- Manufacturers of aircrafts
- Autoritied for civil aviation

### **The following definition is missing**

#### **Violation**

A violation is a conscious and intentional human action or inaction which violates applicable laws, regulations and procedures.

Proof:

In order to promote a non punitive environment (See Basic Regulations (16), and a culture of safety. errors have to be separated from violations. Violations may require lawful actions. Errors must not to be punished!

Proposal: add definition as given above

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for your input, but the definition used by the Agency follows ICAO Annex 1 and JAR-FCL. The Agency does not intend to change it at this time.

comment	<p>2270 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Bundespolizei-Fliegergruppe und Polizeihubschrauberstaffeln/ -fliegerstaffeln der Länder</i></span></p> <p>Abbreviations for single engine piston helicopter SEP(H), single engine turbine helicopter SET(H) and multi engine turbine helicopter MET(H) are missing.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Abbreviations for SEP, SET and MET already exist, as well as for H. Therefore, there is no need for new abbreviations combining those already existing.</p>
comment	<p>4252 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority</i></span></p> <p><i>Definitions - Error management</i></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Error Management is only one of the required Non-technical competencies and should be defined as a Non-technical skill for consistency with previous comments.</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> Definition should be changed for consistency to read -</p> <p>Error <span style="float: right;">management</span>  <i>The Non-technical skill of detecting and responding to errors with countermeasures that reduce or eliminate the consequences of errors, and mitigate the probability of errors or undesired aircraft states.</i></p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 1945 above.</p> <p>In addition, please note that the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task. We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.</p>
comment	<p>4384 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DC-AL</i></span></p> <p>The definition of private pilot is one who is prohibited from receiving remuneration for his piloting operation. Does this not go against the idea of allowing PPL holders to instruct for remuneration in certain circumstances?</p> <p>There is no definition of a leisure pilot.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see the amended text of FCL.010. This has been taken into account for the definition of private pilot.</p> <p>The expression leisure pilot is never used in the text, therefore, there is no need to define it.</p>
comment	<p>4845 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Flight Training Europe</i></span></p>

	<p><u>Page 170, B. Definitions</u></p> <p>SPIC definition needs to emphasize that SPIC flight can only be conducted and counted towards licence issue when conducted under IFR. Change definition to read:</p> <p><b>Flight time under IFR during which the flight instructor will only observe the student acting as pilot-in-command and shall not influence or control the flight of the aircraft.</b></p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see definition of SPIC in the amended text of FCL.010. This is clear from the new text.</p>
comment	<p>5226      comment by: <i>CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority</i></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Threat Management is only one of the required Non-technical competencies and should be defined as a Non-technical skill for consistency with previous comments.</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> Definition should be changed for consistency to read -</p> <p>Threat management The Non-technical Skill of detecting and responding to the threats with countermeasures that reduce or eliminate the consequences of threats, and mitigate the probability of errors or undesired aircraft states.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 4252 above.</p>
comment	<p>5803      comment by: <i>ENAC TLP</i></p> <p>Introduce new definitions or modify the existing ones to satisfy needs of agreement with ICAO Annex 1 or arising from application of Non-Technical Skills, CRM and TEM and advancements in terminology after validation of methodology established by some projects funded by EC such as NOTECHS, JARTEL and ESSAI.</p> <p><b>GM to FCL. 010</b> <b>B. Definitions</b> <b>page 169 to 173</b> <i>To insert the following in alphabetical order:</i></p> <p><i>Assessment of Non-Technical/CRM Skills and TEM - The process of observing, recording, interpreting and debriefing candidates and crew members performance and knowledge using an acceptable methodology in the context of overall performance. It includes the concept of self-critique and feedback which can be given continuously during training or in summary following a test/check. Technical and Non-Technical Skills should always be considered and assessed together and only within a flight operational context.</i></p> <p><i>Behavioural Marker System - a taxonomy or listing of the key non-technical skills, described in behavioural terms and thus directly observable or inferred</i></p>



from communication, that are relevant for effective, safe, and efficient task performance.

*Crew co-ordination - To carry out tasks according to the role, seating position, sequence and timing as allocated by the pilot in command or pre-defined in aircraft operating manuals for normal, abnormal and emergency procedures.*

*Crew Resource Management - The effective utilisation of all available resources to achieve safe and efficient operation.*

*Flight Examiners Manual - With the exception of extracts from PART-FCL and OPS contains guidance by National Authorities for training and management of examiners. The guidance and procedures contained will enhance the application of standards and best practices to meet FCL and OPS requirements.*

*Non-technical skills - Non-technical skills refer to cognitive and social skills required for the safe, effective and efficient operation of the flight that are not technical in nature: Co-operation, Leadership and managerial skills, Decision Making, Situation Awareness, Communication, Threat and Error Management.*

*Technical skills - Behaviors directly related to aircraft control, systems management and execution of standard operating procedures.*

response *Not accepted*

Please see reply to comment 4252 above.

comment 5805

comment by: ENAC TLP

Introduce new definitions or modify the existing ones to satisfy needs of agreement with ICAO Annex 1 or arising from application of Non-Technical Skills, CRM and TEM and advancements in terminology after validation of methodology established by some projects founded by EC such as NOTECHS, JARTEL and ESSAI.

**GM to FCL. 010**  
**C. Abbreviations**  
**page 170 to 173**

***To insert the following in alphabetical order:***

CRM	Crew Resource Management
DM	Decision Making
FEM	Flight Examiners Manual
NTS	Non Technical Skills
SA	Situation Awareness
TS	Technical skills

response *Not accepted*

Please see reply to comment 4252 above.

comment 6155

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**  
GM to FCL.010 B  
**Page No:**  
170

**Comment:**  
Definition of private pilot now incorrect.

	<p><b>Justification:</b> Private pilots may instruct for remuneration.</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Amend definition by adding: 'other than flight instruction for PPL or LPL'.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 4384 above.</p>

comment	<p>6156 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> <b>GM to FCL.010 C</b> <b>Page No:</b> 171 <b>Comment:</b> Correction required. <b>Justification:</b> Acronym incorrect. <b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Change 'Authorised' to Aero medical'.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text amended accordingly.</p>

comment	<p>6157 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> <b>GM to FCL.010 C</b> <b>Page No:</b> 172 <b>Comment:</b> Acronym used in Part Medical is Operational Multi pilot Limitation. <b>Justification:</b> Consistent use of terminology <b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Change 'multi crew' to 'multi pilot'.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text amended accordingly.</p>

comment	<p>6740 <span style="float: right;">comment by: ENAC TLP</span></p> <p><b>GM to FCL.010</b> <b>Definitions and abbreviations</b> <b>B. Definitions</b> <b>Pages 169/170</b></p> <p>Multi-pilot operation <i>Delete the entire text to be transferred and modified to reflect actual situation into FCL.010 (see comment) to add handy clarity to Multi pilot aircraft</i></p>
---------	---

	<i>definition that is preceding in the text.</i>
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see amended text in FCL.010.

comment	6784 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>European HF Advisory Group</i></span>
	<p><b>GM to FCL. 010</b>  <b>B. Definitions</b>  <b>page 169 to 173</b>  <i>To insert the following in alphabetical order</i></p> <p><b>Non-technical skills</b> - Non-technical skills (NTS) refers to the skills and behaviours required for the safe, effective and efficient operation of the flight that are not technical in nature: Co-operation, Decision Making, Situation Awareness, Leadership and Managerial Skills, Communication and Threat and Error Management.</p> <p><b>Behavioural Marker System</b> – a taxonomy or listing of the key non-technical skills, described in behavioural terms and thus directly observable or inferred from communication, that are relevant for effective, safe, and efficient task performance.</p>
response	<i>Not accepted</i> Please see reply to comment 4252 above.

comment	6817 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA CZ</i></span>						
	<p>Following abbreviations are missing :</p> <table style="margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td>LAFI</td> <td>Light Aircraft Flight Instructor</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MI</td> <td>Mountain rating Instructor</td> </tr> <tr> <td>S</td> <td>Sailplane</td> </tr> </table>	LAFI	Light Aircraft Flight Instructor	MI	Mountain rating Instructor	S	Sailplane
LAFI	Light Aircraft Flight Instructor						
MI	Mountain rating Instructor						
S	Sailplane						
response	<i>Accepted</i> Abbreviations included as proposed.						

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart A: General Requirements - AMC to FCL.050 Recording of flight time**

p. 173-181

comment	707 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>FOCA Switzerland</i></span>
	<p>AMC to FCL.050  Recording of flight time:</p> <p>Clarification logbook:</p> <p>The single pilot time in column 5 is only ticked in the example. This makes it very difficult to indicate and verify the actual totals of either Single-engine or Multi-engine time.</p> <p>Proposal:</p>

**Add respective additional columns for clear notification of each activity in hours and minutes.**

response *Not accepted*

The Agency sees that there can be a number of cases where one might want to change particular details in the flight time record format for one or another specific reason.

However, the format in our proposal is based on the format established by JAR-FCL. Pilots of aeroplanes and helicopters in the Member States have been using this format for up to 10 years by now. Any change in format should thence be very carefully considered.

comment **804**

comment by: *Robert Cronk*

This log book format is not relevant or appropriate for glider pilots, or indeed for most SEP or TMG pilots.

response *Partially accepted*

Standardisation and harmonisation are important cornerstones for the Agency. The description of the logbook format given in AMC to FCL.050 supports this standardisation, and is also in line with the logbook format already in JAR-FCL. However, FCL.050 will be amended, to further ensure harmonisation. This will both ensure commonality, but still maintains the possibility for NAAs to approve alternative AMCs for different categories of aircraft and/or special types of operations.

comment **892**

comment by: *ERA*

AMC to FCL.050 Recording of flight time

AMC to FCL.050 Item 1.)1.2)d). ERA members would suggest that it is unnecessary to have "type, including make, model and variant and registration of aircraft" on the pilot log book. It is considered that aircraft registration and type should be sufficient as any detailed additional information could be tracked via the registration. In addition any modification would be difficult at a later date.

response *Not accepted*

In many cases, it will require the mentioned data, to be able to establish the proficiency of the pilot on said type, model and/or variant. Whenever specifying the aircraft type, due regard should be made to also include any such necessary additional data, to enable a positive and singular identification of aircraft type, make, model and variant, when needed.

comment **1420**

comment by: *Bristow Helicopters*

4. (ii) If my previous proposal for an amendment to the helicopter definition of flight time is accepted, it will need to be changed here as well.

response *Not accepted*

The proposal mentioned to change the definition of helicopter flight time has

not been accepted.

comment	2360	comment by: <i>AECA(SPAIN)</i>
	4. (ii) If our previous proposal for an amendment to the helicopter definition of flight time is accepted, it will need to be changed here as well.	
response	<i>Not accepted</i>	
	See response to Comment #1420	
comment	2576	comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i>
	For harmonization purposes this AMC should become IR.	
response	<i>Partially accepted</i>	
	Standardisation and harmonisation are important cornerstones for the Agency. The description of the logbook format given in AMC to FCL.050 supports this standardisation, and is also in line with the logbook format already in JAR-FCL. However, FCL.050 will be amended, to further ensure harmonisation. This will both ensure commonality, but still maintains the possibility for NAAs to approve alternative AMCs for different categories of aircraft and/or special types of operations.	
comment	2790	comment by: <i>David COURT</i>
	As this is an AMC it is only one example.	
	It is not suitable for balloon pilots. I understand alternative AMCs can be submitted and approved in the future but it would be useful for one layout to be agreed at this stage which could be used by all balloon pilots rather than different variations in different countries.	
	Column 1 - Agreed Column 2 – Place - not enough space as we write place names not airfield code letters Column 3 – Place - not enough space as we write place names not airfield code letters Column 4 - Agreed Column 5 – Not required Column 6 – Agreed Column 7 – Agreed Column 8 – Not required Column 9 – Not required Column 10 – Pilot in Command, Under Instruction, Tether, Instructor (co pilot/dual not needed)  Column 11 – Not required Column 12 - Agreed	
response	<i>Partially accepted</i>	
	See response to Comment #804	

comment	<p>2837 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Dave Sawdon</i></span></p>
	<p>There is a long-standing problem with flight time recording which needs to be resolved.</p> <p>When a pilot has a current rating for single pilot aircraft but has not flown for a period it is advisable (or required by rental organisations) that the pilot has a dual currency check with an instructor. There has been considerable confusion about how this should be recorded. I suggest that a specific discussion of this is required, presumably stating that the pilot being checked records it as PICUS or P1/S and the FI records it as P1</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency is aware that there have been cases where some entries in pilot's logbooks have not been in accordance with the regulations in JAR-FCL 1.080/2.080 and associated IEM.</p> <p>After careful consideration of the text proposed in FCL.050 and associated AMC, the Agency is still of the conviction that these offer clear and concise guidance as to how the various flights shall be logged.</p>
comment	<p>3093 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Deutscher Aero Club (DAeC)</i></span></p>
	<p>The proposed format of the log book is not appropriate for gliding due to an overload of details not related to this activity.</p> <p>DAeC proposes to allow a reduced log book format in the AMC adapted to the specific requirements for gliding and/or ballooning to ensure flexibility for the different activities.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p>
	<p>See response to Comment #804</p>
comment	<p>3395 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Richard DUMAS, PPL(A)</i></span></p> <p><b>Autoriser un carnet de vol simplifié pour les LPL ou les PPL ayant un seul rating de classe / type simple</b></p> <p>Raison : pour un titulaire du LPL ou du PPL (A) avec le seul rating de classe / type SEP(T), un carnet de vol à 24 colonnes n'est pas adapté</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>See response to Comment #804</p>
comment	<p>4058 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Julian Scarfe</i></span></p> <p>The requirement to make logbook entries in pen in a printed logbook is absurd in 2009, and is inconsistent with the Commission's mandate to embrace new technology.</p> <p>This part of the AMC makes an exception for commercial air transport, but leaves the rest of us sharpening our quills! Electronic recording of personal flight time has been acceptable in some member states for many years.</p> <p>The corresponding AMC in OPS regarding documents provides a good template:</p>

AMC OPS.GEN.600 Documents and information to be carried on all aircraft  
 2. The documents and information may be available in a form other than on printed paper.  
 Accessibility, usability and reliability should be assured.

AMC OPS.GEN.610 Journey log book  
 3. The information or parts thereof may be retained in a form other than on printed paper.  
 In such cases, an acceptable level of accessibility, usability and reliability should be assured.

I therefore recommend adding the following wording to the end of the sentence:  
 "The information may be recorded in a form other than on printed paper.  
 Accessibility, usability and reliability should be assured. "

response *Not accepted*

There are still many uncertainties regarding the integrity of computer-based logbooks. It is possible that this will be considered again at a later stage, when technology has matured and developed further. For the time being the proposal is to maintain the recording of flight time as set up in JAR-FCL

comment

4440

comment by: *Bond Offshore Helicopters*

4. (ii) If our previous proposal for an amendment to the helicopter definition of flight time is accepted, it will need to be changed here as well.

response

*Not accepted*

See response to Comment #1420

comment

4534

comment by: *Baden-Württembergischer Luftfahrtverband*

AMC FCL.050 Page 177  
**Wording in the NPA**  
 Format of the log book record

**Our proposal**  
 Add launch method for sailplanes

**Issue with current wording**  
 Sailplanes are not accounted for

**Rationale**  
 The log book format does not account for sailplane flights. As discussed in our general comment 3250 Nr. 3 crediting must be implemented across all categories. This requires that sailplane flights must be recorded in the same log book as other flights. For sail planes the launch method must be recorded. This is missing in the proposed format.

response

*Partially accepted*

See response to Comment #804

comment	<p>4537 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Baden-Württembergischer Luftfahrtverband</i></span></p>
	<p>AMC FCL.050 4. Page 179 INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE <b>Wording in the NPA</b> 4. (i) for aeroplanes, touring motor gliders and powered lift, from the moment an aircraft first moves for the purpose of taking off until the moment it finally comes to rest at the end of the flight.</p> <p><b>Our proposal</b> <b>Change:</b> (i) for aeroplanes, touring motor gliders, <b>powered self launching sailplanes</b> and powered lift, from the moment an aircraft first moves for the purpose of taking off until the moment it finally comes to rest at the end of the flight. .... (iv) for non self launching sailplanes from the moment the sailplane moves at the beginning of the launch until it comes to a rest after touch down.</p> <p><b>Issue with current wording</b> A specification for recording of flight time for sail planes is missing</p> <p><b>Rationale</b> Self launching sailplanes should be treated like touring motor gliders. The boundary between TMG and self launching powered gliders is quite artificial so they should not be distinguished in this matter Non self launching sailplanes should have their separate specification as proposed above.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency agrees that the text needs to be amended to reflect the inclusion of the aircraft categories sailplanes and balloons.</p> <p>The text for the amendment will be the relevant text in FCL.010 - Definitions of flight time for the various categories of aircraft.</p> <p>The self-launching motor sailplane is not recognised as a separate category of aircraft. It differs from ordinary sailplanes only in the method for launching, and cannot as such be considered a variant of touring motor gliders.</p>
comment	<p>4682 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Héli-Union</i></span></p>
	<p>4. (ii) If our previous proposal for an amendment to the helicopter definition of flight time is accepted, it will need to be changed here as well.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>See response to Comment #1420</p>
comment	<p>4812 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>AOPA Switzerland</i></span></p>
	<p>It should be permitted also for private flights to use an electronic format for flight details recording. The Agency should propose some softwares for that purpose.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p>



See response to Comment #4058

comment 4847 comment by: *Flight Training Europe*

Page 173/4 AMC to FCL.050, Recording of flight Time

Para 2 does not cover the situation for student pilots or pilots operating single-pilot aircraft under test condition. Add another sub para:

**2.? PICUS (Pilot-in command under supervision) When on an approved course of instruction for the issue of a single pilot licence, rating or certificate a student pilot or pilot shall log PIC flight time for any successful progress/skill test towards said qualification. In addition PIC flight time should be logged for successful flight tests for the revalidation/renewal of any single-pilot rating or certificate.**

response *Not accepted*

See response to Comment #2837

comment 4903 comment by: *HUTC*

4. (ii) If our previous proposal for an amendment to the helicopter definition of flight time is accepted, it will need to be changed here as well.

response *Not accepted*

See response to Comment #1420

comment 5019 comment by: *George Knight*

The proposed rules regarding the recording of flight time are completely over the top with regard to recreational flying - especially in sailplanes. The log-book format is unrealistic and too prescriptive.

- The column widths for e.g PLACE are far too small.
- Many of the columns are related to complex aircraft.
- Relates to multi-pilot operation. Not relevant to light a/c & sailplanes.
- Night & IFR flight. IFR flight not permitted by recreational licenses.
- Flight simulators. Rarely used by recreational pilots.

It should be permitted to have a much simpler log-book format especially for sailplane pilots, and for other recreational pilots of simple aircraft. All that needs to be recorded are:

- Numbers of flights (allows multiple very short flights to be included on same line - e.g. winch launches)
- Date
- Glider type
- Registration
- Place of launch
- Duration of flight or series of flights
- P1/P2 or Instructing
- A comments column for everything else.

Please make this relevant to recreational pilots - not just jet jockeys!

response *Partially accepted*

See response to Comment #804

comment **5154** comment by: *PPL/IR Europe*

Para 2 of this AMC,  
*2. Flight crew logbook entries should be made as soon as practicable after any flight undertaken. All entries in the logbook should be made in ink or indelible pencil.*

seems to preclude the use of electronic logbook software. We think this is not appropriate, and that the AMC para 2 should be appended with the wording:

*"Alternatively, the logbook may be in electronic form, in which case the pilot should maintain a hard copy record by periodically printing the logbook pages and signing them in ink or indelible pencil."*

or some other wording to this effect.

response *Not accepted*

See response to Comment #4058

comment **5685** comment by: *FNAM (Fédération Nationale de l'Aviation Marchande)*

AMC to (1)(1.2)(d): Current regulation and practices only refer to registration and brief description of the aircraft flown in log records. As far as aircraft registration database include "type, make, model and variant" we request the logging requirement for aircraft to be limited to type and registration. We suggest the following formulation:

" d. Type and registration of aircraft "

response *Not accepted*

See response to Comment #892

comment **5884** comment by: *EFLEVA*

AMC to FCL 050 Pilot logbook

EFLEVA suggest that the requirement to write all times in UTC be removed especially when flying in the same time zone. When passing one time zone it would be appropriate to use UTC and mark the entered times with a "Z".

response *Not accepted*

The use of UTC as time reference in aviation is a long standing standard. To start using LMT in some circumstances will not be beneficial to the harmonisation and standardisation.

comment **6275** comment by: *Jonathan Coote*

This does not address the needs of glider pilots.

- Glider pilots fly via a club system; name and pilot account number is sufficient; their address may then be looked up via club records.
- Indication of number of engines is pointless for flying operations at a

	<p>gliding club; this should be exempted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accumulated total time of flight is unnecessary; an exemption should be made.</li> <li>• section 1.5 is irrelevant to gliding operations</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>See response to Comment #804</p>

comment	<p>6277 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Jonathan Coote</i></span></p> <p>Section 3 is ridiculously over-prescriptive; a large proportion of these boxes are irrelevant to glider pilots. The British Gliding Association should be consulted in order to agree on a glider-appropriate format which satisfies the relevant logging requirements. The resulting format should not be enshrined in the NPA but instead be subject to review and flexibility as necessary.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>See response to Comment #804</p>

comment	<p>6317 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>French Fédération Française Aéronautique groups the 580 French powered flying aer-clubs and their 43 000 private pilots</i></span></p> <p><b>AMC to FCL.050 Record of flight time.</b> FFA considers that the completely new requirement to record place and time (in UTC!) for departure and arrival are completely useless in the pilot logbook (at least for Basic LPL, LPL and PPL), since the relevant information are, and must be, recorded in the aircraft flight logbook. Consequently, the FFA propose to delete the four relevant columns in the pilot logbook (i.e. place and time of departure, and place and time of arrival, page 177), or to allow Basic LPL, LPL, and PPL to leave those columns blank). FFA propose also to delete, at least for Basic LPL, LPL, and PPL, the requirement stated page 179 to record all times in UTC.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Regarding the use of UTC, see response to Comment #5884.</p> <p>Regarding the logging of place of departure and place of landing, it is not seen how this is covered by the fact that these are also logged in the aircraft logbook. This aircraft logbook will follow the aircraft, and might be very far away when one for some reason or another might need to establish where the pilot departed or landed on a particular flight. It will also be impossible to establish if a pilot ever has (or has not) flown to/from a particular airfield, or how much cross-country experience the pilot possesses.</p>

comment	<p>6387 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Axel Schwarz</i></span></p> <p>Paragraph 3: The computerised format should not be restricted to commercial air transport flights. The proposed logbook is inadequate for sailplanes, balloons ect. (no multi-pilot times, no IFR, ...).</p>
---------	--

	<p>I suggest a text like:          "Details of flights may be recorded in any format provided the information required by 1. is contained, as applicable.          If records are maintained in a computerised format any changes made to existing entries must be stored in a form to keep the original entry legible.          The following logbook format may be used by all pilots and shall serve as a guideline for the format and contents of any flight time records and logbooks."</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>See response to Comment #4058 regarding computerised recording of flight time.</p> <p>See response to Comment #804 regarding the format of the record</p>
comment	<p>6625 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Light Aircraft Association UK</i></span></p> <p>The LAA would propose to delete the requirement to write all times in UTC. It is proposed that where confusion might exist, e.g. moving from one time zone to another, it would be appropriate to use UTC and suffix the logbook entry with 'Z'.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>See response to Comment #5884</p>
comment	<p>6819 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA CZ</i></span></p> <p>In the example of Notes on recording of flight time in column 5 - SINGLE PILOT TIME - in boxes SE and ME the times should be entered instead of R or the title of column 5 should be changed.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>See response to Comment #707</p>
comment	<p>6906 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Colin Troise</i></span></p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>By convention, within the UK, it has been normal for a pilot under supervision to log the fact that he is "P2", and not log the name of the pilot-in-charge (unless he wishes to do so).</p> <p>The NPA will obviously alter the legal requirement.</p> <p>However, will this convention be allowed for in the transitioning arrangement for the issue of LPL(S)s and SPLs?</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>See response to Comment #2837</p> <p>The transitional arrangements will be detailed in the Cover Regulation that will accompany Part FCL.</p>

comment	<p>7202 comment by: <i>Finnish Aeronautical Association - Kai Mönkkönen</i></p> <p>Pilot´s logbook layout should be only an example – not a regulating form of printed one. Furthermore, it does not contain any space for recording sailplane launch methods that are compulsory to count according to Subpart B Section 5 clause FCL.130.S (c) .</p> <p>Justification: Pilot´s logbook layout should not be regulatory formula, because it can not practically be all covering in that outlook as expressed. If the form is to be given in AMC to FCL.050, then there shall be more appropriate example also for sailplane pilots. However, such a detailed matter should only be an example showing the information a pilot must be able to record for counting validity of his/her privileges.</p> <p>Proposed text: Add a clear text "AN EXAMPLE ONLY" over the form of logbook given in AMC to FCL.050 of Annex III.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>See response to Comment #804</p>
comment	<p>7867 comment by: <i>Peter LACKNER</i></p> <p>Dear ladies and gentlemen,</p> <p>Concerning the item 2.2 (co-pilot flight time) I would suggest to afford writing co-pilot flight time also in single-pilot-aeroplanes (SPA), as soon as pilot duties are fulfilled by both pilots.</p> <p>It would be a big improvement for the savety in aviation and some accidents can be avioded.</p> <p>I will quote following reasons for my suggestion:</p> <p>1) "fresh" PPL-Pilots with few experience often prefer to fly togehter with other pilots. So they are not so overstrained in the event of unforeseen occurrence and they also leanr the basics of cockpit management. It's not easy to find a (maybe more experienced) pilot to sit in the same cockpit, when he is not allowed to write flight time.</p> <p>I must admit, that I'm also not very interested in sit tingin a cockpit togehter with a beginner, be responsible in any case and am not allowed to write the flight time.</p> <p>In the reality beginners often are flying with guests, even they don't feel well to be the only pilot in the cockpit.</p> <p>- Especially IFR Flights can become very dangerous for inexperienced IFR-Pilots, when they are flying alone in IMC. Flying alone in IMC, maybe in icing conditions, can also become a challenge for experienced pilots.</p> <p>When a commercial flight will be undertaken with a single pilot aeroplane, a two-pilots-configuration is compulsory by law. And commercial pilots are nomally much more experienced and better skilled than private pilots.</p> <p>In my opinion e.g. a Piper Seneca should not be flown by only one pilot, except he is a very experienced pilot with several hundred hours of flight time.</p> <p>- Inexperienced pilots or pilots, who had not been flying for a longer period and don't feel save, should have the possibility to make a trainingsflight with a flight instructor, where he and the instructor are allowed to write the flight time (e.g. as PIC and PIC/US).</p>

	<p>I hope, my notes are helpful. With kind regards,</p> <p>Peter Lackner</p> <p>Scientific staff at the FH Joanneum, University of Applied Sciences, Degree Course "Aviation" Commercial pilot (CPL(A)/IR) and flight instructor(PPL(A))</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency agrees to the views expressed in the Comment, with regards to the benefits that can be had by inexperienced pilots who does some flights with more experienced pilots.</p> <p>It is the Agency's clear standpoint though that the Comment's proposal for opening up for all to log co-pilot time will seriously undermine flight safety. Establishing the level of experience for a pilot will have to be done with difficulty and uncertainty, as co-pilot time could encompass anything from a C172s to a B777.</p>
comment	<p><b>7898</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Svenska Ballongfederationen</i></span></p> <p>AMC to FCL.050</p> <p>The log book described is not at all suitable for balloon flight; hence there should not be a need to use it. There are a lot of unnecessary columns and data that do not apply to balloon flight at all. One example of unsuitable columns is departure and arrival. Balloons do not normally fly from e.g. ESGG to ESGP. Balloons typically fly from "Ballongstartfaltet" to "Rollsbo industriområde" which looks like it would never fit in those columns. Data necessary to keep record of for balloon flight should be kept in a log book suitable for balloon flight.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>See response to Comment #804</p>
comment	<p><b>7908</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Royal Netherlands Aeronautical Association</i></span></p> <p>3. Format of the record.</p> <p>We suggest an AMC that would allow the creating of pilot logs that contain a subset of the columns as shown on pages 177/178 and allow the addition of a few columns tailored towards a particular airport. If the airport is VFR only with a non-powered aircraft, several columns are never used and could be used to log information relevant to a particular airport.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>See response to Comment #804</p>
comment	<p><b>7973</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Europe Air Sports, VP</i></span></p> <p>The one in all approach, in this case one logbook, will not work. It is easier to</p>

lay down the information which should be contained in the logbook than to prescribe a format in itself.

The logbook content and format should be reviewed during the review phase.

response *Partially accepted*

See response to Comment #804

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart A: General Requirements - AMC No 1 to FCL.055 Language proficiency**

p. 182-187

comment

341

comment by: *Michel Lacombe AF TRTO*

Numbering error

Number 7 used twice so

BASIC ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

~~7~~ 8

ASSESSORS

~~8-9~~

CRITERIA FOR THE ACCEPTABILITY OF LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT BODIES

~~9-10~~

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment. The proposed editorials will be taken into consideration when drafting the final text.

comment

1421

comment by: *Bristow Helicopters*

This seems to repeat information which is already included in the rule. Duplication of information in more than one location should be avoided for reasons of consistency. Propose deletion of the Rule material and keep as an AMC.

response

*Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please note that when drafting the text the Agency followed closely the provisions of ICAO Annex 1, JAR-FCL and the IEM to JAR-FCL. The text you refer to was taken from Section 2 of JAR-FCL and the Agency plans to keep the content.

comment

2361

comment by: *AECA(SPAIN)*

This seems to repeat information which is already included in the rule. Duplication of information in more than one location should be avoided for reasons of consistency. Propose deletion of the Rule material and keep as an AMC.

response

*Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 1421 above.

comment	<p>3254 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Gérard VOLAN</i></span></p> <p><b>FCL055 Langage proficiency ( pages 7 to 9) and its AMC N°1 ( p 185-186)</b></p> <p>Table 1 seems very difficult to be impartially used as the examiner ( or recorded voice) may has his/her own accent ( disparity is by thousands even within English language native people) and encounter difficulties to have proper communication with the applicant. Even considering this table was in previous JAR materials, it should be either deleted or replaced by a more impartial specification, similar to one used within the European community to assess language proficiency ( example for guidance only as it would need adaptation to the aerail radio communication domain). Consequently the Language proficiency rating scale , table in AMC N°1 should be accordingly reassessed.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please mind that the referenced part of the text was already in JAR-FCL and is an exact repetition of the relevant table in ICAO Annex 1. Therefore the Agency does not intend to change it.</p>
comment	<p>4441 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Bond Offshore Helicopters</i></span></p> <p>This seems to repeat information which is already included in the rule. Duplication of information in more than one location should be avoided for reasons of consistency. Propose deletion of the Rule material and keep as an AMC.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 1421 above.</p>
comment	<p>4683 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Héli-Union</i></span></p> <p>This seems to repeat information which is already included in the rule. Duplication of information in more than one location should be avoided for reasons of consistency. Propose deletion of the Rule material and keep as an AMC.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 1421 above.</p>
comment	<p>4904 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>HUTC</i></span></p> <p>This seems to repeat information which is already included in the rule. Duplication of information in more than one location should be avoided for reasons of consistency. Propose deletion of the Rule material and keep as an AMC.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please refer to the response given to</p>



comment no 1421 above.

comment

5112

comment by: *Diether Memmert*

Die verlangte Sprachprüfung für „Freizeitpiloten“ (recreational aviation) ist absolut überzogen. Auf diesem Sektor hatte sich schon die JAR-Group völlig vergaloppiert.

Es muss doch wohl genügen, wenn der Pilot (d.h. Inhaber eines AZF oder BZF I ) die vorgeschriebene Phrasologie mit der Flugsicherung beherrscht, da andere Erfordernisse äußerst selten auftreten. Vor allem ist nicht zu sehen, wo bei diesen Ereignissen Sicherheitserfordernisse gegenüber Dritten tangiert werden und nur auf diese kommt es ausschließlich an.

Meine Aussage gilt speziell für Segelfluggpiloten, incl. TMG. Das gesamte AMC gehoert textlich entsprechend ueberarbeitet, wobei eine weitere Stufe fuer die "recreational aviation" eingefuehrt werden muss.

Siehe REGULATION (EC) No 216/2008, AnnexIII, Article 7, 1f:

... *A pilot must have demonstrated language proficiency to a degree appropriate to the functions exercised.... ...iii) the ability to communicate with ... air navigation services during all phases of flight...*

#### **ÄNDERUNGEN**

**Neufassung** des AMC auf jeden Fall für SPL, LPL(S) mit/ohne TMG, aber wohl auch für LPL(A) und PPL(A)

Dipl.-Ing. TU Diether Memmert, Segelfluggpilot seit 1953 mit >8500 Flugstunden

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

When drafting the text, the Agency followed closely the provisions and recommendations of ICAO Annex 1, as well as JAR-FCL. However, taking into account the comments received, the Agency has decided to amend its proposals in the following manner:

- In relation to the scope of application of the language proficiency requirement, the text will be amended to exclude sailplane and balloon pilots, and the reference to the need to use the radio telephone will be deleted. After reconsideration of the text of ICAO Annex 1, the Agency considers that this was the intended scope of the requirement.

comment

5886

comment by: *EFLEVA*

AMC n°1 to FCL 055 § 5 Language proficiency

EFLEVA endorses the requirement to establish an appeal procedure.

response

*Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.

comment

6325

comment by: *French Fédération Française Aéronautique groups the 580 French powered flying aer-clubs and their 43 000 private pilots*

**AMC n° 1 to FCL.055 Language proficiency.**

§ 5. The FFA supports the requirement applicable to the authority which should establish an appeal procedure (Page 182).

The FFA proposes to emphasize this requirement by replacing the word "should" by the word "shall".

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your positive feed-back. Please mind that if the Agency replaced the wording "should" by "shall" this would automatically exclude any alternative AMC. Therefore, your proposal will not be taken into consideration.

comment **6627** comment by: *Light Aircraft Association UK*

Paragraph 5. The LAA certainly agrees with the requirement to establish an appeal procedure.

The LAA proposes to emphasize this requirement by replacing the word "should" by the word "shall".

response *Noted*

Thank you for your positive feed-back. Please refer to the response to comment no 6325 above.

comment **7900** comment by: *Svenska Ballongfederationen*

AMC to FCL.055

Language Proficiency

Assessors 8. : It should also be possible for an experienced pilot (balloon or other type) to be an assessor as long as he/she fulfils language proficiency requirements and passes the assessor training.

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please note that the proposed text already takes your proposal into consideration. Second sentence in Assessors 8. states that they should be either aviation specialists (i.e. current or former flight crew members or air traffic controllers).

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart A: General Requirements - AMC No 2 to FCL.055 Language proficiency – Specific requirements for holders of an IR** p. 187-188

comment **3491** comment by: *FOCA Switzerland*

II Draft Decision AMC and GM for Part-FCL  
Subpart A  
AMC No 2 to FCL.055

**Paragraph 3 unreadable**

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment. The editorial changes will be made when drafting the final text.

comment	4791 Paragraph 3 is unreadable	comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i>
response	<i>Accepted</i> Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to comment no 3491 above.	
comment	5889 AMC 2 to FCL 055 Language proficiency EFLEVA does not support this requirement applicable to all instrument rated pilots.	comment by: <i>EFLEVA</i>
response	<i>Noted</i> Thank you for your comment. Please mind that this requirement was taken over from JAR-FCL and is well implemented all over Europe. Therefore, the Agency does not intend to change the text in the proposed way.	
comment	6223 Paragraph 3 needs to be rephrased.	comment by: <i>Icelandic CAA</i>
response	<i>Accepted</i> Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to comment no 3491 above.	
comment	6332 <b>AMC n°2 to FCL.055 Language proficiency - Specific requirements for holders of an IR.</b> As already commented for FCL.055 (d), the FFA disagrees with the systematic requirement of English language proficiency for all instrument rated pilots (IR). The FFA repeat that the English language proficiency should not be required for pilots holding a PPL licence with an instrument rating when flying within their national airspace. Without an English language proficiency check, the IR holder is presently simply restricted to his national airspace and must be allowed to continue to do so.	comment by: <i>French Fédération Française Aéronautique groups the 580 French powered flying aer-clubs and their 43 000 private pilots</i>
response	<i>Noted</i> Thank you for providing your opinion. Please refer to the response to comment no 5889 above.	
comment	6602 Comment: 3. As the text is not understandable please explain what the purpose of this chapter was.  Proposed Text:	comment by: <i>Austro Control GmbH</i>

~~3. Where the examination methods referred above meet are equivalent to those established for the language proficiency requirements in accordance with AMC No 1 to FCL.055, the examination may be used for the purpose of issuing a Language Proficiency endorsement.~~

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your comment. The text needs some editorial changes which will be made when drafting the final text. Please refer to comment no 3491 above.

comment 6629

comment by: *Light Aircraft Association UK*

The LAA, with an excellent knowledge of the procedures throughout Europe disagrees with this requirement applicable to all instrument rated pilots.

The LAA would further question as to whether the English language proficiency should not be required for pilots holding a PPL licence with an instrument rating when flying within their national airspace.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion. Please refer to the response to comment no 5889 above.

comment 6763

comment by: *Adventia, European College of Aeronautics*

Also AMC number 2 to FCL. 055, point 3 is impossible to understand due to the way in which it has been written.

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to comment no 3491 above.

comment 7980

comment by: *Europe Air Sports, VP*

It is not necessary for the holder of an Instrument Rating to communicate and demonstrate the language proficiency in English as long as the language of ATC is the national language. It is agreed that communication between the crew must be possible but to prescribe English is not the solution. Example. A Italian captain, co-pilot cabin crew of an Italian airline certainly will communicate within the crew in Italian.

It is agreed that for mixed nationals English could be a solution.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion. Please refer to the response to comment no 5889 above.

comment 8295

comment by: *Paul Mc G*

English language proficiency should be required for pilots holding a PPL licence with an instrument rating when flying within their national airspace. It should also be obligatory to only use English on the radio! Simply safety and skilling. The BGA and LAA cover this and I copy some of their comments here as they

are so clear!! However, the opinion is not a complete as it should be and some of your proposals have more merit.

response *Noted*

Thank you for your positive feed-back.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart A: General Requirements  
- AMC to FCL.060(b)(4) Recent experience – non-complex helicopters**

p. 188

comment 4753

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

In the list of groups of helicopters, the SEP list proposes to add R22 and R44 to the SEP group taken from JAR-FCL. The R22 should be deleted, as this helicopter has very particular characteristics, and should for safety reasons always be revalidated on type, not via grouping. Because of its characteristics, the R22 has been subject to several specific safety-related regulatory measures from FAA and other authorities. Ignoring this fact will be detrimental to flight safety, and we assume this to be an editorial error.

response *Accepted*

Text amended as proposed.

comment 7075

comment by: *CAA Norway*

AMC to FCL.060(b)(4)

In the list of groups of helicopters, the list in Group 5 proposes to add R22 and R44 to the SEP group taken from JAR-FCL. The R22 should be deleted, as this helicopter has very particular characteristics, and should for safety reasons always be revalidated on type, not via grouping. Because of its characteristics, the R22 has been subject to several specific safety-related regulatory measures from FAA and other authorities. Ignoring this fact will be detrimental to flight safety, and we assume this to be an editorial error. R22 should be deleted.

response *Accepted*

Text amended as proposed.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence  
LPL**

p. 189

comment 5388

comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

Comment:

AMC to FCL.120 and 125, AMC 1 and 2 to FCL.125, AMC 1 and 2 to 125 and 235, AMC to FCL 215 and 220, AMC 1 and 2 to FCL 220, AMC 3 to 235, AMC 1 to FCL.205.S(c), AMC 1 to FCL.205.B(c), AMC 3 to FCL.135B, AMC to FCL.825, all these AMCs should be appendixes.

Justification:

To be consistent with the rest of the text, these AMCs should be appendixes, as they are the legal bases from which the examiners will have the criteria to

	fail or pass the applicant. If there remain AMCs, then the examiner will not have any legal basis to fail an applicant.
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency carefully reviewed this issue but came to the conclusion to keep all the mentioned AMCs as AMCs but not to include them as an Appendix.</p> <p>The conclusion provided by you which says that the examiner will have no legal basis for these examinations if the skill test content list is not in the rule is not right as the basic elements for the skill test are already included in the rule text. As a different procedure would require an alternative AMC (which would have to be approved by the Competent Authority before), the Agency does not agree that the system proposed would create any legal "loopholes" or deficiencies.</p>
comment	<p>6355 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DSvU</i></span></p> <p>AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 Point 1.3 Page 189</p> <p>Comment: In the syllabus is mentioned "Search and rescue" which can cover many things.</p> <p>Proposal: It needs to be more precise what is included in this point. We suggest it is an introduction to the various search and rescue options.</p> <p>Justification: To make it more clear what the subject is covering it is needed with a clarification.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment.</p> <p>Point 1.3 on page 189 deals with Aircraft nationality and registration marks and therefore the Agency believes that your comment most probably refers to paragraph 1.12 Search and rescue. Please remember that "Search and rescue" is known as ICAO terminology and is very well established. The Agency decided therefore to keep this item unchanged. No clarification seems to be needed.</p> <p>It should be highlighted that the syllabus for the LAPL(A) and LAPL(H) will be the same as for the PPL(A) and PPL(H). Please check the syllabus in AMC No 2 to FCL.210 and FCL.215 and you will find some more detailed contents under 010110000 "Annex 12 - Search and Rescue".</p>

comment	<p>3802 <span style="float: right;">comment by: DGAC FRANCE</span></p> <p>AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120</p> <p>Appendix 1, <b>A 1</b> paragraph 1.1.2 : gives credit in full of theoretical knowledge for the issue of a PPL to the holder of a LPL of the same category.</p> <p>Therefore, it will avoid an unnecessary burden (for the regulator and for the executive bodies) to reach the same result.</p> <p><b><i>Have the same theoretical knowledge instruction and examination for LPL(A) and PPL(A), and for LPL(H) and PPL(H).</i></b></p> <p>As it is already the case in the NPA for the theoretical knowledge instruction and examination for respectively LPL (B)and BPL, LPL(S) and SPL.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency agrees and will align the theoretical training syllabus for the LPL(A) with the one for the PPL(A) and also for the helicopter licences. Based on the fact that the LPL system introduced a system of common subjects and additional subjects (in order to support the crediting for the common subjects) for each category of aircraft, this system will also be introduced for the PPL.</p>
comment	<p>6159 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC to FCL.115 and 120</p> <p><b>Page No*:</b> 189</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Given that Appendix 1 A 1.1.2 gives full theoretical knowledge credit for a LPL holder when applying for a PPL. SPL etc in the same category, one would expect the syllabi and style of examination to be the same. However, the syllabi are different and the split of examinations (common and specialist in the LPL) varies between the 2 licences.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> There should be consistency between the LPL(A) and the PPL(A)</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Produce a single syllabus for LPL and PPL/SPL etc using the common/specialist format described in FCL.120(a)</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency agrees and will align the theoretical training syllabus for the LPL(A) with the one for the PPL(A) and also for the helicopter licences. Based on the fact that the LPL system introduced a system of common subjects and additional subjects (in order to support the crediting for the common subjects) for each category of aircraft, this system will also be introduced for the PPL.</p>
comment	<p>6346 <span style="float: right;">comment by: French Fédération Française Aéronautique groups the 580 French powered flying aer-clubs and their 43 000 private pilots</span></p> <p><b>AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 - Syllabus of theoretical knowledge for</b></p>

	<p><b>Basic LPL and LPL.</b> This AMC defines the same syllabus of theoretical knowledge for Basic LPL and LPL. FFA supports this common syllabus as it is much more general and simple than the PPL very detailed syllabus. But the FFA will think about different syllabus for Basic LPL and LPL in the future if experience shows a need for that.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>However, the Agency has received a lot of comments asking for aligning the syllabus for the PPL and the LPL. The Agency carefully reviewed these comments and as a full credit will be provided for the LPL pilot when converting to the PPL in the same class it was decided to keep the PPL syllabus and use it also for the LPL (aeroplanes and helicopter).</p>
comment	<p>6361 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DSvU</i></span></p> <p>AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 Point 1.13 Page 189</p> <p>Comment: In the syllabus is mentioned "Security" which can cover many things.</p> <p>Proposal: As we cannot see what "security" is covering we cannot make any suggestions to improvements except it must be clarified.</p> <p>Justification: To make it more clear what the subject is covering it is needed with a clarification.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment.</p> <p>Please be aware that the wording was taken over from ICAO terminology and is referenced to Annex 17 to the ICAO convention. As this terminology is well established in civil aviation we do not consider it necessary to clarify it.</p> <p>It should be highlighted that the syllabus for the LAPL(A) and LAPL(H) will be the same as for the PPL(A) and PPL(H). Please check the syllabus in AMC No 2 to FCL.210 and FCL.215 and you will find some more detailed contents under 010120000 "Annex 17 - Security".</p>
comment	<p>7797 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span></p> <p>The crediting of LPL towards PPL is 100%, ref App 1 A 1.1.2. The credit of PPL towards higher licences is 100 hours ref App 3 A para 7 versus FCL.515.A(b)(1) or App 3 C para 7 versus App 3 D para 7. The logical minimum theoretical training hours for LPL - PPL is 100 hours. Proposed new text:</p> <p>The training and examination should cover aspects related to non-technical</p>



skills in an integrated manner, taking into account the particular risks associated to the licence and the activity. **An approved course shall comprise at least 100 hours of theoretical knowledge instruction.**

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees with your proposal and will reduce the required amount of theoretical knowledge instruction for the PPL to 100 hours. The syllabus proposed for the PPL (based on JAR-FCL) will be kept and also required for the LPL (aeroplanes/helicopters). The appropriate AMCs for the LPL will be deleted.

It should be mentioned that for the LPL a system of common subjects was introduced in order to address the issue of crediting from one category to another. This system will be kept and also introduced for the PPL.

comment 8157

comment by: *F Mortera*

**2. About the conditions, requirements, syllabus and tests for getting a LPLB or a BPL and their "performance" privileges**

FCL.110.B "LPL Experience reqs.", (page 11 )

FCL.210.B "Experience reqs. And crediting", (page 22)

AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 (Syllabus LPL B) (page 189) = AMC N° 3 to FCL.210.B and FCL.215.B "Syllabus BPL", (page 321)

AMC to FCL.110.B and FCL.210.B "Flight instruction", (page 254)

AMC N° 2 to FCL.125.B and FCL.235 "Skill test", (page 206)

AMC N° 1 to FCL.135.B and FCL.225.B "Extension of class and class and group privs.", (page 262)

AMC N° 2 to FCL.135.B and FCL.225.B (") "Class extension", (page 263)

AMC N° 3 to FCL.210.B and FCL.215.B (Syllabus BPL) page 321 = AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 "Syl. LPL B" (page 189)

APPENDIX 1 / CREDITING T K / A / 1

Probably I missed something but, except for the skill test for BPL, they seem identical. Obviously their privileges are different, but considering that the syllabus is the same for a new balloon pilot, getting their first licence, what does make the difference to choose one or other licence? Is it just the price?

It looks reasonable to share same amounts of minimum training hours, exams and processes according the responsibility of flying a balloon, but what is the real difference if their programs are the same? Just the legal capability of use balloons sized "139" or "141" and receive remuneration or not respectively? It has not too much sense for me.

I'm not suggesting that the BPL requirements must be harder, [but they could be simplified for LPLB or reduced their privileges alternatively, to get the BPL reevaluation. For instance the LPLB can not fly in controlled air space \(it should not be necessary ATC liaison methods\), over cities...](#)

That is the only different here in Spain. As a private pilot (even with a radio rate), we can not fly in CTR or TMA. Only when we are flying for authorized Aerial Works Companies, making commercial flights, we can use the ATC services.

I think that differences must be established between both LPLB and BPL licences not only in economical privileges, but also in their syllabus, training and real performance capabilities.

Even considering carrying passengers as the main balloon commercial activity, advertising and filming are also commercial flights (I understand sponsorship is different to aerial advertising). And as far as I understand they soon will be considered in this way in Europe.

In my experience, the best advertising flights or flights for images recording are those with a little "65", where the pilot is alone in the basket or only with a camera operator. The "risky" flights close the sea, in ATC areas, in very fast winds, landings in small parks into the cities... can be done better with small balloons without passengers.

These other flights, not CAT, have been (and still they are) the economical support in most of the balloon companies that I know. In this case, the big balloons are not only unnecessary, but rather they are not practical.

Establishing different performance capabilities (restrictions) will permit to have a "light" licence, capable to offer a reasonable club / sponsor relationship and a good platform to jump to a professional environment, without favouring misunderstandings about capabilities or privileges between LPLB and BPL.

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your response.

However, as you assigned this standard comment to several other segments please see the responses already provided in these segments. It seems that no specific comment or proposal for the theoretical knowledge syllabus LPL(B) or BPL is provided with your comment. Therefore, no specific response can be provided.

comment 8196

comment by: *Andrew DELANEY*

### **Requirement for spin training**

I have benefitted from practical spinning training with an instructor. I find it amazing that powered pilots often have no practical training in spin recovery. Having said that glider pilots are more susceptible to spinning as we are most likely to fly close to the stall, especially when thermalling which creates a higher likelihood of spinning. In addition glider pilots regularly are required to make field landings. This requires specific training including the possibility of stall or spin due to high workload in these circumstances. I think it's highly desirable that spin training is added to the glider pilot's syllabus.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, it seems that your comment should not be assigned to this segment which deals with the theoretical knowledge syllabus.

Please check the responses already provided to the BGA comment, on which your comment seems to be based, in the appropriate segment for the practical

training SPL/LPL(S).

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence  
LPL - AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 - Syllabus of theoretical knowledge for the LPL - I. Common subjects** p. 189-190

comment *1157* comment by: *KLSPublishing*

under Basic LPL I find here the full ATPL Meteorology Syllabus (all 10 chapters)??

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion. Please remember that the basis for this syllabus was taken from other training plans which already existed for other licences. The group of subjects therefore is not different from "higher" licences but what will be different is the intensity of theoretical training on those subjects.

comment *1541* comment by: *Danish Balloon Organisation*

**AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120:**

We suggest that it is made clear in the AMC that the theoretical knowledge subject "COMMUNICATIONS" does not imply that an R/T license is mandatory

Justification: The mandatory subject Communications and the associated AMC imply that a VFR R/T license is now mandatory also for sailplanes and balloons. ICAO Annex 1 does not require this.

Alternatively it should be stated that all pilots flying today on ICAO compliant licenses without an R/T license shall be able to continue to fly without an R/T license. (Grandfather rights.).

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment. When drafting the syllabus of theoretical knowledge for the LPL, the group of experts took over those items from the PPL theoretical knowledge syllabus. It deemed absolutely necessary for a leisure pilot. Please remember that an R/T licence as you make reference to it is not regulated in this part. It is for the time being still regulated directly by Member States according to international telecommunication agreements. For further details please also refer to the responses to comments on FCL.055.

comment *3426* comment by: *Royal Danish Aeroclub*

In connection to previous comments about radiocommunications, point 4.1 VFR communications should be deleted from the AMC syllabus.  
The ICAO Annex I do not require an radio license.

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment.  
Please refer to the response given to comment No. 1541 in the same segment above.

comment	<p>3600 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Swiss Power Flight Union</i></span></p> <p>The syllabus must have the same structure as the syllabus for PPL. See FCL.215, page 18 and subpart C, page 269-316. Reason: The structure for basic instruction must be the same as for higher education.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment.</p> <p>The Agency agrees in general with your statement. Please be aware that when creating the syllabus for the LPL the group of experts who drafted it already took over as much as possible the structure of the syllabus for the PPL based also on the fact that the LPL licence holder will receive a 100% credit for the common subjects (LPL upgrade to PPL).</p> <p>Based on the comments received, the Agency changed the original proposal and introduced for the LPL aeroplane and helicopter licences the same syllabus (please check the changes introduced). For sailplane and balloon licences this was already the case.</p>
comment	<p>5390 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ECA- European Cockpit Association</i></span></p> <p>Comment: editorial comment: There is hidden text in the table and therefore needs reformatting.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment. The table will be reformatted for the final text.</p>
comment	<p>6286 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Jonathan Coote</i></span></p> <p>The British Gliding Association should retain the freedom to manage the syllabus for glider pilots under the LPL(S) and SPL. By mandating common subjects and dictating the approach to the syllabus, the proposed syllabus will result likely result training material which fails to address the specific requirements of glider pilots, who will then suffer a deterioration of training quality in the subjects which are most relevant to them. Deferral of the syllabus to the BGA allows the flexibility to adjust quickly if any additional topics are deemed important.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment.</p> <p>Please be aware that according to NPA 2008-22b AR.GEN.020 (b) alternative AMCs may be developed and approved. Therefore, your proposal should be handed in as an alternative AMC to the competent authority, which then would decide if with that an equivalent level of safety may be obtained.</p> <p>However, it should be highlighted that the principle of common subjects was introduced in order to allow cross crediting of theoretical knowledge when applying for an LAPL in a different category. The LAPL(S) holder will receive 100% credit for the common subject when upgrading to an LAPL(A). This principle was supported by the experts involved in the drafting but it needs also a harmonisation of the contents for these subjects.</p>

comment	6365	comment by: <i>DSvU</i>
	<p>AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 Point 4 Page 190</p> <p>Comment: In the syllabus is mentioned "Communication".</p> <p>Proposal: Make "Communication" an optional rating.</p> <p>Justification: Most places in the world it is not required to use radio communication as the airspace is having non-controlled airspace. And today it is a separate rating in all countries.</p>	
response	<i>Not accepted</i>	
	<p>The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment No. 1541 in the same segment above.</p>	

comment	7303	comment by: <i>Aero-Club of Switzerland</i>
	<p>The syllabus must have the same structure as the syllabus for PPL. See FCL.215, page 18 and subpart C, page 269-316.</p> <p>Justification: The structure for the basic instruction must be the same as for the higher education.</p>	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	<p>Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment No.3600 above.</p>	

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence  
LPL - AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 - Syllabus of theoretical knowledge for p. 190-192  
the LPL - II. Additional subjects for each category - II.A. Aeroplanes**

comment	470	comment by: <i>London Metropolitan University</i>
	<p>Spelling and format: <b>3. METEOROLOGY</b> 3.7 PRESSURE SYSTEMS (DELETE "19." AND MAKE NORMAL FONT NOT <b>BOLD</b>)</p>	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	
	<p>Thank you for providing this comment. The whole table will be reformatted when drafting the final text.</p>	

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence  
LPL - AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 - Syllabus of theoretical knowledge for p. 192-193  
the LPL - II. Additional subjects for each category - II.B. Helicopters**

comment	471	comment by: <i>London Metropolitan University</i>
	page 193 missing line in the formatting	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	
	Thank you for providing your comment. The proposed editorial will be taken into account when drafting the final text.	

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence  
LPL - AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 - Syllabus of theoretical knowledge for p. 193-194  
the LPL - II. Additional subjects for each category - II.C. Sailplanes**

comment	27	comment by: <i>British Gliding Association</i>
	<p><b>AMC TO FCL.115 and FCL.120</b>  <b>SYLLABUS OF THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE FOR THE LPL</b>  <b>II.C. SAILPLANES</b>  <b>6. OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES - SAILPLANE</b>  <u>NPA Proposal</u>          6.6. SPECIAL OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES AND HAZARDS</p> <p><b><u>BGA Proposal</u></b>          There are procedures and hazards relevant to sailplane flying and operations that differ from those experienced in aeroplanes. The BGA suggests the following text;  <b>6.6. Relevant operational procedures and hazards</b></p>	
response	<i>Not accepted</i>	
	The Agency acknowledges your comment. However, your proposal is referring to a chapter which regulates specific Sailplane topics, therefore the Agency does not consider that the change you proposed is necessary.	
comment	2477	comment by: <i>derekheaton</i>
	operational procedures 6.6 should be reworded as "relevant operational procedures and hazards"	
response	<i>Not accepted</i>	
	Thank you for also providing this comment. For the response please refer to comment No. 27 in the same segment above.	
comment	4612	comment by: <i>Deutscher Aero Club</i>
	<p>AMC TO FCL.115 and FCL.120          SYLLABUS OF THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE FOR THE LPL          II.C. SAILPLANES          6. OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES - SAILPLANE          6.6. SPECIAL OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES AND HAZARDS</p> <p>Comment          There are procedures and hazards relevant to sailplane flying and operations</p>	

	that differ from those experienced in aeroplanes.
	EGU Proposal: 6.6. Relevant operational procedures and hazards
response	<i>Not accepted</i>  Thank you for also providing this comment. For the response please refer to comment No. 27 in the same segment above.
comment	<b>5021</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>George Knight</i></span>  Flight Performance and Planning - Sailplane 7.4  The need to submit ICAO flight plans is not relevant. I've been gliding since 1968 and NEVER had a need to submit a flight plan before launch.  Please remove.
response	<i>Not accepted</i>  Thank you for providing your comment. Please remember that even if you never had to submit any flight plan for your flights there will be certain sailplane activities such as cross border flights where it will be necessary to log a flight plan. Therefore, the Agency will not remove this item.
comment	<b>5594</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Belgian Gliding Federation</i></span>  <i>AMC TO FCL.115 and FCL.120 SYLLABUS OF THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE FOR THE LPL II.C. SAILPLANES 6. OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES - SAILPLANE 6.6. SPECIAL OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES AND HAZARDS</i>  Comment There are procedures and hazards relevant to sailplane flying and operations that differ from those experienced in aeroplanes.  <b><u>Proposal:</u></b> <b><i>6.6. Relevant operational procedures and hazards</i></b>
response	<i>Not accepted</i>  Thank you for also providing this comment. For the response please refer to comment No. 27 in the same segment above.
comment	<b>6671</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Croft Brown</i></span>  AMC TO FCL.115 and FCL.120 SYLLABUS OF THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE FOR THE LPL II.C. SAILPLANES 6. OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES - SAILPLANE NPA Proposal 6.6. SPECIAL OPERATIONAL PROCEDURED AND HAZARDS) Croft Brown endorses the BGA Proposa 6.6. Relevant operational procedures and hazards

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for also providing this comment.  
For the response please refer to comment No. 27 in the same segment above.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence  
LPL - AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 - Syllabus of theoretical knowledge for the LPL - II. Additional subjects for each category - II.D. Balloons** p. 195-196

comment 4038 comment by: *Axel Ockelmann + Manfred Poggensee Commercial Balloon Operators Germany*

**AMC to FCL 115 II D. - Theoretical knowledge balloons**

Environment lessons about the behaviour of the different livestock we fly over becomes more and more necessary to avoid any kind trouble as best as we could. Applicants should learn why and when livestock gets panic.  
(see also comment No. 4041 to AMC FCL.110. and 210.B)

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees with your proposal and has added already an exercise item in the AMC containing the flight training ("low level" flights).

As the syllabus already contains an item 6.2. "Special operational procedures and hazards" this will cover also environmental issues when performing flights in low altitudes. The Agency will keep the wording of the syllabus unchanged.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence  
LPL - AMC to FCL.120 and FCL.125 - Theoretical knowledge examination and skill test for the LPL** p. 196

comment 708 comment by: *FOCA Switzerland*  
AMC to FCL.120 and FCL.125

**It is desired to have a centralised "Question Bank" for theoretical examination knowledge as it exists for CPL / IR and ATPL (A/H). The examination needs to be harmonised in order to be mutually accepted. Such examination should be translated in English and national languages as appropriate.**

response *Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.

The issue of a centralised "Question Bank" for theoretical examination knowledge apart from those questions for ATPL (A/H) and CPL/IR was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed and should be subject to further work in a separate rule-making task.

We suggest that you submit a rule-making proposal on this issue to the Agency.



comment	<p>4971 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Royal Danish Aeroclub</i></span></p> <p>AMC to FCL.120 and FCL.125</p> <p>The text in 1.4:          "The period of 18 months mentioned in FCL.025(b) should be counted .."          should be changed to "<b>The period of 24 months mentioned in FCL.025(b) should be counted...</b>"</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment. In this case the Agency does not intend to make an exception and put 24 months instead of 18 as we think that during 24 months the pilots might have forgotten what they were taught in the beginning.</p>
comment	<p>6366 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DSvU</i></span></p> <p>AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.125          Point 1.1          Page 196</p> <p>Comment:          It is mentioned that there should be 120 multiple choice questions.</p> <p>Proposal:          There must be mentioned how many questions that are in the different subjects such as "Air law", "Human performance" etc.</p> <p>Justification:          There should be an equal number of questions for each subject. As "Communication" is suggested taken out of the general requirement the number of questions should also be reduced.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment. The Agency does not agree with your proposal to give an equal number of comments for every subject as there are subjects where it will be necessary to have more questions than in others. Also the subject "Communication" is considered to be very important and therefore will not be taken out.</p>
comment	<p>6368 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DSvU</i></span></p> <p>AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.125          Point 1.2          Page 196</p> <p>Comment:          "Communication practical classroom testing may be conducted" should be removed with reference to comments to to AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120, Point 4, Page 190 above</p> <p>Proposal:          Make "Communication" an optional rating.</p> <p>Justification:</p>

	<p>Most places in the world it is not required to use radio communication as the airspace is having non-controlled airspace. And today it is a separate rating in all countries.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please mind that communications is not only related to radio telephony but also to the fact that a pilot has to learn to use radio telephony devices and to fly an aircraft at the same time.</p>
comment	<p>6369 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DSvU</i></span></p> <p>AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.125 Point 1.4 Page 196</p> <p>Comment: The period of 18 months mentioned in FCL.025(b) should be counted from the end of the calendar month when the applicant first attempted an examination</p> <p>Proposal: We suggest the number of months is increased to 24 months.</p> <p>Justification: In many countries the soaring season is relative short and thus it may be a problem to obtain a license in only 18 months.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment No. 4917 in the same segment above</p>

<p><b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence</b>  <b>LPL - AMC No 1 to FCL.125 - Contents of the skill test for the issue of a</b>  <b>Basic LPL(A) and a LPL(A)</b></p>	<p>p. 196-200</p>
--	-------------------

comment	<p>709 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>FOCA Switzerland</i></span></p> <p>Subpart B AMC # 1 to FCL.125;</p> <p>Para 4 "with simulated engine failure"</p> <p><b>Since BLPL and LPL pilots are only entitled to operate single engine aeroplanes, such limitation shall be deleted.</b></p> <p>Section 3 (En route procedures)</p> <p>Clarification: BLPL are not entitled to fly in meteorological conditions which do not allow to return to the field of departure.</p> <p>Proposal.</p>
---------	---

	<p><b>Limit this item to LPL only, excluding BLPL.</b></p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency agrees with your first comment and will delete the reference to flights "with simulated engine failure" here in the LPL subpart. However, it should be stated that this is only the deletion of a limit which is used in the case of other licences for the multi-engine exercise. The check items in section 5 will stay.</p> <p>Regarding your comment on the check items in section 3, the Agency agrees that in general the Basic LPL holder will be limited to local flights within no more than 50 km with no intermediate landings. Having this in mind the items in section 3 were reduced to very basic navigational skill which would allow to divert and land on another airfield in the case of emergencies. To make this even more clear and to follow the proposals received, the Agency has deleted item e (diversion to another airfield) but will keep the rest of this section as proposed.</p>
comment	<p><b>2261</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Mike Grierson</i></span></p> <p>Skill Test Tolerances Height +/- 200 feet with simulated engine failure! With only one engine that is blatant nonsense!</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response already provided to comment No. 709 (FOCA Switzerland) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p><b>3492</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>FOCA Switzerland</i></span></p> <p>Subpart B Leisure Pilot Licence</p> <p>AMC 1 to FCL.125; Para 4 The limitation with simulated engine failure is not adequate</p> <p>AMC 1 to FCL.125 and to FCL.235 Section (3)(a) of report form is not applicable for glider</p> <p>AMC 2 to FCL.125 and to FCL.235 Para 2: It should be clear that skill-test are not carried out when a mass of people is around</p> <p>AMC 1 to FCL.110.BA/H If this AMC stays in it should follow the same structure as PPL. Para 2.2: should the pilot be instructed in "RT" as well. This remark is valid for all non ICAO-licences foreseen in this part.</p> <p>AMC to FCL.135.S and FCL.225.S Theoretical knowledge subjects are different from those foreseen in FCL.135.S</p>

	<p>AMC 1 and 2 to FCL.135.B and FCL.225.B Title and content not in accordance.</p>		
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment.</p> <p>However, as the comment is dealing with items of different AMCs please see the responses already provided in the other segments and check also the resulting text.</p> <p>As to your first comment, please see the response already provided to your comment No. 709 in the same segment above.</p> <p>As to your second comment on AMC 1 to FCL.125 and FCL.235, the Agency does not agree and will keep the check item in (a). However, as the term "level" seems to cause misinterpretations the wording will be changed.</p> <p>Regarding your third comment, the Agency does not agree as for no other skill test such a limitation is mentioned in the AMC material. Although the exercise "crowd control" which can be demonstrated and checked already with the team members does not require that a lot of people should be around, the Agency does not believe that it is necessary to define how many persons will be allowed to be around.</p> <p>Please see the response already provided to the CAA Belgium in the appropriate segment. The Agency is of the opinion that the wording in 2.2. includes also the ability to use the R/T equipment. The Agency does believe that an instructor will show his/her student how to use the radio before the first solo flight and does not see the need to specifically ask for this.</p> <p>Regarding your last comment, the Agency agrees and will add the subject "Principles of flight" in FCL.135.S.</p>		
comment	<p>3601 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Swiss Power Flight Union</i></span></p> <p>Height: with simulated engine failure is the height limits + / - 200 feet with a 1-engine aircraft not possible</p>		
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response already provided to comment No. 709 (FOCA Switzerland) in the same segment above.</p>		
comment	<p>3787 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></span></p> <p>Part FCL AMC N° 1 to FCL .125</p> <p>LPL pilots are not entitled to fly multi-engine aeroplanes.</p> <p>In Paragraph 4. we propose the following modification :</p> <p>Height</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; width: 50%;">normal flight</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 50%;">± 150 feet</td> </tr> </table>	normal flight	± 150 feet
normal flight	± 150 feet		

	<del>with simulated engine failure</del> ± 200 feet
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response already provided to comment No. 709 (FOCA Switzerland) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p>4239 comment by: <i>CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority</i></p> <p>The competency of "exercise good judgement and airmanship" is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.</p> <p>Ammend to read</p> <p><del>"exercise good judgement and airmanship</del> - <i>apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test</i>".</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.</p> <p>The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.</p>
comment	<p>4387 comment by: <i>DC-AL</i></p> <p>I suggest we include the use of a satellite navigation aid if carried, since these are becoming very popular and are excellent aids if used properly.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>As you might have seen the Agency included GPS training for the LPL(A) student pilot but as the method of how to fulfil the check items "orientation" or "diversion to an alternate aerodrome" is not defined. The Agency will not require a GPS as mandatory check item for the LPL.</p>
comment	<p>4792 comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></p> <p>Paragraph 4: The limitation with simulated engine failure is not adequate</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response already provided to comment No. 709 (FOCA</p>

Switzerland) in the same segment above.

comment **5030** comment by: *George Knight*

P 198  
Section 3 EnRoute

This should have added to it engine shut-down and propeller feathering and restart procedures for motor gliders intended for unpowered flight.

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency does not agree that this should be a mandatory item for the skill test but agrees that this exercise must be included in the training syllabus.

Based on the input received, the Agency will include an additional exercise with the title "Stopping and re-starting the engine" which has to be completed only when the training is provided on a TMG.

comment **5506** comment by: *Irv Lee (Higherplane Aviation Training Ltd)*

Section 1 of the content of the skills test for the BASIC LPL is missing the 'NOTAM' checking / briefing. NOTAM checking is vital in today's environment and should be a compulsory part of the test. Weather, documentation, mass and balance are all included, NOTAM checking is missing, it needs to be added. Suggest Section 1.a of the test schedule is amended to include 'NOTAM briefing' too. e.g.:  
1.a Pre-flight documentation, NOTAM and weather brief

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.  
The Agency agrees and will add "NOTAM" in section 1.

comment **5507** comment by: *Irv Lee (Higherplane Aviation Training Ltd)*

Section 1 of the content of the skills test for the LPL is missing the 'NOTAM' checking / briefing. NOTAM checking is vital in today's environment and should be a compulsory part of the test. Weather, documentation, mass and balance are all included, NOTAM checking is missing, it needs to be added. Suggest Section 1.a of the test schedule is amended to include 'NOTAM briefing' too. e.g.:  
1.a Preflight documentation, NOTAM and weather brief

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.  
Please see the response to your comment No. 5506 above. The Agency will also include the term "NOTAM" as a skill test item for the LPL.

comment **5824** comment by: *ENAC TLP*

The technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed flight test tolerances

(standards) need some specifications for NTS and TEM avoiding the use of terms such as 'good judgement and airmanship' that are easily prone to subjectivity, bias and abuse during assessment because of a lack of common understanding.

**Need:** more clear and unambiguous standards for the assessment of non-technical skills during skill test and proficiency checks for class/type ratings and license skill tests.

**Proposal:** specify differently the non technical abilities to be demonstrated during test/checks to exercise good airmanship and related Flight test tolerances

#### **AMC 1 to FCL125**

#### **Contents of the skill test for the issue of a Basic LPL(A) and LPL(A) FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES**

**page 197** To be modified as follows (*italics*)

3. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

- as it is;

- as it is;

- *apply NTS and TEM as needed to exercise good airmanship;*

- as it is;

- as it is.

response *Noted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

6160

comment by: UK CAA

#### **Paragraph:**

AMC No 1 to FCL.125 Paragraph 1

#### **Page No\*:**

197

#### **Comment:**

It seems strange that, for a PPL(A) the navigation test route as described in AMC 1 to FCL.220 1 'may' finish at a different airfield from the airfield of departure but for the LPL it 'should' finish at a different airfield.

#### **Justification:**

There should be consistency between the LPL(A) and the PPL(A)

#### **Proposed Text:**

#### **(if applicable)**

Standardise the 2 test formats.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response already provided to your comment to AMC 1 to FCL.220. The Agency decided to allow a landing at the aerodrome of departure also for the LPL(A) although an intermediate landing on another airfield seems to be a useful check item. This might be included on a later stage.

comment	<p>6161</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: UK CAA</p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b></p> <p>AMC No 1 to FCL.125 Paragraph 4</p> <p><b>Page No:</b></p> <p>197</p> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p>Remove height tolerance 'with single engine failure'</p> <p><b>Justification:</b></p> <p>Test schedule is for single-engine aeroplanes and TMGs</p> <p><b>Proposed Text:</b></p> <p><b>(if applicable)</b></p> <p>Delete height tolerance</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response already provided to comment No. 709 (FOCA Switzerland) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p>6162</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: UK CAA</p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b></p> <p>AMC No 1 to FCL.125 5. BLPL Skill Test</p> <p><b>Page No:</b></p> <p>198</p> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p>BLAPL test includes item 3d – diversion to alternate aerodrome.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b></p> <p>This appears to be contradicted by AMC No 1 to FCL.125 1.</p> <p><b>Proposed Text:</b></p> <p><b>(if applicable)</b></p> <p>Remove test requirement for diversion to alternate aerodrome.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency agrees and will delete this item from the mentioned check items in section 3.</p>
comment	<p>6164</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: UK CAA</p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b></p> <p>AMC No 1 to FCL.125 5 &amp; 6. BLPL &amp; LPL Skill Test</p> <p><b>Page No:</b></p> <p>198 &amp; 200</p> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p>Section 4 – allowing one precision, flapless, idle power landing to replace 3 separate circuits is inappropriate.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b></p> <p>A flapless, glide, precision circuit is not taught.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p>



Thank you for providing your opinion.

It should be pointed out that the content of this skill test is based on the JAR-FCL skill test for the PPL(A). As no problems so far were known with this option for the examiner to combine some of these exercises the Agency included this option also for the LPL skill tests.

The Agency reviewed the issue and came to the conclusion that the three items mentioned might be not the ones which should be combined during one single approach. The Agency deleted this option for the LPL skill test.

comment

6166

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC No 1 to FCL.125 5 &amp; 6. BLPL &amp; LPL Skill Test

**Page No:**

198 &amp; 200

**Comment:**

Section 4 – allowing one precision, flapless, idle power landing to replace 3 separate circuits is inappropriate.

**Justification:**

A flapless, glide, precision circuit is not taught.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to your comment No. 6164 in the same segment above. The option will be deleted also for the Basic LPL(A) skill test.

comment

6168

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC No 1 to FCL.125 6. LPL Skill Test

**Page No:**

200

**Comment:**

Section 5 c is missing an asterisk

**Justification:**

Typographical error

response

*Noted*

Thank you for identifying this editorial mistake.

The text will be changed accordingly.

comment

6965

comment by: CAA CZ

It should be specified that skill test has to be executed on single engine aeroplane.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the Agency does not believe that it is necessary to mention this in

the AMC as the rule text (please see FCL.105.A) clearly defines the privileges of the LPL(A) holder as "...are to act as pilot-in-command of a single-engine piston aeroplane land or a TMG..". Furthermore, FCL.125 clearly requires: "Applicants for the skill test shall have received instruction on the same class or type of aircraft to be used for the skill test. The privileges will be restricted to the class or type used for the skill test..".

Based on this, the Agency does not see any other solution as conducting the skill test also only on an SEP aeroplane or a TMG. No need for a text change is seen.

comment

7146

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC No 1 to FCL.125 para 3

**Page No:**

197 of 647

**Comment:**

The competency of "exercise good judgement and airmanship" is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.

**Justification:**

Consistency across licence skill tests.

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Amend to read;

~~"exercise good judgement and airmanship"~~ - *apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test*.

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.

The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment

7310

comment by: *Aero-Club of Switzerland*

Please delete under 4. the +/- 200 ft.

Justification: To maintain a bandwidth of +/- 200 ft when simulating an engine failure with a single-engined A/C is not a realistic option.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response already provided to comment No. 709 (FOCA Switzerland) in the same segment above.

comment

7802

comment by: CAA Finland

Paragraph 4:

As LPL is limited for single-engine aircraft only, there is no possibility to keep the altitude with simulated engine failure. Line shall be removed.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response already provided to comment No. 709 (FOCA Switzerland) in the same segment above.

comment

7804

comment by: CAA Finland

Skill test form:

The numbering system differs from CR/TR skill test forms and should be harmonized. I support the structure of CR/TR form as there is clearly easy to add subparts like 2.4 > 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.1		
1.2		
1.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.1		
2.2		
2.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.1		
3.2		
3.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your comment.

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the tables included in Appendices to Part-FCL (namely Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

- To leave the content/format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms. The tables developed for the SPL/BPL and LPL are based on these JAR-based lists and will be kept also.
- In the meantime, to develop report forms to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the relevant AMCs as published in this NPA.
- To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning Objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMCs to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

comment 8152

comment by: GASCO

In para. 4 Speed Take off & Approach the Flight test Tolerance +15 and -5 kts is allowed. This is a 20 kt range and +15 in a number of aircraft could mean an enormous float resulting in the aircraft going off the end of the runway. Although it is the current standard, this is an issue that has come to the attention of my organisation and it is suggested that the tolerance should be a maximum of plus +10, preferably even less. A pilot that cannot control the climb or approach speed accurately is likely to get into trouble.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

As you certainly know these limits were introduced with JAR-FCL for the PPL(A) licence. The drafting group developing the requirements for the LPL decided to use the same limits as for the PPL.

Although the Agency in general agrees with your comment that the given range of 20 knots might be too much, it is not envisaged at this time to change the limits taken over from JAR-FCL for the PPL licences. It would be therefore not justifiable to introduce a smaller range for the LPL. The Agency will keep these limits unchanged at this stage.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence**

**LPL - AMC No 2 to FCL.125 - Contents of the skill test for the issue of a Basic LPL(H) and a LPL(H)** p. 200-204

comment 440

comment by: *Rod Wood*

The first test schedule, para 5, is titled to Basic LPL(H), which I have commented should not be included as a helicopter license, and LPL(H) within the one test schedule. BLPL(H) are not taught some of the exercises to be tested. If my comment is not accepted and the license BLPL(H) is retained then this test schedule should be reviewed.

What is the difference between Section 2 j and l? I presume p refers to Confined Areas! This is not taught.

In para 1, the LPL(H) candidate is to land at another aerodrome at the end of the nav leg. Why? This has been achieved during the flying syllabus of the rating and is unnecessary.

The above comments would equally apply to para 6, section 2 k and m and q.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Based on the fact that the Agency decided to delete the Basic LPL for the helicopter category (please see the responses provided to FCL.105.BA/H), the contents of skill test foreseen for this Basic LPL(H) were deleted from the AMC. The new title is: "Contents of the skill test for the issue of an LPL(H)".

The text in paragraph 1 will be changed in order to allow the examiner to choose a route ending at the aerodrome of departure or at another aerodrome.

The exercises chosen for the skill test are based on the JAR-FCL skill test for the PPL(H) and the Agency decided to stay as close as possible with these contents as they are already in place and well known and accepted by the ATOs, instructors and examiners. As "confined areas" will be taught for the LPL(H) the mentioned items will be kept.

comment

664

comment by: FOCA Switzerland

Subpart B  
AMC No 2 to FCL.125; Section 2; letter "n"

For safety reason:

**Delete "Autorotative landing"**

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the Agency does not agree. Based on the input received from the experts, it was decided to introduce a list of contents which should cover more or less the same exercises as for the PPL(H). The list of skill test items for the PPL(H) is based on the JAR-FCL skill test and contains also the check item "autorotative landing". Please see also AMC No 2 to FCL.220.

Checking this issue and trying to receive some background information the Agency found out that all Member States the full autorotative and recovery manoeuvres with landing and touch down will be trained as foreseen in the syllabus but that in several Member States during the PPL(H) skill test only an autorotation with power recovery before touch down is included. In some other Member States this exercise with a touch down included is also required during the skill test. As this item needs a further safety assessment before deleting such an established JAR-FCL skill test item the Agency will keep the wording used in JAR-FCL at this stage also for the LPL(H) skill test.

comment

5825

comment by: ENAC TLP

The technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed flight test tolerances (standards) need some specifications for NTS and TEM avoiding the use of terms such as 'good judgement and airmanship' that are easily prone to subjectivity, bias and abuse during assessment because of a lack of common understanding.

**Need:** more clear and unambiguous standards for the assessment of non-technical skills during skill test and proficiency checks for class/type ratings and license skill tests.

**Proposal:**

Specify differently the non technical abilities to be demonstrated during test/checks to exercise good airmanship and related Flight test tolerances

**AMC 1 to FCL125**

**Contents of the skill test for the issue of a Basic LPL(H) and LPL(H)**

**FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES**

**page 201**

3. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:
  - as it is;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- as it is;</li> <li>- <i>apply NTS and TEM as needed to exercise good airmanship;</i></li> <li>- as it is;</li> <li>- as it is.</li> </ul>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.</p> <p>The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.</p>
comment	<p>7149 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC No 2 to FCL.125 para 3</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 201 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The competency of “exercise good judgement and airmanship” is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Consistency across licence skill tests.</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Amend to read; <del>“exercise good judgement and airmanship</del> - <i>apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test”.</i></p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.</p> <p>The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.</p>
comment	<p>7153 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC No 1 to FCL.125 and to FCL.235 para 3</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 204 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The competency of “exercise good judgement and airmanship” is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Consistency across licence skill tests.</p>

	<p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Amend to read; <del>"exercise good judgement and airmanship - apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test".</del></p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task. The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.</p>
comment	<p><b>7806</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span></p> <p>Paragraph 4: As LPL is limited for single-engine aircraft only, there is no possibility to keep the altitude with simulated engine failure. Line shall be removed.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency agrees with your statement that the LPL is limited to single-engine helicopters only. However, as the skill test list provides in paragraph 4 only the limit for checking items for "simulated major emergency" and not for a "simulated engine failure" (as it is the case for the LPL(A)) the Agency does not agree with your proposal. Please see section 5, check the different emergency scenarios and you will discover that during an exercise with a simulated malfunctions of these different systems the limits of 200 ft should stay.</p>
comment	<p><b>7808</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span></p> <p>Para 4: Speed limit expressed opposite way as normally:  <b>+15 / - 10 knots</b></p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The limits you are commenting on are directly transferred from the skill test in JAR-FCL 2. However, checking the content list for the LPL(A) and the PPL(A) the Agency has to admit that the opposite way of mentioning the limits is used.</p> <p>Although the amendment does not change anything in a practical sense, the Agency accepts your proposal and will exchange the two limits in order to be consistent with the AMC for the LPL(A) skill test.</p>
comment	<p><b>7812</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span></p>



Skill test form:

The numbering system differs from CR/TR skill test forms and should be harmonized. I support the structure of CR/TR form as there is clearly easy to add subparts like 2.4 > 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.1		
1.2		
1.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.1		
2.2		
2.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.1		
3.2		
3.3		
And		
So		
On		


Examiners signature

response **Noted**

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the tables included in Appendices to Part-FCL (namely Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

- To leave the content/format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms. The tables developed for the SPL/BPL and LPL are based on these JAR-based lists and will be kept also.
- In the meantime, to develop report forms to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the relevant AMCs as published in this NPA.
- To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning Objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMCs to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence  
LPL - AMC No 1 to FCL.125 and to FCL.235 - Contents of the skill test for the issue of a LPL(S) and of an SPL** p. 204-206

comment 28

comment by: *British Gliding Association*

p206 **AMC No1 to FCL.125 and to FCL.235**  
**Contents of the skill test for the issue of a LPL(S) and of an SPL**

.....

**SECTION 2 LAUNCH METHOD****SECTION 2(A)c - delete the word 'simulate' as this is not needed.****SECTION 3 GENERAL AIRWORK**NPA Proposal

a Maintain straight and level flight; attitude .....

*Comment:*

*Level flight is not appropriate for sailplanes*

**BGA Proposal**

***a Maintain straight flight; attitude .....***

**NPA Proposal**

**Section 3**

***Comment:***

*There is no proposed requirement to test for local area navigation. This is a critical skill.*

**BGA Proposal**

***add:***

***h Local Area Navigation and awareness: Maintain appropriate awareness and maintenance of location, particularly with respect to local airspace and traffic requirements***

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your response.

The proposal to delete the word "simulated" was discussed and the Agency decided not to delete it. This is in line with the common wording used for other skill tests where e.g. the wording "simulated engine failure during take-off" is used. The Agency will change the wording in order to read: "simulated launch failure". This will ensure that such a launch failure exercise has to be included and can be (as it will be mostly the case) simulated. The "s" will be deleted in order to indicate that one simulated launch failure should be enough. The Agency does not see a problem with this wording.

Regarding your proposal on the local area awareness, the Agency agrees and will change the text accordingly.

As to the item of the exercise "straight flight", please see the response already provided to comment No. 2024 (R. Partridge).

comment 68

comment by: *British Gliding Association*

Page 205

AMC 1 to FCL.125 and FCL.235

**Contents of the skill test for the issue of a LPL(S) and of an SPL**

.....

**NPA Proposal**

2. .... Checks should be completed in accordance with the flight manual and/or the authorised check list ....

***Comment:***

*Local circumstances may require checklist items in addition to those specified by the manufacturer.*

**BGA Proposal**

***2. .... Pre flight servicability checks should be carried out in accordance with the flight manual or the servicing schedule. Pre flight vital actions should be carried out as appropriate, but must include the minimum described in the flight manual.***

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your input.

As this sentence you are referring to is not only aiming at the daily pre-flight

service inspection but at all the other checks (e.g. a pre-landing check), the wording proposed cannot be introduced. Not all ATOs in the different Member States might be familiar with the terms "flight servicability" and "servicing schedule" and some of the checks would be clearly excluded by using this wording proposed by you.

The Agency does not consider that the wording used could create any problem. If local circumstances will require additional items to be checked, this can be easily added by the ATO as the wording "in accordance" and the term "authorised check list" will allow this.

Please keep in mind that this list of contents does not establish the way checklists or the content of a checklist has to be drafted/designed but only the "guideline" how these existing checklists have to be used during an examination flight. It was agreed to keep this kind of wording (using the term "authorised checklist") for all the other skill test forms in the LPL/PPL section.

comment 472 comment by: *London Metropolitan University*

grammar correction  
delete "an SPL" and insert "a SPL"

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency will do a final editorial review. This kind of grammatical issues will be checked and the text changed accordingly.

In this specific case the Agency will check again but at this stage the Agency considers that the used "an" is right when followed by "SPL". This is different when followed by a "BPL" or "PPL".

comment 473 comment by: *London Metropolitan University*

Add just before table on page 205  
"4. Contents of the skill test for the issue of a LPL(S) and of a SPL."

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency will do a final editorial review. This kind of grammatical or more editorial issues will be checked and the text changed accordingly.

comment 1017 comment by: *George Rowden*

Comment: It is noted that there is no proposal to test the pilot's local navigation skills. This is a crucial skill, particularly for pilots close to going solo. I therefore propose that the requirement to demonstrate awareness and maintenance of location, particularly in respect of local airspace and other traffic be included.

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response already provided to comment No. 28 in the same segment above.

However, as you are mentioning this local area awareness as an important item before flying solo it has to be highlighted that this AMC does not contain the training syllabus but the items to be checked.

comment 1018

comment by: George Rowden

*Local circumstances may require additional items to be checked in addition to those specified by the manufacturer.*

*It is therefore proposed that serviceability checks pre flight be carried out as per the flight manual or servicing schedule.*

*Checks before take off should include as a minimum those recommended in the flight manual but can include additional checks dictated by local practice.*

response Noted

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response already provided to comment No. 68 in the same segment above.

As the wording allows using an "authorised checklist", no further change is required.

comment 1516

comment by: Keith WHITE

Section 3 (a) Gliders do not maintain "level" flight [see also p356].

Could add other requirements: "**Turn onto a selected path taking account of wind.**" and "**Effect of steep turns on stalling speed.**" The latter is critically important when thermalling in the presence of other gliders, since a stall/spin could precipitate a serious accident.

response Partially accepted

Thank you for providing your opinion.

As to your first proposal, the Agency agrees and will delete the term "level".

Regarding your proposal to add an exercise called: "Turn onto a selected path taking account of wind", the Agency decided not to include it as it is not seen as a primary safety item.

As to your third proposal, the Agency will not add this specific emergency exercise as the exercises in section 3 (spin avoidance and recovery) will assess the candidate's performance in stalling/spinning situations in a satisfactory manner. As this kind of exercises will be contained in the training, the Agency will not add this as an additional checking item.

comment 1537

comment by: Keith WHITE

Section 2 (A) c. Winch and car launch failures can come in a number of guises and at different heights, requiring different decisions on what to do subsequently. Many simulated launch failures are needed to provide adequate

experience of all types of failure. **A minimum number and type [different heights, cable break, power failure, etc.] should probably be defined in consultation with the national gliding authorities.**

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the Agency does not intend to add a certain number of these exercises or to define the heights or types of simulated launch failures here as this is only the list of contents for the final skill test.

The Agency does not believe that it really makes sense to ask for more than one simulated launch failure exercise during the skill test but the examiner is free to go through other possible scenarios verbally.

Requiring such a differentiation as proposed by you would result in at least 5-7 flights for the sailplane skill test.

As the national sailplane bodies were already involved in the drafting, the Agency does not see a need to consult them on this issue again.

comment

1586

comment by: *Keith WHITE*

Section 3 (f). It is not explicit that recovery from a fully developed spin should be practiced for gliders.

Gliders are frequently flown at low speed when trying to gain height in poor lift conditions. The flying speed for a glider to achieve minimum sink is near to stall speed. In such conditions, it is relatively easy to spin the aircraft, and probably much more likely than in powered aircraft which have little reason to fly near the stall point. For this reason, I think it is necessary to **include recovery from fully developed spins as a specific exercise which must be adequately demonstrated.**

I have heard it said that, some years ago, an American competitor in a gliding competition spun to his death because the American gliding syllabus does not [or did not] include recovery from fully developed spins. Under some circumstances a full spin can develop rapidly, and the full spin condition is highly disorientating, so, unless experienced and practiced, recovery from full spinning is likely to be ineffective.

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, taking into account that a skill test could take place at an airfield with only winch launch facilities and a weather situation which will not allow to climb higher than the winch launch release height (e.g. 1200-1500 ft), the Agency does not intend to ask for a fully developed skill.

Indeed, this issue was raised during the drafting phase of these requirements when the European gliding licensing experts gave their input and the clear advice was not to include such an exercise.

Additionally, it should be recognised that several ATOs do not have the appropriate double seater sailplane to train the fully developed spin.

As the training syllabus will be amended to ask for a fully developed spin, this

issue should be sufficiently covered during the training and it the content list as published asking for "spin avoidance and recovery" will be kept.

comment **2024** comment by: *Ray Partridge*

Straight and LEVEL flight is clearly inappropriate to a glider which by design is always descending through the air. I will not make any comment about the lack of understanding this implies.

response **Noted**

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency is fully aware that a sailplane will no be able to keep the altitude or flight level unless flying in ridge soaring or wave conditions or if using its engine in the case of powered sailplanes which are also included.

The term "straight and level" was proposed and agreed during the drafting phase and the Agency would like to comment on your well understood remark that sailplane licensing experts were involved during the drafting phase.

The Agency was told that this term was used already in several Member States in order to indicate that the wings have to be levelled. As the wording used can end up in misinterpretation, the Agency decided to accept the comments received on this issue and to delete the term "and level".

comment **2480** comment by: *derekheaton*

Page 206  
section 3

a comment -Gliders cannot maintain level flight!

h it would be worthwhile including a knowledge of local area navigation and maintenance of location, airspace restrictions and traffic local to the airfield

response **Noted**

The Agency acknowledges your comment.

Please see responses already provided to comments No. 28 (BGA) and comment No. 2024 (R. Partridge).

comment **4240** comment by: *CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority*

he competency of "exercise good judgement and airmanship" is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.

Amend to read; "~~exercise good judgement and airmanship~~ - apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test".

response **Not accepted**

The Agency acknowledges your comment.

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.  
The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment 4507 comment by: *George Knight*

Page 206

Section 3 (a) (General Airwork)  
Gliders do not maintain level flight.

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.  
Please see the response already provided to comment No. 2024 (R. Partridge) in the same segment above.

comment 4512 comment by: *George Knight*

*"...Checks should be carried out in accordance with the flight manual and/or authorised check list for the sailplane on which the test is being taken."*

This may not be sufficient.

**Propose:**

***"...Checks should include those in the flight manual and/or authorised check list for the sailplane on which the test is being taken."***

response *Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.  
Please see the response already provided to comment No. 68 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment 4614 comment by: *Deutscher Aero Club*

p206 AMC No1 to FCL.125 and to FCL.235  
Contents of the skill test for the issue of a LPL(S) and of an SPL .....  
SECTION 2 LAUNCH METHOD  
SECTION 2(A)c - delete the word 'simulate' as this is not needed.  
SECTION 3 GENERAL AIRWORK  
a) Maintain straight and level flight; attitude .....

Comment:

Level flight is not appropriate for sailplanes

EGU Proposal:

a Maintain straight flight; attitude .....

Section 3

Comment:

There is no proposed requirement to test for local area navigation. This is a critical skill.

EGU Proposal:



	add: h) Local Area Navigation and awareness: Maintain appropriate awareness and maintenance of location, particularly with respect to local airspace and traffic requirements
response	<i>Partially accepted</i>  Thank you for providing your opinion.  Please see the response already provided to comment No. 28 (BGA) in the same segment above.
comment	<b>4615</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Deutscher Aero Club</i></span>  Page 205 AMC 1 to FCL.125 and FCL.235 Contents of the skill test for the issue of a LPL(S) and of an SPL..... NPA Proposal 2. .... Checks should be completed in accordance with the flight manual and/or the authorised check list .... Comment: Local circumstances may require checklist items in addition to those specified by the manufacturer. EGU Proposal 2. .... Pre-flight service ability checks should be carried out in accordance with the flight manual or the servicing schedule. Pre-flight vital actions should be carried out as appropriate, but must include the minimum described in the flight manual.
response	<i>Not accepted</i>  The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please see the response already provided to comment No. 68 (BGA) in the same segment above.
comment	<b>4793</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span>  Section 3 (a) of report form is not applicable for glider
response	<i>Not accepted</i>  Thank you for providing your opinion.  The Agency does not agree that the exercise item "Maintain straight flight; attitude and speed control" should be deleted as all these elements are important for sailplane operations and should be trained and checked.  Regarding the original wording containing the term "and level", please see the response already provided to comment No. 2024 (R. Partridge) in the same segment above.
comment	<b>5509</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Irv Lee (Higherplane Aviation Training ltd)</i></span>  Section 1 of the content of the skills test for the LPL(S) and SPL is missing the 'NOTAM' checking / briefing. NOTAM checking is vital in today's environment and should be a compulsory part of the test. Weather, documentation, mass

and balance are all included, NOTAM checking is missing, it needs to be added. Suggest Section 1.a of the test schedule is amended to include 'NOTAM briefing' too.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your comment.

The Agency is of the opinion that for local flights like for the skill test in sailplanes a full study of all the NOTAMS might not be very useful but will add the term "airspace brief" in section 1 in order to reflect this issue.

comment

5595

comment by: *Belgian Gliding Federation*

*p206 AMC No1 to FCL.125 and to FCL.235*

*Contents of the skill test for the issue of a LPL(S) and of an SPL*

*.....*

*SECTION 2 LAUNCH METHOD*

*SECTION 2(A)c - delete the word 'simulate' as this is not needed.*

*SECTION 3 GENERAL AIRWORK*

*a) Maintain straight and level flight; attitude .....*

Comment:

Level flight is not appropriate for sailplanes

**Proposal:**

**a) Maintain straight flight; attitude .....**

Section 3

Comment:

There is no proposed requirement to test for local area navigation. This is a critical skill.

**Proposal:**

**add:**

**h) Local Area Navigation and awareness: Maintain appropriate awareness and maintenance of location, particularly with respect to local airspace and traffic requirements**

response

*Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response already provided to comment No. 28 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment

5596

comment by: *Belgian Gliding Federation*

*Page 205*

*AMC 1 to FCL.125 and FCL.235*

*Contents of the skill test for the issue of a LPL(S) and of an SPL*

*.....*

NPA Proposal

*2. .... Checks should be completed in accordance with the flight manual and/or the authorised check list ....*

Comment:

Local circumstances may require checklist items in addition to those specified by the manufacturer.

**Proposal**

**2..... Pre-flight service ability checks should be carried out in accordance with the flight manual or the servicing schedule. Pre-flight vital actions should be carried out as appropriate, but must include the minimum described in the flight manual.**

response *Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.

Please see the response already provided to comment No. 68 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment

5657

comment by: *Robert John*

3a "Level" flight not an appropriate description for sailplanes. "Stable" perhaps?

3g 45degs is scarcely "steep" for a sailplane. 60 degs is usually regarded as a steep turn.

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.

Regarding your first comment, please see the response already provided to comment No. 2024 (R. Partridge) in the same segment above.

Regarding the exercise steep turns, the Agency does not agree as in normal gliding operations a bank angle of more than 45° is definitely not necessary. As an item for the exercise "unusual attitudes" this exercise item might be included but the Agency does not agree that the basic training should contain turns with 60° bank angle.

comment

5827

comment by: *ENAC TLP*

The technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed flight test tolerances (standards) need some specifications for NTS and TEM avoiding the use of terms such as 'good judgement and airmanship' that are easily prone to subjectivity, bias and abuse during assessment because of a lack of common understanding.

**Need:** more clear and unambiguous standards for the assessment of non-technical skills during skill test and proficiency checks for class/type ratings and license skill tests.

**Proposal:** Specify differently the non technical abilities to be demonstrated during test/checks to exercise good airmanship and related Flight test tolerances

**AMC 1 to FCL125**

**Contents of the skill test for the issue of a LPL(S) and of an SPL(A)**

**FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES**

**page 205**

	<p>3. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- as it is;</li> <li>- as it is;</li> <li>- <i>apply NTS and TEM as needed to exercise good airmanship;</i></li> <li>- as it is;</li> </ul> <p>- as it is.</p>
response	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your comment.</p> <p>The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.</p> <p>The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.</p>

comment	<p><b>6062</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Martyn Johnson</i></span></p> <p>SECTION 3 GENERAL AIRWORK          NPA Proposal          a Maintain straight and level flight; attitude .....</p> <p>Comment:          Level flight is not appropriate for sailplanes</p>
---------	--

response	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your comment.</p> <p>Please see the response already provided to comment No. 2024 (R. Partridge) in the same segment above.</p>
----------	--

comment	<p><b>6293</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Jonathan Coote</i></span></p> <p>Seems generally sensible, but is in danger of being too prescriptive. It may be more suitable to defer this detail to the BGA, which would allow it to be updated with the evolution of equipment, technology, regulation, and common practices.</p>
---------	---

response	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Regarding the level of detail of this AMC, it should be added that representative of the national gliding bodies were involved in the drafting already. Based on the syllabus structure and detail already introduced with JAR-FCL, the Agency decided to define a similar level of detail for the training in the other aircraft categories.</p> <p>As to your remark of future changes, technology developments and common practices it should be highlighted that a procedure for alternative AMCs will be introduced. In addition to this the Agency will be able to modify these AMCs if necessary in due time.</p>
----------	--

comment	<p><b>6305</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Diana King</i></span></p>
---------	---

FCL 805 (Page 42)

Comment:

It seems entirely inappropriate for sailplane towing and banner towing to be put together. The nature of the operation is completely different. Sailplane towing requires two pilots in different aircraft to fly in close formation with each other and for each to fly in such a way as not to endanger the other aircraft. This a completely different technique to that of banner towing, where the towing aircraft has control of the whole operation without any external input from any other pilot.

The sailplane tow pilot needs to have understanding of the sailplane pilot's requirement to be positioned safely in the appropriate part of the sky. This is normally most successfully achieved by towplane pilots who are either themselves glider pilots or who have taken time and trouble to learn the nature of soaring flight from the glider pilots that they tow.

I do not have the technical competence to propose detailed standards and therefore support the BGA proposals for a sailplane towing rating.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, it seems that your comment was addressed to the wrong segment as this AMC contains the content of the skill test for the LPL(S) and the SPL.

Please see the responses provided in the segment for FCL.805 dealing with the towing ratings and the resulting text. Check the response provided to the BGA comment as you are also referring to that comment. Please be aware that:

- the Agency never proposed similar rules for the 2 different ratings
- there are different experience and training requirements
- the Agency will keep them in one paragraph but split the requirements
- 5 familiarisation flights in a sailplane are sufficient as the experience in a lot of Member States shows.

comment *6311*

comment by: *Oxford Gliding Club*

Winch launch failures are often broken down into the following categories.

- 1) Low level failures
- 2) Medium height - straight ahead
- 3) Medium height - circuit

These should be explicitly tested for.

The word 'Simulate' is misleading. if the launch failure has been initiated by the examiner or is is a real failure, the actions following will be the same. Once a launch has failed, it cannot be 'unfailed'.

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the Agency is surprised receiving such a proposal.

Following your proposal would mean that the skill test for the sailplane pilot,

for which normally 3-4 flights (winch launches) should be sufficient in order to cover the required program, would require at least 6-8 flights as the 3 simulated launch failures proposed by you will not allow to combine them with other exercises. The Agency does not agree with your proposal and believes that one simulated launch failure should be enough to test the candidate's competence how to deal with these situations.

The wording proposed by the Agency was developed in close cooperation with the sailplane gliding experts involved in the drafting. Following the comments received, the Agency will change the wording to "simulated launch failure" as it is an agreed term also in skill tests for other categories like "simulated engine failure". The Agency does not understand the problem with this wording.

comment **6606** comment by: *Austro Control GmbH*

Comment to Section 3 General Airwork:  
Manoeuvre not appropriate for this type of aeroplane.

Proposed Text:

~~a) Maintain straight and level flight; attitude and speed control~~

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

It should be highlighted that this segment contains an AMC dealing with the skill test on sailplanes - not on aeroplanes.

The Agency does not agree that the exercise item "Maintain straight flight; attitude and speed control" should be deleted as all these elements are important for sailplane operations and should be trained and checked.

Regarding the original wording containing the term "and level" please see the response already provided to comment No. 2024 (R. Partridge) in the same segment above.

comment **6676** comment by: *Croft Brown*

p206 AMC No1 to FCL.125 and to FCL.235  
Contents of the skill test for the issue of a LPL(S) and of an SPL

.....

SECTION 2 LAUNCH METHOD

SECTION 2(A)c - delete the word 'simulate' this is not needed.

SECTION 3 GENERAL AIRWORK

NPA Proposal

a Maintain straight and level flight; attitude .....

Comment:

Level flight is not appropriate for sailplanes

BGA Proposal

a Maintain straight flight; attitude .....

NPA Proposal

Section 3

Comment:

There is no proposed requirement to test for local area navigation. This is a critical skill.

Croft Brown endorses the BGA Proposal

add:  
h Local Area Navigation and awareness: Maintain appropriate awareness and maintenance of location, particularly with respect to local airspace and traffic requirements

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response already provided to comment No. 28 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment **6687** comment by: *Croft Brown*

Page 205  
AMC 1 to FCL.125 and FCL.235  
Contents of the skill test for the issue of a LPL(S) and of an SPL  
.....  
NPA Proposal  
2. .... Checks should be completed in accordance with the flight manual and/or the authorised check list ....  
Comment:  
Local circumstances may require checklist items in addition to those specified by the manufacturer.  
BGA Proposal  
2. .... Pre flight servicing checks should be carried out in accordance with the flight manual or the servicing schedule. Pre flight vital actions should be carried out as appropriate, but must include the minimum described in the flight manual.

response *Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.  
Please see the response already provided to comment No. 68 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment **6837** comment by: *Colin Troise*

Section 2 (Launch Method)

There is no mention of "Bungee" launching, although this appears and is regulated elsewhere in the NPA.

Section 3 (Airwork)

Paragraph (a)

If your experts know how to keep a sailplane in level flight without eventually stalling it, the gliding community would be very interested to hear how it is done!

If by "level" you mean with its wings parallel to the nominal ground surface, then you need a better way of describing it - "straight" would do.

Paragraph (g)

response

For sailplanes a 45 degree bank is not a "steep" turn - it is a relatively normal thermal turn. Please refer to National Bodies for a consensus on "steep", but my personal opinion is that this would be over 60 degrees.

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, it must be clearly pointed out that the Agency is surprised about your response on the issue of bungee launching. Firstly, it has to be clarified that not all the items which are contained in the training syllabus must be checked during the skill test. Introducing this as a principle (including all exercises in the skill test) would mean that a cross country flight, all other launch methods or an outlanding exercise must be included. This is definitely not possible and would end up in a situation where such a skill test would be a high burden for future student pilots. Secondly, the Agency strongly believes that a bungee launch in a double seater (because the examiner should be able to check the "performance" of the candidate from the air), like for example the ASK 21, will create some problems for the ground crew (the Agency even believes that such a take-off method cannot be used with the modern double seater fleet actually available). Furthermore, the average flight time of such launch will not be sufficient to cover a lot of the required exercises. Based on all these arguments, the Agency has carefully reviewed your comment but cannot agree with your proposal to include the bungee launch here.

Thank you also for the explanations on the term "straight and level". The Agency is fully aware that normally a sailplane will not be able to keep the altitude or flight level unless flying in ridge soaring or wave conditions or if using its engine in the case of powered sailplanes which are also included.

The term "straight and level" was proposed and agreed during the drafting phase and the Agency would like to comment on your well understood remark in pointing out that sailplane licensing experts were involved during the drafting phase. The Agency was told that this term was used already in several Member States in order to indicate that the wings have to be levelled. As this can be misinterpreted, the Agency decided to accept the comments received on this issue and to delete the term "and level".

Regarding your third comment on the steep turns, please see the response already provided to comment No. 5657 (R. John) in the same segment above. The Agency would like to add that turns with "over 60 degrees", as proposed by you, are not seen as adequate and necessary for the training of a future sailplane pilot as this has no practical benefit for sailplane operations.

comment

7398

comment by: *David Chapman*

Local navigation to a specific area is quite important to sailplanes, the cockpit load (avinate, navigate, communicate) leaves little time to read maps to compare with visible terrain and ground features. A "site check" flight is appropriate in many situations for sailplane pilots.

response

*Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.

Please see response already provided to comment No. 28 (BGA) in the same segment above.



comment 7572 comment by: *Andrew Sampson*  
 Section 3 general Airwork, (a) a glider cannot maintain level flight! If it did it ould stall. If it maintains a constant attitude above stall it will not be level!

response *Noted*  
 Thank you for providing this explanation about sailplane operations.  
 Please see the response already provided to comment No. 2024 (R. Partridge) in the same segment above.

comment 7813 comment by: *CAA Finland*  
 Skill test form:

The numbering system differs from CR/TR skill test forms and should be harmonized. I support the structure of CR/TR form as there is clearly easy to add subparts like 2.4 > 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.1		
1.2		
1.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.1		
2.2		
2.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.1		
3.2		
3.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

response *Noted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the tables included in Appendices to Part-FCL (namely Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

- To leave the content/format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms. The tables developed for the SPL/BPL and LPL are based on these JAR-based lists and will be kept also.
- In the meantime, to develop report forms to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the relevant AMCs as published in this NPA.
- To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning Objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMCs to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

comment 7865

comment by: *Graham Bishop*

p206 Level flight is not appropriate for sailplanes.

	Section 3 there is no requirement to test for local area navigation as there is now.
response	<i>Noted</i>  The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please see responses already provided to comments No. 28 (BGA) and comment No. 2024 (R. Partridge).
comment	<b>8298</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Paul Mc G</i></span>  Contents of the skill test for the issue of a LPL(S) and of an SPL NPA Proposal a Maintain straight and level flight; attitude Level flight is not appropriate for sailplanes, if we abide by the laws of physics rather than those of humans!
response	<i>Noted</i>  Thank you for providing your opinion and the additional information about the laws of physics, the human factors and of course the human limitations.  Please see the response already provided to comment No. 2024 (R. Partridge) in the same segment above and you will discover why the term "maintain straight and level flight" was proposed by the experts involved in order to clarify that the wings have to be levelled during these exercises. The Agency will change the wording.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence  
LPL - AMC No 2 to FCL.125 and FCL.235 - Contents of the skill test for the issue of a LPL(B) and a BPL** p. 206-209

comment	<b>238</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Paul SPELLWARD</i></span>  I congratulate EASA on this excellent, thorough and complete specification for the skill test for BPL & LPL(B). This will ensure consistent and high standards in all member states.
response	<i>Noted</i>  Thank you for this positive feedback on the proposal for the skill test LPL(B) and BPL.
comment	<b>474</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>London Metropolitan University</i></span>  Page 207 just before table add: 5. Contents of the skill test for the issue of a LPL(B) and a BPL.
response	<i>Partially accepted</i>  Thank you for providing your opinion.  The Agency will amend the text to read:  4. Contents of the skill test for the issue of an LPL(B) and a BPL (Hot Air Balloon).

comment	<p>3788 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Klaus HARTMANN</i></span></p> <p>Contents of the skill test for the issue of a LPL(B) and a BPL          In SECTION 4 für hot air balloon und gas balloon 'approach and landing procedures' ist kein passenger pre-landing briefing, wie es in 'AMC No 1 to FCL.205 B (c) Section 4' enthalten ist, aufgeführt. Nicht nur die Passagiere von gewerblichen Ballonfahrern müssen diese Sicherheits-Einweisung erhalten. Daher sollte es auch hier aufgenommen und bei skill tests geprüft werden.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency agrees and will add the passenger pre-landing briefing as item d in section 4.</p>
comment	<p>4241 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority</i></span></p> <p>he competency of "exercise good judgement and airmanship" is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.</p> <p>Amend to read; "<del>exercise good judgement and airmanship</del> - apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test".</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.</p> <p>The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.</p>
comment	<p>4794 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p>Paragraph 2: It should be clear that skill-test are carried out when a mass of people is around (expect comment from Ireland)</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>However, the Agency does not understand why the comment is asking for "a mass of people" around.</p> <p>As the control of spectators who are usually attracted by the take-off of a balloon is an important safety issue, the Agency decided to include this item in the skill test.</p> <p>Section 2 mentions that the applicant should demonstrate crowd control. This does not necessarily mean that a lot of people are required to demonstrate</p>

this. The main elements of this exercise can be checked by asking questions and by simulating these typical situations with 2 or three crew members functioning as the "crowd". The Agency does not intend to change or clarify anything as the ballooning experts and the ballooning training organisations have no problems with the wording proposed. The examiners will know anyway how to check this item. Later on this kind of issue will be clarified in the examiner's manual (future rulemaking task).

comment **5026** comment by: *George Knight*

P 206  
Section 2 (C)  
a ATC liaison - compliance.

**Propose**

The above should be optional. Many/most launch sites used by self launching sailplanes do not have ATC.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency does not understand why the comment is referring to a sailplane operating site as this AMC contains only the skill test items for balloon pilots.

The item "ATC liaison - compliance" in section 2 (which is General Airwork) is optional as the term "if applicable" is added. It should be mentioned that the Agency is of the opinion that this is definitely an important checking item. Based on this the Agency will make this item in section 3 (En-route procedures) mandatory.

comment **5503** comment by: *Chris Gowers*

Page 213 BLPL Exercise 10B. Note 1 refers to spin avoidance training which should be completed on the full LPL (A).

On page 227 in the LPL(A) syllabus there is no reference to spin avoidance training in exercise 10B.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your comment and for the identification of this mistake.

The Agency fully agrees that this exercise was forgotten in the syllabus for the LPL(A) and will amend the text accordingly. An additional exercise 11 will be added in the LPL(A) syllabus with the title: "Spin avoidance".

comment **5518** comment by: *Chris Gowers*

BLPL(A) The exercises that follow in the syllabus have different numbering to those included in the LPL(A) at page 224 onward. For each category of aircraft, the numbering system should be consistent the same e.g. climbing is always exercise 7, stalling exercise 10 etc

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

As the syllabus for the Basic LPL(A) contains slightly different exercises than the syllabus for the LPL(A), following your proposal would mean that the syllabus for the Basic LPL would have a numbering like 9, 10, 12.

The Agency is of the opinion that the better solution is to have a consistent numbering in one document and will keep the numbering system as proposed.

As the other categories contain totally different exercises like "soaring techniques" (sailplane syllabus) or "Inflation" (balloon syllabus) the consistent system throughout all the categories as proposed by you will not work.

comment

5848

comment by: ENAC TLP

The technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed flight test tolerances (standards) need some specifications for NTS and TEM avoiding the use of terms such as 'good judgement and airmanship' that are easily prone to subjectivity, bias and abuse during assessment because of a lack of common understanding.

**Need:** more clear and unambiguous standards for the assessment of non-technical skills during skill test and proficiency checks for class/type ratings and license skill tests.

**Proposal:** to specify differently the non technical abilities to be demonstrated during test/checks to exercise good airmanship and related Flight test tolerances

**AMC 1 to FCL125** Contents of the skill test for the issue of a Basic LPL(B) and a BPL

#### **FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES**

##### **page 207**

3. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

- as it is;

- as it is;

- *apply NTS and TEM as needed to exercise good airmanship;*

- as it is;

- as it is.

response

*Noted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

7156

comment by: UK CAA

#### **Paragraph:**

AMC No 2 to FCL.125 and FCL.235 para 3

#### **Page No:**

207 of 647

#### **Comment:**

The competency of "exercise good judgement and airmanship" is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.

**Justification:**

Consistency across licence skill tests.

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Amend to read;

~~"exercise good judgement and airmanship - apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test".~~

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.

The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment

7761

comment by: *Christophe Saeys*

It is important that ALL pilots are familiar with ATC-contact and use of transponder. Not only "when applicable". For a student, it is easy to choose an exam area where no atc-contact is needed, and doing so avoiding his mastering this part of ballooning is checked by the examiner. Propose obligatory controlled flight.

response

*Partially accepted*

Thank your for providing your opinion on the issue of the check item "ATC contact".

It should be highlighted that the Agency received quite some comments proposing to keep this item always optional with the reasoning that ATC contact cannot established everywhere. The Agency carefully reviewed this issue and agrees in general that this item should be part of the check. It was therefore decided to delete the term "if applicable" in section 3 "En-route Procedures".

The Agency does not agree that the use of a single equipment item like the transponder should be included as a mandatory check item as most of the balloons in Europe are not equipped with a Mode S transponder.

comment

7814

comment by: *CAA Finland*

Skill test form:

The numbering system differs from CR/TR skill test forms and should be harmonized. I support the structure of CR/TR form as there is clearly easy to add subparts like 2.4 > 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.1		
1.2		
1.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.1		
2.2		
2.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.1		
3.2		
3.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

response *Noted*



The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the tables included in Appendices to Part-FCL (namely Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

- To leave the content/format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms. The tables developed for the SPL/BPL and LPL are based on these JAR-based lists and will be kept also.
- In the meantime, to develop report forms to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the relevant AMCs as published in this NPA.
- To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning Objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMCs to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

comment

8159

comment by: *F Mortera*

**2. About the conditions, requirements, syllabus and tests for getting a LPLB or a BPL and their "performance" privileges**

**FCL.110.B "LPL Experience reqs.", (page 11 )**

**FCL.210.B "Experience reqs. And crediting", (page 22)**

**AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 (Syllabus LPL B) (page 189) = AMC N° 3 to FCL.210.B and FCL.215.B "Syllabus BPL", (page 321)**

**AMC to FCL.110.B and FCL.210.B "Flight instruction", (page 254)**

**AMC N° 2 to FCL.125.B and FCL.235 "Skill test", (page 206)**

**AMC N° 1 to FCL.135.B and FCL.225.B "Extension of class and class and group privs.", (page 262)**

**AMC N° 2 to FCL.135.B and FCL.225.B (") "Class extension", (page 263)**

**AMC N° 3 to FCL.210.B and FCL.215.B (Syllabus BPL) page 321 = AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 "Syl. LPL B" (page 189)**

**APPENDIX 1 / CREDITING T K / A / 1**

Probably I missed something but, except for the skill test for BPL, they seem identical. Obviously their privileges are different, but considering that the syllabus is the same for a new balloon pilot, getting their first licence, what does make the difference to choose one or other licence? Is it just the price?

It looks reasonable to share same amounts of minimum training hours, exams and processes according the responsibility of flying a balloon, but what is the real difference if their programs are the same? Just the legal capability of use balloons sized "139" or "141" and receive remuneration or not respectively? It has not too much sense for me.

I'm not suggesting that the BPL requirements must be harder, **but they could be simplified for LPLB or reduced their privileges alternatively, to get the BPL reevaluation. For instance the LPLB can not fly in controlled air space (it should not be necessary ATC liaison methods), over cities...**

That is the only different here in Spain. As a private pilot (even with a radio rate), we can not fly in CTR or TMA. Only when we are flying for authorized Aerial Works Companies, making commercial flights, we can use the ATC services.

I think that differences must be established between both LPLB and BPL licences not only in economical privileges, but also in their syllabus, training and real performance capabilities.

Even considering carrying passengers as the main balloon commercial activity, advertising and filming are also commercial flights (I understand sponsorship is different to aerial advertising). And as far as I understand they soon will be considered in this way in Europe.

In my experience, the best advertising flights or flights for images recording are those with a little "65", where the pilot is alone in the basket or only with a camera operator. The "risky" flights close the sea, in ATC areas, in very fast winds, landings in small parks into the cities... can be done better with small balloons without passengers.

These other flights, not CAT, have been (and still they are) the economical support in most of the balloon companies that I know. In this case, the big balloons are not only unnecessary, but rather they are not practical.

Establishing different performance capabilities (restrictions) will permit to have a "light" licence, capable to offer a reasonable club / sponsor relationship and a good platform to jump to a professional environment, without favouring misunderstandings about capabilities or privileges between LPLB and BPL.

response

*Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.

However, as it is your standard comment already assigned to several other segments and no specific comment on the AMC in this segment is provided, the Agency is not able to give a substantiated answer.

The content of the skill test for the LPL(B) and the BPL are the same but you will find an additional AMC for the BPL commercial privilege extension.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence  
LPL - AMC No 1 to FCL.110.BA/H - Flight instruction for the basic leisure pilot licence - Basic LPL (A)** p. 209-216

comment

1946

comment by: *Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch*

**The definition of the syllabus is too restrictive with respect to the EC Regulations 216/2008 on common rules in civil aviation (Basic Regulations)**

**Proof:**

1) Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations call for the knowledge of " non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors."

This is NOT ""threat and error management"!

2) §(16) of the Basic Regulations principles claim for a "promotion of a "culture of safety"

3) "threat and error management" is a special approach and methodology not accepted by all. More modern and general accepted techniques exist (see my comments on TEM, definitions error and error management and the Basic Regulations of the EC.

**Proposal:**

Exchange

"The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles of threat and error management and also cover:"

by

"The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles of human performance and limitations and non-technical skills with regard to flight safety and also cover:"

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

The Agency would like to suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment

4795

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

If this AMC stays in it should follow the same structure as PPL  
Paragraph 2.2: should the pilot be instructed in "RT" as well. This remark is valid for all non ICAO-licenses foreseen in this Part.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

As the syllabus for the Basic LPL(A) is a reduced syllabus compared with the syllabus for the PPL(A) or the LPL(A), the Agency is not able to use the same structure as for the PPL. It should be pointed out that most of the exercises are quite close to the exercises for the PPL(A).

The mentioned paragraph 2.2 contains the standard phrase that the instructor should ensure that the applicant can operate the required systems and the equipment. This term includes also the use of the radio as it might be necessary to use it in an emergency situation or in order to stay in contact with

ATC, the airfield or the instructor. The Agency does not see a need to specify the issue of "radiotelephony communication" specifically.

comment 4848 comment by: *Flight Training Europe*

Page 210, Flight Instruction for the Basic LPL

Para 2. 1 (e) states that "**flight at critically high airspeeds, recognition of, and recovery from, spiral dive**" should be covered on the course, but none of these items are covered in Exercises in para 3 Syllabus of Flight Instruction. Nor are they mentioned in the skill test; therefore **add the recovery from a spiral dive to the skill test profile.**

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

You are right with your statement that this item is mentioned in paragraph 2.1 whereas it was decided to delete both items from the Basic LPL syllabus.

The syllabus for the full LPL contains both training items under exercise 15 "Advanced turning" and exercise 6 "Straight and level".

In order to be consistent, the Agency will delete 2.1. (e).

comment 4849 comment by: *Flight Training Europe*

Page 210 to 216

The numbering of the exercises in the Basic LPL(A) Syllabus of Flight Instruction differs significantly from those of the LPL(A), PPL, LAFI and FI(A). This will lead to unnecessary confusing, especially for a new instructor. **Recommend renumbering the Basic LPL(A) Syllabus to align it with the numbering of the "Long Briefs and Air Exercises" for the Flight Instructor Syllabus (page 473) and where necessary omit the exercise contents stating – "not to be taught for the Basic LPL(A)".**

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

As the syllabus for the Basic LPL(A) is a reduced syllabus compared with the syllabus for the PPL(A) or the LPL(A), the Agency is not able to use the same numbering as for the PPL/LPL.

The option proposed by you would lead to several "not to be taught for the Basic LPL(A)" which seems not to be a suitable solution. The Agency believes that a separate syllabus for the Basic LPL and an individual continuous numbering should be kept.

It should be mentioned already that the Agency took into account your similar comment on the LPL(A) segment and will align the LAFI syllabus with the LPL(A) and PPL(A) syllabus.

comment 5393 comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

	<p>Comment on paragraph 1.1.: the following paragraph should be in the Part OR:  1. ENTRY TO TRAINING  1.1 Before being accepted for training an applicant should be informed that the appropriate medical certificate must be obtained before solo flying is permitted.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency will take your comment into account when reviewing the comments received on Part OR. For the time being, it will be kept in this AMC in order to ensure that this issue is covered.</p>
comment	<p>5398 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Chris Gowers</i></span></p> <p>Para 3.1 Third line Delete "I", insert "in"</p> <p>Typo error</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for identifying this editorial mistake. The text will be changed accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>5417 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Chris Gowers</i></span></p> <p>Exercise 6 delete "lateral level" insert "wings level"</p> <p>I think that is what is meant by lateral level. Lateral level is not a term usually used in aviation English.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The term "lateral level" was introduced with JAR-FCL and never questioned. The Agency will not change the expression used at this stage as it seems that the term is well understood.</p>
comment	<p>5429 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Chris Gowers</i></span></p> <p>Exercise 8, Title. Different font to the rest of the page</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for identifying this formatting error. The text will be changed accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>5455 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Chris Gowers</i></span></p> <p>Page 209. AMC No1 Does this title fit the following paragraphs? It does not appear to.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p>

However, the Agency does not understand the meaning behind your comment as the AMC mentioned (page 209) is the one on the flight instruction for the Basic LPL.

comment **5513** comment by: *Chris Gowers*

Exercise 11/12E What is a mislanding?

I have never heard this term before and nor have any of my colleagues. Does this mean a "balked" landing?

response **Noted**

Thank you for providing your input.

The Agency used exactly the JAR-FCL wording for this exercise item. At this stage the Agency cannot see a reason to change the wording as it is an agreed term used for several years now. Please check the wording in JAR-FCL and see also the syllabus for the PPL(A) in AMC to FCL.210.A.

The term as used means any mistake during the landing phase which might cause a go-around (examples could be: rounding out too high/touch down and leaving the ground again - "jumping").

comment **5523** comment by: *Chris Gowers*

Page 214 The note after Exercise 11/12E

This refers to a further training requirement for nosewheel/tailwheel aircraft if the pilot trains on the other configuration. However the details of the required conversion training do not appear to be listed in the EASA FCL document.

Is this intentional and to be left to the discretion of the ATO? If this is the case then a further sentence should be added to that effect.

response **Noted**

Thank you for providing your comment.

You are right with your statement that the issue of familiarisation or difference training was only covered in subpart H (class- and type ratings) so far. As the LPL should contain no reference to subpart H because the text is based on the system of type- and class-ratings which are not envisaged for the LPL, it was decided to add this issue in the appropriate Implementing Rules.

You will find the requirement for additional training if another variant of aeroplane than the one used for the skill test should be flown now in FCL.135.BLAPL (new numbering). Please see the resulting text. Additionally a GM will be assigned with further information on the required differences and familiarisation training.

comment **6690** comment by: *Light Aircraft Association UK*

The training syllabus for the Basic LPL notes that spin awareness/training needs to be taught for the full LPL. LAA suggest that there are significant

safety benefits in teaching spin awareness and recovery techniques even for the Basic LPL. As a result of accidents, the UK microlight training syllabus for 3-axis aircraft was altered to include the recognition of the incipient spin, instruction on spin avoidance and spin recovery (note that the student is not expected to enter a spin, but the principles are taught).

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, when drafting the rules for this Basic LPL the experts came to the conclusion that the exercises 10A and 10B (Slow Flight and Stalling) will provide a sufficient level to operate under the limited privileges of the Basic LPL.

The Agency will not add the exercise "Spin avoiding". However, in order to stress the fact that this exercise should cover also the beginning spin stage, the Agency decided to add the following sub-item in exercise 10B: "Demonstration of recovery at the incipient spin stage".

comment *7160* comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**  
AMC No 1 to FCL.110.BA/H para 2.1

**Page No:**  
209 of 647

**Comment:**  
The use of the expression "threat and error management" is too loose and needs to be aligned with the exercise of NTS by the applicant.

**Justification:**  
Consistency across licence skill tests.

**Proposed Text:  
(if applicable)**  
Amend to read;  
~~"threat and error management~~ *non-technical skills...*".

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.  
The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment *7163* comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**  
AMC No 1 to FCL.110.BA/H para 3.2

**Page No:**  
210 of 647

**Comment:**  
The use of the expression "good airmanship" is too loose and needs to be aligned with the exercise of NTS by the applicant.

**Justification:**

	<p>Consistency across licence skill tests.</p> <p><b>Proposed Text:</b>  <b>(if applicable)</b>          Amend to read;          “.. needs of <del>good airmanship</del> <i>non-technical skills</i> and...”.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.          The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.</p>
comment	<p><b>8301</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Paul Mc G</i></span></p> <p>With power airplanes and shorter wingspan of larger chord the approach should change. BUT perhaps arrangements should be suggested for power pilots to experience actual spins in gliders during training? Perhaps it could be advised, without mandation?</p> <p>The training syllabus for the Basic LPL notes that spin awareness/training needs to be taught for the full LPL. There are significant safety benefits in teaching spin awareness and recovery techniques even for the Basic LPL. As a result of accidents, the UK microlight training syllabus for 3-axis aircraft was altered through the BMAA to include the recognition of the incipient spin, instruction on spin avoidance and spin recovery but the student is not expected to enter a spin, although principles are taught. I wonder?</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>It seems that you are proposing to include a non-mandatory flight in a sailplane in order to receive instruction in spinning and spin avoidance.</p> <p>As such a voluntary experience or familiarisation flight can be done any time and has no direct connection to the training provided by a LAFI(A) on an aeroplane the Agency will not include such an exercise.</p> <p>As the second part of your comment is a copy of comment No. 6690 please see response to that comment in the same segment above.</p>

<p><b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence          LPL - AMC No 2 to FCL.110.BA/H - Flight instruction for the basic leisure          pilot licence - Basic LPL H)</b> <span style="float: right;">p. 216-224</span></p>
---

comment	<p><b>422</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Rod Wood</i></span></p> <p>If the BLPL(H) is to be retained contrary to my comment against FCL.105.BA/H, comment 252 and FCL.110.BA/H, comment 271, this syllabus</p>
---------	--



should be revised to reflect the standard helicopter exercise numbers in the LPL(H) and higher. Those exercise numbers not included in the BLPL(H) should be omitted but the retention of the standard numbers would lead to no confusion amongst long established instructors and allow them to immediately recognise the omissions.

Exercise 20, (BLPL(H)) and 21, (LPL(H)), how confusing is that, should omit downwind quickstops. This is a quasi military manoeuvre and there should be no place for it in the syllabus at this level of competency

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, based on the comments received proposing to delete the Basic LPL for helicopters, the Agency carefully reviewed this issue and came to the final conclusion not to introduce such a basic licence for the helicopter category.

Based on this all the AMCs related to the Basic LPL(H) will be deleted.

Regarding your comment on exercise 21 in the syllabus for the LPL(H), please be aware that this exercise was already introduced with JAR-FCL. The Agency does not see a need to exclude this exercise from the LPL(H) syllabus.

comment 1947

comment by: *Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch*

**The definition of the syllabus is too restrictive with respect to the EC Regulations 216/2008 on common rules in civil aviation (Basic Regulations)**

Proof:

1) Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations call for the knowledge of " non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors."

This is NOT ""threat and error management"!

2) §(16) of the Basic Regulations principles claim for a "promotion of a "culture of safety"

3) "threat and error management" is a special approach and methodology not accepted by all. More modern and general accepted techniques exist (see my comments on TEM, definitions error and error management and the Basic Regulations of the EC.

Proposal:

Exchange

"The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles of threat and error management and also cover:"

by

"The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles of human performance and limitations and non-technical skills with regard to flight safety and also cover:"

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

The Agency would like to suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment 4245 comment by: *CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority*

The current text states;

**2. FLIGHT INSTRUCTION**

**2.1 The Basic LPL(H) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles of threat and error management and also cover:**

However, 'Threat and Error Management' is just part of the Non-technical skills required for competency.

**Proposal:** Ammend the text to read '

**2. FLIGHT INSTRUCTION**

**2.1 The Basic LPL(H) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the required Non-technical Skills and also cover:**

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

The Agency would like to suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment 7167 comment by: *UK CAA*

**Paragraph:**

AMC No 2 to FCL.110.BA/H para 2.1

**Page No:**

216 of 647

**Comment:**

The use of the expression "threat and error management" is too loose and needs to be aligned with the exercise of NTS by the applicant.

**Justification:**

Consistency across licence skill tests.

**Proposed Text:**

**(if applicable)**

Amend to read;

" principles of ~~threat and error management~~ *non-technical skills...*".

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.

The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment

7170

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC No 2 to FCL.110.BA/H para 3.2

**Page No:**

217 of 647

**Comment:**

The use of the expression "good airmanship" is too loose and needs to be aligned with the exercise of NTS by the applicant.

**Justification:**

Consistency across licence skill tests.

**Proposed Text:**

**(if applicable)**

Amend to read;

".. needs of ~~good airmanship~~ *non-technical skills* and...".

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.

The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence**

**LPL - AMC to FCL.110.A - Flight instruction for the leisure pilot licence - p. 224-231**

**LPL (A)**

comment

1948

comment by: Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch

**The definition of the syllabus is too restrictive with respect to the EC Regulations 216/2008 on common rules in civil aviation (Basic Regulations)**

Proof:

1) Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations call for the knowledge of " non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors."

This is NOT ""threat and error management"!

2) §(16) of the Basic Regulations principles claim for a "promotion of a "culture of safety"

3) "threat and error management" is a special approach and methodology not accepted by all. More modern and general accepted techniques exist (see my

comments on TEM, definitions error and error management and the Basic Regulations of the EC.

Proposal:

Exchange

"The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles of threat and error management and also cover:"

by

"The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles of human performance and limitations and non-technical skills with regard to flight safety and also cover:"

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

The Agency would like to suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment

4850

comment by: *Flight Training Europe*

Page 224, Flight Instruction for the LPL

Para 2. 1 (e) states that "**flight at critically high airspeeds, recognition of, and recovery from, spiral dive**" should be covered on the course, These items are covered in the Syllabus of Flight Instruction under advanced turns, but only the flying of steep turns are examined on the skill test; therefore **add the recovery from a spiral dive to the skill test profile.**

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

You are right with your statement that both items are mentioned in paragraph 2.1. Furthermore, the syllabus contains these training items under exercise 15 "Advanced turning" and exercise 6 "Straight and level".

The item "steep turns" is also part of the skill test for the LPL(A) but not the exercise "recovery spiral dive". This is based on the proposals of the experts involved in the drafting and the Agency does not see a need to include this item at this stage without further assessment.

comment

4851

comment by: *Flight Training Europe*

Pages 225 to 231

The numbering of the syllabus exercises in the LPL(A) differs significantly from those of the Basic LPL(A), PPL, LAFI and FI(A). This will lead to unnecessary confusing, especially for a new instructor. **Recommend renumbering the**

**LPL(A) Syllabus of Flight Instruction to align it with the numbering of the “Long Briefs and Air Exercises” for the Flight Instructor Syllabus (page 473) and where necessary omit the exercise contents stating – “not to be taught for the LPL(A)”.**

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Originally the syllabus for the LPL(A) was a reduced syllabus compared with the syllabus for the PPL(A) as the exercise "spin avoidance" was deleted. Based on this the Agency decided not to use the same numbering as for the PPL. Based on decision to include this exercise, the numbering will be aligned (for the Basic LPL syllabus a different numbering will be kept).

Taking your proposal into account, the Agency will align the numbering also with the syllabus for the LAFI(A) training course. There are only two differences as the LAFI(A) course contains an exercise for night flying instruction whereas the LPL(A) syllabus will contain an additional exercise 19 called "Stopping and re-starting the engine (in the case of TMGs only)". The Agency believes that a separate syllabus (and numbering) should be kept for the Basic LPL. Please see the response already provided to your comment in the appropriate segment.

comment 5527

comment by: *Chris Gowers*

Page 228 The note after Exercise 11/12E

This refers to a further training requirement for nosewheel/tailwheel aircraft if the pilot trains on the other configuration. However the details of the required conversion training do not appear to be listed in the EASA FCL document.

Is this intentional and to be left to the discretion of the ATO? If this is the case then a further sentence should be added to that effect.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your comment.

You are right with your statement that the issue of familiarisation or difference training was only covered in subpart H (class- and type ratings) so far. As the LPL should contain no reference to subpart H because the text is based on the system of type- and class-ratings which are not envisaged for the LPL, it was decided to add this issue in the appropriate Implementing Rules.

You will find in the amended text the requirement for additional training if another variant of aeroplane than the one used for the skill test should be flown now in FCL.135.BLAPL (new numbering). Please see the resulting text. Additionally an AMC will be assigned with further information.

comment 6171

comment by: *UK CAA*

**Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL.110.A and AMC to FCL.930.LAFI

**Page No:**

**224/398**

	<p><b>Comment:</b> Exercise Numbers are different from those at AMC to FCL.110.A 2 1</p> <p><b>Justification:</b></p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Amend AMC to FCL.110.A to match PPL and LAFI exercises.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>As the syllabus for the LPL(A) was originally a slightly reduced syllabus compared with the syllabus for the PPL(A), the Agency was not able to use the same structure and numbering as for the PPL. (The same problem exists for the Basic LPL syllabus).</p> <p>However, taking your proposal into account, the Agency will align the numbering of this AMC with the numbering used for the syllabus of the LAFI(A) training course. There are only two differences as the LAFI(A) course contains an exercise for night flying instruction whereas the LPL(A) syllabus will contain an additional exercise 19 called "Stopping and re-starting the engine (in the case of TMGs only)". The Agency believes that a separate syllabus (and numbering) should be kept for the Basic LPL.</p>
comment	<p>6174 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC to FCL.110.A</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 225</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Exercise numbering. It is unfortunate that the exercise numbering for the LPL(A) differs from the PPL(A); the omission of Ex 11 Spin Avoidance is especially regrettable.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> This will lead to much confusion at schools where training is given for both licences.</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Use consistent exercise numbering for the BLPL(A), LPL(A) and PPL(A)</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The syllabus for the LPL(A) originally did not contain the exercise "spin avoidance". Based on the comments received and after careful consideration of the issue the Agency came to the conclusion that this training item should be included. As proposed by you also exercise 11 will be included.</p> <p>As this also means that the main difference between the LPL and PPL syllabus does not any longer exists the same structure and numbering can be used. (Only the Basic LPL syllabus numbering will be slightly different). There are only two differences as the PPL(A) syllabus contains the exercise 19 "Basic instrument flight" whereas the LPL(A) syllabus will contain an additional exercise 19 called "Stopping and re-starting the engine (in the case of TMGs only)" instead of this.</p>

comment	<p>6175 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC to FCL.110.A</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 230/1</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Exercise 17C appears to require the use of GPS rather than any other radio navaid thus requiring the carriage of GPS.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> This would require the carriage of GPS in any LPL(A) training aeroplane.</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Change to 'GPS or VOR/ADF'.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The group of experts involved in the drafting of the LPL training requirements were of the opinion that GNSS training should be included in the flight training as a mandatory item. Nothing is said that all the aircraft used in the ATO must be equipped with a GPS as it would be sufficient if one of the training aircraft is equipped.</p> <p>However, as some training aircraft might not yet be equipped with a GPS, the Agency will accept also the training item "VOR/NDB" and will add it as an alternative training item.</p>
comment	<p>7173 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC to FCL.110.A para 2.1</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 224 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The use of the expression "threat and error management" is too loose and needs to be aligned with the exercise of NTS by the applicant.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Consistency across licence skill tests.</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Amend to read; " principles of <del>threat and error management</del> <i>non-technical skills...</i>".</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.</p> <p>The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.</p>

comment	<p>7177 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC FCL.110.A para 3.2</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 225 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The use of the expression "good airmanship" is too loose and needs to be aligned with the exercise of NTS by the applicant.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Consistency across licence skill tests.</p> <p><b>Proposed Text:</b> <b>(if applicable)</b> Amend to read; ".. needs of <del>good airmanship</del> <i>non-technical skills</i> and...".</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task. The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.</p>

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence**  
**LPL - AMC to FCL.110.H - Flight instruction for the leisure pilot licence - p. 231-241**  
**LPL (H)**

comment	<p>1252 <span style="float: right;">comment by: Aeromega</span></p> <p>See earlier comments regarding the inappropriateness of this licence for helicopters. If the LPL (H) is to continue to exist, I suggest that lessons retain the PPL numbering e.g. Ex 22 is always navigation whether covered under a PPL or an LPL. Lessons omitted from the LPL can be left blank to avoid confusion in student records and log books.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment.</p> <p>The Agency has decided to keep the LPL for helicopters but not to introduce the Basic LPL(H). See the responses provided already to your comments in the appropriate segment for the rule text.</p> <p>Regarding your comment on the structure and numbering of this AMC for the LPL(H) compared to the numbering of the PPL(H) syllabus, the Agency does not understand the problems mentioned. Exercise 22 is in both cases the navigation exercise. It seems that you have mixed up something - no change or further amendment is required.</p>
comment	<p>1951 <span style="float: right;">comment by: Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch</span></p> <p><b>The definition of the syllabus is too restrictive with respect to the EC Regulations 216/2008 on common rules in civil aviation (Basic</b></p>



**Regulations)**

Proof:

1) Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations call for the knowledge of " non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors."

This is NOT ""threat and error management"!

2) §(16) of the Basic Regulations principles claim for a "promotion of a "culture of safety"

3) "threat and error management" is a special approach and methodology not accepted by all. More modern and general accepted techniques exist (see my comments on TEM, definitions error and error management and the Basic Regulations of the EC.

Proposal:

Exchange

"The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles of threat and error management and also cover:"

by

"The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles of human performance and limitations and non-technical skills with regard to flight safety and also cover:"

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

The Agency would like to suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment

7181

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL.110.H para 2.1

**Page No:**

231 of 647

**Comment:**

The use of the expression "threat and error management" is too loose and needs to be aligned with the exercise of NTS by the applicant.

**Justification:**

Consistency across licence skill tests.

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Amend to read;

" principles of ~~threat and error management~~ *non-technical skills...*".

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.  
The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment

7183

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC FCL.110.H para 3.2

**Page No:**

232 of 647

**Comment:**

The use of the expression "good airmanship" is too loose and needs to be aligned with the exercise of NTS by the applicant.

**Justification:**

Consistency across licence skill tests.

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Amend to read;

".. needs of ~~good airmanship~~ *non-technical skills* and...".

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.  
The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence**

**LPL - AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S - Flight instruction for the leisure pilot (sailplanes) and the sailplane pilot licence (SPL)**

p. 241-246

comment

49

comment by: *Stefan JAUDAS*

Requiring a medical certificate before first solo rather than before first training flight is very welcome. Cost and trouble with obtaining a medical certificate **before** the student pilot actually knows whether she or he actually does enjoy flying does scare off some potential student pilots.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

comment

258

comment by: *British Gliding Association*

**AMC TO FCL.110.S AND TO FCL.210.S  
FLIGHT INSTRUCTION FOR THE LEISURE PILOT LICENCE (SAILPLANE)  
AND THE SAILPLANE PILOT LICENCE (SPL)  
3. SYLLABUS OF FLIGHT INSTRUCTION**

Exercise 10: Spin recognition and avoidance

Page 243

&

**AMC to FCL.930.LAFI**

**Light Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course**

**PART 2 C. Sailplanes**

Page 441

Note: Although exercise 11B is not required for the LPL course, it is a requirement for the LAFI course.

NPA Proposal

Full spinning is not included

*Comment:*

*UK gliding experience and safety data is that full spinning must be included in each syllabus. The BGA is very keen to see the requirement for full spin training to be retained for LPL(S) & SPL!*

**BGA Proposal**

***Exercise 10: Spin recognition and avoidance and developed spins***

***- safety checks***

***- stalling and recovery at the incipient spin stage (stall with excessive wing drop, about 45deg)***

***- Instructor induced distractions during the spin entry***

***- entry into fully developed spins***

***- recognition of full spins***

***- standard spin recovery***

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion and the proposal to extend exercise 10 in order to include the fully developed spin.

See also the response already provided on the same comment assigned to the AMC to FCL.930.LAFI.

Firstly, it should be highlighted that the Agency did an evaluation of the existing national training requirements during the drafting phase of Part-FCL and found out that such an exercise including fully developed spins is actually not included in the training syllabus of mandatory training items in several Member States. When drafting the requirements for this NPA, the Agency was informed by sailplane licensing experts that a lot of gliding clubs in different Member States would have difficulties to provide this kind of spin training based on the fact that suitable training double seaters with the necessary spinning characteristics would not be available (as it is the case already for flight training provided on TMGs or SEPs). Additionally, the experts were of the opinion that the exercises proposed (No. 9 "Stalling" and No. 10 "Spin recognition and avoidance") will provide a sufficient level of training and experience to cope with all kind of unusual attitudes or stalling/spinning situations.

This was mainly the reason why the Agency, after having discussed this issue, decided to require "spin recognition and avoidance" mentioning only "stalling and recovery at the incipient spin stage".

When dealing with these comments and evaluating the proposal to add "fully developed spins" as a mandatory training item, the Agency carefully reviewed

this issue and all the implications the introduction of such an additional exercise would have. It does agree that such training would provide additional skills for specific emergency situations. The Agency also supports the principle that such training should always be provided by the ATO if the training aircraft used will allow to fly such a manoeuvre.

However, during the review of the comments the Agency contacted again the licensing experts representing the European gliding community. The above mentioned problem of the availability of suitable training aircraft was highlighted again by the experts and the Agency was strongly advised by them not to introduce this exercise as a mandatory training item on the European level. It has also to be recognised that nearly all the comments received on this issue are sent by stakeholders from one Member State and that most of them used your comment as a reference.

The Agency came to the conclusion that "fully developed spins" and "appropriate spin recovery" should not be included as an additional mandatory training item. However, in order to address this issue and to point out that spinning and the appropriate action items to stop it should be performed if the aircraft allows to demonstrate it, the AMC material will be amended in order to address this issue.

comment

362

comment by: *British Gliding Association*

Exercise Numbering  
Page 242 to 246

**AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S**

**FLIGHT INSTRUCTION FOR THE LEISURE PILOT (SAILPLANES) AND THE SAILPLANE PILOT LICENCE**

**&**

Pages 440 & 441

**AMC TO FCL.930.LAFI**

**Light Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course**

**PART 2 C. Sailplanes**

The exercise numbers do not match

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees in general that the numbering of the syllabus contained in this AMC should be the same as the one used for the instructor course. The differences were mainly based on the fact that only for the instructor course the exercise on fully developed spins was included in the syllabus as a mandatory training item.

Based on the comments received containing proposals for a re-ordering of the exercises, the Agency decided to follow these proposals and align the numbering of the two AMCs.

The new order will be (see the other responses provided to comments dealing with this issue in the same segment below):

Exercise 9: Slow flight and stalling

Exercise 10: Spin recognition and avoidance and developed spins

Exercise 11: Take-off / Launch methods  
 Exercise 12: Circuit, approach and landing  
 Exercise 13: First Solo  
 Exercise 14: Advanced Turns  
 Exercise 15: Soaring techniques

comment

572

comment by: *British Gliding Association***AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S**

SYLLABUS OF FLIGHT INSTRUCTION

NPA Proposal

Exercise 12A: Thermalling

*Comment:*

*In common with other maritime nations, the UK has several coastal gliding clubs where thermal flying is available only intermittently. As a result it may be difficult for some clubs to teach this as a practical exercise. Where this is the case the BGA would wish instead to allow those clubs to satisfy the training requirement through practical & theoretical briefings.*

**BGA Proposal**

***Exercise 12A Thermalling (if applicable during training and if possible at training site)***

***Note: If weather conditions during training do not allow the practical training of soaring techniques, all items of the air exercise have to be discussed and explained during a long briefing exercise only.***

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.  
 However, the Agency does not agree with the reasoning provided.

The comments received were reviewed carefully but it should be mentioned that the exercise "Thermalling" is one of the main elements of sailplane operations and must be trained at a certain stage of the basic training for the licence. This practical exercise for flying in a thermal requires different skills and techniques which will be very important for the future "performance" of the licence holder. The term "performance" includes not only the ability to fly in a thermal and gain altitude (for cross-country flight in order to prevent an outlanding) but also different techniques which are further described in the AMC. The text mentions:

- lookout procedures (when entering - in a thermal - when leaving)
- use of audio soaring instruments
- joining a thermal and giving way
- flying in close proximity to other sailplanes

The Agency does not agree with your proposal to talk through such an exercise only by explaining and discussing the above mentioned issues only on a theoretical basis.

It seems that you have overlooked the fact that this AMC requires the student pilot already to have completed some cross-country training (see exercise 17). The Agency does not understand how the contents of this exercise could be trained without using thermals or other soaring techniques.

However, based on other comments and on the fact that at some operating

sites/airfields it might even be easier to provide instruction for the other two soaring techniques the Agency decided to include a note requiring that at least one of the three soaring techniques must be instructed. This should solve the issue and will guarantee that most of the general safety related contents (lookout procedures / flying in close proximity with other sailplanes) have to be trained. The other techniques like joining a thermal and flying together with other sailplanes could be simulated also during these flights.

comment 876 comment by: *alphamike*

response *Noted*

No text provided with this comment.

comment 946 comment by: *Colin Field (UK Glider Pilot)*

It is absolutely vital to everyone yet to learn to fly, that the requirement for full familiarisation with spin avoidance, recognition and recovery is maintained before the solo standard can be reached. One needs only to look back at glider accident records over the last 10 years to see how many have been caused by inadvertant spinning, particularly on approach, or in turbulent conditions near a ridge.

If pupils are not fully taught about the dangers of spinning and how to avoid it, it will severely increase the number of spin-related accidents, and therefore drastically reduce safety.

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

See the response already provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment 947 comment by: *Colin Field (UK Glider Pilot)*

The requirement for thermalling before the Licence can be issued, would have serious implications for clubs such as the Channel Gliding Club (where I have flown, and trained to solo standard), which are close to the sea and therefore restricted in the amount of thermal soaring available. It also affects trainees who are learning at a time of year when thermal soaring is not very common.

This requirement should be removed, since the IGC have its own methods of assessing soaring ability through the issue of various Badges.

response *Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

See the response already provided to comment No. 572(BGA) in the same segment above.

It should be highlighted that the "various badges" you mentioned seemed to be introduced to create "methods of assessing the soaring ability". This is

exactly the intension of this requirement as the Agency considers this exercise as a basic and important element of sailplane operations.

comment 959 comment by: *Robert Cronk*

p 243, Ex 10 - spin recognition and avoidance. The instruction syllabus as set out here does not include full spinning. Gliders spend more of their time in relatively slow flight, including when thermalling, and **full spin recognition and recovery** has long been a vital part of UK glider pilot training, and remains a vital area of training.

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

See the response already provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment 1021 comment by: *George Rowden*

Comment. The NPA excludes the requirement for full spin training for the LPL(SS) and SPL but UK sailplane experience and safety data suggests the opposite.

*I therefore propose that the requirement for incipient and full spin training is included in the LPL(S) & SPL training syllabus.*

response *Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

See the response already provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment 1326 comment by: *George Knight*

The exercise numbers are not consistent with those for instructors on AMC to FCL on page 440 through 458.

Full spins and recovery are excluded from the syllabus. I believe that this is a serious omission. Unlike other fixed wing flying machines gliders spend a large proportion of their flight time very close to the glider's stalling speed (because that is where minimum sink and best glide are to be found on the polar curve). When thermalling in turbulent conditions it is not uncommon for inadvertent stalls to occur when thermalling flight goes out of strong lift into sink. Some gliders that are inclined to spin may do so inadvertently. It should also be remembered that some gliders allow the pilot to deliberately fly near the aft c of g limit using ballast weights or water in the tail to achieve this (to get better performance). Again spins are more likely in these circumstances. Some gliders thermal with flaps down - again making them more likely to spin. Some older gliders (and there are many vintage gliders still flying) do not have such forgiving characteristics as modern aircraft.

Full spins are a significant factor in accident statistics in gliders..

For these reasons I believe that the syllabus must include full spin and recovery as a mandatory element in gliders.

response

*Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

As to your first comment, please see the response already provided to comment No. 362 (BGA) in the same segment above.

As to your second item on the "full developed spin", please see the response already provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment

1488

comment by: *Andrew Sampson*

Exercise 10

It is important to include actual full spins and recovery, including simulated stall/spin from winch failure, thermal turn etc .

response

*Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

See the response already provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment

1518

comment by: *Keith WHITE*

para 3.3 "... be aware ***of*** the needs ***for*** ..."

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing the information about this editorial mistake.

The Agency agrees and will amend the text accordingly.

comment

1519

comment by: *Keith WHITE*

3.3 Ex 1 flight controls. Add "**trimmer**" to controls list.

response

*Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your input.

The Agency will add the trim in exercise 1 and will use a different order.

comment

1520

comment by: *Keith WHITE*

Ex 8. Also "**turn onto selected path taking account of wind.**"

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your input.

The Agency does not agree and believes that the item "turns onto selected headings" will include exercises like the mentioned one if the instructor feels them necessary.



comment	<p>1521 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Keith WHITE</i></span></p> <p>2.1 should mention <b>NOTAMS</b>.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The term "NOTAM" is used in several other AMCs like the one for the skill test in other airspace categories. For sailplanes (as most of the flights are local flights) it was decided to use the general term "airspace" instead.</p> <p>In 2.1. (a) the term "airspace and weather briefing" will be added.</p> <p>It should be pointed out that item (I) already asks for compliance with air traffic services procedures.</p>
comment	<p>1585 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DAeC LV Niedersachsen</i></span></p> <p>Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren, zu den dargestellten Inhalten auf Seite 243 unter Exercise 9A bis 10 möchte ich im folgenden Stellung nehmen: Die hier aufgeführten Inhalte zur Schulung besonderer Flugzustände sind nach meiner fachlichen Einschätzung unzureichend. Die <u>praktische Schulung von Trudelübungen</u> gehört zur <u>handwerklichen Befähigung jedes Segelfliegers</u>. Die mangelnde Ausbildung dieser Befähigung kostet leider gegenwärtig immer noch vielen Luftsportlern das Leben.(internationale Unfallstatistiken belegen dies anschaulich) Es ist eine irriige Vorstellung zu glauben, dass die Schulung der ersten Anzeichen von überzogenen Flugzuständen, das Ausleiten von Abkippen usw. bei der Ausbildung ausreichend ist. Der Flugschüler muß in der Ausbildung befähigt werden das Trudeln selbständig auszuleiten, denn in der Gefahrensituation Trudeln muß er, um zu überleben zwei Dinge können:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• das Trudeln erkennen</li> <li>• umgehend geeignete Steuerbewegungen zum Ausleiten des Trudeln durchführen</li> </ul> <p>Da er unbeabsichtigt in diese Situation gelangen kann, ist die praktische Befähigung der Schüler und sogar eine gewisse Inübunghaltung der Scheininhaber von großer Bedeutung. Es ist leider traurige Realität, dass selbst langjährig tätige Fluglehrer, aufgrund mangelnder Forderung in den zurückliegenden Jahren, selbst nie getrudelt haben, dies jedoch den Schülern in der Ausbildung vermitteln sollen! Mit den neuen europäischen Ausbildungsinhalten sollte nicht die Gelegenheit verpaßt werden, um die handwerkliche Befähigung zukünftiger Segelfluggenerationen zu verbessern. Damit könnte zudem ein wirksamer Beitrag geleistet werden, um die Unfallstatistiken der Zukunft etwas besser aussehen zu lassen. Die gern angeführte Begründung</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment. As it seems that the comment was sent twice please see the response provided to your comment No. 1588 in the same segment below.</p>

comment

1588

comment by: DAeC LV Niedersachsen

Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren,  
zu den dargestellten Inhalten auf Seite 243 unter Exercise 9A bis 10 möchte ich im folgenden Stellung nehmen:

Die hier aufgeführten Inhalte zur Schulung besonderer Flugzustände sind nach meiner fachlichen Einschätzung unzureichend.

Die praktische Schulung von Trudelübungen gehört zur handwerklichen Befähigung jedes Segelfliegers. Die mangelnde Ausbildung dieser Befähigung kostet leider gegenwärtig immer noch vielen Luftsportlern das Leben. (internationale Unfallstatistiken belegen dies anschaulich)

Es ist eine irrige Vorstellung zu glauben, dass die Schulung der ersten Anzeichen von überzogenen Flugzuständen, das Ausleiten von Abkippen usw. bei der Ausbildung ausreichend ist. Der Flugschüler muß in der Ausbildung befähigt werden das Trudeln selbständig auszuleiten, denn in der Gefahrensituation Trudeln muß er, um zu überleben zwei Dinge können:

- das Trudeln erkennen
- umgehend geeignete Steuerbewegungen zum Ausleiten des Trudelns durchführen

Da er unbeabsichtigt in diese Situation gelangen kann, ist die praktische Befähigung der Schüler und sogar eine gewisse Inübunghaltung der Scheininhaber von großer Bedeutung.

Es ist leider traurige Realität, dass selbst langjährig tätige Fluglehrer, aufgrund mangelnder luftrechtlicher Forderungen in den zurückliegenden Jahren, selbst nie getrudelt haben, dies jedoch den Schülern in der Ausbildung vermitteln sollen!

Mit den neuen europäischen Ausbildungsinhalten sollte die Gelegenheit nicht verpasst werden, um die handwerkliche Befähigung zukünftiger Segelfluggenerationen zu verbessern. Damit könnte zudem ein wirksamer Beitrag geleistet werden, um die Unfallstatistiken der Zukunft etwas besser aussehen zu lassen.

Die gern angeführte Begründung, dass die modernen doppelsitzigen Segelflugzeuge nicht trudeln, darf vor dem Hintergrund der fatalen Konsequenzen nicht gelten. Es ist ein organisatorisches Problem der Vereine und Flugschulen dafür zu sorgen, dass mit den Schülern getrudelt wird, denn es gibt ausreichend Alternativen und es geht hier um den Schutz von Menschenleben!

Diese Zeilen habe ich als Luftsportler verfasst, der seit 35 Jahren mit Segelflugzeugen fliegt über viele Jahre selbst als Fluglehrer tätig war und seit mehr als 20 Jahren Flugunfälle mit Segelflugzeugen untersucht.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen  
Frank Stahlkopf

response

**Noted**

Thank you for providing your opinion and the information provided about the issue of "stalling and spinning training".

As mentioned already in your comment it should be pointed out again that such an exercise including fully developed spins is actually not included in the training syllabus of mandatory training items in several Member States.

When drafting the requirements for this NPA, the Agency was told by sailplane licensing experts that a lot of gliding clubs in different Member States would have difficulties to provide this kind of spin training based on the fact

that suitable training double seaters with the necessary spinning characteristics would not be available. This was mainly the reason why the Agency, after having discussed this issue, decided to require "spin recognition and avoidance" mentioning only "stalling and recovery at the incipient spin stage".

During the review of the comments received the Agency again discussed this issue with the licensing experts of the European gliding community and came to the conclusion that the proposed additional spinning training cannot be included at this stage. In order to understand the reasoning behind please see the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment

1952

comment by: *Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch*

**The definition of the syllabus is too restrictive with respect to the EC Regulations 216/2008 on common rules in civil aviation (Basic Regulations)**

Proof:

1) Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations call for the knowledge of " non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors."

This is NOT ""threat and error management"!

2) §(16) of the Basic Regulations principles claim for a "promotion of a "culture of safety"

3) "threat and error management" is a special approach and methodology not accepted by all. More modern and general accepted techniques exist (see my comments on TEM, definitions error and error management and the Basic Regulations of the EC.

Proposal:

Exchange

"The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles of threat and error management and also cover:"

by

"The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles

of human performance and limitations and non-technical skills with regard to flight safety and also cover:"

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

The Agency would like to suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment

2108

comment by: *Vincent EARL*

## Exercise 10

Spinning is not listed as an exercise, only spin avoidance is required. This is a serious deficiency in the requirements. All student glider pilots must be familiarised with the physical and visual characteristics of a fully developed spin as well as the correct recovery technique to be applied.

To a novice pilot who is not used to spiral dives and fully developed spins, the sensations and visual appearance of these manoeuvres are similar. Without specific training and the demonstration of both the Spiral Dive and fully developed spin, they may inadvertently apply the wrong recovery technique if they are solo and inadvertently find themselves in one of these situations.

If the incorrect recovery technique is applied, it can overstress the glider airframe with potentially fatal results. For this reason, both spiral dives and fully developed spins should be mandatory pre-solo training exercises for all LPL(S) and SPL students.

response

*Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

See the response already provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment

2481

comment by: *derekheaton*

page 243

exercise 10

flight instruction should include recognition, avoidance and recovery from full spins.

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

See the response already provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment

2482

comment by: *derekheaton*

page 245

Exercise 12A

It is not always practicable to fly all aspects of this exercise BUT it is essential that the safety aspects of sharing a thermal are fully understood.

Therefore where it is not practical to fly this part then it must be covered during a long dedicated ground briefing.

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

See the response already provided to comment No. 572(BGA) in the same segment above.

comment

2886

comment by: *David Bowden*

AMC to FCL 110.S

I disagree with the attempt to include a training manual.

Ensuring that pilots have the necessary skills to fly safely is the job of the instructor.

EASA should define the standard to be achieved.

EASA should ensure that there is an organisational structure to train instructors. To monitor and refresh their skills and continuously monitor and introduce improvements.

We are lucky in that the BGA has over the years developed training syllabuses and a body of experience. Any thing that undermines this does so at the expense of safety.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the statement provided on a "training manual" is not understood. It seems that the proposed AMC containing the training syllabus for sailplane pilots is named a "training manual" but this is not right. The AMC to FCL.110.S contains clearly only a training syllabus but should not be categorised as training manual.

With this training syllabus, which is by the way based on the input received by all the important gliding organisations in Europe, the Agency does not intend to "undermine" the BGA and its activity. Alternative AMCs can be developed at any stage (if really necessary) together with the competent authority.

In order to give you the full picture some reasons should be added why such a European sailplane training syllabus had to be developed:

- political decision to have uniform licences and rules in Europe
- task for the Agency to develop these requirements based on ICAO, JAR-FCL and existing national requirements
- involvement of the industry (in this case: gliding community)

This might help you to understand the reasoning behind and to accept that reaching a certain compromise will in most cases mean that some of the existing national training requirements have to be changed slightly.

comment

3508

comment by: *Bob BOYD*

Excercise 10. Spin recognition and avoidance.

As a very experienced gliding instructor, I have taught many people to enter a spin, recognise it as a spin or a spiral dive and take the appropriate recovery action. The wrong recovery action could cause the break up of the glider. It has been shown with absolute certainty that experiencing the full spin AND spiral dives is vital.

response

*Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

See the response already provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment **3532** comment by: *James Clarke*

Full spinning must be included in this syllabus. Gliders spend a lot of time at low speeds in turbulent air, competence in recognising and preventing a spin is required but also familiarisation and the ability to recover from a full spin is an essential skill.

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

See the response already provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment **3908** comment by: *Paweł Góra*

Exercise 10: Spin recognition and avoidance.  
Having in mind aerodynamical properties of gliders as well as the fact that spin happens quite often in this class of aircraft, it seems to be necessary to perform full spin and recovery from it in this exercise (not only excessive wing drop as it is proposed).

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

See the response already provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment **3973** comment by: *Ulster Gliding Club*

Exercise 12A: Thermalling  
Opportunities to thermal can be scarce in coastal clubs such as ours.  
It should be possible to comply with Exercise 12A by using briefings, if necessary.

response *Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

See the response already provided to comment No. 572 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment **4151** comment by: *Claudia Buengen*

Exercise 10 does not seem to require full and further spinning exercises. I believe that as gliders often fly at speeds not far from their stall speeds, spin training is an essential part of the training syllabus.

Suggestion:

comprehensive spin training syllabus as currently taught by the BGA in the UK.

Exercise 12 may be difficult to achieve in a country like the UK where thermals are not always present, or in gliding clubs that rely on winch launches as their only launch method.

Suggestion:

This should not be included in the compulsory flying syllabus but with a theoretical briefing as an alternative training method.

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

See the response already provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

As to your second issue please see the response already provided to the appropriate BGA comment No. 572 in the same segment above.

It should be mentioned that the Agency does not understand how comprehensive spin training should be introduced as mandatory training item (as described in your comment) if at the same time such a club has difficulties to perform thermal flights when they "rely on winch launches as their only launch method".

comment

4276

comment by: *Graham Morris*

It is evident from this common syllabus for the FI for both the LP(S) and the SPL that both Licenses carry the same privileges, albeit with slightly different medical requirements. I see no logic in this. Let's have 1 licence and 1 (the lower) medical requirement.

The proposal that an FI LP(S) could not instruct for the SPS will, if implemented, create enormous confusion and problems on all Sailplane training airfields across Europe.

I can accept that the higher medical requirement might be justified for professional sailplane instructors, given the greater exposure to risk, however, to duplicate the license structure is completely unwarranted just to follow the practice of other areas of General & Commercial aviation, which unlike the sport of soaring, include substantial commercial activity.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees with your statement that there are not a lot of differences between the LPL(S) and the SPL. It is also right that a LAFI(S), based on the general principle that an instructor can only instruct for a licence she /he holds himself/herself, will not be allowed to provide instruction for the LPL(S).

The main differences are the different medical level (and the option to use the GMP instead of the AME in the case of the LPL) and the commercial privilege.

Accepting your proposal to delete one of these two licences would mean that the Agency would have to delete the LPL(S). This is based on the fact that only the SPL will be an ICAO compliant licence due to the required medical level. It is supported by all Member States that an ICAO based licence for all categories has to be introduced.

The Agency discussed the comments and proposals received on this issue but came to the conclusion not to delete the LPL(S) in order to keep the option provided for a different medical which can be completed with the involvement of a GMP.

comment 4392

comment by: *Paul SMITH*

The proposal is that full spinning is not required. Since gliders spend a lot of time circling and may be often near the stall, I believe it is essential that full spins and recovery are taught.

The proposal is that thermalling must be taught during training. The opportunity to teach and demonstrate thermalling techniques depend on the chance encounters with thermals. For winch only sites this certainly cannot be planned for

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

See the response already provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

As to your second issue, please see the response already provided to the appropriate BGA comment No. 572 in the same segment above.

It should be highlighted that the justification provided ("For winch only sites this certainly cannot be planned for") is not understood as a lot of clubs in different Member States are actually operating on a "winch only" airfield which does not prevent them from doing long distance cross-country flights by using thermals. It should also be mentioned that it seems to be strange to propose mandatory spinning exercises if thermal flights from a winch only site will cause problems. The Agency does not accept the reasoning provided.

comment 4616

comment by: *Deutscher Aero Club*

Exercise Numbering

Page 242 to 246

AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S

FLIGHT INSTRUCTION FOR THE LEISURE PILOT (SAILPLANES) AND THE SAILPLANE PILOT LICENCE

&

Pages 440 & 441

AMC TO FCL.930.LAFI

Light Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course

PART 2 C. Sailplanes

Comment:

The exercise numbers do not match

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment but as this is a duplicate of comment No. 362. Please see the response for comment No. 362 (BGA).



comment	<p>4961 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Royal Danish Aeroclub</i></span></p> <p>In exercise 10 "recovery at the incipient spin stage" should be changed to "recovery from fully developed spin".</p> <p>It is important that new pilots know the characteristics of a spin - at least with an instructor on board. After flying solo - the spin could come very unexpected and should have been exercised before flying solo.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your opinion.</p> <p>See the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p>5032 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>George Knight</i></span></p> <p>2 FLIGHT INSTRUCTION 2.1 ...principles of threat and error management...</p> <p>Propose This is meaningless jargon in terms of sailplanes. Please change to: "2.1 The LPL (S) / SPL flight instruction syllabus should <del>take into account the principles of threat and error management and also</del> cover:</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The term "threat and error management" is based on the framework provided by the Basic Regulation and has to be kept for all licences. The Agency believes strongly that this topic also applies to sailplane operations.</p>
comment	<p>5033 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>George Knight</i></span></p> <p>2 Flight Instruction 2.1 "(d) flight at high angle of attack (critically low airspeeds), recognition of, and recovery from, incipient and full stalls and spins;"</p> <p><b>Comment</b> The above is inconsistent with exercise 10 on page 243 which does not require recovery from full spins.</p> <p>Because sailplanes fly for much of the time, especially when thermalling, very near the minimum sink speed - which is just above the stall - gliders are at much greater risk of inadvertent entry to a spin on gusty days with turbulent thermals than other classes of aircraft. For that reason sailplane pilots must have been trained to recover from full spins.</p> <p><b>Propose</b> Change exercise 10 on page 243 to include recovery from full spins.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p>

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

See the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment

5034

comment by: *George Knight*

P 241

2

2.1 "(I) Compliance with air traffic services..."

This is not possible at most gliding sites as there is no ATC.

Propose:

"(I) Compliance with air traffic procedures and communication procedures **where provided.**"

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency is fully aware that at most of the gliding operating sites or airfields no ATC contact is directly available.

However, as item (I) clearly asks for "compliance with air traffic services procedures" the Agency does not understand why this wording could create any problem. The Agency is of the opinion that it is also a basic training item for gliding operations (local flights and cross-country) to comply with the respective (i) air traffic procedures.

If this would really be not possible as stated by you, the club operating at such an airfield should check their procedures. The Agency strongly believes that compliance with the air traffic rules and air traffic service procedures is a basic element of the training and will not change this item as proposed with your comment.

Furthermore, it should be added that cross-country flight training is also part of the flight training syllabus. Most of the experienced instructors are nowadays using this opportunity to show the student pilot how to comply with the airspace regulations and ATC related procedures. Contacting the flight information service in order to receive information about the status of a certain airspace, requesting weather information or contacting ATC in order to request a clearance to cross certain airspace are only a few simple examples why this training item is also a "must" for a sailplane pilot.

comment

5035

comment by: *George Knight*

The exercise numbers are not consistent with those used for instructor training.

response

*Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

See the response already provided to comment No. 362(BGA) in the same segment above.

comment	<p>5036 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>George Knight</i></span></p> <p>Exercise 17B</p> <p>Use of radio should be optional in sailplanes.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency has understood that the use of a radio as a training item for the exercise "cross-country flying" should be only optional as it seems that in several Member States the use of the radio is not required for sailplane operations.</p> <p>Although the Agency strongly believes that the knowledge and experience (if a student pilot has not done it during the training, he/she will have problems to use it in the right way later on) gained with such an exercise would be an important training item during a cross-country flight (see also the item "procedures for transiting regulated airspace"), the additional term "if applicable" will be added.</p>
comment	<p>5197 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Paul Morrison</i></span></p> <p>I think it is imperative that glider pilots continue to receive training in full spins and the correct recovery technique as gliders, by the very nature of thermalling, are often flying close to the stall where the chances of an inadvertent full or incipient spin are far greater than for powered pilots. This proposal will ultimately compromise flight safety as the first experience of a full spin may result from an inadvertent departure, perhaps at low level where the chances of a safe recovery will be greatly reduced.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your opinion.</p> <p>See the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p>5198 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Paul Morrison</i></span></p> <p>The proposal is that thermalling must be taught during training. As the opportunity to teach and demonstrate thermalling techniques will depend on both the time of year and weather conditions and ultimately the chance encounter with thermals, how can this be guaranteed or planned for especially at winch only sites where the maximum altitude attained may be between 1,000 and 1,500ft AGL?</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your opinion.</p> <p>See the response already provided to comment No. 572(BGA) in the same segment above.</p>

comment	<p>5221</p> <p>comment by: <i>Needwood Forest Gliding Club</i></p> <p>AMC to FCL 110.S</p> <p>We disagree with including as a regulation (that has the force of law) what amounts to a training manual. Ensuring that pilots have the required skills to fly safely is the job of the instructor.</p> <p>EASA should define the standards. More importantly EASA should ensure that there is an organisational structure to train instructors, monitor and refresh their skills and continuously introduce improvements.</p> <p>The BGA has supervised all aspects of gliding in the UK and that particularly includes training. Training is based upon decades of experience. Methods and standards are continuously under review and we believe represent the optimal approach.</p> <p>Any change that undermines this position does so at the expense of safety. Any additional regulation will impose financial burdens and creates more barriers to our sport.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>As this is basically a copy of comment No. 2886 (D. Bowden) in the same segment above please see the response already provided.</p>
comment	<p>5597</p> <p>comment by: <i>Belgian Gliding Federation</i></p> <p>Exercise Numbering</p> <p><i>Page 242 to 246</i></p> <p><i>AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S</i></p> <p><b><i>FLIGHT INSTRUCTION FOR THE LEISURE PILOT (SAILPLANES) AND THE SAILPLANE PILOT LICENCE</i></b></p> <p>and</p> <p><i>Pages 440 &amp; 441</i></p> <p><b><i>AMC TO FCL.930.LAFI</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Light Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course</i></b></p> <p><b><i>PART 2 C. Sailplanes</i></b></p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>The exercise numbers do not match.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment but as this is a duplicate of comment No. 362. Please see the response for comment No. 362 (BGA).</p>
comment	<p>5634</p> <p>comment by: <i>Tom GARDNER</i></p> <p>Spin training (recognition, avoidance, recovery) should be mandatory!</p> <p>I believe training in spin recovery at low altitude is necessary. An inexperienced pilot is likely to be overwhelmed by the sensations of their first spin, and are unlikely to be able to recover in time. This risk is easily avoided by practicing spinning repeatedly until they recover reliably.</p>

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

See the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment

5840

comment by: *Alan Morton*

In reference to thermalling training on P 245, I am a member of the Ulster Gliding Club which is based at a coastal site and is mainly involved with ridge soaring and wave flying. The opportunities there for training pilots in thermalling are few and far between and the training requirement as set out would be difficult to implement. Perhaps this requirement could be met by theoretical briefings and airborne simulation of thermal turns even when not in lift or doing the same in good ridge lift when well clear of other gliders.

response

*Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

See the response already provided to comment No. 572(BGA) in the same segment above.

Based on your input and the additional information that at some operating sites/airfields, it might even be easier to provide instruction for the other two soaring techniques (ridge/wave). The Agency decided to include a note requiring that at least one of the three soaring techniques must be instructed.

comment

6028

comment by: *Phil King*

### 3. SYLLABUS OF FLIGHT INSTRUCTION

#### Exercise 10: Spin recognition and avoidance

I would very likely have been killed in 1971 by spinning into a hillside while ridge soaring if I had been trained on this syllabus. I recovered from a full spin and avoided hitting the hillside by a margin of about 20m. My wife and brother-in-law have had similar near-death experiences. In my view it is essential to include recovery from a full spin in the syllabus. I support the BGA proposal:

#### *Exercise 10: Spin recognition and avoidance and developed spins*

- *safety checks*
- *stalling and recovery at the incipient spin stage (stall with excessive wing drop, about 45deg)*
- *Instructor induced distractions during the spin entry*
- *entry into fully developed spins*
- *recognition of full spins*
- *standard spin recovery*

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

See the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment	<p>6296 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Jonathan Coote</i></span></p> <p>Instruction for the LPL(S) and SPL should be both interchangeable, and by either LPL(S)- or SPL-rated instructors interchangeably. At present, I understand there is an asymmetry whereby only one of the instructor types is mandated to instruct both licenses.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your opinion.</p> <p>However, it must be pointed out that as a basic principle the instructor has to hold at least the licence he/she is instructing for. In the case of the instructor who wishes to provide instruction for the LPL(S) and for the SPL the solution will be that he/she has to hold an FI(S) certificate.</p>
comment	<p>6313 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Diana King</i></span></p> <p>AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S Flight Instruction for the Leisure Pilot (Sailplanes) and SPL</p> <p>Exercise 10 Spin recognition and avoidance</p> <p>Comment: I consider it essential that glider pilots should be trained to enter and recover from full spins. In soaring flight it is normal to fly close to the stall in order to maximise the opportunities for using the lift. There is therefore a risk that the pilot may inadvertently enter a spin. Incipient spin recognition and recovery should and frequently does protect pilots from a full spin; however it is not uncommon for the pilot to fail to notice the signs and to enter a full spin. Experience of the full spin is essential if the pilot is to recognise the mistake immediately and make a prompt recovery, without being overcome by fear.</p> <p>I write this with particular feeling as I believe I owe my life to the high quality of spin training that I received as a student glider pilot. Many years ago, during a cross country soaring flight in difficult conditions, I spun an aircraft from about 600 feet above the ground. I believe that I was able to carry out the spin recovery in spite of the inevitable terror simply because I had seen full spins before and had been thoroughly trained in the recovery process.</p> <p>I support the BGA proposals for this section.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your opinion.</p> <p>See the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p>6331 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DSvU</i></span></p> <p>AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S 3.1</p> <p>Comment: The demonstrations and practices need not necessarily be given in the order listed</p>

	<p>Proposal: Exercise 1 – 11 and 13 must be completed prior Exercise 14 (solo)</p> <p>Justification: With the current wording it would be possible to skip several exercises prior initial solo – that is probably not the intent.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency agrees with your statement that 3.1. describes only that the numbering should be used as an exercise reference list and that the order can be changed.</p> <p>The Agency will add your proposal as an additional item 3.3. (actual 3.3. will be re-numbered). Taking into account some other comments on the order of this content list and some problems indicated with the exercise "soaring techniques", the Agency decided to change the order of the exercises slightly in order to address all these proposals. Exercise 12 has not to be completed necessarily before the first solo flight.</p>
comment	<p>6333 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DSvU</i></span></p> <p>AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S Ex. 4 to Ex. 17</p> <p>Comment: The sentence "lookout procedures" is used 9 times</p> <p>Proposal: Reduce it to once or twice.</p> <p>Justification: It is, from an early stage, expected from the student to have a good lookout procedure – don't have to mention it continuously.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency was not aware that the term "lookout procedures" was used exactly 9 times. However, the Agency does not agree with your proposal and will keep all the remarks regarding lookout procedures as it was included on purpose as a very important training item which should not be covered with only a general statement in the introduction.</p> <p>As this syllabus with all its specific sub-issues for each exercise will be used to develop a training plan or to provide information for the training organisations, the student pilots, the instructors and the examiners the Agency is of the opinion that these repetitive remarks should be kept.</p> <p>Furthermore, it should be highlighted that the lookout procedures when joining a thermal might be different from the ones to be used when doing some ridge soaring activities or when joining the circuit. As there are some specifics for each of these situations the term should be kept in each of these exercise descriptions.</p>

comment	<p>6335</p> <p>comment by: <i>DSvU</i></p> <p>AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S</p> <p>Ex. 4</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>At no point during the flight training is "change of aircraft control" mentioned.</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>Insert a bullet in Ex. 4 stating: "Change of aircraft control"</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>Student must learn the importance of always knowing who is flying the glider. This is done by "challenge and response" I.e. "You have control / I have control"</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency agrees that this is an important item. However, as it is more a methodological issue for the instructor than a real content of one of the exercises the Agency will not follow your proposal to add it in exercise 4 "Initial Air Experience".</p> <p>As it is more related to the instructor's responsibilities the Agency will add this issue in AMC to FCL.930.LAFI which is the training course content for the instructor.</p>

comment	<p>6337</p> <p>comment by: <i>DSvU</i></p> <p>AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S</p> <p>Ex. 5</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>The use of trim should be introduced earlier than in Ex. 7</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>Insert an extra bullet in Ex.5 stating "Use of trim"</p> <p>Delete same bullet from Ex.7</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>Use of trim needs to be introduced as early as possible to ease the control of the glider.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency agrees in general that the trim should be used already very early in order to ease the control of the glider (elevator - hand forces).</p> <p>If this should be done already in exercise 5 "effect of controls" (as proposed by you), if it should be shown as a separate additional exercise or as proposed by the Agency based on the input received by the sailplane licensing experts during the drafting phase in exercise 7 "Straight Flying" this should be decided by the instructor.</p> <p>As you already mentioned in one of your other comments, this AMC mentions</p>



under 3.2. that the exercises may be combined, may be taught in different flights or a different order. This will allow the instructor to introduce the trim at any time but later when introducing exercise number 7.

The Agency will therefore not follow your proposal and keep the wording of exercise 7 as proposed including the use of the trim.

comment

6339

comment by: *DSvU*

AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S  
Ex. 11

Comment:

There is not mentioned anything about "Release procedures" (from cable/rope) in any of the launch Exercises.

Proposal:

Add a bullet to 11A, 11B, 11D and 11E stating: "Release procedures"

Justification:

"Release" is an important part of several launch methods, and must be practiced.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees with your proposal to add the release procedures and will add it as proposed. As the release procedure during bungee launch normally cannot be influenced by the pilot in command the Agency believes that this topic is already covered with the item "use of the launch equipment". Based on this the term "release procedures" will not be added in 11E.

comment

6342

comment by: *DSvU*

AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S  
Ex. 12

Comment:

Soaring techniques with thermalling, ridge and wave flying is placed prior Ex. 14 solo, and require specific weather condition to be completed.

Proposal:

Move Ex. 12 to after Ex. 14.

Justification:

Seasons and or local conditions may prevent the student from flying Ex. 12 prior solo. Even though it is moved to after Ex. 14, it does not prevent the IP from using available thermals etc. in an earlier stage.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees with your proposal and will change the order. Based on your additional comment asking for a clarification that certain exercises have

to be completed prior the first solo flight the order of the exercises will be changed in order to address this. (exercise 12 "soaring techniques" will be moved to be number 15)

comment

6344

comment by: DSvU

AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S  
Ex. 15

Comment:

Ex 15 bullet 3 reads: "recoveries from unusual attitudes, including spiral dives"

Proposal:

Move mentioned bullet prior solo.

Justification:

It is essential that the student learn to recover from unusual attitudes and steep turns prior solo.

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency does not accept your proposal based on the fact that the exercises 9 "Stalling" and 10 "Spin recognition and avoidance" have to be completed before the first solo flight. The Agency believes that these exercises will guarantee sufficient training on this kind of unusual attitudes in order to be able to fly solo.

Exercise 15 should contain the 45° bank turns but also repeat the stall and spin avoidance and the recoveries from unusual attitudes. This should be kept and no change will be introduced at this stage.

comment

6348

comment by: DSvU

AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S  
Ex. 15 to Ex. 17

Comment:

There is no requirement mentioned to fly any of these exercises solo, and there is not mentioned the possibility to fly some exercises solo.

Proposal:

Add an Ex. 14B reading:

Add a requirement to fly both dual and solo Exercises after initial solo.

Justification:

Many clubs depend on only one dual trainer. It is proven cost effective to include a single seat trainer to relieve the usage of the dual trainer.

It is important that the student learn to fly a pre-briefed program with several manoeuvres, so he/she learn to adjust for unforeseen issues (i.e. insufficient altitude to fly all the briefed manoeuvres) – this should be done dual prior solo.

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees in general that most of these exercises (there might be quite some instructors who are not willing to send a student solo for practicing exercise 10 - fully developed spins) should be flown during the during training but as well during the required solo flights.

However, the Agency does not believe that it is necessary and wise to put such an additional requirement in the AMC material as FCL.110.S already requires at least 2 hours of solo flight time which will contain more or less the all the exercises in the second part of the syllabus (after first solo).

Based on the input received and on the evaluation of the existing national requirements, the Agency decided to introduce the mandatory cross-country flight (see the resulting text for FCL.110.S). This flight can be completed with an instructor or as a solo cross-country flight.

Due to local specificities or weather related problems it might happen that some of the exercises cannot be flown solo

comment

6353

comment by: *DSvU*

AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S Ex. 17

Comment:

Use of radio and phraseology.

Proposal:

Make this item optional.

Justification:

There should not be a requirement to have a Radio Certificate. Only where it is necessary to comply with local regulations.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency has understood that the use of a radio as a training item for the exercise "cross-country flying" should be only optional as it seems that in several Member States the use of the radio is not required for sailplane operations.

Although the Agency strongly believes that the knowledge and experience (if you have not done it during the training you will have problems to do it later on) gained with such an exercise would be an important training item during a cross-country flight (see also the item "procedures for transiting regulated airspace"), the additional term "if applicable" will be added.

comment

6644

comment by: *Oxford Gliding Club*

Exercise 10.

As a club, Oxford believe that full spin training is essential to safe gliding. In thermalling flight, the glider may be flown close to the stalling point and while an inadvertent spin is unlikely, it is certainly possible, especially for low-currency pilots or type conversion flights.

Most gliders are single seaters, and thus safety pilots for type conversions

cannot be carried. Hence familiarity with all possible flight regimes is a valuable safety aid.

Exercise 12a: thermalling.

The proposal is that thermalling must be taught during training. The opportunity to teach and demonstrate thermalling techniques depend on the chance encounters with thermals. For winch only sites this certainly cannot be planned for.

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

Regarding the issue of introducing a "spinning exercise" please see the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

As to your second issue please see the response already provided to the appropriate BGA comment No. 572 in the same segment above.

It should be highlighted that the justification provided ("For winch only sites this certainly cannot be planned for") is not understood as a lot of clubs in different Member States are actually operating on a "winch only" airfield which does not prevent them from doing long distance cross-country flights by using thermals. The Agency does not accept this reasoning.

comment 6656

comment by: *David PYE*

Exercise 10: Spin recognition and avoidance and developed spins

- safety checks
- stalling and recovery at the incipient spin stage (stall with excessive wing drop, about 45deg)
- Instructor induced distractions during the spin entry
- entry into fully developed spins
- recognition of full spins
- standard spin recovery

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

Regarding the issue of introducing a "spinning exercise" please see the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment 6691

comment by: *Croft Brown*

AMC TO FCL.110.S AND TO FCL.210.S

FLIGHT INSTRUCTION FOR THE LEISURE PILOT (SAILPLANE) AND THE SAILPLANE LICENCE (SPL)

3. SYLLABUS OF FLIGHT INSTRUCTION

Exercise 10: Spin recognition and avoidance

Page 243

&

AMC to FCL.930.LAFI

Light Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course

PART 2 C. Sailplanes

Page 441

Note: Although exercise 11B is not required for the LPL course, it is a requirement for the LAFI course.

NPA Proposal

Full spinning is not included

Comment:

UK gliding experience and safety data is that full spinning must be included in each syllabus. The BGA is very keen to see the requirement for full spin training to be retained for LPL(S) & SPL!

Croft Brown endorses the BGA Proposal

Exercise 10: Spin recognition and avoidance and developed spins

- safety checks
- stalling and recovery at the incipient spin stage (stall with excessive wing drop, about 45deg)
- Instructor induced distractions during the spin entry
- entry into fully developed spins
- recognition of full spins
- standard spin recovery

response *Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

Regarding the issue of introducing a "spinning exercise", please see the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above and the response already provided on your comment to AMC to FCL.930.LAFI.

comment

6693

comment by: *Croft Brown*

Exercise Numbering

Page 242 to 246

AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S

FLIGHT INSTRUCTION FOR THE LEISURE PILOT (SAILPLANES) AND THE SAILPLANE PILOT LICENCE

&

Pages 440 & 441

AMC TO FCL.930.LAFI

Light Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course

PART 2 C. Sailplanes

The exercise numbers do not match

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing this comment but as this is a duplicate of comment No. 362 please see the response for comment No. 362 (BGA).

comment

6695

comment by: *Croft Brown*

AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S

SYLLABUS OF FLIGHT INSTRUCTION

NPA Proposal

Exercise 12A: Thermalling.

Comment:

In common with other maritime nations, the UK has several coastal gliding clubs where thermal flying is available only intermittently. As a result it may be difficult for some clubs to teach this as a practical exercise. Where this is the case we would wish to allow those clubs to satisfy the training requirement

	<p>through practical &amp; theoretical briefings.          Croft Brown endorses the BGA Proposal          Exercise 12A Thermalling (if applicable during training and if possible at training site)          Note: If weather conditions during training do not allow the practical training of soaring techniques, all items of the air exercise have to be discussed and explained during a long briefing exercise only.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your opinion.</p> <p>See the response provided to comment No. 572 (BGA) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p>7186 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b>          AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S para 2.1  <b>Page No:</b>          241 of 647  <b>Comment:</b>          The use of the expression "threat and error management" is too loose and needs to be aligned with the exercise of NTS by the applicant.  <b>Justification:</b>          Consistency across licence skill tests.  <b>Proposed Text:</b>  <b>(if applicable)</b>          Amend to read;          " principles of <del>threat and error management</del> <i>non-technical skills...</i>".</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.          The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.</p>
comment	<p>7191 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b>          AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S para 3.2  <b>Page No:</b>          242 of 647  <b>Comment:</b>          The use of the expression "good airmanship" is too loose and needs to be aligned with the exercise of NTS by the applicant.  <b>Justification:</b>          Consistency across licence skill tests.  <b>Proposed Text:</b>  <b>(if applicable)</b>          Amend to read;          ".. needs of <del>good airmanship</del> <i>non-technical skills and...</i>".</p>

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.

The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment

7193

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL.110.B and to FCL.210.B para 2.1

**Page No:**

241 of 647

**Comment:**

The use of the expression "threat and error management" is too loose and needs to be aligned with the exercise of NTS by the applicant.

**Justification:**

Consistency across licence skill tests.

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Amend to read;

" principles of ~~threat and error management~~ *non-technical skills...*".

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.

The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

The wording used ("threat and error management") will be kept at this stage.

comment

7379

comment by: Roger STARLING

Exercise 10:

Due to the proximity to the stall at which glider pilots operate, recovery from a full spin is a vital training exercise. It would be irresponsible not to include this as a compulsory exercise.

response

*Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

Regarding the issue of introducing a "spinning exercise", please see the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment

7404

comment by: David Chapman

full spin training is needed for both recognition and recovery, particularly as

the so qualified pilot can then easilly progress to passenger flying, when increased workload can increase possibility for undetected approach to spin-risk conditions.

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

Regarding the issue of introducing a "spinning exercise", please see the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment 7725

comment by: *Roger Hurley*

Page 243 exercise 10 should include experience of and development of skills in recovery from a fully developed spin. It is crucial that trainee pilots experience a full spin and know what to do in the event. Useless to realise when inadvertently spinning that 1) I've never done this before, 2) this is really disconcerting, and 3) what do I do now?

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

Regarding the issue of introducing a "spinning exercise", please see the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment 7838

comment by: *Dick Dixon*

I have over 1,800 hours instructing in gliders including examining and instructor training. I am convinced that we need to continue to instruct full spin and recovery techniques in gliders. Whilst not all 2-seater training gliders will spin readily, I have never flown a single- seater which will not spin readily if provoked - and some do not need very much provoking. ( I have flown 40 types of 2-seater glider and 66 types of single seater).

I strongly recommend that spin training continue to be included in the gliding ab-initio syllabus.

response *Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

Regarding the issue of introducing a "spinning exercise", please see the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment 7852

comment by: *Tim FREEGARDE*

I support the BGA proposal to include full spinning in the gliding syllabus.

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

Regarding the issue of introducing a "spinning exercise", please see the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.



comment	7872	comment by: <i>Graham Bishop</i>
	Current practice requires full spinning this should be retained as part of the syllabus	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	The Agency acknowledges your opinion.	
	Regarding the issue of introducing a "spinning exercise", please see the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.	
comment	8033	comment by: <i>Andy Balkwill</i>
	It is worrying that Exercise 10 does not include training for recovery from full spins. Given the high proportion of time flying relatively close to the stall and the consequence of yaw being present leading to a spin the British Gliding Association (BGA) has always emphasised the importance of spin avoidance and recovery training. As a BGA instructor I consider this approach to be entirely correct. Although clearly the NPA represents minimum standards and there would presumably be no impediment to including additional requirements such as full spins, it is concerning that EASA do not appear to recognise the importance of this issue. I urge you to reconsider and include full spinning in the syllabus.	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	The Agency acknowledges your opinion.	
	Regarding the issue of introducing a "spinning exercise", please see the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.	
comment	8041	comment by: <i>Nick Hill</i>
	The syllabus of flight instruction excersise 10: Spin recognition and avoidance makes no mention of training in full spinning. As sailplanes spend a significant time circling, often near the stall, I believe taht full spin training should be taught. This should include a trainee pilot being able to demonstrate full spin entry and recovery.	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	The Agency acknowledges your opinion.	
	Regarding the issue of introducing a "spinning exercise", please see the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.	
comment	8045	comment by: <i>Nick Hill</i>
	Excersise 12A Thermalling under the Syllabus of flight training mandates the section on Thermalling. The oppertunity to teach and demonstrate thermalling techniques depends on the weather conditions and availability of thermals. In the UK for at least one third of the year this may not be possible and for some clubs located near coasts this may be even more limited. Whilst a saiplane pilot will need to learn these skills to fly cross country I believe it should be	
	Excersie 12A Thermalling (if applicable during training and if possible at the	

	training site) in line with section 12B ridge flying and 12 Wave flying.
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your opinion.</p> <p>See the response provided to comment No. 572 (BGA) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p><b>8062</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Lasham gliding society</i></span></p> <p>The NPA proposal states that full spinning is not required for the issue of a licence. as the Chief instructor at a large gliding operation i feel that full spinning and recovery has to be included in the pre -licence syllabus</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your opinion.</p> <p>Regarding the issue of introducing a "spinning exercise", please see the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p><b>8172</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Richard GREENAWAY</i></span></p> <p>I would like to make a suporting comment to the suggestions made by Bob Boyd CFI of Shalbourne Soaring society here in the UK.. Any infringements on our current levels of air space would make the sport almost pointless and unworkable. #3508</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>However, it must be pointed out that the Agency is not aware about the suggestions made by Mr. B. Boyd in the UK. Secondly, it must be highlighted that this part is dealing with licensing issues but not with airspace related issues.</p>
comment	<p><b>8299</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Paul Mc G</i></span></p> <p>Flight instruction for the leisure pilot licence (sailplane) and The sailplane pilot licence (spl) 3. Syllabus of flight instruction Exercise 10: Spin recognition and avoidance. There seem to be some problems here.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your opinion.</p> <p>You spotted "some problems" but without mentioning them clearly. The Agency assumes that you are also referring to the BGA comment on this exercise in which this organisation proposes to introduce a "spinning exercise". Please see the response provided to comment No. 258 (BGA) in the same segment above.</p>

comment	8302	comment by: <i>Paul Mc G</i>
	<p>Flight instruction for the leisure pilot (sailplanes) and the Sailplane pilot licence  P 40 -441  AMC TO FCL.930.LAFI  Light Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course  PART 2 C. Sailplanes</p> <p>The exercise numbers do not match</p>	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	
	<p>Thank you for providing this comment but as this is a duplicate of comment No. 362 please see the response for comment No. 362 (BGA).</p>	

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence  
LPL - AMC to FCL.135.S and FCL.225.S - Extension of privileges to touring motor gliders - LPL(S) and SPL** p. 247-253

comment	665	comment by: <i>FOCA Switzerland</i>
	<p>Subpart B  AMC to FCL.135.S and FCL.225.S</p> <p><b>Crediting of theoretical knowledge for the issue of a pilot licence in another category shall only be possible if such examination on the common subjects contains the same level for all categories.</b></p>	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	<p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency agrees with your general statement that full crediting for a certain subject (pilot licence in another category) should only be given if the same content was already covered.</p> <p>In general, all the common subjects mentioned in FCL.120 are exactly the same for all four LPL categories and for the PPL in these categories.</p> <p>However, it should be pointed out that this AMC to FCL.135.S and FCL.225.S is dealing only with the extension of privileges for an LPL(S) holder or an SPL holder to TMG. No crediting is provided as this theoretical knowledge instruction will be only an "ad-on" for SPL or LPL(S) holder who already completed most of the theoretical knowledge instruction for the sailplane licence.</p> <p>The text of the Implementing Rule will be amended in order to reflect the contents mentioned in the AMC. The subject "Principles of Flight" will be added.</p>	
comment	4796	comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i>
	<p>Theoretical knowledge subjects are different from those foreseen in FCL.135.S</p>	
response	<i>Noted</i>	

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The text of the Implementing Rule will be amended in order to reflect the contents mentioned in the AMC. The subject "Principles of Flight" will be added.

comment **5038** comment by: *George Knight*

3.4 Hydraulics

**Recommend:**

Remove this bullet point. The only hydraulics are likely to be the pedal operated brakes which are covered in the following bullet. I've never encounters a TMG with an engine operated hydraulic pump

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees with your statement and will amend the text accordingly.

comment **5039** comment by: *George Knight*

3.4 Measurement of aerodynamic parameters

**Recommend:**

Remove this requirement - it does not seem to cover anything not already covered by the previous bullet point "instrument and indication systems"

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The items contained in the syllabus are based on the JAR-FCL syllabus for aeroplanes. Some specific TMG related issues were chosen as an add-on to the already provided subjects for the SPL or LPL(S).

However, the Agency does agree with your proposal and will amend the text accordingly.

comment **5042** comment by: *George Knight*

Exercise 3 - air traffic control procedures

**Comment**

This should be where available - many/most sailplane/TMG airfields do not have.

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency reviewed this issue but only agrees to a certain degree as it is the opinion of the Agency that this item of the exercise 3 "Taxiing" should be trained at a certain stage.

Based on the fact that this can be instructed also during the cross-country

flight training (which will have to include another airfield anyway), the Agency agrees with your proposal to add "if applicable" in exercise 3. This item will be added in exercise 15 (Navigation).

comment **5043** comment by: *George Knight*

Exercise 6

"-Side slipping (or suitable types)"

Correct spelling of **or** to **on**.

response *Accepted*

Thank you for identifying this editorial mistake.  
The Agency agrees and will amend the text accordingly.

comment **5044** comment by: *George Knight*

Exercise 7. Last line page 249.

Most TMGs do not have a gyro heading indicator so will need to use timed rate 1 turns.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your response.

The Agency agrees and will change the "and" into "or" in order to allow timed rate 1 turns and not to require a gyro heading indicator.

comment **5051** comment by: *George Knight*

Exercise 10

**Comment**

Few TMGs have flaps, they usually have air-brakes. Several of the proposed tasks in this exercise assume flaps. Specifically:

- effect of wind on approach and touchdown speeds, **use of flaps**
- **short landing...** (the exercise is not the same with airbrakes as with flaps)
- **flapless approach**

**Suggest:**

Rephrase as required to cater for TMGs instead of SEPs.

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees in general that in most cases the TMG is not equipped with flaps, slats or spoilers but with airbrakes as used also in most sailplanes.

Based on this fact the wording in exercise 10 has to be amended. An additional exercise "Use of flaps or airbrakes" will be introduced. As to the issue "Flapless approach and landing" the term "if applicable" will be added. The item "short

landing" will be kept unchanged as it can be flown with all the different flap/airbrake systems.

comment	5054	comment by: <i>George Knight</i>
	Exercise 12	
	What is the relevance of 'engine cooling' to a forced landing without power?	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	
	The Agency agrees and will delete this item.	

comment	5113	comment by: <i>Diether Memmert</i>
	<p>Der vorliegende Entwurf, NPA 2008-17a+b+c, verfehlt, was den nichtgewerblichen Teil auf dem Sektor Segelflug und TMG (recreational aviation) angeht, in einigen Punkten seine originäre Aufgabe, nämlich Sicherheit <b>gegenüber Dritten unter Beachtung der Verhältnismäßigkeit</b> zu gewährleisten.</p> <p>Mehr Sicherheit wird nicht durch weitere Überprüfungen, Auflagen und bloße Behauptungen erreicht. Daß es auch anders sehr gut funktioniert, wurde mit dem richtigen Augenmaß an Vorschriften in den letzten mehr als fünfzig Jahren u.a. im Bereich des DAeC nachgewiesen. Und dies betraf mehr als die Hälfte der europäischen Segelflieger, also eine sicher aussagekräftige Mehrheit!</p> <p>In den Flugvereinen des DAeC wurde eine vorbildliche Leistung mit gutem Sicherheitsstandard bei Ausbildung, In-Übunghaltung, sowie Weiterbildung von Piloten und Fluglehrern in weitgehend ehrenamtlicher Tätigkeit erbracht. Dies sollte sicherlich für die gesamte EU als Richtschnur dienen können.</p> <p>Aus dem angeblichen Sicherheitsaspekt wird hier nur ein weiterer Überprüfungsproporz im Freizeitpilotenbereich aufgebaut, der aber gegenüber der bewährten deutschen Vereinsausbildung ausschließlich die Kosten erhöht. Die soziale Kompetenz von Vereinen und die Vorteile einer freiwillig „überwachten“ ehrenamtlichen Vereinsumgebung werden ignoriert, der Aspekt der Eigenverantwortlichkeit des Piloten wird völlig unterdrückt.</p> <p>Es ist eben nicht richtig, daß ein System, das sicherlich im gewerblichen Bereich seine Gültigkeit hat, auch einfach dem Freizeitsport übergestülpt werden kann.</p> <p>Der vorgeschlagene verwaltungstechnische Überbau (FIE, ATO, Beschränkung der Gültigkeit mit periodischer fliegerischer Überprüfung, etc.) ist unnötig und kostet die Piloten (aus ihrer Tasche!) nur zusätzliche Gebühren. Diese Mittel fehlen dann für Erlangung von mehr Flugpraxis. Diese war aber schon immer das wirkungsvollste Mittel zum Erhalt ausreichender Flugsicherheit!</p> <p>Diese Aufgaben haben bei uns mit Erfolg die Segelfluglehrer mit uebernommen.</p> <p>Ein modernes, auf Förderung und Wachstum des Luftsports gerichtetes Regelwerk muß sich am Autoführerschein für Erwerb und Erhalt orientieren. Nur so kann sich auch erfolgreich eine Hinführung des Nachwuchses zum Interesse an direkten und indirekten fliegerischen Berufen entwickeln.</p> <p>Dipl.-Ing. TU Diether Memmert, Segelflugpilot seit 1953 mit &gt;8500 Flugstunden</p> <p><b>Aenderungen:</b></p> <p>2. Streiche den gesamten Absatz.</p>	

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.

However, as it is again your standard comment containing general statements not related to this AMC containing the syllabus for the TMG extension the Agency is not able to provide a substantiated response.

Your short additional remark on item 2 is proposing to delete this sentence which asks the ATO to issue a certificate of satisfactory completion of the training. The Agency does not agree at all with your proposal as long as you have not explained your alternative solution how the "paperwork" has to be done in order to allow the competent authority to issue the licence. As it is an AMC, you can propose an alternative AMC on this issue if really necessary.

No change required.

comment

6298

comment by: *Jonathan Coote*

Section 3 is entirely over-prescriptive and should be under the remit of the British Gliding Association which is uniquely experienced and able to tailor and update such syllabi to grass-roots requirements.

response

*Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.

Please see also the comment already provided to AMC to FCL.110.S and to FCL.210.S.

Section 3 contains the theoretical knowledge syllabus for the pure sailplane pilot in order to act as a pilot-in-command on a TMG. The Agency considers the items mentioned as necessary to reach a satisfactory level of knowledge required nowadays to conduct flights with a TMG throughout Europe. As most of these issues are agreed, standards for operating a powered aircraft in most Member States and no specific example is provided which of the items mentioned should be deleted the Agency is not able to provide a substantiated response.

The Member States will not any longer be able to establish a national syllabus different from this one but they will be able to propose a different syllabus as an alternative AMC. If the organisation mentioned by you "is uniquely experienced and able to tailor and update such syllabi", nothing will prevent them from proposing an alternative AMC to the competent authority for approval.

comment

6373

comment by: *DSvU*

AMC to FCL.135.S and FCL.225.S

Comment:

1. "The aim of the flight training is to qualify.....on a TMG"

Proposal:

Delete the entire paragraph.

	<p>Justification:          There is an increasing need for educating directly on TMG without being dependant on a full glider pilot education prior conversion to TMG          The option of extending the privileges from LPL(S) and SPL to TMG is still an option with the reduced requirements as stated in FCL.135.S</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>However, the Agency has not understood the reasoning behind your comment.</p> <p>It should be clarified that this AMC is only providing the training syllabus for the additional training required in FCL.135.S in order to extend the privileges of an SPL or LPL(S) holder to act as pilot-in-command on TMGs.</p> <p>If - as stated by you - there is a need to instruct directly on TMG but "without being dependant on a full glider pilot education" the LPL(A) or PPL(A) route will be the best and only solution. The Agency does not intend to delete the first sentence of this AMC because a similar sentence is also used in FCL.135.S. Please check this requirement and the resulting text provided.</p>

comment	<p>6374 <span style="float: right;">comment by: DSvU</span></p> <p>AMC to FCL.135.S and FCL.225.S</p> <p>Comment:          2. "The approved training organisation..... the training"</p> <p>Proposal:          Change the paragraph to read. <i>If extending privileges from LPL(S)/SPL, the approved training organization should issue a certificate of satisfactory completion Of the training.</i></p> <p>Justification:          The approved training organization should still be able to issue the license in case of extension from LPL(S)/SPL</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>However, the Agency will not change the sentence in 2 as this is a standardised procedure which will allow the competent authority to check the training provided before issuing the licence. As a general requirement endorsement on the licence or extensions of the privileges have to be endorsed by the competent authority. The ATO will not be allowed to do so.</p> <p>No change of the wording is required.</p>
comment	<p>6377 <span style="float: right;">comment by: DSvU</span></p> <p>AMC to FCL.135.S and FCL.225.S</p> <p>Comment:          Ex 4, 5, 6, 8A, 8B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 all use the bullet: "Airmanship"</p>



	<p>Proposal: Reduce the amount or delete all</p> <p>Justification It is always expected that a student uses good airmanship – don't have to mention it in almost all exercises.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency partially agrees and will do a careful review of the item "airmanship". As a future rulemaking task the issue of non technical skills will be further evaluated and a general wording will be defined at a later stage. In the meantime the JAR-FCL based terms like "airmanship" have to be used in order to address this issue.</p>

comment	<p>6378 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DSvU</i></span></p> <p>AMC to FCL.135.S and FCL.225.S</p> <p>Comment: Ex 14A Departure – Use of radio</p> <p>Proposal: Make this item optional</p> <p>Justification: There should not be a requirement to have a Radio Certificate. Only where it is necessary to comply with local regulations.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>However, the Agency does not agree that the use of the radio should be an optional item for the flight instruction on TMGs. As the student pilot has to conduct a solo cross-country flight to another airfield, will cross-regulated airspace, should contact flight information service he/she should be trained how to do this.</p> <p>The exercise item "Use of the radio" cannot be a voluntary item and will be kept therefore.</p>

comment	<p>6379 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DSvU</i></span></p> <p>AMC to FCL.135.S and FCL.225.S</p> <p>Comment: Ex 14B: Navigation problem at lower level and in reduced visibility</p> <p>Proposal: Delete "and in reduced visibility"</p> <p>Justification:</p>
---------	--

response

The term "reduced visibility" is not clearly defined. Even if it was it might be difficult to experience this in some geographical locations.

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the Agency does not agree. This is already an accepted training item in the powered aircraft syllabus in most of the Member States as the accident cause "VFR flight in marginal weather conditions" is still one of the main factors for fatal accidents (CFIT accidents - see exercise training item "vertical situational awareness").

The Agency does not understand the problems mentioned in your comment and will keep this exercise unchanged. It will be at the discretion of the instructor to decide when to do this exercise.

comment

6380

comment by: DSvU

AMC to FCL.135.S and FCL.225.S

Comment:

The Exercises need to be adjusted to allow AMC to FCL.135.S and FCL.225.S (TMG) as a stand alone education. This can be done by "borrowing" exercises from AMC to FCL.210.A "Flight Instruction for the private pilot license – aeroplane" After the adjustment, a renumbering will be required.

Alternately AMC No 1 to FCL.110.BA/H Flight Instruction for the basic leisure pilot license – Basic LPL(A) can be used.

Proposal:

Insert AMC to FCL.210.A "Flight Instruction for the Private Pilot License – Aeroplane" Ex 3 and 4 between the TMG Ex 2 and 3.

Ex 3 and 4 to be inserted read:

*Exercise 3: Air experience*

*– flight exercise*

*Exercise 4: Effects of controls*

*– primary effects when laterally level and when banked*

*– further effects of aileron and rudder*

*– effects of:*

*– airspeed*

*– slipstream*

*– power*

*– trimming controls*

*– flaps*

*– other controls, as applicable*

*– operation of:*

*– mixture control*

*– carburettor heat*

*– cabin heating/ventilation*

*– airmanship*

Justification:

These following adjustments will justify a complete education on TMG, without the need to complete the syllabus for gliders beforehand. However the academics and the academics exam must be taken as for LPL(S) and SPL.

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response already provided to your comment No. 6373 in the same segment above.

The Agency already clearly stated that there will be no "stand-alone education" on TMG with this AMC as this syllabus has to be read in conjunction with the requirement FCL.135.S which is clearly an add-on for the LPL(S) or SPL holder.

There is no need to "borrow" exercises from the LPL(A) syllabus because the only way to receive the privilege to fly a TMG without a full SPL / LPL will be anyway the LPL(A) route.

comment

6382

comment by: *DSvU*

AMC to FCL.135.S and FCL.225.S

Comment:

The Exercises need to be adjusted to allow AMC to FCL.135.S and FCL.225.S (TMG) as a stand alone education. This can be done by "borrowing" exercises from AMC to FCL.210.A "Flight Instruction for the private pilot license – aeroplane" After the adjustment, a renumbering will be required

Proposal:

Insert AMC to FCL.210.A "Flight Instruction for the Private Pilot License – Aeroplane" Ex 11 including note 1 and 2 between the TMG Ex 8B and 9.

Ex 11 with notes to be inserted read:

*Exercise 11: Spin avoidance*

- *airmanship*

- *safety checks*

- *stalling and recovery at the incipient spin stage (stall with excessive wing drop,*

*about 45°)*

- *instructor induced distractions during the stall*

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response already provided to your comment No. 6373 in the same segment above.

The Agency already clearly stated that there will be no "stand-alone education" on TMG with this AMC as this syllabus has to be read in conjunction with the requirement FCL.135.S which is clearly an add-on for the LPL(S) or SPL holder.

There is no need to "borrow" exercises from the LPL(A) syllabus because the only way to receive the privilege to fly a TMG without a full SPL/LPL will be anyway the LPL(A) route.

comment

6384

comment by: *DSvU*

AMC to FCL.135.S and FCL.225.S

## Comment:

The Exercises need to be adjusted to allow AMC to FCL.135.S and FCL.225.S (TMG) as a stand alone education. This can be done by "borrowing" exercises from AMC to FCL.210.A "Flight Instruction for the private pilot license – aeroplane" After the adjustment, a renumbering will be required

## Proposal:

Insert AMC to FCL.210.A Ex 14 between TMG Ex 9/10E and 11.

*Ex 14 to be inserted read:*

*Exercise 14: First solo*

*– instructor's briefing, observation of flight and debriefing*

*NOTE: During flights immediately following the solo circuit consolidation the following should be revised.*

- procedures for leaving and rejoining the circuit*
- the local area, restrictions, map reading*
- use of radio aids for homing*
- turns using magnetic compass, compass errors*
- airmanship*

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response already provided to your comment No. 6373 in the same segment above.

The Agency already clearly stated that there will be no "stand-alone education" on TMG with this AMC as this syllabus has to be read in conjunction with the requirement FCL.135.S which is clearly an add-on for the LPL(S) or SPL holder.

There is no need to "borrow" exercises from the LPL(A) syllabus because the only way to receive the privilege to fly a TMG without a full SPL/LPL will be anyway the LPL(A) route.

comment 6385

comment by: *DSvU*

FCL.135.S (1)

## Comment:

The holder of a LPL(S) may have an extension to TMG by having completed 4 hours of dual instruction.

## Proposal:

That requirement should be replaced to a number of hours judged by a FI or, if not accepted, reduced to 2 hours of dual instruction.

## Justification:

Many TMG's are as easy to handle as any other sailplane, e.g. SF-25, and there is no need at all for 4 hours dual instruction.

A FI should be able to assess which training is appropriate for a student – otherwise his/hers ability should be considered as insufficient.

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

It seems that your comment has been addressed to the wrong segment as this segment contains the AMC but not the rule text. Please study also the responses already provided in the appropriate segment for FCL.135.S and the resulting text.

The proposed 4 hours dual flight training (at least) will be kept as the Agency considers them necessary to cover the dual exercises proposed with the training syllabus. Please calculate the necessary flight time for the all the exercises (including a cross-country training flight to other airfields) and you will immediately agree that this cannot be done within 2 hours.

comment 6967 comment by: CAA CZ

Section 3 it should be taught also subject 3.5 Navigation. But in FCL.135.S (page 16) this subject is not stated among other subjects.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the comment is slightly wrong with spotting this mistake. Please check the rule text in FCL.135.S and you will discover that the subject Navigation is already mentioned.

The Agency realised that the subject "Principles of Flight" was missing and will add it in FCL.135.S.

comment 8151 comment by: William Treacy

No reference to stopping or starting engine in flight. No reference to landing the aircraft with the engine stopped.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees that an exercise item "stopping and starting the engine" should be included. The exercise 12 (Forced landing without power) already contains most of the mentioned elements. This exercise might be trained in the beginning also at other airfield before simulating such a forced landing in "outlanding" conditions. Based on this and on the fact that the pre-requisite is to hold an SPL or LPL(S) (which includes a lot of pure sailplane landings) the exercise "landing with the engine stopped" is already covered.

However, for the other item the Agency will add an additional exercise called: "Stopping and re-starting the engine".

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence  
LPL - AMC to FCL.110.B and to FCL.210.B - Flight instruction for the  
leisure pilot licence - Balloon flight instruction for the balloon pilot licence  
(BPL)** p. 254-262

comment 235 comment by: Paul SPELLWARD

I congratulate EASA on this excellent, thorough and complete instruction

	specification for BPL & LPL(B). This will ensure consistent and high standards in all member states.
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this positive feedback on the proposals for the LPL(B) and BPL syllabus.</p>
comment	<p>1953 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch</i></span></p> <p><b>The definition of the syllabus is too restrictive with respect to the EC Regulations 216/2008 on common rules in civil aviation (Basic Regulations)</b></p> <p>Proof:</p> <p>1) Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations call for the knowledge of " non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors." This is NOT "“threat and error management”!</p> <p>2) §(16) of the Basic Regulations principles claim for a "promotion of a "culture of safety"</p> <p>3) "threat and error management" is a special approach and methodology not accepted by all. More modern and general accepted techniques exist (see my comments on TEM, definitions error and error management and the Basic Regulations of the EC.</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>Exchange "The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles of threat and error management and also cover:"</p> <p>by "The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles <u>of human performance and limitations and non-technical skills with regard to flight safety</u> and also cover:"</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task. The Agency would like to suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.</p>
comment	<p>2791 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>David COURT</i></span></p> <p>The exercises are well explained and split the training elements down very well</p>
response	<i>Noted</i>

Thank you for providing this positive feedback on the proposals for the LPL(B) and BPL syllabus.

comment

2897

comment by: *Jeremy Hinton*

With respect to Exercises 6,7, and 8. : the 'Hands-off / Hands-on' procedure devolves control from the pilot to the ground crew. Control and responsibility rest with the pilot if the quick-release method is used. 'Hands-off / Hands-on' is a legacy procedure dating from before the quick release was in universal use. It may be of some help with weighting off, but it is the assessment of lift, and a lift-off under the control of the pilot which should be the essential components of the exercise.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing this comment.

The Agency agrees completely with your statement that nowadays the use of the quick release should be the common procedure which means that the traditional method "Hands -off/Hands-on" should only be used for the weighing off but not as a "stand-alone" take-off procedure.

However, as this was already recognised during the drafting, the Agency decided to include the "hand-off/Hands on" procedures in the mentioned exercises before mentioning the item "use of the quick release" in order to make clear that the "Hands-off/Hands-on" procedures are only supporting actions but not the final "take-off method".

In order to make this even more clear, the Agency will take your input into account and will add the item "assessment of lift". It is for the responsibility of the instructor to teach the correct techniques which will not endanger the ground crew.

comment

3790

comment by: *Klaus HARTMANN*

Flight instruction for the LPL(B) and BPL

Im 2.1 flight instruction syllabus für LPL(B) und BPL ist unter Punkt (i) und in Exercise 21 der tethered flight zur Ausbildung aufgeführt. Der tethered flight stellt eine besondere Betriebsform dar für die der Ballon eigentlich ungeeignet ist, da sehr hohe Kräfte am Ballon durch Wind und Turbulenzen auftreten können die nicht ungefährlich sind und oft unterschätzt werden. Daher ist eine besonders sorgfältige Ausbildung erforderlich. Andererseits ist nicht anzunehmen, dass nach der Ausbildung zum BPL und vor allem zum LPL(B) viele Piloten tethered flights durchführen werden. Dies wird im wesentlichen im kommerziellen Bereich Anwendung finden. Dies liegt auch daran, dass um tethered flights sicher durchführen zu können ein hoher Aufwand an Mannschaft, Zeit und Kosten durch zusätzliche Ausrüstung erforderlich ist. Diese Anschaffungen und der Aufwand ist ebenso erforderlich bei allen authorized trainings organisations, da im vorliegenden Entwurf dieser Teil der Ausbildung vorgeschrieben ist. Außer im skill test zur Erweiterung des BPL auf commercial privileges findet keine Überprüfung bei den übrigen skill tests statt. Soll die aufwendige Ausbildung Bestandteil der Grundausbildung bleiben, sollte die Ausbildungszeit von 16h und 20 Starts und Landungen um die zusätzliche erforderliche Zeit und Starts für diesen Ausbildungsteil erhöht werden, bzw. separate Zeiten und Starts für diese Flüge definiert werden. Zusätzlich müssen die erworbenen Fähigkeiten auch in den skill tests für BPL und LPL(B)

einbezogen werden.

Um den für viele student pilots, instructors, examiners und ATOs unnötig hohen Zeit-, Kosten- und Personalaufwand einzusparen wird folgendes vorgeschlagen:

Die wenigen Piloten die tethered flights durchführen wollen, können ein zusätzliches tethered flight rating, analog zum night rating, an einer ATO mit entsprechender Ausrüstung und entsprechendem Lehrpersonal erwerben. Der Syllabus dafür ist bereits vorhanden und muß nur aus den jetzt bestehenden Ausbildungsgängen separiert werden. Unter Umständen kann eine dafür autorisierte ATO dann die erfolgreiche Ausbildung bestätigen.

In 'Exercise 2: Preparation for flight' sind sensitive areas aufgeführt. Es gibt keine Hinweise, welche Art sensitive areas gemeint sind. Um zu verdeutlichen das die Luftfahrt-Verantwortlichen auch den Naturschutz und Naturschutzgebiete berücksichtigen sollte er in allen Sylabi explizit genannt werden, so wie zum Beispiel auch die landowner relations.

In 'Exercise 5: Inflation' wird nach 'cold inflation' der Punkt 'use of restraint line' genannt. Sehr oft sind die einzelnen Punkte nicht in der logischen Reihenfolge innerhalb einer exercise aufgeführt. Allerdings gehört 'use of restraint line' in die vorhergehende exercise 4 'assembly and layout'.

In 'Exercise 6: Take off in wind less than 8 knots' und 'Exercise 8: Take off in wind more than 8 knots' sind feste Windwerte vorgegeben, die dann in der Praxis ausgebildet werden müßten. 8 kt Wind am Startplatz im freien Gelände sind aber bereits eine Herausforderung für geübte Piloten und nicht ungefährlich bei zusätzlichen Böen oder Turbulenzen. Im Flughandbuch von Schroeder fire Balloons wird für ungeübte Piloten bei 10 kt Wind am Startplatz mit Problemen gerechnet und empfehlen daher maximal 8 kt. Daher sollte für die sichere Ausbildung auf eine Angabe von einer Mindest-Windgeschwindigkeit beim Start verzichtet werden. Starts bei verschiedenen Windgeschwindigkeiten sind bei der Ausbildung erwünscht. Daher sollten die beiden exercises zusammengelegt werden unter Beibehaltung des Punktes 'preparation for false lift' unter der Überschrift 'Take off in different wind conditions' wie in exercise 6 von AMC to FCL.930.LAFI verwendet.

In 'Exercise 14: Navigation' im Unterpunkt 'use of GPS (if applicable)' sollte '(if applicable)' gestrichen werden, da der Gebrauch des GPS grundsätzlich ausgebildet werden sollte.

In den Exercises 16, 17, 19, 20 ist der Punkt pre landing checks enthalten. Hier müssen aber auch die Passagiere noch einmal mit Anweisungen auf die Landung vorbereitet werden. So ist es im AMC No 1 to FCL.205 B (c) Section 4 enthalten: 'Passenger pre-landing briefing'. Dieser wichtige Punkt muß auch in den genannten Exercises enthalten sein und soll vor jeder Landung ausgeführt werden. Auch Passagiere bei Nicht-kommerziellen Fahrten haben Anspruch auf korrekte Einweisung vor der Landung. Außerdem dienen sie zur rechtlichen Absicherung des Piloten.

In Exercise 18 sollte der Naturschutz aufgenommen werden

In 'Exercise 19: Landing in wind less than 8 knots' und 'Exercise 20: Landing in wind more than 8 knots' werden minimale und maximale Windgeschwindigkeiten für Landungen in der Ausbildung vorgegeben. Ein besseres Unterscheidungsmerkmal wären statt dessen 'langsame Landungen mit stehendem Ballon' und 'Schleiflandungen mit liegendem Ballon'. Feste



Windwerte lassen sich dafür aber nicht angeben, da es zu stark von der verwendeten Ballongröße abhängt.

In keiner exercise wird der Umgang mit Flüssiggas erwähnt, einem wichtigen Sicherheitsthema. Auch z.B. das Betanken der Flaschen sollte in der Ausbildung enthalten und aufgeführt werden. Das Thema 'Betankung' und 'Umgang mit Flüssiggas' könnte zusammen mit 'regelmäßige Wartungsarbeiten am Ballon' in einer exercise kombiniert werden.

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you very much for providing your opinion.

Based on your first comment on the proposed exercise 21 "Tethered flight", the Agency carefully reviewed the issue. It seems that in several Member States this exercise is not included in the normal training syllabus but treated as a separate training or qualification.

The Agency also understood from your comment that the equipment for this kind of exercise when included in the syllabus would impose an additional burden for most of the training organisations as such equipment is not used in several Member States so far.

Taking into account that tethered flights are actually forbidden in at least one Member State and based on a further evaluation of the existing requirements, the Agency decided to delete this exercise from the basic training syllabus for the LPL and the BPL.

However, the Agency does not agree with your proposal to introduce a separate additional rating for tethered flights. It was decided to create a new paragraph for an extension of the privileges to tethered flights in order to address the issue. The exercise will also be deleted from the AMC material to this requirement and assigned to the new additional paragraph (separate AMC). Based on another comment, the item "controlled climb to at least 60 feet" will be added.

As to your second comment on exercise 2, the Agency agrees that with the item "sensitive areas" in most cases nature protection areas are meant. In order to clarify this issue, the Agency will add the term.

Regarding your comment on exercise 5, the Agency agrees and will mention the issue "use of the restraint line" already in exercise 4.

As to your comment on the three different exercises for take-offs, the Agency so far proposed to distinguish between a take-off in normal conditions and a take-off with a higher wind speed. The Agency has understood the problem explained (limitations provided by the flight manual of specific balloons) and has to admit that a different wording and structure is used for the same exercises in the LAFI training syllabus (AMC to FCL.930.LAFI). Taking all these information into account, it was decided to merge the three exercises 6, 7 and 8 and to mention all the contents under a new exercise called: "Take off in different wind conditions".

Regarding your comment on exercise 14 and the proposal to delete the term "(if applicable)", the Agency does not agree as the GPS is not a mandatory equipment item and is not required in several national regulations for the balloon instruction.

The Agency agrees that the item "passenger pre-landing briefing" should be added in the mentioned exercises. The text will be amended accordingly.

The item "Nature protection areas" will be added under exercise 18.

The two different landing situations with different wind speeds will be put together in a similar way as already agreed for the take-offs with different wind speeds. This exercise will also be aligned with the syllabus for the LAFI.

As your last item you propose to add an exercise for the re-fuelling of the cylinders and minor maintenance work. The Agency agrees with the first item only and will add this issue in exercise 1.

comment

4039

comment by: *Axel Ockelmann + Manfred Poggensee Commercial Balloon Operators Germany*

**AMC FCL.110.B and 210.B - Flight training balloon**

Exercise 6 and should be avoided. Most manufacturers do not recommend such conditions for beginners.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, as exercise 6 contains only the take-off in wind less than 8 knots the Agency believes that this must be a mistake. This exercise will be kept but the Agency decided to create a new exercise with the title "Take off in different wind conditions" which will cover exercises 6, 7 and 8. The numbers mentioned (8 knots) will be deleted.

comment

4040

comment by: *Axel Ockelmann + Manfred Poggensee Commercial Balloon Operators Germany*

**AMC FCL.110.B and 210.B - Flight training balloon**

Exercise 20 and should be avoided. Most manufacturers do not recommend such conditions for beginners.

Moreover to have conditions more than 8 knots at landing in the morning you risk to have thermic conditions, in the evening you may to start even when you have more than 10 knots.

That is not useful.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The two different landing situations with different wind speeds will be put together in a similar way as already agreed for the take-offs with different wind speeds. This exercise will also be aligned with the syllabus for the LAFI and no specific numbers for the wind speed will be mentioned.

comment

4041

comment by: *Axel Ockelmann + Manfred Poggensee Commercial Balloon Operators Germany*

**AMC FCL.110.B and 210.B - Flight training balloon**

	<p>We comment already in Nr. 4038 the need of theoretical knowledge about the behaviour of the different livestock to avoid trouble as best as possible. In the flight training the student should perform flying considering the consequences out of what he/she learns about that, for example holding one level with the permanent burning whisper burner and landing also with the permanent burning whisper burner. (see also comment No. 4038)</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment.</p> <p>Please see also the response provided to your comment No. 4038.</p> <p>The Agency agrees with your concerns and proposals and will add the following two items in exercise 15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- use of the burner, whisper burner and parachute</li> <li>- avoidance of protection areas</li> </ul>
comment	<p><b>5581</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Aerovision</i></span></p> <p>Please add more information for training for tethered flight. For example, a tether under test, using an industry approved three-point system, up to 60 feet is essential. Also, some questions, like the maximum load to be carried under a tether (answer - 75%).</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency agrees that the training item "tethered flight" needs further consideration.</p> <p>Based on the comments received dealing with exercise 21 "Tethered flight", the Agency carefully reviewed the issue. It seems that in several Member States this exercise is not included in the normal training syllabus but treated as a separate training or qualification. The Agency also understood from another comment that the equipment for this kind of exercise when included in the syllabus would impose an additional burden for most of the training organisations as such equipment is not used in several Member States so far. In at least one Member State this kind of operation is not allowed so far.</p> <p>Based on a further review of the evaluation of the existing requirements in different Member States, the Agency decided to delete this exercise from the basic training syllabus for the LPL and the BPL. Instead of this it was decided to create a new paragraph for an extension of the privileges to tethered flights in order to address the issue. The exercise will be deleted from the AMC material and assigned to the new additional paragraph.</p> <p>The additional issue "three point system" and the altitude mentioned in your comment will be incorporated.</p>
comment	<p><b>6225</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Cary Crawley</i></span></p> <p>Section 2.2 Seems to suggest unlicensed,unchecked and unspecified hours limitation on "Solo"flights.This seems very dangerously undefined and open to</p>

a great deal of abuse. I would suggest a prohibition or at least a highly defined limitation to "Solo" flying until after basic P.P.L. type check flight at a minimum of 16 hours Instruction. However I would also suggest raising the minimum qualifying hours of instruction from the suggested 16 hours "dual instruction" to 20 hours "dual instruction". Even 20 hours instruction is less than the actual recorded average of hours spent flight-training prior to U.K.P.P.L. check-flight.

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the Agency does not understand the meaning behind your statement that the mentioned solo flights under supervision of the instructor will be based on an "unlicensed, unchecked and unspecified hours limitation".

Subparagraph 2.2. defines clearly that before allowing the student pilot to undertake his/her first solo flight, the flight instructor should ensure that the applicant can operate the required systems and equipment. The Agency does not agree that the current requirements are "open to a great deal of abuse" as stated in your comment. It is the responsibility of the instructor to decide when the student pilot will be ready for the first solo flight. In the opinion of the Agency no further minimum amount of flight instruction time must be defined. It should be highlighted that the first solo flight is already an important element of the training syllabus for aeroplane, helicopter and sailplane pilots without any additional specifically defined or checked hours limitation as requested by you.

The Agency does not see a need for introducing any minimum requirement but in order to address your concerns it will add a note in exercise 22 "First Solo" mentioning that all the other exercises have to be completed and a competent level have to be reached before flying solo. Every qualified and experienced instructor will take this into account anyway.

Regarding your additional proposal for raising the amount of training hours in FCL.110.B the Agency does not agree as the term "at least" is already used which will allow the instructor and the ATO to require more training flights before recommending the student pilot for the skill test. Nothing prevents the ATO to provide 20 hours of flight time and 50 take-offs if the student pilot needs this amount of training to reach the required competent and safe level in order or pass the skill test.

comment

7197

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL.110.B and to FCL.210.B para 3.2

**Page No:**

254 of 647

**Comment:**

The use of the expression "good airmanship" is too loose and needs to be aligned with the exercise of NTS by the applicant.

**Justification:**

Consistency across licence skill tests.

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Amend to read;

".. needs of ~~good airmanship~~ *non-technical skills* and...".

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.

The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

The expression used "good airmanship" will be kept for the moment.

comment

8158

comment by: *F Mortera*

**2. About the conditions, requirements, syllabus and tests for getting a LPLB or a BPL and their "performance" privileges**

**FCL.110.B "LPL Experience reqs.", (page 11 )**

**FCL.210.B "Experience reqs. And crediting", (page 22)**

**AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 (Syllabus LPL B) (page 189) = AMC N° 3 to FCL.210.B and FCL.215.B "Syllabus BPL", (page 321)**

**AMC to FCL.110.B and FCL.210.B "Flight instruction", (page 254)**

**AMC N° 2 to FCL.125.B and FCL.235 "Skill test", (page 206)**

**AMC N° 1 to FCL.135.B and FCL.225.B "Extension of class and class and group privs.", (page 262)**

**AMC N° 2 to FCL.135.B and FCL.225.B (") "Class extension", (page 263)**

**AMC N° 3 to FCL.210.B and FCL.215.B (Syllabus BPL) page 321 = AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 "Syl. LPL B" (page 189)**

**APPENDIX 1 / CREDITING T K / A / 1**

Probably I missed something but, except for the skill test for BPL, they seem identical. Obviously their privileges are different, but considering that the syllabus is the same for a new balloon pilot, getting their first licence, what does make the difference to choose one or other licence? Is it just the price?

It looks reasonable to share same amounts of minimum training hours, exams and processes according the responsibility of flying a balloon, but what is the real difference if their programs are the same? Just the legal capability of use balloons sized "139" or "141" and receive remuneration or not respectively? It has not too much sense for me.

I'm not suggesting that the BPL requirements must be harder, [but they could be simplified for LPLB or reduced their privileges alternatively, to get the BPL revaluation. For instance the LPLB can not fly in controlled air space \(it should not be necessary ATC liaison methods\), over cities...](#)

That is the only different here in Spain. As a private pilot (even with a radio rate), we can not fly in CTR or TMA. Only when we are flying for authorized Aerial Works Companies, making commercial flights, we can use the ATC services.

I think that differences must be established between both LPLB and BPL licences not only in economical privileges, but also in their syllabus, training and real performance capabilities.

Even considering carrying passengers as the main balloon commercial activity,

advertising and filming are also commercial flights (I understand sponsorship is different to aerial advertising). And as far as I understand they soon will be considered in this way in Europe.

In my experience, the best advertising flights or flights for images recording are those with a little "65", where the pilot is alone in the basket or only with a camera operator. The "risky" flights close the sea, in ATC areas, in very fast winds, landings in small parks into the cities... can be done better with small balloons without passengers.

These other flights, not CAT, have been (and still they are) the economical support in most of the balloon companies that I know. In this case, the big balloons are not only unnecessary, but rather they are not practical.

Establishing different performance capabilities (restrictions) will permit to have a "light" licence, capable to offer a reasonable club / sponsor relationship and a good platform to jump to a professional environment, without favouring misunderstandings about capabilities or privileges between LPLB and BPL.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, as this is a comment already addressed to other segments, please see the responses already provided on the reason for creating a BPL and an SPL(B) and the differences like the medical standard, the commercial privilege or the introduction of different groups for the BPL.

The Agency does not intend to link a privilege of any licence to a certain airspace category based on the fact that the Member States still have a totally different airspace structure. Limiting the LPL(B) to uncontrolled airspace only would in several Member States mean that ballooning with an LPL would be simply forbidden. In addition to this the Agency does not believe that limiting a certain licence holder to a certain airspace category could reduce the amount of flight instruction significantly because most of the flight training has to be spent anyway on the basic techniques.

Regarding your proposal to reduce the training for the LPL(B), the Agency does not agree. Based on the input received during the drafting phase, the Agency came to the conclusion that the required amount of at least 16 hours flight time and 20 take-offs should be kept in any case as the minimum amount of training for a balloon pilot.

For the additional OPS issues mentioned, please see the responses provided to NPA 2009-02b and the resulting text.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence  
 LPL - AMC No 1 to FCL.135.B and to FCL.225.B - Flight instruction  
 (theoretical knowledge) for the extension to another balloon class: p. 262-267  
 Leisure pilot licence - Balloon/balloon pilot licence (BPL)**

comment 4799 comment by: CAA Belgium  
 AMC 1 and 2 to FCL.135.B and FCL.225.B Title and content not in accordance

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees and will change the title of both AMCs in order to address the different contents. AMC 1 is dealing with the theoretical knowledge instruction only whereas AMC 2 contains the flight instruction.

comment

8160

comment by: *F Mortera*

**2. About the conditions, requirements, syllabus and tests for getting a LPLB or a BPL and their "performance" privileges**

**FCL.110.B "LPL Experience reqs.", (page 11 )**

**FCL.210.B "Experience reqs. And crediting", (page 22)**

**AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 (Syllabus LPL B) (page 189) = AMC N° 3 to FCL.210.B and FCL.215.B "Syllabus BPL", (page 321)**

**AMC to FCL.110.B and FCL.210.B "Flight instruction", (page 254)**

**AMC N° 2 to FCL.125.B and FCL.235 "Skill test", (page 206)**

**AMC N° 1 to FCL.135.B and FCL.225.B "Extension of class and class and group privs.", (page 262)**

**AMC N° 2 to FCL.135.B and FCL.225.B (" "Class extension", (page 263)**

**AMC N° 3 to FCL.210.B and FCL.215.B (Syllabus BPL) page 321 = AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 "Syl. LPL B" (page 189)**

**APPENDIX 1 / CREDITING T K / A / 1**

Probably I missed something but, except for the skill test for BPL, they seem identical. Obviously their privileges are different, but considering that the syllabus is the same for a new balloon pilot, getting their first licence, what does make the difference to choose one or other licence? Is it just the price?

It looks reasonable to share same amounts of minimum training hours, exams and processes according the responsibility of flying a balloon, but what is the real difference if their programs are the same? Just the legal capability of use balloons sized "139" or "141" and receive remuneration or not respectively? It has not too much sense for me.

I'm not suggesting that the BPL requirements must be harder, [but they could be simplified for LPLB or reduced their privileges alternatively, to get the BPL revaluation. For instance the LPLB can not fly in controlled air space \(it should not be necessary ATC liaison methods\), over cities...](#)

That is the only different here in Spain. As a private pilot (even with a radio rate), we can not fly in CTR or TMA. Only when we are flying for authorized Aerial Works Companies, making commercial flights, we can use the ATC services.

I think that differences must be established between both LPLB and BPL licences not only in economical privileges, but also in their syllabus, training and real performance capabilities.

Even considering carrying passengers as the main balloon commercial activity, advertising and filming are also commercial flights (I understand sponsorship is different to aerial advertising). And as far as I understand they soon will be considered in this way in Europe.

In my experience, the best advertising flights or flights for images recording are those with a little "65", where the pilot is alone in the basket or only with a

camera operator. The "risky" flights close the sea, in ATC areas, in very fast winds, landings in small parks into the cities... can be done better with small balloons without passengers.

These other flights, not CAT, have been (and still they are) the economical support in most of the balloon companies that I know. In this case, the big balloons are not only unnecessary, but rather they are not practical.

Establishing different performance capabilities (restrictions) will permit to have a "light" licence, capable to offer a reasonable club / sponsor relationship and a good platform to jump to a professional environment, without favouring misunderstandings about capabilities or privileges between LPLB and BPL.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, as this comment was assigned to several other segments, please see the responses already provided to your other comments.

The AMC in this segment is dealing with the extension to another class of balloons. As no specific comment on the content of this AMC is provided the Agency is not able to provide a substantiated response.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart B: Leisure pilot licence LPL -AMC No 3 to FCL.135.B and FCL.225.B - Contents of the skill test for the extension of aLPL(B) or A BPL to another balloon class (hot air airship)**

p. 267-268

comment 5852

comment by: ENAC TLP

The technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed flight test tolerances (standards) need some specifications for NTS and TEM avoiding the use of terms such as 'good judgement and airmanship' that are easily prone to subjectivity, bias and abuse during assessment because of a lack of common understanding.

**Need:** more clear and unambiguous standards for the assessment of non-technical skills during skill test and proficiency checks for class/type ratings and license skill tests.

**Proposal:** to specify differently the non technical abilities to be demonstrated during test/checks to exercise good airmanship and related Flight test tolerances

**AMC N°3 FCL 135.B and FCL 225.B**

**Contents of the skill test for the extension of LPL(B) or BPL to another class**

**page 267**

**FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES**

3. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

- as it is;
- as it is;
- *apply NTS and TEM as needed to exercise good airmanship;*
- as it is;
- as it is.



response

*Noted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.  
The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

7201

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC No 3 to FCL.135.B and FCL.225.B para 3

**Page No:**

267 of 647

**Comment:**

The expression "exercise good judgement and airmanship" is too loose and needs to be aligned with the exercise of NTS by the applicant.

**Justification:**

Consistency of testing

**Proposed Text:**

**(if applicable)**

Amend to read;

~~"exercise good judgement and airmanship~~ - *apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test*".

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.  
The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment

7818

comment by: CAA Finland

Skill test form:

The numbering system differs from CR/TR skill test forms and should be harmonized. I support the structure of CR/TR form as there is clearly easy to add subparts like 2.4 > 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.1		
1.2		
1.3		
And		

On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.1		
2.2		
2.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.1		
3.2		
3.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

response *Noted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the tables included in Appendices to Part-FCL (namely Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

- To leave the content/format of the tables unchanged from what was

included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms. The tables developed for the SPL/BPL and LPL are based on these JAR-based lists and will be kept also.

- In the meantime, to develop report forms to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the relevant AMCs as published in this NPA.
- To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning Objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMCs to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart C: Private Pilot Licence (PPL), Sailplane Pilot Licence (SPL) and Balloon Pilot Licence (BPL)**

p. 269

comment

3392

comment by: *Richard DUMAS, PPL(A)*

**Conserver le contenu du PPL(A) théorique conforme à celui des JAR FCL.**

1. Le NPA complexifie **inutilement** le contenu théorique à maîtriser. Exemples d'items inutiles et certainement au delà du PPL (A) version JAR FCL :

- Search and rescue signals: signals with surface craft, ground/air visual signal code, air/ground signals...
- Hydraulic systems: hydraulic fluids (types, characteristics, limitations)...
- Position transmitter: different types, design, operation, characteristics, accuracy...
- Transmission modes: VHF, HF, Satcom, principles, bandwidth, operational limitations, use...
- Contaminated runways: kinds of contamination, estimated surface friction, friction coefficient...

2. Cette complexification va probablement conduire au **non-renouvellement** des PPL(A) JAR FCL en PPL(A) EASA. Un tel non-renouvellement systématique ne figure pas dans les objectifs du NPA

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your comment. Please mind that when drafting the text of this NPA, the Agency followed closely the provisions of JAR-FCL, JAA NPA 34 and of ICAO. The points you listed were already included in the Syllabus of theoretical knowledge for the PPL(A) in Section 2 to JAR-FCL 1 Subpart C. They were only listed in a different way namely by taking into account the relevant learning objectives. This change in the presentation does not have any impact in the conversion of national licences to licences according Part-FCL.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart C: Private Pilot Licence (PPL), Sailplane Pilot Licence (SPL) and Balloon Pilot Licence (BPL) - AMC No 1 to FCL.210 and FCL.215 - Syllabus of theoretical knowledge for the private pilot licence – aeroplanes and helicopters**

p. 269

comment	2577	comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i>
	<p>Why is the syllabus for PPL(A) AMC-material and for CPL,IR and ATPL IR-material? It should all be taken into IR's as it is all ICAO regulated material.</p>	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	<p>Thank you for providing your comment. The Agency has carefully evaluated where to put the syllabus. As they were to be found in Section 2 of JAR-FCL, the Agency decided to put it into the AMC part. In any case, all comments related to Theoretical Knowledge Syllabus for the ATPL, CPL and IR will be reviewed by Rulemaking Task FCL.002.</p>	
comment	3215	comment by: <i>Susana Nogueira</i>
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	<p>No text provided with this comment.</p>	
comment	3804	comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i>
	<p>AMC N°1 to FCL.210 and FCL.215</p> <p>Appendix 1, <b>A 1</b> paragraph 1.1.2: gives credit in full of theoretical knowledge for the issue of a PPL to the holder of a LPL of the same category.</p> <p>Therefore, it will avoid an unnecessary burden (for the regulator and for the executive bodies) to reach the same result.</p> <p><b><i>Have the same theoretical knowledge instruction and examination for LPL(A) and PPL(A), and for LPL(H) and PPL(H).</i></b></p> <p>As it is already the case in the NPA for the theoretical knowledge instruction and examination for respectively LPL (B)and BPL, LPL(S) and SPL.</p>	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	
	<p>Thank you for providing this comment. The Agency considers it to be a very practicable approach. Please refer also to the response to comment No. 7820 below.</p> <p>A reference will be included in the AMC material for the theoretical knowledge instruction for the LAPL(A) and (H) explaining that the same syllabus as for the PPL(A) or (H) has to be used.</p>	
comment	4754	comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i>
	<p>Theoretical knowledge bridge syllabi PPL(A)/(H) seems to need proof reading,</p>	

the "x" marks in the table are inconsistent. E.g. item 01 01 01 02 – ICAO objectives and composition – is marked as being in the syllabi of both PPL(A) and PPL(H), but is also in the bridge syllabus between these two.

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment. The editorial you highlighted will be taken in consideration when drafting the final text.

comment

5396

comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

Comment: change text as follows:

The following tables contain the syllabi for the courses of theoretical knowledge, as well as for the theoretical knowledge examinations for the PPL(A) and (H). The training ~~and examination~~ should cover aspects related to nontechnical skills in an integrated manner, taking into account the particular risks associated to the licence and the activity.

Justification:

Due to the low requirements of the examiners for the PPL, and the lack of training in assessment of NTS, ECA considers that the examination of NTS cannot be done when the instructor for a PPL cannot instruct on this. If you don't train the instructors on how to develop NTS, they will not be able to train for this. Furthermore, a person cannot be examined about something he/she hasn't received.

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment. Please note that when drafting the text, the Agency followed closely the provisions of JAR-FCL. The Agency is persuaded that your proposal does not bring any surplus in safety as the non technical skills are sufficiently trained during the instructor's course.

comment

7078

comment by: *CAA Norway*

AMC no 1 to FCL.210 & 215

Theoretical knowledge bridge syllabi PPL(A)/(H) seems to need proof reading, the "x" marks in the table are inconsistent. E.g. item 01 01 01 02 – ICAO objectives and composition – is marked as being in the syllabi of both PPL(A) and PPL(H), but is also in the bridge syllabus between these two.

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment No. 4754 above.

comment

7820

comment by: *CAA Finland*

The credit of PPL towards higher licences is 100 hours ref App 3 A para 7 versus FCL.515.A(b)(1) or App 3 C para 7 versus App 3 D para 7. The logical minimum theoretical training hours for LPL - PPL is 100 hours. Proposed new text:

The training and examination should cover aspects related to non-technical skills in an integrated manner, taking into account the particular risks associated to the licence and the activity. **An approved course shall**

comprise at least 100 hours of theoretical knowledge.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment.  
The Agency considers it to be valuable. Please also refer to the response to comment No. 3804 above which should be kept in line with your proposal.

The text of the AMC containing the TK syllabus for the LAPL will be amended accordingly.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart C: Private Pilot Licence (PPL), Sailplane Pilot Licence (SPL) and Balloon Pilot Licence (BPL) - AMC No 1 to FCL.210 and FCL.215 - Syllabus of theoretical knowledge for the private pilot licence – aeroplanes and helicopters - 010 00 00 00 - Air law and ATC procedures** p. 269-272

comment

6177

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC No 1 to FCL.210 and 215

**Page No:**

269

**Comment:**

Given that Appendix 1 A 1.1.2 gives full theoretical knowledge credit for a LPL holder when applying for a PPL, SPL etc. in the same category, one would expect the syllabi and style of examination to be the same. However, the syllabi are different and the split of examinations (common and specialist in the LPL) varies between the 2 licences.

**Justification:**

There should be consistency between the LPL(A) and the PPL(A)

**Proposed Text:**

**(if applicable)**

Produce a single syllabus for LPL and PPL/SPL etc using the common/specialist format described in FCL.120(a)

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment. The Agency agrees with your arguments and would like to put your attention to two comments in the section dealing with general part of this AMC. These are the responses to comments no 3804 and 7820. The consequence will be one single syllabus for PPL(A)/LPL(A) and PPL(H)/LPL(H) with a minimum of 100 theoretical training hours.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart C: Private Pilot Licence (PPL), Sailplane Pilot Licence (SPL) and Balloon Pilot Licence (BPL) - AMC No 1 to FCL.210 and FCL.215 - Syllabus of theoretical knowledge for the private pilot licence – aeroplanes and helicopters - 021 00 00 00 - Aircraft general knowledge - airframe and systems, electrics, powerplant, emergency equipment** p. 272-279

comment

5516

comment by: ECA- European Cockpit Association

Comment on line 021 11 03 01, page 277:

There should be crosses in the "PPL" and "bridge" boxes also for Aeroplane, as Diesel engines are now available for light aircraft.

Justification:

The danger of using the wrong type of fuel should be taught. It is not clear that this part is only taught in H.

response *Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment. This part of the syllabus deals with turbine engines which run on kerosine only. Turbine engines in general will not be taught during PPL courses.

comment

6181

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC 1 to FCL.210 & 215 (021 15 02)

**Page No:**

278 of 647

**Comment:**

Require to include other types of anti-torque systems

**Justification:**

Require to be consistent with paragraph 082 066 02/03

**Proposed Text:**

**(if applicable)**

Tail rotor/Fenestron/NOTAR

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment. However, your comment would be a significant change to JAR-FCL and therefore will not be taken into account for the final text. Please mind that all comments related to Theoretical Knowledge Syllabus for the ATPL, CPL and IR (Appendix 2) will be reviewed by Rulemaking Task FCL.002 which then might reflect to Appendix 1 as well.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart C: Private Pilot Licence (PPL), Sailplane Pilot Licence (SPL) and Balloon Pilot Licence (BPL) - AMC No 1 to FCL.210 and FCL.215 - Syllabus of theoretical knowledge for the private pilot licence – aeroplanes and helicopters - 040 00 00 - Human performance** p. 287-290

comment

877

comment by: Thomas Bircher

EINE PILOTENGERCHTE INFORMATION

**WAS IST DAS ?**

- Der Pilot führt das Flugzeug durch Raum und Zeit vorwärts, ein zurück gibt es nicht !

Eine pilotengerechte Information ist deshalb:

- Einfach und klar
- Eindeutig
- Steht in nützlicher Zeit zur Verfügung

Pilotengerechte Informationen erhöhen die Flugsicherheit !

## Flugsicherheit

- Muss jeden Flug neu erstritten werden
- Ist nicht käuflich
- Ist proportional zur Motivation aller Beteiligten
- Ein positives Umfeld erhöht sie.

Eine pilotengerechte Information ist somit Bestandteil der Flugsicherheit  
Andere Faktoren:

- Fluggerät (Konstruktion, Zustand, Unterhalt, Wartung)
- Flugplatz (Infrastruktur, Organisation, Unterstützung)
- Wetter (Aktuell, Qualität Vorhersage)
- Flugaufgabe ( Angemessen, machbar, sinnvoll)

Es wäre deshalb wünschenswert, wenn alle Bodenstellen die Informationen für Piloten erarbeiten, ihre Werke stets in erster Priorität auf des Prädikat PILOTENGERECHT prüfen würden !

Es soll hier noch auf einige Punkte hingewiesen werden, die die Flugsicherheit beeinträchtigen:

- Schlechtes Betriebsklima
- (zu) hohe Arbeitsbelastung
- Extreme und nicht nachvollziehbare Gebühren
- Zu viele und kaum verständliche Vorschriften
- Unzufriedene Kunden
- Checkitis

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment and thanks you for providing your opinion. Please be assured that your arguments will be taken into consideration for future rule making tasks.

comment

1963

comment by: *Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch*

**The COMPETENCY UNITS, methods, definitions and aims of this syllabus are misleading and do not concur with the EC's Basic Regulation regarding non-technical skills for pilots.**

Below is a more elaborate proof for that (in German)

**Proposal:**

**Install a working group of European experts on Human Factors in civil aviation with the clear appointment to develop a syllabus which is consistent with the EC's Basic Regulations and integrates modern views on Human Factors.**

Proof

Der vorgeschlagene Lehrplan (Syllabus) setzt falsche Prioritäten, hat eine nicht sinnvolle Ausrichtung und führt zu fehlgeleiteten Unterrichtseinheiten

Zum überwiegenden Teil wird medizinisch- körperliches Detailwissen, z.B. funktionelle Anatomie des Auges (wie viele Zapfen und Stäbchen sind auf der Netzhaut?) erwartet. Weiterhin werden Selbstverständlichkeiten abgefragt, z.B. Alkohol bzw. Sauerstoffmangel beeinträchtigen das Urteilsvermögen. Viele Themen sind so theoretisch, dass sie für die fliegerische Praxis keine praktische



Relevanz besitzen. Macht die Kenntnis der physikalischen Gesetze von Boyle-Mariotte, Dalton und Henry uns wirklich zu sicheren und besseren Piloten? Ich meine definitiv nein.

Die derzeitige Ausrichtung ist auf die Vermittlung von Fakten über den menschlichen Körper, atmosphärische Gasgesetze, Gesundheit und Hygiene sowie simpler psychologischer Grundtatsachen ausgerichtet. Z.B ist es doch selbstverständlich, dass man schlechte Entscheidungen trifft, wenn man müde oder gestresst ist. Möglichkeiten der Veränderung oder gar der Prävention werden nicht vermittelt.

Die Unterrichtspraxis des bisherigen Faches „Menschliches Leistungsvermögen“ (Human Performance and Limitations), welcher (leider) fast den gleichen Lehrplan wie der EASA Vorschlag besitzt, zeigt dies! In jedem Verein, den ich kenne, wird bevorzugt derjenige Fluglehrer, der ein Medizinstudium hinter sich gebracht hat, beauftragt den Unterricht in diesem Fach zu halten. Der Unterricht ist dann in der Regel eine Medizinvorlesung über menschliche Physiologie.

**Ich fordere daher einen Umbau dieses Fachs mit einem neuem Lernziel, geänderten Inhalten und geändertem pädagogischem Konzept!**

Das Lernziel dieses Fachs sollte die Verhütung von Unfällen in der Fliegerei sein. Dabei sollten die körperlichen Faktoren nicht im Vordergrund stehen, da sie nachweislich für Unfallgeschehen nur eine untergeordnete Rolle spielen. Persönlichkeitseigenschaften zu vermitteln ist ebenso wenig sinnvoll, da sich daran im Rahmen einer Pilotenausbildung kaum etwas ändern lässt.

Stattdessen sollte das kompetente Handeln als Pilot (Human Competence) im Zentrum des Fach stehen. Die Inhalte sollten sich an folgenden vier Prämissen messen lassen.: Die Themen sollten

- 1) handlungsorientiert sein (im Gegensatz zu theoretisch („nice to know“)
- 2) nicht selbstverständlich sein (klar, dass wir bei Dämmerung schlechter sehen)
- 3) häufig auftretende Situationen behandeln (Beispiel: Vergessen des Fahrwerks vs. Ausfall der Druckkabine)
- 4) (über-) lebenswichtig sein ( im Gegensatz zu „persönlicher Hygiene“)

Mit diesen Prinzipien lassen sich viele der im derzeitigen Vorschlag genannten Themen als wenig sinnvoll eliminieren.

Mit der von mir geforderten Ausrichtung „Unfallprävention“ (**Human Performance becomes Accident Prevention**) wird das **menschliche Verhalten** in das Zentrum des Interesses gerückt.

Deshalb sollte in diesem Bereich eine handlungsorientierte Wissensvermittlung sowohl über den Einzelnen, wie auch über das soziale System (Verein, Flugschule) und den gesellschaftlichen Kontext, Hersteller, Behörden erfolgen. Es bieten sich hierzu die bereits in der professionellen Fliegerei verwendeten Human Factors Methoden der Psychologie sicheren Handeln in Risikobereichen an (siehe z.B das Buch Human Factors von Badke-Schub et al, Springer 2008).

Das bewusste Management von Risiken muss an die Stelle des unerreichbaren Zieles der absoluten Fehlerfreiheit von Pilotenhandlungen stehen.

Der Pilot ist dabei als ein an sich schon komplexes System zu verstehen,

welches ein Bestandteil von weiteren komplexen Systemen, Verein/ Flugschule, Behörde, Hersteller, Wartungsbetriebe, Gesellschaft ist. Um Unfällen vorzubeugen, oder die schwere solcher Vorfälle mindern zu können, schlage ich vor, die folgende Sichtweise auf Unfälle im Rahmen des umzugestaltenden Fachs zu vermitteln:

Ein komplexes System (also der Pilot, aber auch sein Verein) kann sich nur dann effektiv vor Unfällen schützen, wenn es

- permanent und aktiv nach selbst minimalen Abweichungen, Vorfällen, Störungen, (=Fehler /incidents) sucht
- das Finden solcher Fehler belohnt
- Fehler positiv bewertet als Lernchancen
- die gefundenen Fehler auswertet und geeignet kommuniziert
- aus den gefundenen Abweichungen Maßnahmen mit dem Ziel der Unfallprävention ableitet
- die Wirksamkeit seiner so getroffenen Maßnahmen überprüft

Wenn ich als einzelner Pilot anerkenne, dass ich irgendwann einmal eine unbeabsichtigte Fehlhandlung begehen werde, die sich unter geeigneten Umständen zu einem schweren Unfall auswachsen kann, muss ich sowohl persönlich wie auch im Verein mein Verhalten ändern. Persönliche und soziale Sicherheitsnetze, die im Falle eines Fehlers greifen, werden damit wichtig. Im Fach Unfallprävention sollten die angehenden Piloten lernen, wie sie bei sich selbst und auch im sozialen System durch diese Sichtweise anders Handeln können.

Ein Beispiel hierfür: es muss vermittelt werden, dass wir Piloten dazu neigen unsere eigenen Fehler bei jedem Flug zu vergessen und zu verdrängen. Weiterhin, dass wir dieser Neigung durch geeignete Methoden aktiv begegnen können.

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please keep in mind that when drafting the NPA, the Agency followed closely Section 2 to JAR-FCL 1 and 2 and the provisions of ICAO Annex 1. The project you proposed would mean a significant change compared to those existing regulations. However, as the Agency considers it well founded, it will be taken into consideration by a future rule-making task. All comments related to the Theoretical Knowledge Syllabus for the ATPL, CPL and IR (Appendix 2) will be reviewed by Rule-making Task FCL.002 and this will reflect on your comment as well.

comment 5200

comment by: DAeC

<![endif]-->

**General Comment on - 040 00 00 00 HUMAN PERFORMANCE**

**HP&L Training Syllabus.**

1. The presented EASA Syllabus for Human Factors / Human Performance and Limitations Training has to be adapted to **sport-pilots needs**. – Only a few practical examples / subjects (out of experience) are required to teach them HP&L Basics, to **achieve HF-Awareness**.
2. Only that, what can be **practically taught in classroom** to beginners should be on the Basic HF list. – Students are predominantly “weekend amateurs” with little academic background and intellectual training.

3. The full elaborated scientific list of HF items will be found on the **ATPL level**, but this is **useless for basic training**. – There is no personnel resources or time at all available on the aeroclub level to teach that proposed Syllabus (EASA draft) effectively.
4. It should be clear: Following NPA 17B HPL would also set a task, in developing a **licence test questionnaire PPL**. The present concept does not provide a useful list for the real HF issues.
5. The present Draft has to be **stripped from unnecessary academic and not required HF syllabus items**, in reference to recognized demands. (predominantly Physiology)
6. That new focus **must primarily improve HF- Safety Awareness and HF Competency** in sports aviation. (Competency is: Skill, Attitude and Knowledge. Ref. EASA 2008). These objectives are not apparent, but must be communicated in little time to all student pilots.
7. The proposed HF Syllabus draft should primarily use the **ICAO** reference **"Fundamental Human Factors Concepts"** from 2002 (alternate UK CAP 719). It incorporates all required HF Training concepts of today and should be the main reference for the new EASA HF Training concept.
8. Those **HP&L objectives** present in academic terms as follows:
  - a. Multidimensional psycho, cognitive and social factors in **social-technical systems**
  - b. Complex psychic / social influences with the **limits in performance and skills**.
  - c. Additional **human capabilities** / issues have to be identified:
    - i. **Pilots / individuals and groups** in the technical environment
    - ii. **Distribution of tasks, responsibilities**
    - iii. Interaction: **Man – machine interface**
    - iv. **Improvement of communications** to prevent and resolve human failure.
    - v. Typical human skills: **Cooperation** for the Solution of Flight Safety problems  
**Only with a practical, simple, convincing setup this complex issue can be communicated!**
9. **Flight safety** is primary target; it is the result of **adequate Behaviour**.  
 The present draft does not reflect this predominant aspect at all.
10. **The whole subject HP&L has to get additional attention, as a final answer is not finalized yet. - HF specialists are ready to work and continue this international task for EASA.**
11. **Advanced** Knowledge of Human Factors should be added to **basic** HF knowledge at a later stage. – **Specific training of instructors, leadership and aero-club administrators**, - also specific training in special flight conditions, like high altitude glider mountain flying-, has to be specifically taught as **Advanced Human Factors** Training in additional settings. This must be clearly noted and differentiated, as their focus is totally different.
12. Following Headlines should also be highlighted:
  - a. Ineffective forms of **Communication** : Failures have to be communicated openly.
  - b. **Errors in Flight**, have to have priority in Human Factors

training.

Knowledge based errors, perception errors, tunnel vision, decision errors, violations.

- c. These **predominant reasons for mishaps** have to be presented and be evaluated in **debriefings**, to build awareness for safe flying.
  - d. Human Factors are the **main factors and causes in GA incidents**, compared to any other handicap, medical illness or sudden incapacitation in flight (>300 to 1).
  - e. **Statistics of typical Flight Accidents** have to be presented. It should be the major teaching tool.
13. Above that, training should be done by using **modern teaching methods** and didactics: Workshops, films, journals, interactive teaching, etc. They are also proposed by ICAO.
14. All **Human Factors Technical Terms** should be clearly predefined by EASA as already done in **standardized English** Language. -
15. For the basic HF training of new pilots alternatively each **national language** and their practical explanations should prevail at home, teaching to train the basic HF skills on the aero-club level.
16. An alternate Draft-**Proposal** for discussion of an alternative EASA PPL syllabus for Human Factors / Human Performance and Limitations (i.e. with the JAR HF Working Group) is attached.

Juergen K Knueppel  
MD, Flight Surgeon  
DAeC Human Factors Working Group  
Germany

For the German AeroClub / DAeC

response *Noted*

Thank you very much for your comment and for providing your opinion. Please refer to the response given to comment no 1963 in this segment.

comment

5217

comment by: DAeC

Generic Example / "PPL – Aeroclub Syllabus" Proposal for Discussion  
Juergen K Knueppel, DAEC HF Working Group, Braunschweig, Germany

Concerning 040 00 00 00 **Human Factors** / Part **Human Performance**

**-Flight Safety is the main Objective of HF / HP&L**

-The Majority of flight-accidents / incidents are a result of **Human Behavior**.

-Training Task: **Improve Flight Safety, Accident prevention** on the basis of **understanding and training in HF..**

0x0 01 00 00 Human Factors Concepts / Description of **Safe Flight Operations**.

0x0 01 01 00 Human Factors Basics / Reference: **HF-ICAO Doctrine**, UK-CAP 719, "**Fundamental Human Factors Concepts**"

0x0 01 02 00 Human Factors Statistics: **Demonstration of Typical Flight Accidents, - Incidents** / Accident Data / Reports

0x0 02 **BASICS HF Presentations, for Student Pilots and Pilots**

**0x0 02 01 Flight Safety Standards and competent behavior, (Competence = Skill, Attitude, Knowledge)**

Rules of Flight Operations, Pilot Competence, Safety Culture, Learn from Mistakes, Safety Resources, Safe Flight

**0x0 02 02 Pilot Errors / Team Errors**

Lack of Flight Proficiency, Perception Errors, Decision Errors, Violations  
Communication of Pilot Errors, Attitude and Behaviour, Lack of Preparation  
Reason's Suisse Cheese Model, HFACS (Human Factors Analysis & Classification System)

**0x0 02 03 Contributing Factors**

-Psychologic Factors

Mental Disturbances, Motivation, Stress; Behavior & Hazardous Attitude

-Medical Factors

I'M SAFE, "Drugs", Perception Deficiencies, Fitness

-Physiological Aspects

Vision, Dehydration, Oxygen, Spatial Desorientation

**0x0 02 04 Flight Operations**

Organization, Communication, Responsibilities, Air Task and Flying Skills, Following Rules and Procedures, Pre-Flight Briefing, Post-Flight Briefing

**0x0 02 05 Social Factors**

Cooperation, Social Climate, Safety Culture, Command and Control, Role Models

**0x0 02 06 00 HF Pilot Training Sessions / Educating Competent Behaviour**

**0x0 02 06 01 Communication / Perception, Work Shops**

Planning, Routine and Emergency Situations, Use of Resources, Fly Top ("Program"),

Reporting / Communication of unsafe Flight Situations, Self Critique

**0x0 02 06 02 Drill of Emergency Situations**

Planning for flights utilizing Checklists, Mental Preparation fo Emergencies, Risk Management,

CRM, Anticipation, Planning under Time Pressure, LOFT, FORDEC, Situational Awareness

**0x0 02 06 03 Organisation und Leadership**

Administration Management, Instructors Role, Command and Control, Flight Proficiency related Air Task, Incident Investigation.

**0x0 02 06 04 Dealing with Stress**

Typical Stress Situations, Personal Stress Prevention, Stress Relaxation Technique,

Emotions, Decreasing Stress in Flight, Mental Training

**0x0 03 ADVANCED HF, for Instructors, Leadership, Administrators, HF Specialists**

**0x0 03 01 Application of Human Factors in Flight Operations:** Safe Flight Operations, Airfield Procedures, Base Ops,

Financing, Local Procedures, SOPs, Networking, Emergencies & SAR, Safety Culture, NOTAM, Weather Reports

**0x0 03 02 Human Factors in Maintenance and Equipment:** Cockpit

	Ergonomics, Maintenance, Visibility, Markings, Technical Checks, Documentation, Control Devices & Instrument Ergonomics, Colour Coding, SAR Equipment
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you very much for your comment and for providing your opinion. Please refer to the response given to comment no 1963 in this segment.</p>
comment	<p>6182 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b>  <b>AMC No 1 to FCL.210 and FCL.215</b>  <b>Page No:</b>  288  <b>Comment:</b>  The Health and Hygiene section of the syllabus does not cover some of the most important health issues for pilots.  <b>Justification:</b>  Including topics such as 'fitness to fly' and 'reporting of illness' on the syllabus ensures that pilots are aware of the health issues that are relevant for aviators and aware of their responsibilities in this area.  <b>Proposed Text:</b>  <b>(if applicable)</b>  'Problem areas for pilots' 040 02 03 03  Add '- Reporting of illness' and  '- Fitness to fly'</p> <p>'Intoxication' 040 02 03 04  Add '- prescribed medication'</p> <p>Also, for improved categorisation,  Amend 'alcohol' to 'alcohol and drugs'.  Amend 'drugs and self-medication' to 'self-medication'.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment.</p> <p>The Agency decided not to accept your first proposal to add "reporting of illness" and "fitness to fly". Please bear in mind that when drafting the text, the Agency closely followed Section 2 of JAR-FCL 1 and 2. The change you proposed would mean a significant change to the JAR-FCL system without an additional safety impact as the items you would like to add to the subject Human Performance are already covered by the subject Air Law. Thus, the proposed change will not be taken into consideration when drafting the final text.</p> <p>Your proposal to add "prescribed medication" and to amend "alcohol and drugs" will be accepted and the text amended accordingly.</p>

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart C: Private Pilot Licence (PPL), Sailplane Pilot Licence (SPL) and Balloon Pilot Licence (BPL) - AMC No 1 to FCL.210 and FCL.215 - Syllabus of theoretical knowledge for the private pilot licence – aeroplanes and helicopters - 050 00 00 - Aerology** p. 290-291

comment	475	comment by: <i>London Metropolitan University</i>
	Formatting of "METEOROLOGY"	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	
	Thank you for your comment. The editorial will be taken into consideration for the final text.	

<b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart C: Private Pilot Licence (PPL), Sailplane Pilot Licence (SPL) and Balloon Pilot Licence (BPL) - AMC No 1 to FCL.210 and FCL.215 - Syllabus of theoretical knowledge for the private pilot licence – Airships</b>	p. 317-320
---	------------

comment	2578	comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i>
	Should be in IR's :see also comment on AMC 1 to FCL210 and FCL 215 on page 269.	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	Thank you for providing your comment. The Agency has carefully evaluated where to put the syllabus. As they were to be found in Section 2 of JAR-FCL, the Agency decided to put it into the AMC part. In any case, all comments related to Theoretical Knowledge Syllabus for the ATPL, CPL and IR will be reviewed by Rulemaking Task FCL.002.	

<b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart C: Private Pilot Licence (PPL), Sailplane Pilot Licence (SPL) and Balloon Pilot Licence (BPL) - AMC No 3 to FCL.210 and FCL.215 - Syllabus of theoretical knowledge for the balloon pilot licence and the sailplane pilot licence</b>	p. 321
--	--------

comment	6301	comment by: <i>Jonathan Coote</i>
	This is an excellent approach.	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	Thank you for your positive feedback.	

comment	8156	comment by: <i>F Mortera</i>
	<u><b>2. About the conditions, requirements, syllabus and tests for getting a LPLB or a BPL and their "performance" privileges</b></u>	
	FCL.110.B "LPL Experience reqs.", (page 11 ) FCL.210.B "Experience reqs. And crediting", (page 22) AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 (Syllabus LPL B) (page 189) = AMC N° 3 to FCL.210.B and FCL.215.B "Syllabus BPL", (page 321) AMC to FCL.110.B and FCL.210.B "Flight instruction", (page 254) AMC N° 2 to FCL.125.B and FCL.235 "Skill test", (page 206) AMC N° 1 to FCL.135.B and FCL.225.B "Extension of class and class and group privs.", (page 262) AMC N° 2 to FCL.135.B and FCL.225.B (") "Class extension", (page 263)	

**AMC N° 3 to FCL.210.B and FCL.215.B (Syllabus BPL) page 321 = AMC to FCL.115 and FCL.120 "Syl. LPL B" (page 189)  
APPENDIX 1 / CREDITING T K / A / 1**

Probably I missed something but, except for the skill test for BPL, they seem identical. Obviously their privileges are different, but considering that the syllabus is the same for a new balloon pilot, getting their first licence, what does make the difference to choose one or other licence? Is it just the price? It looks reasonable to share same amounts of minimum training hours, exams and processes according the responsibility of flying a balloon, but what is the real difference if their programs are the same? Just the legal capability of use balloons sized "139" or "141" and receive remuneration or not respectively? It has not too much sense for me.

I'm not suggesting that the BPL requirements must be harder, [but they could be simplified for LPLB or reduced their privileges alternatively, to get the BPL reevaluation. For instance the LPLB can not fly in controlled air space \(it should not be necessary ATC liaison methods\), over cities...](#)

That is the only different here in Spain. As a private pilot (even with a radio rate), we can not fly in CTR or TMA. Only when we are flying for authorized Aerial Works Companies, making commercial flights, we can use the ATC services.

I think that differences must be established between both LPLB and BPL licences not only in economical privileges, but also in their syllabus, training and real performance capabilities.

Even considering carrying passengers as the main balloon commercial activity, advertising and filming are also commercial flights (I understand sponsorship is different to aerial advertising). And as far as I understand they soon will be considered in this way in Europe.

In my experience, the best advertising flights or flights for images recording are those with a little "65", where the pilot is alone in the basket or only with a camera operator. The "risky" flights close the sea, in ATC areas, in very fast winds, landings in small parks into the cities... can be done better with small balloons without passengers.

These other flights, not CAT, have been (and still they are) the economical support in most of the balloon companies that I know. In this case, the big balloons are not only unnecessary, but rather they are not practical.

Establishing different performance capabilities (restrictions) will permit to have a "light" licence, capable to offer a reasonable club / sponsor relationship and a good platform to jump to a professional environment, without favouring misunderstandings about capabilities or privileges between LPLB and BPL.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, as this comment was addressed already to several other segments, please see the responses already provided.

This AMC is dealing with the syllabus of theoretical knowledge for the balloon pilot licence. As no specific comment or proposal dealing with the contents of



this AMC is provided, the Agency is not able to provide an additional substantiated comment.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart C: Private Pilot Licence (PPL), Sailplane Pilot Licence (SPL) and Balloon Pilot Licence (BPL) - AMC to FCL.215 and FCL.220 - Theoretical knowledge examination and skill test for the PPL**

p. 321

comment 2579 comment by: CAA Belgium

Are these references correct? There is no FCL 220.

response *Noted*

Thank you for pointing this out. In fact the references are not correct. The text will be amended accordingly.

comment 6826 comment by: CAA CZ

Para FCL.220 does not exist in this NPA.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response to comment no 2579 above.

comment 6834 comment by: CAA CZ

General comment.

We recommend to number all single AMCs as 1 initially. When new AMC will be published, there will be no need to add "1" to existing AMC. It will facilitate possible references to that AMC.

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing this very forward-thinking comment. It will be taken into consideration by a future rule-making task.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart C: Private Pilot Licence (PPL), Sailplane Pilot Licence (SPL) and Balloon Pilot Licence (BPL) - AMC No 1 to FCL.220 - Contents of the skill test for the issue of a PPL(A)**

p. 321-324

comment 2262 comment by: Mike Grierson

Skill Test Tolerances  
Height +/- 200 feet with simulated engine failure!  
With only one engine that is blatant nonsense!

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your comment. Please mind that when drafting the text, the Agency followed closely the provisions of JAR-FCL. In the Flight Examiners Manual (JAA Administrative and Guidance Material Section 5: Personnel Licensing Part 2: Procedures) many explanations of how

to check engine failures are given. This manual will be transferred to Part-FCL by the future rule making task FCL.002.

comment **2580** comment by: *CAA Belgium*

There is no FCL 220.  
(FCL 235 ?)

response *Accepted*

Thank you for your comment. The text will be amended accordingly.

comment **3495** comment by: *FOCA Switzerland*

Subpart C  
AMC No 1 to FCL.220

Para 4 add: .. with simulated engine failure **if multiengine aeroplane is used.**

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment. The contents will be changed accordingly.

comment **3606** comment by: *Susana Nogueira*

Point 4. To add bolded words in two times:

'With simulated engine failure **if multiengine aeroplane is used**'

response *Accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please refer to the response provided to comment No. 3495 in the same segment above.

comment **4808** comment by: *CAA Belgium*

Point 4 ... with simulated engine failure if multiengine aeroplane is used

response *Accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please refer to the response to comment No. 3495 in the same segment above.

comment **5491** comment by: *Irv Lee (Higherplane Aviation Training Ltd)*

Section 1 of the content of the skills test for a PPL is missing the 'NOTAM' checking / briefing. NOTAM checking is vital in today's environment and should be a compulsory part of the test. Weather, documentation, mass and balance are all included, NOTAM checking is missing, it needs to be added.

Suggest Section 1 (a) of the test schedule is amended to 'Preflight documentation, weather and NOTAM brief'

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment.  
When drafting this text, the Agency followed closely the provisions of JAR-FCL 1. In this text the NOTAMs were not mentioned whilst in JAR-FCL they were already. Therefore there is an inconsistency with AMC No 2 to FCL.220 (which will be renamed in FCL.235). The NOTAM checking will be added when drafting the final text.

comment

5854

comment by: ENAC TLP

The technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed flight test tolerances (standards) need some specifications for NTS and TEM avoiding the use of terms such as 'good judgement and airmanship' that are easily prone to subjectivity, bias and abuse during assessment because of a lack of common understanding.

**Need:** more clear and unambiguous standards for the assessment of non-technical skills during skill test and proficiency checks for class/type ratings and license skill tests.

**Proposal:** to specify differently the non technical abilities to be demonstrated during test/checks to exercise good airmanship and related Flight test tolerances.

#### AMC N° 1 to FCL.220

#### Contents of the skill test for the issue of a PPL (A)

#### page 321/322

#### FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES

3. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

- as it is;
- as it is;
- *apply NTS and TEM as needed to exercise good airmanship;*
- as it is;
- as it is.

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment. However, please remember that when drafting the text, the Agency closely followed the provisions of JAR-FCL where this wording actually comes from. Please be informed that in the Flight Examiners Manual (JAA Administrative and Guidance Material Section 5: Personnel Licensing Part 2: Procedures) many explanations of how to check the exercise of good judgement and airmanship are given. This manual will be transferred to Part-FCL by the future rule making task FCL.002.

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

6183

comment by: UK CAA

#### Paragraph:

AMC No 1 to FCL.220 1

#### Page No:

321

#### Comment:

It seems strange that, for a LPL(A) the navigation test route as described in AMC 1 to FCL.125 1 'should' finish at a different airfield from the airfield of departure but for the PPL it 'may' finish at a different airfield.

**Justification:**

There should be consistency between the LPL(A) and the PPL(A)

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Amend to read 'The route to be flown for the navigation test should be chosen by the flight examiner. (FE). The route should end at an aerodrome different from the aerodrome of departure.'

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment. Please remember that when drafting the text, the Agency closely followed the provisions of JAR-FCL. Having discussed your proposal, the Agency decided not to accept it as at the end of the day both wordings would leave it to the examiner to decide whether to return to the aerodrome of departure or not.

comment

6184

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC No 1 to FCL.220 5

**Page No:**

322

**Comment:**

Sentence incomplete.

**Justification:**

Typographical error.

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Amend to read: 'The skill test contents and sections set out in this AMC should be used for the skill test for the issue of a PPL(A) on single engine aeroplanes and touring motor gliders.'

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment.

The change to the text will be made according the original JAR-FCL text which states that the test contents shall be used for the skill test for the issue of a PPL(A) on single-engine and multi-engine aeroplanes (to be added). In order to clarify that this skill test can be done also on a TMG this will be added also as proposed with your comment.

comment

6611

comment by: Austro Control GmbH

Comment to Section 5 abnormal and emergency procedures:

a) Simulated engine failure after takeoff

- on a single engine aeroplane such a manoeuvre seems to be inappropriate.

Proposed Text:

**Delete a**

response *Accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.

Please refer to the response provided to comment No. 3495 above.

comment	6828	comment by: CAA CZ
	Para FCL.220 does not exist in this NPA.	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 2580 above.	
comment	7203	comment by: UK CAA
	<p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC No 1 to FCL.220 para 3</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 322 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The competency of "exercise good judgement and airmanship" is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Consistency of testing</p> <p><b>Proposed Text:</b> <b>(if applicable)</b> Amend to read; <del>"exercise good judgement and airmanship</del> - <i>apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test</i>".</p>	
response	<i>Not accepted</i>	
	The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment No. 5854 in this segment.	
comment	7828	comment by: CAA Finland
	<p>Normally PPL skill test is with single-engine aircraft, but may be (with additional experience) be multi-engine. The piloting skills in abnormal situation must be safe, but 15 degrees heading requirement is too tight.</p> <p>Height normal flight <math>\pm</math> 150 feet with <b>major failure or</b> simulated engine failure <b>on multi-engine aircraft</b> <math>\pm</math> 200 feet Heading / Tracking of radio aids normal flight <math>\pm</math> 10° with simulated engine failure <math>\pm</math> <b>20° or <math>\pm</math> 30 on multi-engine aircraft</b></p> <p>Speed takeoff and approach +15/-5 knots all other flight regimes <math>\pm</math> 15 knots <b>with simulated engine failure (multi-engine aircraft only) +20 knots / - 5 knots</b></p>	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please remember that the Agency followed the provisions of JAR-FCL when drafting the text. The changes you	

proposed are significantly different from JAR-FCL. Please remember also that in the FEM many additional details of how these items should be checked are mentioned.

comment 7834

comment by: CAA Finland

Skill test form:

The numbering system differs from CR/TR skill test forms and should be harmonized. I support the structure of CR/TR form as there is clearly easy to add subparts like 2.4 > 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.1		
1.2		
1.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.1		
2.2		
2.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.1		
3.2		
3.3		

And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

response

*Noted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the skill test/proficiency check tables included in the Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL (e.g. Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality. Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

To leave the content/ format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms.

In the meantime, to develop report forms as AMC material to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the applicable AMCs e.g. AMCs to Appendices 7, 9 and 12, as published in this NPA.

To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart C: Private Pilot Licence (PPL), Sailplane Pilot Licence (SPL) and Balloon Pilot Licence (BPL) - AMC No 2 to FCL.220 - Contents of the skill test for the issue of a PPL(H)** p. 324-327

comment

2581

comment by: CAA Belgium

There is no FCL 220.

(FCL 235?)

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment. The text will be amended accordingly.

comment

4242

comment by: *CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority*

he competency of "exercise good judgement and airmanship" is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.

Amend to read; "~~exercise good judgement and airmanship~~ - *apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test*".

response

*Noted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

5829

comment by: *ENAC TLP*

The technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed flight test tolerances (standards) need some specifications for NTS and TEM avoiding the use of terms such as 'good judgement and airmanship' that are easily prone to subjectivity, bias and abuse during assessment because of a lack of common understanding.

**Need:** more clear and unambiguous standards for the assessment of non-technical skills during skill test and proficiency checks for class/type ratings and license skill tests.

**Proposal:**

Specify differently the non technical abilities to be demonstrated during test/checks to exercise good airmanship and related Flight test tolerances

**AMC N° 2 to FCL.220**

**Contents of the skill test for the issue of a PPL (H)**

**page 324**

**FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES**

3. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

- as it is;
- as it is;
- *apply NTS and TEM as needed to exercise good airmanship;*
- as it is;
- as it is.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 4242 above.

comment

6185

comment by: *UK CAA*

**Paragraph:**



	<p>AMC 2 FCL.220 Section 2 (o)  <b>Page No:</b>  326 of 647  <b>Comment:</b>  Section 2 Item o refers to Autoroative Landing. The flight syllabus Exercise 16 refers to Simulated Engine Off Landing.  <b>Justification:</b>  Clarification/Standardisation  <b>Proposed Text:</b>  <b>(if applicable)</b>  Change wording to Simulated Engine Off Landing.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 7839 in this segment.</p>
comment	<p>6186 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b>  AMC 2 FCL.220 Section 2 (q)  <b>Page No:</b>  326 of 647  <b>Comment:</b>  Section 2 Item q presumably refers to a Confined Area or an Off Airfield Landing Site  <b>Justification:</b>  Clarification - Confined Area is mentioned in the Section 2 title but not specified as item (q).  <b>Proposed Text:</b>  <b>(if applicable)</b>  technique for a confined area.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 7839 in this segment.</p>
comment	<p>6188 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b>  AMC 2 FCL.220 Section 3  <b>Page No:</b>  326 of 647  <b>Comment:</b>  The LPL Skill Test item e now includes Collision Avoidance (look out procedures) but it is not in the PPL Skill Test  <b>Justification:</b>  Standardisation.  <b>Proposed Text:</b>  <b>(if applicable)</b>  Insert new test item Collision Avoidance (look out procedures)</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 7839 in this segment.</p>

comment	<p>6189 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC 2 FCL.220 Section 3 (e)</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 326 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The term 'where available' is confusing as it is unclear to whether it refers to the aircraft fit or ground station. Normally this had referred to VOR/NDB but now GPS is in the syllabus can this be used.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Aircraft are required to be suitably equipped for the test therefore it should be made clear.</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Delete (where available) insert <b>(VOR/NDB/GPS)</b></p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 7839 in this segment.</p>
comment	<p>6190 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC 2 to FCL.220 Section 4</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 326 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Unusual Attitude recovery are covered under IF syllabus and should be tested.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Safety</p> <p><b>Proposed Text:</b> Add new item e. Recovery from Unusual Attitude with sole reference to instruments.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 7839 in this segment.</p>
comment	<p>6193 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC 2 to FCL.220 Section 5 (g)</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 327 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Reference to Appendix 9 B.1 is inappropriate as it refers to aeroplanes.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Clarification</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment. The text will be amended accordingly.</p>

comment	6829	comment by: CAA CZ
	Para FCL.220 does not exist in this NPA.	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	
	Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment No. 2581 in this segment.	
comment	6982	comment by: CAA CZ
	<p><b>(AMC No. 1/2 to FCL.220)</b> <i>Note: Number of the paragraph is in brackets because it does not exist. The number is just proposed place where the text should be added.</i></p> <p><i>„Application and Report Form for the PPL(A)/(H) Skill Test“ according to paragraph IEM FCL 1.135/2.135 is not included in the proposal. It should be completed.</i></p>	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	
	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>You are right with the numbering error identified. The text will be amended accordingly to read: "AMC No 2 to FCL.235".</p> <p>The 'Application and Report Form' for the PPL(A)/(H) Skill Test, according to paragraph IEM FCL 1.135/2.135 is indeed not included in the proposal. The Agency will add this form as a combined form for several other skill tests as an AMC. Please see the resulting text.</p>	
comment	7205	comment by: UK CAA
	<p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC No 2 to FCL.220 para 3</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 324 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The competency of "exercise good judgement and airmanship" is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Consistency of testing</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Amend to read; <del>"exercise good judgement and airmanship"</del> - <i>apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test".</i></p>	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to the comment no 4242 in this segment.	
comment	7836	comment by: CAA Finland

The piloting skills in abnormal situation must be safe, but 15 degrees heading requirement is too tight. Speeds are expressed on opposite way than normally. Amended text proposal:

Height  
 normal forward flight ± 150 feet  
 with simulated major emergency ± 200 feet  
 hovering I.G.E. flight ± 2 feet  
 Heading / Tracking of radio aids normal flight ± 10°  
 with simulated major emergency ± **20°**  
 Speed  
 takeoff **and** approach **+15 knots / - 10 knots**  
 all other flight regimes ± 15 knots

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 7839 in this segment.

comment

7839

comment by: *CAA Finland*

Skill test form:

The numbering system differs from CR/TR skill test forms and should be harmonized. I support the structure of CR/TR form as there is clearly easy to add subparts like 2.4 > 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.1		
1.2		
1.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.1		
2.2		
2.3		
And		
So		

On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.1		
3.2		
3.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

response **Noted**

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the skill test/proficiency check tables included in the Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL (e.g. Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality. Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

To leave the content/format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms.

In the meantime, to develop report forms as AMC material to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the applicable AMCs e.g. AMCs to Appendices 7, 9 and 12, as published in this NPA.

To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMC material to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account

for that work.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart C: Private Pilot Licence (PPL), Sailplane Pilot Licence (SPL) and Balloon Pilot Licence (BPL) - AMC p. 327-329 No 3 to FCL.235 - Content of the skill test for the issue of the PPL(As)**

comment

1954

comment by: Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch

**CONTENT OF THE TEST too restrictive with respect to the EC Regulations 216/2008 on common rules in civil aviation (Basic Regulations)**

Proof:

1) Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations call for the knowledge of " non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors."

This is NOT ""threat and error management"!

2) §(16) of the Basic Regulations principles claim for a "promotion of a "culture of safety"

3) "threat and error management" is a special approach and methodology not accepted by all. More modern and general accepted techniques exist (see my comments on TEM, definitions error and error management and the Basic Regulations of the EC.

Proposal:

Exchange

In CONTENT OF THE TEST4 "and principles of threat and error management apply in all sections".

by

"and principles of human performance and limitations and non-technical skills with regard to flight safety apply in all sections

response

*Not accepted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

5942

comment by: ENAC TLP

The technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed flight test tolerances (standards) need some specifications for NTS and TEM avoiding the use of terms such as 'good judgement and airmanship' that are easily prone to subjectivity, bias and abuse during assessment because of a lack of common understanding.

**Need:** more clear and unambiguous standards for the assessment of non-technical skills during skill test and proficiency checks for class/type ratings and license skill tests.

**Proposal:** to specify differently the non technical abilities to be demonstrated during test/checks to exercise good airmanship and related Flight test

tolerances

**AMC N° 3 to FCL.235**

**Contents of the skill test for the issue of a PPL (As)  
page 324**

**FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES**

3. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

- as it is;
- as it is;
- *apply NTS and TEM as needed to exercise good airmanship;*
- as it is;
- as it is.

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment No. 1954 above.

comment

6791

comment by: CAA CZ

Abbreviation for an airship should be corrected (~~ASs~~) - in this NPA the symbol composed of the capital letter "A" and the small letter "s" is used .

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for your comment.

This editorial will be changed accordingly.

comment

7206

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC No 3 to FCL.235 para 2

**Page No:**

327 of 647

**Comment:**

The competency of "exercise good judgement and airmanship" is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.

**Justification:**

Consistency of testing

**Proposed Text:**

**(if applicable)**

Amend to read;

~~"exercise good judgement and airmanship~~ - *apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test*".

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment.

Please refer to the response given to comment No. 1954 in the same segment above.

<b>to FCL.210.A - Flight Instruction for the Private Pilot Licence - Aeroplane</b>
--

comment	<p>666 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>FOCA Switzerland</i></span></p> <p>Subpart C AMC to FCL.210.A</p> <p><b>The flight instruction syllabus should take into account also the local environment and geographical topography of the country in which instruction for the issue of licence is given.</b></p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency agrees in general that this topic must be part of the flight training provided but checking the syllabus you will find the following note under exercise 14 which is the first solo flight:</p> <p>"During flights immediately following the solo circuit consolidation the following should be revised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- procedure for leaving and rejoining the circuit</li> <li>- the local area, restrictions, map reading....."</li> </ul> <p>The Agency believes that the issue raised with your comment is covered and will not introduce an additional exercise.</p>
comment	<p>3603 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Susana Nogueira</i></span></p> <p>Exercise 18C</p> <p>GPS is missing</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response provided to comment No. 3792 (DGAC France) in the same segment below.</p>
comment	<p>3792 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></span></p> <p>Part FCL AMC to FCL.210.A, Use of GPS is missing Add in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Exercice 18 (c) Radio navigation syllabus for PPL(A),</li> <li>- Exercice 22 c Radio navigation syllabus for PPL(H),</li> <li>- Exercice 14 c Radio navigation syllabus for PPL(As),</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Use of Global Navigation Satellite Systems</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b><i>selection of waypoints</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>to/from indications, orientation</i></b></li> </ul>



	<b>- error messages</b>
response	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency agrees that there should be consistency between the LPL(A) and PPL(A) syllabus regarding this issue.</p> <p>This inconsistency is based on the fact that the established principle for the drafting phase of these requirements was to transfer the JAR-FCL syllabus for the PPL without introducing a lot of changes. As the syllabus for the LPL was drafted in a different way and is not strictly JAR-based, this important topic (exercise for the use of the GPS) was included.</p> <p>However, the Agency agrees that this topic should also be covered during the PPL training and will amend the text accordingly by using the text already introduced in the LPL section.</p>
comment	<p><b>4382</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DCA Malta</i></span></p> <p>GPS training missing, it is required in LPL and PPL flight training</p>
response	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response provided to comment No. 3792 (DGAC France) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p><b>4804</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p>exercise 18C: GPS is missing</p>
response	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response provided to comment No. 3792 (DGAC France) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p><b>5288</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p>Part FCL AMC to FCL.210.A, Use of GPS is missing Add in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Exercice 18 (c) Radio navigation syllabus for</li> <li>- Exercice 22 c Radio navigation syllabus for PPL(H),</li> <li>- Exercice 14 c Radio navigation syllabus for PPL(As), <b><i>Use of Global Navigation Satellite Systems</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>selection of waypoints</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>to/from indications, orientation</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>error messages</i></b></li> </ul>
response	<p><b>Accepted</b></p>

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to comment No. 3792 (DGAC France) in the same segment above.

comment 5533 comment by: *Chris Gowers*

Page 334 The note after Exercise 11/12E

This refers to a further training requirement for nosewheel/tailwheel aircraft if the pilot trains on the other configuration. However the details of the required conversion training do not appear to be listed in the EASA FCL document.

Is this intentional and to be left to the discretion of the ATO? If this is the case then a further sentence should be added to that effect.

response *Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please remember that the Agency closely followed the provisions of JAR-FCL when drafting the text of NPA 2008-17. The proposed training syllabus of flight instruction for the PPL aeroplane was taken over from JAR-FCL which is well established in the JAA member states. As the Agency does not see any surplus in safety in your proposal, the text will not be changed in this respect.

comment 5540 comment by: *Chris Gowers*

Exercise 6 delete "lateral level" insert "wings level"

I think that is what is meant by lateral level. Lateral level is not a term usually used in aviation English.

response *Noted*

Thank your for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 5533 above.

comment 6195 comment by: *UK CAA*

**Paragraph:**

AMC to 210.A 3

**Page No:**

330

**Comment:**

Exercise numbering. It is most unfortunate that the exercise numbering for the LPL(A) at AMC to 110.A 3 differs from the PPL(A). This is unnecessary and will lead to much confusion at schools where training is given for both licences.

**Justification:**

There should be consistency between the LPL(A) and the PPL(A).

**Proposed Text:**

**(if applicable)**

Amend LPL(A) exercise numbering to agree with PPL(A) exercise numbering.

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment. As there is a different training

programme for the LPL licence, it will not be possible to align the two numbering systems.

comment

6196

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC to 210.A 3

**Page No:**

336

**Comment:**

GPS does not appear in Ex 18C for the PPL whereas it is the only airborne radio aid taught in the LPL. This is inconsistent.

**Justification:**

There should be consistency between the LPL(A) and the PPL(A)

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Add GPS to the list of radio navigation aids.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to comment No. 3792 (DGAC France) in the same segment above.

The Agency agrees that there should be not such an inconsistency between the LPL(A) and PPL(A) syllabus regarding this issue. It is based on the fact that the Agency was asked to transfer the JAR-FCL syllabus for the PPL without changing it. As the syllabus for the LPL was drafted in a different way and is not only JAR based this important item was included for the LPL.

The Agency agrees and will amend the text accordingly.

comment

6615

comment by: Austro Control GmbH

General remark:

Local environment such as mountains should have an influence to the syllabus.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to comment No. 666 (FOCA Switzerland) in the same segment above.

comment

6619

comment by: Austro Control GmbH

Comment to Exercise 18C: Radio navigation:

GPS is missing

Proposed Text:

Insert

**Use of Global Navigation Satellite Systems**

- **Selection of waypoints**
- **to/from indications, orientation**
- **error messages**

response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response provided to comment No. 3792 (DGAC France) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p>6971 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAA CZ</span></p> <p>In syllabus for PPL(A) training the exercise 18C – Using of GPS should be added.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response provided to comment No. 3792 (DGAC France) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p>7208 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC to FCL.210.A para 2.1</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 330 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The use of the expression “threat and error management” is too loose and needs to be aligned with the exercise of NTS by the applicant.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Consistency across licence skill tests.</p> <p><b>Proposed Text:</b> <b>(if applicable)</b> Amend to read; “ principles of <del>threat and error management</del> <i>non-technical skills...</i>”.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.</p> <p>We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.</p>
comment	<p>7844 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAA Finland</span></p> <p>Exercise 18C GPS is missing. New text proposal after DME:</p> <p>GPS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- availability</li> <li>- programming the route</li> <li>- different modes of presentation and scales</li> <li>- course deviation indicator</li> </ul>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p>

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to comment No. 3792 (DGAC France) in the same segment above.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart C: Private Pilot Licence (PPL), Sailplane Pilot Licence (SPL) and Balloon Pilot Licence (BPL) - AMC to FCL.210.H - Flight Instruction for the Private Pilot Licence (Helicopter)** p. 338-348

comment

1251

comment by: *Aeromega*

Ex 22c

It is now essential that we include formal instruction on proper use of a GPS in the syllabus. With the public having an instinctive understanding of Satellite Navigation Systems through the motor industry it is naive and dangerous to ignore the limitations and dangers of relying on GPS and just pretend that students won't use them.

EX 27

The PPL (H) syllabus should have Instrument Flying reduced to one hour of appreciation. The inclusion of I/F in the PPL has encouraged pilots to believe they can fly in IMC when recent accident statistics suggest they cannot. I/F is fine as a pre cursor to Night Flying but 5 hours out of a minimum 45 is disproportionate and this sends the wrong message to a PPL (H).

response

*Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees that there should be a consistency between the LPL(H) and PPL(H) syllabus regarding the issue of instruction how to use the GPS.

The actual inconsistency is based on the fact that the Agency was originally tasked to transfer the JAR-FCL syllabus for the PPL without introducing too many changes or amendments. As the syllabus for the LPL was drafted in a different way and is not only JAR based this important topic was already included.

The Agency agrees and will amend the text accordingly.

Regarding your second issue (instrument flying instruction), the Agency reviewed all the comments received on the rule text in FCL.210.H and on the AMC material dealing with the issue of the instrument training. After careful consideration and further discussions with the experts, the Agency decided to delete the required 5 hours instrument flight time but to keep the requirement for a basic instrument training and a 180° turn. Please see also the responses provided to the comments on FCL.210.H. The AMC material will not be changed in order to address this basic training for the 180° turn by solely reference to instruments.

comment

1949

comment by: *Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch*

**The definition of the syllabus is too restrictive with respect to the EC Regulations 216/2008 on common rules in civil aviation (Basic Regulations)**

Proof:

1) Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations call for the knowledge of " non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors."

This is NOT ""threat and error management"!

2) §(16) of the Basic Regulations principles claim for a "promotion of a "culture of safety"

3) "threat and error management" is a special approach and methodology not accepted by all. More modern and general accepted techniques exist (see my comments on TEM, definitions error and error management and the Basic Regulations of the EC.

Proposal:

Exchange

"The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles of threat and error management and also cover:"

by

"The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles of human performance and limitations and non-technical skills with regard to flight safety and also cover:"

response

*Not accepted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.

We suggest that you submit a rule-making proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

1955

comment by: *Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch*

**The definition of the syllabus is too restrictive with respect to the EC Regulations 216/2008 on common rules in civil aviation (Basic Regulations)**

Proof:

1) Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations call for the knowledge of " non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors."

This is NOT ""threat and error management"!

2) §(16) of the Basic Regulations principles claim for a "promotion of a "culture of safety"

3) "threat and error management" is a special approach and methodology not accepted by all. More modern and general accepted techniques exist (see my comments on TEM, definitions error and error management and the Basic Regulations of the EC.

	<p>Proposal: Exchange "The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles of threat and error management and also cover:"</p> <p>by "The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles <u>of human performance and limitations and non-technical skills with regard to flight safety</u> and also cover: "</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment No. 1949 above.</p>
comment	<p><b>3604</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Susana Nogueira</i></span></p> <p>Exercise 22 C</p> <p>GPS is missing.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion. Please see the response provided to comment No. 3793 (DGAC France) in the same segment below.</p>
comment	<p><b>3793</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></span></p> <p>Part FCL AMC to FCL.210.H</p> <p>Use of GPS is missing</p> <p>Add in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Exercice 18 (c) Radio navigation syllabus for PPL(A),</li> <li>- Exercice 22 c Radio navigation syllabus for PPL(H),</li> <li>- Exercice 14 c Radio navigation syllabus for PPL(As),</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Use of Global Navigation Satellite Systems</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b><i>selection of waypoints</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>to/from indications, orientation</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>error messages</i></b></li> </ul>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency agrees that there should be consistency between the LPL(A) and PPL(A) syllabus regarding this issue. It is based on the fact that the Agency was tasked to transfer the JAR-FCL syllabus for the PPL (in this syllabus the GPS is not mentioned) without changing it. As the syllabus for the LPL was drafted in a different way and is not only JAR-based, this important topic (introducing the GPS) was already included.</p>

The Agency agrees and will amend the text accordingly.

comment **4805** comment by: *CAA Belgium*

exercise 22C: GPS is missing

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.  
Please see the response provided to comment No. 3793 (DGAC France) in the same segment above.

comment **5289** comment by: *CAA Belgium*

Part FCL AMC to FCL.210.H

Use of GPS is missing

Add in

- Exercice 18 (c) Radio navigation syllabus for PPL(A),
- Exercice 22 c Radio navigation syllabus for PPL(H),
- Exercice 14 c Radio navigation syllabus for PPL(As), ***Use of Global Navigation Satellite Systems***
- ***selection of waypoints***
- ***to/from indications, orientation***
- ***error messages***

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.  
Please see the response provided to comment No. 3793 (DGAC France) in the same segment above.

comment **5399** comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

Comment: editorial comment on 3rd line, page 246:  
– omni bearing selector (OMBS)

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment. The editorial change will be taken into consideration when drafting the final text.

comment **6197** comment by: *UK CAA*

**Paragraph:**

AMC 2 to FCL.210H paragraph 2.1

**Page No:**

338 of 647

**Comment:**

The paragraph refers to Principles of Threat and Error Management, however Threat and Error Management is not included in the JAR/EASA FI syllabus so the FI is not qualified to instruct. Threat and Error Management needs to be included in the Teaching and Learning element of the FI courses.

**Justification:**

Safety



response

*Noted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.

We suggest that you submit a rule-making proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

6199

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC 2 to FCL. 210H paragraph 2.1(h)

**Page No:**

338 of 647

**Comment:**

'Touchdown Autorotation' is an American term not used in this document and means the same as simulated engine off landing.

**Justification:**

Clarification/Standardisation

**Proposed Text:**

Delete touchdown autorotation or powered recovery, insert autorotation to power recovery,

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment. The content of this chapter was taken over from JAR-FCL 2.125 and the training course contents are well established like this all over Europe. Your proposal does not provide an added value in safety and therefore the text will not be changed.

comment

6201

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC 2 to FCL.210H paragraph 3 Ex 22c

**Page No:**

346 of 647

**Comment:**

LPL (H) syllabus now includes GPS so should be included in PPL syllabus.

**Justification:**

Standardisation

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Copy text from LPL syllabus Ex 22 page 239

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to comment No. 3793 (DGAC France) in the same segment above.

comment

6202

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC 2 to FCL.210H paragraph 3 Ex 22 &amp; 23

**Page No:**

	<p>346 &amp; 347 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> List of profiles is missing the Running take off and Cushion Creep take off profiles</p> <p><b>Justification:</b></p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Insert - running take off - cushion creep take off</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>However, as the content of the flying training syllabus was taken over from Section 2 of JAR-FCL 2 (where those exercises were not required), the Agency is of the opinion that such an amendment of the training syllabus needs an additional safety assessment before introducing it. At this stage the Agency cannot see the need to include these two exercises as mandatory training items for a PPL(H) candidate.</p>
comment	<p>6207 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC 2 to FCL.210H paragraph 3 Ex 28a &amp; 28b</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 348 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Night Flying cannot be completed as part of a helicopter PPL course because of the requirements of FCL.810 (b) (1) i.e. completed at least 100 hrs of flight time as pilot in helicopters after the PPL course</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Standardisation</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Delete Ex 28a and 28b in toto.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment. Please remember that the 100 hours flight time could well have been obtained on an LPL(H). In this case the pilot would well be able to obtain a night rating together with his or her PPL(H).</p>
comment	<p>6973 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAA CZ</span></p> <p>In syllabus for PPL(H) training the exercise 22C – Using of GPS should be added.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion. Please see the response provided to comment No. 3793 (DGAC France) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p>7209 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p>

**Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL.210.H para 2.1

**Page No:**

338 of 647

**Comment:**

The use of the expression "threat and error management" is too loose and needs to be aligned with the exercise of NTS by the applicant.

**Justification:**

Consistency across licence skill tests.

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Amend to read;

" principles of ~~threat and error management~~ *non-technical skills...*".

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.

The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment

7846

comment by: *CAA Finland*

Exercise 22C

GPS is missing. New text proposal after DME:

GPS

- availability
- programming the route
- different modes of presentation and scales
- course deviation indicator

response

*Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to comment No. 3793 (DGAC France) in the same segment above.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart C: Private Pilot Licence (PPL), Sailplane Pilot Licence (SPL) and Balloon Pilot Licence (BPL) - AMC p. 348-355 to FCL.210.As - Flight Instruction for the Private Pilot Licence - Airships**

comment

1950

comment by: *Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch*

**The definition of the syllabus is too restrictive with respect to the EC Regulations 216/2008 on common rules in civil aviation (Basic Regulations)**

Proof:

1) Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations call for the knowledge of " non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors."

This is NOT ""threat and error management"!

2) §(16) of the Basic Regulations principles claim for a "promotion of a "culture of safety"

3) "threat and error management" is a special approach and methodology not accepted by all. More modern and general accepted techniques exist (see my comments on TEM, definitions error and error management and the Basic Regulations of the EC.

Proposal:

Exchange

"The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles of threat and error management and also cover:"

by

"The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles of human performance and limitations and non-technical skills with regard to flight safety and also cover:"

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

The Agency would like to suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment

1956

comment by: *Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch*

NOTE: under 2.1 "...management and cover" the word also is missing, which results in a too restrictive syllabus it should say "... management and **ALSO** cover"

Furthermore:

**The definition of the syllabus is too restrictive with respect to the EC Regulations 216/2008 on common rules in civil aviation (Basic Regulations)**

Proof:

1) Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations call for the knowledge of " non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors."

This is NOT ""threat and error management"!

2) §(16) of the Basic Regulations principles claim for a "promotion of a "culture of safety"

3) "threat and error management" is a special approach and methodology not accepted by all. More modern and general accepted techniques exist (see my

comments on TEM, definitions error and error management and the Basic Regulations of the EC.

Proposal:

Exchange

"The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles of threat and error management and also cover:"

by

"The Basic LPL(A) flight instruction syllabus should take into account the principles of human performance and limitations and non-technical skills with regard to flight safety and also cover:"

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Regarding your first proposal, the Agency does not agree as adding the word "also" in 2.1. will change nothing. The Agency does not see why not using the word "also" would result in a too restrictive syllabus.

As to your second issue, it has to be highlighted that issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at the JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

comment

3605

comment by: *Susana Nogueira*

Exercise 14C

GPS is missing

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing this comment.

Please see the response provided to comment No. 3795 (DGAC France) in the same segment below.

comment

3795

comment by: *DGAC FRANCE*

Part FCL AMC to FCL.210.As

Use of GPS is missing

Add in

- Exercice 18 (c) Radio navigation syllabus for PPL(A),
- Exercice 22 c Radio navigation syllabus for PPL(H),
- Exercice 14 c Radio navigation syllabus for PPL(As),

***Use of Global Navigation Satellite Systems***

- ***selection of waypoints***
- ***to/from indications, orientation***

	<b>- error messages</b>
response	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency agrees that there should be consistency between the LPL and the PPL syllabus regarding this issue.</p> <p>This inconsistency is based on the fact that the Agency was tasked to transfer the JAR-FCL syllabus for the PPL without changing it. The syllabus for the PPL(As) is based on the existing PPL syllabus.</p> <p>As the syllabus for the LPL was drafted in a different way and is not only JAR-based, this important topic (exercise for the use of the GPS) was already included in that subpart.</p> <p>However, taking all the comments received into account the Agency agrees and will amend the text accordingly by using the text already introduced in the LPL section.</p>
comment	<p><b>4806</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p>exercise 14C: GPS is missing</p>
response	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment.</p> <p>Please see the response provided to comment No. 3795 (DGAC France) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p><b>5290</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p>Part FCL AMC to FCL.210.As Use of GPS is missing Add in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Exercice 18 (c) Radio navigation syllabus for PPL(A),</li> <li>- Exercice 22 c Radio navigation syllabus for PPL(H),</li> <li>- Exercice 14 c Radio navigation syllabus for PPL(As), <b><i>Use of Global Navigation Satellite Systems</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>selection of waypoints</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>to/from indications, orientation</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>error messages</i></b></li> </ul>
response	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment.</p> <p>Please see the response provided to comment No. 3795 (DGAC France) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p><b>6975</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA CZ</i></span></p> <p>In syllabus for PPL(As) training the excercise 22C – Using of GPS should be added.</p>
response	<p><b>Accepted</b></p>

Thank you for providing this comment.  
Please see the response provided to comment No. 3795 (DGAC France) in the same segment above.

comment

7210

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL.210.As para 2.1

**Page No:**

348 of 647

**Comment:**

The use of the expression "threat and error management" is too loose and needs to be aligned with the exercise of NTS by the applicant.

**Justification:**

Consistency across licence skill tests.

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Amend to read;

" principles of ~~threat and error management~~ *non-technical skills...*".

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.

The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart C: Private Pilot Licence (PPL), Sailplane Pilot Licence (SPL) and Balloon Pilot Licence (BPL) - AMC No1 to FCL.205.S (c) - Contents of the proficiency check for the extension of SPL privileges to exercise commercial privileges on a glider** p. 355-356

comment

342

comment by: Michel Lacombe AF TRTO

## NUMBERING ERROR

"2" is used twice

## AMC No1 to FCL.205.S (c)

Contents of the proficiency check for the extension of SPL privileges to exercise commercial privileges on a glider

1. The applicant should be responsible for the flight planning and should ensure that all equipment and documentation for the execution of the flight are on board.

2. An applicant should indicate to the FE the checks and duties carried out. Checks should be completed in accordance with the authorised check list for the sailplane on which the test is being taken.

## FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCE

~~2-~~ **3.** The applicant should demonstrate the ability to:

- operate the sailplane within its limitations;
- complete all manoeuvres with smoothness and accuracy;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- exercise good judgment and airmanship;</li> <li>- apply aeronautical knowledge; and</li> <li>- maintain control of the sailplane at all times in such a manner that the successful outcome of a procedure or manoeuvre is never seriously in doubt.</li> </ul> <p>4. The applicant should demonstrate his / her skill in at least the winch or aerotow method of launching.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for identifying this editorial mistake. The text will be changed accordingly.</p>
comment	<p><b>806</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Robert Cronk</i></span></p> <p>This all seems sensible.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this positive feedback.</p>
comment	<p><b>2583</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p>As there is only one AMC to FCL 205.S(c), the figure 1 after AMC may be deleted.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank your for your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency agrees and will delete the number in this case.</p>
comment	<p><b>2951</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>FEDERATION FRANCAISE D'AEROSTATION</i></span></p> <p><b>AMC No 1 to FCL.205.B (c)/ Test de Compétence.</b>  Il est exigé 2 tests de compétence après 75 heures de vol pour qu'un titulaire de la licence BPL puisse exercer une activité commerciale. Nous pensons que ce test de compétence peut être réalisé par un FE (instructeur examinateur) au cours <b>d'un seul vol de 60 minutes avec au minimum 2 ascensions</b>. Ceci est d'autant plus vrai pour les ballons à gaz car la durée moyenne d'un vol est de plusieurs heures.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>However, it seems that your comment is assigned to the wrong segment as this AMC is dealing with the contents of the proficiency check for the commercial privilege on a sailplane.</p> <p>Please see the responses provided to the comments received for the segment you are referring to.</p> <p>It should be highlighted that the AMC for the proficiency check (balloons) contains a sentence which allows the examiner to conduct the check in 2 flights asking further for a total flight time of 60 minutes. This sentence clearly allows also to do this check within one flight. This sentence was added to provide</p>



some kind of flexibility for such a check flight based on the specific needs of ballooning operations. As it is an AMC you are allowed to establish an alternative AMC together with your competent authority if there is a need for it.

The Agency does not intend to change the text.

comment

5114

comment by: *Diether Memmert*

**Section 3, Punkt a:**  
'maintain straight and **level flight**' ???

Das machen Sie mir mal laengere Zeit mit einem Segelflugzeug vor!  
Ist wohl nicht ernst gemeint, oder doch?

Dipl.-Ing. TU Diether Memmert, Segelflugpilot seit 1953 mit >8500  
Flugstunden

**Aenderungen:**

(3)(a) Streiche 'and level'

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The wording was developed together with some gliding experts. The term "straight and level flight" was chosen in order to describe that the wings should be levelled. It seems that this wording could be more likely interpreted as "keeping the flight level" which is except in very rare cases (ridge and wave soaring conditions) normally not the case.

The Agency agrees and will delete the term "and level".

comment

5511

comment by: *Irv Lee (Higherplane Aviation Training Ltd)*

Section 1 is missing the 'NOTAM' checking / briefing. NOTAM checking is vital in today's environment and should be a compulsory part of the test. Weather, documentation, mass and balance are all included, NOTAM checking is missing, it needs to be added.

Suggest Section 1.a of the test schedule is amended to include 'NOTAM briefing' too.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees to a certain extend that all the skill tests and proficiency checks should mention the item "NOTAM / Airspace" Briefing as this is an essential element when planning a cross-country flight. Based on the fact that all these check flights with sailplanes are normally only local flights, checking of the NOTAMs will only provide useful information in very few cases.

However, taking your proposal into account and address with this also the general topic of checking the airspace regulations for the take-off site the Agency decided to add "NOTAM" in section 1. The Agency will amend the text

accordingly and will revise the other skill tests/proficiency checks for the LPL to include this important issue.

comment

5949

comment by: *ENAC TLP*

The technical training and knowledge required for each category of licence and rating are well defined, however, the proposed flight test tolerances (standards) need some specifications for NTS and TEM avoiding the use of terms such as 'good judgement and airmanship' that are easily prone to subjectivity, bias and abuse during assessment because of a lack of common understanding.

**Need:** more clear and unambiguous standards for the assessment of non-technical skills during skill test and proficiency checks for class/type ratings and license skill tests.

**Proposal:** to specify differently the non technical abilities to be demonstrated during test/checks to exercise good airmanship and related Flight test tolerances

**AMC N° 1 to FCL.205.S (c)**

**Contents of the proficiency check for the extension of SPL privileges....**

**page 355**

**FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES**

2. The applicant shall demonstrate the ability to:

- as it is;
- as it is;
- *apply NTS and TEM as needed to exercise good airmanship;*
- as it is;
- as it is.

response

*Not accepted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

6304

comment by: *Jonathan Coote*

Again, the BGA has an excellent record on defining the detail of the requirements; this detail should be deferred to the responsibility of the BGA. The detailed requirements appear generally fine, but there needs to be the flexibility to respond to changes in procedures, equipment, and improvements in understanding of safety issues, and update such requirements dynamically without requiring amendments to this proposed legislation.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency has understood the message provided but it should be pointed out that this segment contains an AMC for the skill test in order to extend the privileges of an SPL pilot to commercial operations. As no example is provided in which way the mentioned BGA could take over certain responsibilities for any detail provided with this document, the Agency is not able to provide a

substantiated response.

Please be aware that an AMC is no Implementing Rule and provides exactly the flexibility you are referring to. Nothing will prevent you or the BGA to develop an alternative AMC (if really needed) and to establish this AMC together with your competent authority.

comment

7265

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC No 1 to FCL.205.S para 3

**Page No:**

355 of 647

**Comment:**

The competency of "exercise good judgement and airmanship" is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.

**Justification:**

Consistency of testing

**Proposed Text:**

**(if applicable)**

Amend to read;

~~"exercise good judgement and airmanship"~~ - apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test".

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.

The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment

7847

comment by: CAA Finland

Skill test form:

The numbering system differs from CR/TR skill test forms and should be harmonized. I support the structure of CR/TR form as there is clearly easy to add subparts like 2.4 > 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.1		
1.2		
1.3		
And		
So		
On		


Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.1		
2.2		
2.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.1		
3.2		
3.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

response *Noted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the tables included in Appendices to Part-FCL (namely Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

To leave the content / format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms. The tables developed for the SPL / BPL and LPL are based on these JAR-based lists and will be kept also.

In the meantime, to develop report forms to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the relevant AMCs as published in this NPA.

To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning Objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMCs to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

comment	<p><b>7860</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Tim FREEGARDE</i></span></p> <p>AMC No1 to FCL205S Section 3(a) Level flight generally tricky in sailplanes.</p>
response	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The wording was developed together with some gliding experts. The term "straight and level flight" was chosen in order to describe that the wings should be levelled. It seems that this wording could be more likely interpreted as "keeping the flight level" which is for gliding operations except in very rare cases (ridge and wave soaring conditions) normally not the case.</p> <p>The Agency agrees and will delete the term "and level".</p>

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart C: Private Pilot Licence (PPL), Sailplane Pilot Licence (SPL) and Balloon Pilot Licence (BPL) - AMC No 1 to FCL.205.B (c) - Contents of the proficiency check for extension of the BPL privileges to exercise commercial privileges** p. 356-359

comment

1158

comment by: *Edgar Uekoetter*

Für einen Europäischen Bürger ist diese Art der Kommentierung eine Zumutung! Ob ich hier richtig bin mit meinem Kommentar, kann ich leider nicht erkennen. Aber jetzt sachlich:

Die geplante 6-jährige Wiederholungsprüfung ist aus meiner 25-jährigen Tätigkeit als Fluglehrer nicht dafür zielführend, dass zukünftig weniger Unfälle oder Behinderungen im Flugverkehr passieren. Das zeigt jede Statistik zu diesem Thema.

In den Vereinen besteht grds. eine wesentlich bessere Kontrolle und Aus- bzw. Weiterbildung der Piloten über Flugfertigkeiten und Beherrschung eines Flugzeuges, als dieses jemals durch erhöhte staatliche Kontrolle möglich sein wird. Es steht in ursächlichem Interesse der ehrenamtlich tätigen Ausbilder in den Vereinen, dass sowohl Regeln eingehalten werden und die Piloten sicher fliegen.

Ich schlage vor, dass die Verantwortung von Ausbildung und Überprüfung von Sportpiloten den Verbänden und den Vereinen zusteht. Dieses hat in der Vergangenheit hervorragend funktioniert. Eindeutiger Nachweis ist hierfür die Unfallstatistik am Beispiel Segelflug. Trotz erheblich zunehmender Überlandflugkilometer -sh. OLC contest- ist es in den letzten Jahren nicht zu einer Steigerung der Flugunfälle gekommen. Im Vergleich zum Straßenverkehr sind die durchschnittlich 20 Unfälle p.a. im Bereich Segelflug/Motorsegler in Deutschland sehr gering. Auch die Eigenverantwortung der Piloten für sich selbst, andere und auch für das Flugzeug steht an oberster Stelle. Enger gefasste Gesetze sind hier eher kontraproduktiv

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

As to your first comment on the Comment Response Tool and the way of involvement of stakeholders, it should be pointed out that this system was developed in order to support stakeholders for the commenting process on the Agency's proposals. The CRT system should allow to enter comments easily and to assign a certain comment to a specific paragraph/segment. The Agency does not understand why the system provided should be an unreasonable demand. As no explanation is provided, the Agency is not able to give a substantiated response on this. Please be aware that this system was not only designed in order to fulfil the needs for stakeholders but also for the Agency in order to be able to deal with the comments (in this case more than 8000 comments for Part-FCL) and to provide this kind of detailed responses to all the comments.

This segment contains the AMC for the proficiency check in order to extend the privileges of a BPL holder (commercial privileges). It seems that your comment is not dealing with this AMC but containing general information and comments which should have been addressed to another segment (recency requirement or revalidation of licences). Please study therefore the responses provided in the appropriate segments and check the resulting text.

Regarding the mentioned issue of a mandatory proficiency check, the Agency would like to highlight that the proposed mandatory proficiency check was deleted and a biannual training flight with an instructor for all LPL, PPL, BPL and SPL holders was introduced.

The reasoning behind your comment (based on an example using accident

statistics and cross-country activities in Germany) is understood but does not provide any additional information as only a comparison between Member States having introduced mandatory checks or tests with other Member States having such a requirement not in place would provide additional information. Based on the fact that in Germany no reliable data on numbers of launches or flight hours for sailplane operations is available (and therefore no accident rates are available which are necessary to make comparisons), your statement must be questioned. The figure provided (only 20 accidents per year in average with sailplanes/TMG) is definitely wrong. Please check the official accident statistics provided by the German national AIB (BFU).

comment

1341

comment by: *David MARTIN*

There will be some minor benefits to the proposed issuing of a glider pilot licence but;

#### Cloud/VMC flight

The conditions attached to a licence will place severe restrictions on glider flying especially in the UK.

Glider pilots have enjoyed the freedom to fly close to and even in cloud. This has caused few of any problems and indeed since power pilots are restricted to not flying close to cloud it could be argued that this is a safer place to be.

The removal of the existing privilege to fly close to or in cloud will have a serious impact on gliding and especially in the UK.

My own club is located in a mountain/hill of the UK and there may be times when it is perfectly safe fly but the cloud/flying VMC minima specified will not permit this. This is a severe restriction in my and my fellow members rights and privileges that I have exercised for over 30 years and the club for over 70years.

It will be an anomaly that unregistered and effectively uncontrolled hang and paragliders will be able to continue flying in mountain wave and ridge soarable conditions when sailplanes on adjacent sites are grounded due to the proposed new rules.

#### Currency on type and method of launch

Rules already exist within clubs and the BGA that require pilots to remain current on the type of aircraft flown and the method of launch, so further tighter restriction is unnecessary.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

It seems that your comment should have been addressed to another segment as this AMC is dealing with a proficiency check for balloon pilots.

Please see the responses already provided on this issue in the appropriate segments.

It should be mentioned that the reasoning provided with this comment must be

questioned. As most of the Member States have introduced the ICAO airspace categories, the general rule is that in airspace G VFR traffic is allowed to fly close to clouds up to an altitude of 3000 ft. Airspace E requires a vertical distance of 1000 ft from clouds for the VFR traffic (considering sailplane operations are VFR operations as no Instrument Rating is available for sailplane pilots). This vertical distance was introduced in order to protect the IFR traffic flying in IMC conditions (meaning in the cloud and below) and to avoid a collision. The argument provided with your comment that flying close to cloud "is a safer place to be" is not true as the IFR traffic under control of ATC would not be informed about the other traffic.

Taking into account all these problems and some other important aspects (IMC/Instrument rating for aeroplanes), the Agency decided to initiate a separate rulemaking task dealing with the issue of qualifications for flying in IMC. A cloud flying rating for sailplane pilots will be one of the elements to be discussed. This was already indicated in the Explanatory Note of this NPA. You will have the opportunity to study the proposals for such a rating and take part in the consultation process as this concept will be published as separate NPA.

Regarding your second issue of "currency on type and method of launch", the Agency acknowledges your opinion but will not delete these requirements from the future licensing requirements. As the proposed rules are based on an evaluation of the existing requirements in different Member States, most of these rules should not be much tighter than the rules you are talking about. As no example is provided, the Agency is not able to further deal with this issue or change the proposal.

comment

2584

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

As there is only one AMC to FCL 205.B(c), the figure 1 after AMC may be deleted.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for identifying this editorial mistake.  
The Agency agrees and will change the text accordingly.

comment

2640

comment by: *Bob Berben*

For the proficiency check commercial privileges BPL you are requiring in section 6 "Tethered Flight".

This is a very bad idea.

Please do not promote this dark part of ballooning. Talk to experienced pilots to convince yourself about this stupid dangerous "ballooning" activity. A balloon is made for free flying; not trying to keep it tethered on ropes a few meters above ground with all the unpredictable movements. Far too much unnecessary mishaps happened already.

Implementing this as a mandatory part of a proficiency-check is the wrong part of proof for airmanship.

It would be much better to check professional ability of increased workload for example by requiring the check flight with passengers on board in controlled airspace, using VHF and transponder, instead of stupid tethering.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.



The exercise "tethered flights" was included in the training syllabus for the LPL(B) and the BPL based on the proposal provided by the ballooning licensing experts. The Agency understood that this kind of operation is treated differently in the Member States. It seems to be a usual launch method or procedure in at least three Member States whereas some other States have not introduced or even forbidden this kind of operation.

Based on the comments received, the Agency decided not to include it as part of the normal training syllabus for the licence but to develop a separate paragraph for an extension to tethered flights.

As this kind of extension should not be a mandatory item, the Agency agrees with your proposal and will delete it from the skill test for the commercial privilege.

As to your additional proposals the Agency would like to highlight that the item "ATC liaison" is already included. The Agency does not agree with the proposal to ask for a flight in a specific airspace category or using a transponder as these items might not be appropriate in all Member States (not all commercial balloon operators are equipped with a Mode S transponder/controlled airspace C or D cannot be reached from certain operating sites or a clearance for entering cannot be received).

comment

3083

comment by: *Profballoon Vzw*

We don't see the correlation between a commercial license and a Tethered flight. Balloons are made to fly. Keeping a balloon as a tether on the ground for a certain period of time is way more risky than flying and only a few pilots are positive about this activity. It is mostly done during balloon events for show or under pressure of a sponsor. Nothing proves that a pilot can fly a balloon if he can keep it standing up on the ground for an hour or so.

There are way more important things that might be checked to proof capacity for a commercial flight: flying in controlled airspace, radio contact, using transponder, landowner relationship, check flight with passengers,... To us, this would be way more efficient than a tether.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response already provided to comment No. 2640 (B. Berben) in the same segment above.

comment

5172

comment by: *air events ballooning*

Tether flights have nothing to do with the skills to flying a balloon. or with the knowledge of a PIC of his material.

No problem with more and longer solo flights before examination etc.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response already provided to comment No. 2640 (B. Berben) in the same segment above.

The second issue mentioned is not covered with this AMC. Please see the responses provided on the segment dealing with the experience requirements for the LPL(B) and the BPL. The Agency has taken the concerns and proposals of the various comments on this issue (only from one Member State) into account and will allow more than one solo flight.

comment 5662

comment by: *Peter VAN DEN NOORTGATE*

Requiring in this NPA part section 6, a "Tethered Balloon Flight" is totally unnatural. Hot-air balloons are made/constructed to fly free in airspace. In Belgium our licence qualification is called a rating for "free manned balloon". Tethering balloons, especially with passengers/kids, is a dangerous activity that should be totally abandoned, read discouraged by EASA. It should certainly not be a standard qualification that is tested for or granted on a BPL (whether it be with commercial privileges or not). Tethering should definitely not be promoted in the world of ballooning.

We typically see tethering being practised in Portugal & Italy due to the emphasis on advertising with balloons rather than carrying passenger in balloon baptising rides. This is mainly because there are less people interested in the very expensive rides in these countries (low opportunity, not many pilots = high price). But please, do not generalise this tethering as a common practice in all European countries. Certainly not request it as a requirement/qualification for all European BPL's.

I propose that, if one would really need a rating/extension to be added on its BPL to exercise tethered lifts/flights, that that is checked separately like it is done for a mountain or night flight rating. If you don't have the rating, then you can't do it. It's that simple.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.  
Please see the response already provided to comment No. 2640 (B. Berben) in the same segment above.

comment 5892

comment by: *Belgium*

We think that tethered flight is a very bad idea. Please do not promote this part of ballooning. A balloon is made for flying not to keep it on ropes a few meters above the ground. A lot of accidents happened in the past with tethered flights!!!

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.  
Please see the response already provided to comment No. 2640 (B. Berben) in the same segment above.

It should be highlighted that the Agency is not aware of the fact that (as mentioned by you) "a lot of accidents happened in the past with tethered flights". If this would be the case, the Agency would further investigate the issue and might postpone the introduction of this extension of privileges. So far this information is not supported by any statistical data or additional information about accidents with tethered flights. The Agency would be interested to receive additional information on this issue.

comment	6231 <span style="float: right;">comment by: Cary Crawley</span>
	<p>I would suggest different size categories of SMALL-up to 2,975 cu.m.or 105,000 cu.ft.MEDIUM-2,975 cu.m. or 105,000 cu ft. to 5,100 cu.m. or 180,000 cu.ft.LARGE-5,100 cu.m.or 180,000 cu.ft to 7,790 cu.m. or 275,000 cu.ft.EXTRA-LARGE-sizes exceeding 7,790 cu.m. or 275,000 cu.ft.I have over c.1,000 flying hours with commecial passengers in the largest category here and feel qualified to judge.</p>
response	Noted
	<p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>However, as this segment is dealing only with the comments on the content of the proficiency check for the commercial privilege please see the responses provided on the AMC to FCL.225.B.</p> <p>Based on the huge amount of comments received the Agency decided to establish the following groups of balloons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• less than 4000m<sup>3</sup></li> <li>• 4001m<sup>3</sup> - 7000m<sup>3</sup></li> <li>• 7001m<sup>3</sup> - 10500m<sup>3</sup></li> <li>• more than 10500m<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>

comment	7227 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span>
	<p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC No 1 to FCL.205.B (c) para 3</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 356 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The competency of “exercise good judgement and airmanship” is too loose and is open to subjectivity, bias, and abuse (because of the lack of common understanding with a standardised interpretation). This will undermine the confidence in the licensing rules and assessment process.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Consistency of testing</p> <p><b>Proposed Text:</b> <b>(if applicable)</b> Amend to read; <del>“exercise good judgement and airmanship</del> - <i>apply non-technical skills correctly for the conduct of the test”.</i></p>
response	Not accepted
	<p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>However, the issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rule-making task.</p> <p>The Agency suggests that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue.</p>

comment	7355 <span style="float: right;">comment by: Gerrit Dekimpe</span>
---------	--

For the check commercial privileges BPL you are requiring in section 6 "Tethered Flight".  
 This is a bad idea.  
 Please do not promote this part . A balloon is made for free flying ; not trying to keep it tethered on ropes a few meters above ground with all the unpredictable movements. Far too much mishaps happened already.  
 Implementing this as a part of a proficiency-check is the wrong part of proof for airmanship.  
 It would be much better to check professional ability of increased workload for example by the check flight with passengers on board in controlled airspace, instead of stupid tethering.

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.  
 As this is only a copy of another comment please see the response already provided to comment No. 2640 (B. Berben) in the same segment above.

comment **7848**

comment by: *CAA Finland*

Skill test form:

The numbering system differs from CR/TR skill test forms and should be harmonized. I support the structure of CR/TR form as there is clearly easy to add subparts like 2.4 > 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.

The form should start from new page and already have a summary page like:

	Not OK	OK
1.1		
1.2		
1.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
2.1		
2.2		
2.3		
And		

On		

Examiners signature

	Not OK	OK
3.1		
3.2		
3.3		
And		
So		
On		

Examiners signature

response *Noted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting changes to the tables included in Appendices to Part-FCL (namely Appendices 4, 7, 9 and 12). These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

To leave the content / format of the tables unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL. These tables are not to be considered as EASA forms, but as mere content lists. They can serve as a basis for national authorities and training organisations to develop their own check lists for forms. The tables developed for the SPL / BPL and LPL are based on these JAR-based lists and will be kept also.

In the meantime, to develop report forms to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations). These report forms will be based on the content of the relevant AMCs as published in this NPA.

To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning Objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices and AMCs to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

comment	8096	comment by: <i>Hoogstraats Balloon Team bvba</i>
	A Balloon is not made for tethered flights. Tethered flights do not prove your skills as a pilot, and does not improves the pilotsexperience.	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	Thank you for providing your opinion. Please see the response already provided to comment No. 2640 (B. Berben) in the same segment above.	

<p><b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart C: Private Pilot Licence (PPL), Sailplane Pilot Licence (SPL) and Balloon Pilot Licence (BPL) - AMC to FCL.225.B - Extension of privileges to another balloon class or group</b></p>	p. 359
--	--------

comment	92	comment by: <i>Ballons Libert</i>
	<p>We wonder if the capacities of the envelopes related to the groups are well chosen.</p> <p>Most of the European student pilots learn to fly on a hot air balloon with a capacity around 2000 m<sup>3</sup>. A 4000 m<sup>3</sup> hot air balloon is already a big difference.</p> <p>The medium group is also very large (4000 m<sup>3</sup> to 10000 m<sup>3</sup>).</p> <p>Maybe a 4 groups categorisation (maximum 3500 m<sup>3</sup>, 3500 m<sup>3</sup> to 6000 m<sup>3</sup>, 6000 m<sup>3</sup> to 10000 m<sup>3</sup> and more than 10000 m<sup>3</sup>), or groups based on the number of passengers should be more pertinent.</p>	
response	<i>Partially accepted</i>	
	<p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Based on the huge amount of comments received on the issue of the different groups of balloons (see also the comments and responses in the segment for FCL.225.B), the Agency carefully reviewed this issue and came to the conclusion that a fourth group should be introduced.</p> <p>The following groups will be introduced for the BPL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• less than 4000m<sup>3</sup></li> <li>• 4001m<sup>3</sup> - 7000m<sup>3</sup></li> <li>• 7001m<sup>3</sup> - 10500m<sup>3</sup></li> <li>• more than 10500m<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>	

comment	2639	comment by: <i>Bob Berben</i>
	<p>The " MEDIUM " group is taken a bit too large.</p> <p>For example : a student pilot gets his BPL with the skill test in a 3000 m<sup>3</sup> after a very normal training period of +- 6 months. He flies non-commercially for a year and has 75 hours as PIC, and passes his proficiency check for his commercial qualification. A short period afterwards he performs the 3 required instruction flights on a medium class balloon ( let's say a 4100 m<sup>3</sup> which is not too different from his smaller balloon of his earlier experience), and obtains the extension for the "Medium" group.</p> <p>From that moment on he is allowed to fly on any balloon in this medium group. So it is legally ok from that moment on to see this "young" inexperienced pilot</p>	

	<p>flying commercially with a large number of passengers in a 10.000 m<sup>3</sup> balloon. I know that actually there are even no "groups" at all in a lot of countries, but implementing EASA rules is the ideal occasion to settle this old problem.</p> <p>The definition of the medium group has to be adapted ; or split it up in 2 or impose more experience in time and hours.</p> <p>The definition of the small and large groups is ok.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response provided to comment No. 92 (Balloons Libert) in the same segment above.</p> <p>Additionally, it should be mentioned that the Agency based on several comments proposing it (see comments on FCL.225.B and the Agency's responses) decided to introduce a certain amount of flight time to be completed in order to move from one group to another.</p>
comment	<p>2792 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>David COURT</i></span></p> <p>The group sizes are sensible.</p> <p>The training proposed to move to another group is simple and well thought out.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for this positive feedback.</p> <p>However, based on the huge amount of comments dealing with the issue of groups (see also the responses provided to FCL.225.B), the Agency decided to change some of the proposals slightly.</p> <p>Please see the responses provided to the comments No. 92 (Balloons Libert) and No. 2639 (B. Berben) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p>3084 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Profballoon Vzw</i></span></p> <p>The split in different groups is a good idea and we can only support this. The only remark we have is that the "medium" Group is too wide. Example: a Young pilot who has 75hrs on a 3600m<sup>3</sup> (4 pax and an open basket) can go for his proficiency check so he can get his commercial qualification. Immediately after this, he can make his 3 instruction flights on a "medium" balloon, i.e. a 4100m<sup>3</sup> (5 pax and a partition basket). The step between both balloons is really small. Now he has his rating for "medium" balloons. He is allowed to fly balloons up to 10.000m<sup>3</sup> (about 16 pax and a dubble T-basket) without any experience in a lot of "in between" sizes of balloons (single-T, dubble-T, extended etc...) We have to admit in Belgium, and we regret, that there are no classes at all at this moment. This is the moment and time to correct this and create groups or classes. Splitting the "medium" Group in 2 (i.e. 4000-6000m<sup>3</sup> and 6000-10000m<sup>3</sup>) would be a major step forward.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p>

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to comment No. 92 (Balloons Libert) in the same segment above.

Additionally, it should be mentioned that the Agency based on several comments proposing it (see comments on FCL.225.B and the Agency's responses) decided to introduce a certain amount of flight time to be completed in order to move from one group to another.

comment

3496

comment by: *FOCA Switzerland*

Subpart C  
AMC to FCL.225.B

Titel: **Delete "group", only classes for balloon**

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the Agency does not agree with your proposal as this AMC describes the different classes of balloons but also the different groups of balloons (size related). Please study the responses provided to FCL.225.B and you will discover why this definition of groups will be kept.

comment

3678

comment by: *Axel Ockelmann + Manfred Poggensee Commercial Balloon Operators Germany*

**AMC to FCL.225.B Extension of privileges to another group**

We are not happy with the group seizes. We suggest other options:

Small seize up to 3 400 m<sup>3</sup>;  
Medium seize up to 6 000 m<sup>3</sup>;  
Large seize more than 6 000 m<sup>3</sup>.  
maybe a big seize for more than 10.000m<sup>3</sup>

**Reason:**

The small seize will be usually used for training and first "independent" steps and getting the necessary praxice. So after 16 hours student with a skill test and 30 hours pic with a prof check CAT should be possible without a lack of security.

The range of the medium seize we suggest is the most used seize for CAT in one man organisations in Germany.

The seize more than 6 000 m<sup>3</sup> usually in Europe is the big seize. At 6 000 m<sup>3</sup> there is a border. If you fly a bigger seize than 6 000 m<sup>3</sup> you need 2 crew members, you need 2 cars to carry all people back to the launch field and (do not laugh) it very difficult to remember the passengers names.

There are a only few balloons having a seize of more than 10 000 m<sup>3</sup>. This will cause problems to find instructor and examiner.

response

*Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.



Please see the response provided to comment No. 92 (Balloons Libert) in the same segment above.

Additionally, it should be mentioned that the Agency based on several comments proposing it (see comments on FCL.225.B and the Agency's responses) decided to introduce a requirement for a certain amount of flight time to be completed to move from one group to another.

comment 3797

comment by: *Klaus HARTMANN*

Unter Ziffer 3. werden die Hüllengrößen der 3 Ballongruppen festgelegt. Hierbei ist die Spanne der Gruppe 'medium' sehr hoch ausgefallen. Ballone der Gruppe 'large' ab 10000m<sup>3</sup> gibt es nur noch wenige. Piloten die z.B. Ballone mit 4250m<sup>3</sup> fahren, können nicht automatisch Ballone mit 9500m<sup>3</sup> gleich sicher fahren. Außerdem wird es, wenn überhaupt, nur sehr wenig Prüfer für die Gruppe 'large' geben. Piloten, die Ballone der Gruppe 'large' fahren sind im gewerblichen Bereich tätig und bilden nur selten aus und können somit auch keine Prüfer sein. Daher schlage ich vor den Bereich der Ballongruppe 'medium' auf 4000 - 6000m<sup>3</sup> oder maximal 4000 – 7000m<sup>3</sup> festzulegen. Ballone dieser Größe decken den Bereich 6-12 Insassen ab.

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to comment No. 92 (Balloons Libert) in the same segment above.

Additionally, it should be mentioned that the Agency based on several comments proposing such a requirement (see comments on FCL.225.B and the Agency's responses) decided to add a requirement for a certain amount of flight time to be completed in order to move from one group to another.

comment 5296

comment by: *AEPA (Spanish Balloon Pilots Association)*

AEPA (Spanish Balloon Association) The groups of balloons that EASA is proposing are very disproportionate. We are very worried that you apply this groups of size.

AEPA means that a LPL have to fly only the small type of balloons. With this ditribution of groups, you are giving to a pilot the possibility to change a licence of a 3.000 m3 balloon (only 3 passengers, small basket and fast reaction of the envelope landing) just with 3 instruction flights to a 10.000 m3 balloon (the responsability of 20 passengers, big and longer basket and complicate reaction of the envelope landing with strong wind).

We please you to change the difference of the groups to **small**: Hot air balloons with a maximum envelope capacity of 3.000 m3.

**Medium**: Hot air balloons with an envelope capacity between 3.000 m3 and 6.000 m3.

**Large**: hot air balloons with of more than 6.000 m3.

Other option is to applicate another size.

**Gigant**: Hot air balloons with more than 10.000 m3.

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to comment No. 92 (Balloons Libert) in the same segment above.

Additionally, it should be mentioned that the Agency based on several comments proposing it (see comments on FCL.225.B and the Agency's responses) decided to introduce a requirement for a certain amount of flight time to be completed to move from one group to another.

comment

5610

comment by: *Aerovision*

The EASA proposed sizes are very good. These should NOT be considered for change.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for this positive feedback.

However, based on the huge amount of comments dealing with the issue of groups (see also the responses provided to FCL.225.B), the Agency decided to change some of the proposals slightly.

Please see the responses provided to the comments No. 92 (Balloons Libert) and No. 2639 (B. Berben) in the same segment above.

comment

6165

comment by: *Belgium*

We ask for an extra group between the Medium and the Large Group.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to comment No. 92 (Balloons Libert) in the same segment above.

Additionally, it should be mentioned that the Agency based on several comments proposing it (see comments on FCL.225.B and the Agency's responses) decided to introduce a requirement for a certain amount of flight time to be completed to move from one group to another.

comment

6255

comment by: *Tom Bourgoy*

I think the medium group is too big.  
I propose to make the medium group from 4000 to 7000 cub.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to comment No. 92 (Balloons Libert) in the same segment above. The Agency will add exactly the additional group you are proposing (4001m<sup>3</sup> - 7000m<sup>3</sup>).

Additionally, it should be mentioned that the Agency based on several

comments proposing such a change (see comments on FCL.225.B and the Agency's responses) decided to introduce a requirement for a certain amount of flight time to be completed to move from one group to another.

comment 6898

comment by: *Ives Lannoy*

My personal opinion as a commercial balloon pilot about the rating groups for ballooning is that the group between 4000 m<sup>3</sup> and 10.000 m<sup>3</sup> is too large. In fact someone who has enough experience to climb from small to medium may be experienced enough to fly a 5000 m<sup>3</sup> but not a 10000 m<sup>3</sup> carrying maybe 15 to 20 passengers in some northern countries. these large balloons and huge number of passengers need more experienced pilots to my personal opinion. I suggest to make more (5) groups : 0 to 3000 m<sup>3</sup>, 3000 to 4500 m<sup>3</sup>, 4500 m<sup>3</sup> to 6000 m<sup>2</sup>, 6000 to 8500 m<sup>3</sup> and then above 8500 m<sup>3</sup>. But anyway i think the possible step from 4000 m<sup>3</sup> to 10000 m<sup>3</sup> is too big and not responsible. Now is the moment for making a good rating program in sizes of balloons and the required experience to fly them.

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to comment No. 92 (Balloons Libert) in the same segment above.

Additionally, it should be mentioned that the Agency based on several comments proposing it (see comments on FCL.225.B and the Agency's responses) decided to introduce a requirement for a certain amount of flight time to be completed to move from one group to another.

comment 7337

comment by: *Volker Loeschhorn*

Gasballooning: Proposal to withdraw groups for gasballoons - only one group for all volumes.

Explanatory statement: Today the biggest gasballoon (manned free balloons) have a volume of maximum 1260 cubicmeters. Since 1988 at least not one gasballoon was built bigger than 1000 (1050) cubicmeters. For regulary flights, it is not attended to have bigger gasballoons than 1260 cubicmeters. In principe it is possible to built bigger gasballoons, but this made only sense for special purposes like flight to the stratosphere, flight around the world, flight over the mount everest. So perhaps we will have one or two balloons for 3,4 or 5 flights in the next fifty years. Why create rules for aircrafts that didn't exist, and if one day such an aircraft will be built, there are no pilots nor instructors familar with that aircraft.

If this proposal is not acceptable for you, please change group small from 1200 cubicmeters to 1260 cubicmeters.

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees with your proposal and will change the maximum envelope capacity for the group of small gas balloons (new name will be group A) to 1260m<sup>3</sup>. There will be only one additional group B for gas balloons above 1260m<sup>3</sup>.

comment	<p>7357 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Gerrit Dekimpe</i></span></p>
	<p>This group is taken too large.  For example : a student pilot gets his BPL with the skill test in a 3000 m<sup>3</sup> after a normal training period of +- 6 months. He flies non-commercially for a year and has 75 hours as PIC, and passes his check for his commercial qualification. A period afterwards he performs the 3 instruction flights on a medium class balloon ( let's say a 4100 m<sup>3</sup>) and obtains the extension for the "Medium" group.  From that moment on he is allowed to fly on any balloon in this medium group. So it is legally ok from that moment on to see this "young" inexperienced pilot flying commercially with a large number of passengers in a 10.000 m<sup>3</sup> balloon. I know that actually there are even no "groups" at all in a lot of countries, but implementing EASA rules is the ideal occasion to settle this problem.</p> <p>The definition of the medium group has to be adapted ; or split it up in 2 or impose more experience in time and hours.</p> <p>The definition of the small and large groups is ok.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response provided to comment No. 92 (Balloons Libert) in the same segment above.</p> <p>Additionally, it should be mentioned that the Agency based on several comments proposing it (see comments on FCL.225.B and the Agency's responses) decided to introduce a requirement for a certain amount of flight time to be completed to move from one group to another.</p>
comment	<p>7762 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Christophe Saeys</i></span></p>
	<p>Medium group is much too large; a 4100m<sup>3</sup> balloon should not belong to the same group as a 10000m<sup>3</sup> balloon; from 7000m<sup>3</sup> on a balloon can be considered large.  Suggest to lower the base for large to 7000 or 8000m<sup>2</sup>.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response provided to comment No. 92 (Balloons Libert) in the same segment above.</p> <p>Additionally, it should be mentioned that the Agency based on several comments proposing it (see comments on FCL.225.B and the Agency's responses) decided to introduce a requirement for a certain amount of flight time to be completed to move from one group to another.</p>
comment	<p>7833 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>COUSIN Dominique</i></span></p>
	<p>FCL.225.B page 359</p> <p>We disagree with the group size.  we propose :</p>

	<p>small : up to 3 400 m3  medium : up to 6 000 m3  large : up to 10 000 m3  big large : more than 10 000 m3</p> <p>prevent a young pilot directly goes from a balloon less than 4000 m3 to a 9800 m3 balloon</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response provided to comment No. 92 (Balloons Libert) in the same segment above.</p> <p>Additionally, it should be mentioned that the Agency based on several comments proposing it (see comments on FCL.225.B and the Agency's responses) decided to introduce a requirement for a certain amount of flight time to be completed to move from one group to another.</p>

comment	<p>7965 comment by: <i>Professionele Ballonvaarders Nederland</i></p> <p>AMC to FCL 205 ( B)</p> <p><b>2. The present rating-system</b> for ballooning In the Netherlands contains 4 classes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A ) up to 105.000 cu.ft. and max. 4 POB to 75 hours</li> <li>· B ) up to and including 140.000 cu.ft. from 75 to 150 hours</li> <li>· C ) up to and including 210.000 cu.ft. from 150 to 250 hours</li> <li>· D ) &gt; everything larger than 210.000 cu.ft. more then 250 hours of experience, with 5 check flights before every transition with an Fi.</li> </ul> <p>We are content with this rating-system. In the proposals of Easa this rating-system is configured different, and seem too wide ranged in our opinion for the category ( B) 4.000 to 10.000 M3. The top part of this class needs a very thorough experience and should not be underestimated. I could not discover the required hours and training or the class rates, but hope they will be sufficiently high.</p> <p>r proposal : more groups / classes. Experience hours closer to the listed definitions above . ( that is if I have understood correctly that the proposed requirement is only 20 hours and then 3 flights with an Fi in the new group.?)</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response provided to comment No. 92 (Balloons Libert) in the same segment above.</p> <p>Additionally, the Agency based on several comments proposing it (see comments on FCL.225.B and the Agency's responses) decided to introduce a requirement for a certain amount of flight time to be completed to move from one group to another (as proposed in your comment).</p>

comment	<p><b>8008</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Olivier CUENOT</i></span></p> <p>This group size could be better with :</p> <p>small : up to 3 400 m<sup>3</sup>  medium : up to 6 000 m<sup>3</sup>  large : up to 10 000 m<sup>3</sup>  Extra large : more than 10 000 m<sup>3</sup></p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response provided to comment No. 92 (Balloons Libert) and No. 7833 (C. Dominique) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p><b>8072</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Hans VAN HOESEL</i></span></p> <p>There is a proposed limit of small size balloons of 4000 m<sup>3</sup>.  Generally spoken: a balloon pilot starts his career with flying balloons in this group. Flying a 4000 m<sup>3</sup> balloon needs additional training because the presence of rotation vents in the envelope AND in combination with a different layout of the basket. As experienced balloon instructor I suggest to limit the upper size in the small balloon category to 3400 m<sup>3</sup>, because the envelope handling lines and the lay out of the basket used up and including this size, are more according the experience of the pilot.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response provided to comment No. 92 (Balloons Libert) in the same segment above.</p> <p>Additionally, it should be mentioned that the Agency will keep the proposed definition for the smallest group (up to a maximum of 4000m<sup>3</sup>). Please see also the responses provided in the segment for FCL.225.B. It was decided to introduce the maximum envelope size of 3400m<sup>3</sup> for the LPL(B).</p>
comment	<p><b>8104</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Hoogstraats Balloon Team bvba</i></span></p> <p>A small balloon is max 3000 m<sup>3</sup>.  A medium balloon is 3000 - 5000 m<sup>3</sup>  A large balloon is &gt; 5000 m<sup>3</sup></p> <p>You can get the right information from the balloon manufacturers.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response provided to comment No. 92 (Balloons Libert) in the same segment above.</p> <p>The Agency does not understand what kind of information the manufacturers of balloons should provide in order to be able to establish different groups of balloons for deciding on the future licensing requirements. The Agency (see also the comments received on this AMC) does not agree with your proposal to</p>

introduce a group "large" for all balloons with an envelope capacity above 5000m<sup>3</sup>. Please study also the other comments provided by stakeholders to understand why the Agency does not agree that someone who is able to fly a balloon with an envelope size of 5100m<sup>3</sup> should be allowed to fly a balloon with an envelope size of 11.000m<sup>3</sup> without further training or checking.

comment **8191** comment by: *Philippe HAMAIN*

For economic reasons, it's not reasonable to have 2 pilots in a balloon ; for 10000m<sup>3</sup> balloons, this idea needs rethinking.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the Agency has never mentioned or required in Part-FCL that two pilots have to be in a balloon. This might be an OPS requirement for certain commercial operations but clearly not a licensing requirement.

comment **8192** comment by: *Philippe HAMAIN*

Concerning the class of the balloons, the EASA proposes 3 classes. I think a fourth class is necessary :

- little class until 3000m<sup>3</sup> / 3500
- middle class until 6000 / 6500m<sup>3</sup>
- large class until 10000m<sup>3</sup>
- extra large over 10000m<sup>3</sup>

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to comment No. 92 (Balloons Libert) in the same segment above.

Additionally, it should be mentioned that the Agency will keep the proposed definition for the smallest group (up to a maximum of 4000m<sup>3</sup> - it will be named group A). Please see also the responses provided in the segment for FCL.225.B. It was decided to introduce the maximum envelope size of 3400m<sup>3</sup> for the LPL(B).

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart F: Airline Transport Pilot Licence - ATPL - AMC to FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H - ATPL – Modular theoretical knowledge course**

p. 360

comment **8027** comment by: *Tomasz Gorzenski*

This is requested that EASA allows for all kind of theoretical knowledge courses to be available also as 100% distance learning (Internet online courses) -with no need for any classroom work.

This is XXI century, aviation theoretical knowlegde for pilots (even JAA ATPL) is not a rocket science. Today people are getting their college or university degrees through the exclusive use of online courses and EASA wants to keeps us in the middle ages of education? This is ridiculous!

response *Noted*

The possibility for 100% distance learning was never included in JAR-FCL.

To change this would require further consideration and work, which should be the object of a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you present a proposal to the Agency.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart G: Instrument Rating:  
AMC to FCL.625(c) - Renewal of Instrument Rating -Refresher Training**

p. 361

comment 820

comment by: *OAA Oxford*

1.2(d) IR expiry exceeding 7 years could potentially require the applicant to undergo the full training course for the issue of an IR. JAR-FCL 1.185 (c) required only the theoretical knowledge examination and skill test.

response *Partially accepted*

A period of 7 years is a long time. The Agency considers it a safety issue that such candidates should repeat the complete training course, i.e. do all manoeuvres/procedures at least once, if shown to be proficient, and otherwise repeat manoeuvres/procedures as needed. If the candidate shows to be proficient in some manoeuvres/procedures, there is obviously no need to do the associated "repetitive" lessons.

comment 2592

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

§1.

Replace "*determined on a case by case basis by the approved training organisation*" by "*determined on a case by case basis by the competent authority.*"

Reason: avoid unhealthy competition between different FTO's that might choose for the lowest and cheapest additional training.

response *Not accepted*

There will always be an element of competition between Approved Training Organisations (ATOs), and there is always the danger of an ATO "undercutting" the amount of training needed. This is one reason for the well established procedure of having the Authority assess if the applicant fulfils all requirements for a licence/rating, and also having to pass an associated Skill Test/Proficiency Check. In this manner our normal safeguards are in place.

On top of this, in a risk-based oversight system, an ATO undercutting the training of candidates should stand out, with a higher than normal failure rate.

comment 2593

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

§ 1.2(b) and (c).

It is necessary to impose the minimum duration of a training session.

Reason: 1) harmonization and 2) avoid unhealthy competition between FTO's.

response *Not accepted*



As this AMC covers various categories of aircraft and various means of training, the Agency considers it most practical to avoid putting a specific number of hours on the duration.

Also, please see the reply to comment 2592 above.

comment **3216** comment by: *Susana Nogueira*

Paragraph 1:

... The amount of refresher training needed should be determined on a case by case basis **by the competent authority...**

Justification: To avoid competition between ATO's.

response *Not accepted*

Please see the reply to comment 2592 above.

comment **3416** comment by: *NACA*

**AMC to FCL.625(c) - 1.2 (b and c)**

1. The minimum duration of a training session should be stated.

**Also see AMC to FCL.740(b)(1)**

response *Not accepted*

Please see the reply to comment 2593 above.

comment **5400** comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

Comment:

Requirement for minimum duration of training session (i.e. 3 hours) should be added.

Justification:

The amount of training given in a training sessions should be made clear. ECA recommends to add a definition or clarification of the training time. This clarification should also be applicable to all other parts in the regulation where training sessions are referred to and no amount is defined.

response *Not accepted*

Please see the reply to comment 2593 above.

comment **7338** comment by: *ECOGAS*

Current wording:

1.2(d) "Expiry for longer than 7 years; the applicant should undergo the full training course for the issue of the IR"

Issue:

Different from JAR 1.185(c) without supporting safety case for change

Suggestion:

	Require only theoretical knowledge examination and skill test per JAR requirements, an undergo training found to be necessary as a result.
response	<i>Partially accepted</i>
	Please see the reply to comment 820 above.

comment	7941	comment by: <i>Atlantic Training Support</i>
	1.2(d) require only theoretical knowledge examination and skill test as per JAR requirements	

response	<i>Partially accepted</i>
	Please see the reply to comment 820 above.

<p><b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart H: Class and Ratings - AMC No1 to FCL.725(a) - Syllabus of theoretical Knowledgeinstruction for p. 368-372 class/type ratings - B. Single and multi-engine helicopters</b></p>
--

comment	5402	comment by: <i>ECA- European Cockpit Association</i>
---------	------	--

Comment on paragraph 1.10.2, line 4: delete "VLF Omega":  
 – communication and navigation system (e.g. HF, VHF, ADF, VOR/DME, ILS, marker beacon) and area navigation systems (e.g. GPS, ~~VLF Omega~~)

Justification:

This system is no longer in use nowadays, so there is no need to train about it.

response	<i>Accepted</i>
----------	-----------------

	Text of B.10.2 has been amended as proposed.
--	--

<p><b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart H: Class and Ratings - AMC No1 to FCL.725(a) - Syllabus of theoretical Knowledgeinstruction for p. 372-373 class/type ratings - C. Airships</b></p>
---

comment	343	comment by: <i>Michel Lacombe AF TRTO</i>
---------	-----	---

Numbering error in paragraph systems

1.4 Systems

1.4.1 Hydraulic

1.4.2 Pneumatic

1.5 ~~4.3~~ Landing gear

1.6 ~~4.4~~ Fuel system

1.7 ~~4.5~~ Fire warning and extinguishing system

1.8 ~~4.6~~ Emergency equipment

1.9 ~~4.7~~ Electrical systems

1.10 ~~4.8~~ Avionics, Radio Navigation and communication equipment

1.11 ~~4.9~~ Instrumentation

1.12 ~~4.10~~ Engines and propellers

1.13 ~~4.11~~ Heating / ventilation / aircondition

1.14 ~~5~~ Operational procedures during start, cruise, approach and landing,

	<p>1.44 5 .1 Normal operations 1.44 5.2 Abnormal operations</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency has reviewed your proposal but came to the conclusion to keep the numbering which was proposed with the NPA. Hydraulic and pneumatic systems should be kept as a separate item whereas the following subjects should have a separate number not being a subparagraph of "Systems" as proposed in your comment.</p>

<p><b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart H: Class and Ratings - AMC No 2 to FCL.725(a) -Flight Instruction for Type Ratings - Helicopters</b></p>	<p>p. 373-375</p>
--	-------------------

comment	<p>18 <span style="float: right;">comment by: ADAC Luftrettung GmbH</span></p> <p>In AMC No 2 to FCL.725 (a) 3. the credits given using a STD are divided into FS level C or D and FTD level 2 or 3. There is no credit given for level A or B full flight simulators having a higher level as FTD's. Since the level of qualification will determine the amount of credit given for the FSTD anyway, either all levels should be addressed, or better just the type of device!</p> <p>Furthermore the definition FS does not comply with the terminology given in JAR-FSTD H.005 (b) which will be in effect on the 1 August 2008. There the correct abbreviation is "<b>FFS</b>" for <b>F</b>ull <b>f</b>light <b>S</b>imulator.</p> <p>Therefore we request to change the wording to FFS and delete the attached levels C/D or 2/3:</p> <p>...Using FS <b>FFS</b> <del>C/D</del>: At least.....</p> <p>...Using FTD <del>2/3</del>: At least.....</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>1: Accepted. FS is amended to FFS.</p> <p>2: Not accepted. Minimum levels in JAR FCL2 are levels FFS -C or D- and FTD level 2 or 3</p>
comment	<p>1422 <span style="float: right;">comment by: Bristow Helicopters</span></p> <p>3. MPH row column headed "In helicopter and FSTD associated training credits" Last line: using FTD 2/3: At least <del>6</del> 4 hours helicopter, and at least 12 hours total.</p> <p>Justification: 4 hours is the correct figure as published in JAR-FCL 2 Amendment 6 issued 01.02.07. There were typographical errors introduced into earlier FCL-2 amendments, which have probably been reflected in the EASA NPA, but the Am 6 version is correct as originally decided in the JAA LSST(H) committee.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p>

The correct number is 4 hours and not 6 hours

comment

1423

comment by: *Bristow Helicopters*

There is no minimum training stated for extension of the IR(H) to further types. The tables in 3 and 4 relate to the type rating training only. If IR(H) privileges are required on type, training must still be given to cover the items in the Part FCL type training/skill test/proficiency check schedule Section 5, and it would be advisable to state a minimum training time requirement for clarity.

Justification:

JAR-FCL 2 contained the following statement relating to the instrument training requirements and this should be used to form the basis of an amendment to this AMC. The last line will either need to reflect the correct Part FCL rule (although I understand it is permissible to refer to the rule in an AMC), or show the minimum training which is 5 hours in this case. I have amended the text accordingly:

**Holders of an IR(H) wishing to extend the IR(H) to further types shall have additionally two hours flight training on type by sole reference to instruments according to IFR which may be conducted in a FS C/D or FTD 2/3. Holders of a SE IR(H) wishing to extend the IR privileges to a ME IR(H) for the first time shall ~~comply with JAR-FCL 2.240(a)(4)~~ complete at least 5 hours training.**

response

*Accepted*

Text has been added as proposed.

comment

2142

comment by: *British International Helicopters*

There is no minimum training stated for extension of the IR(H) to further types. The tables in 3 and 4 relate to the type rating training only. If IR(H) privileges are required on type, training must still be given to cover the items in the Part FCL type training/skill test/proficiency check schedule Section 5, and it would be advisable to state a minimum training time requirement for clarity.

Justification:

JAR-FCL 2 contained the following statement relating to the instrument training requirements and this should be used to form the basis of an amendment to this AMC. The last line will either need to reflect the correct Part FCL rule (although I understand it is permissible to refer to the rule in an AMC), or show the minimum training which is 5 hours in this case. I have amended the text accordingly:

**Holders of an IR(H) wishing to extend the IR(H) to further types shall have additionally two hours flight training on type by sole reference to instruments according to IFR which may be conducted in a FS C/D or FTD 2/3. Holders of a SE IR(H) wishing to extend the IR privileges to a ME IR(H) for the first time shall ~~comply with JAR-FCL 2.240(a)(4)~~ complete at least 5 hours training.**

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment. Please also refer to the response given to comment no 1423.

comment	<p>2362 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>AECA(SPAIN)</i></span></p> <p>3. MPH row column headed "In helicopter and FSTD associated training credits" Last line: using FTD 2/3: At least <del>6</del> <b>4</b> hours helicopter, and at least 12 hours total.</p> <p>Justification: 4 hours is the correct figure as published in JAR-FCL 2 Amendment 6 issued 01.02.07. There were typographical errors introduced into earlier FCL-2 amendments, which have probably been reflected in the EASA NPA, but the Am 6 version is correct as originally decided in the JAA LSST(H) committee.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment. Please also see comment no 1422.</p>

comment	<p>2363 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>AECA(SPAIN)</i></span></p> <p>There is no minimum training stated for extension of the IR(H) to further types. The tables in 3 and 4 relate to the type rating training only. If IR(H) privileges are required on type, training must still be given to cover the items in the Part FCL type training/skill test/proficiency check schedule Section 5, and it would be advisable to state a minimum training time requirement for clarity.</p> <p>We have amended the text accordingly :</p> <p><b>Holders of an IR(H) wishing to extend the IR(H) to further types shall have additionally two hours flight training on type by sole reference to instruments according to IFR which may be conducted in a FS C/D or FTD 2/3. Holders of a SE IR(H) wishing to extend the IR privileges to a ME IR(H) for the first time shall <del>comply with JAR-FCL 2.240(a)(4)</del> complete at least 5 hours training.</b></p> <p>Justification: JAR-FCL 2 contained the following statement relating to the instrument training requirements and this should be used to form the basis of an amendment to this AMC. The last line will either need to reflect the correct Part FCL rule (although we understand it is permissible to refer to the rule in an AMC), or show the minimum training which is 5 hours in this case.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment. Please also see comment no 1423.</p>

comment	<p>3299 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></span></p> <p>Part FCL AMC N° 2 to FCL.725 (a)</p> <p>In the first column " Helicopter types" of the table there are references to Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.245 (b) (3) , this has to be corrected with the new reference of : Appendix 11 Part FCL</p>
---------	---

## 4. Additional types

Helicopter types
SEP(H) to SEP(H) within Appendix <b>11 Part FCL 1 to JAR-FCL 2.245(b)</b>
SEP(H) to SEP(H) not included in Appendix <b>11 Part FCL 1 to JAR-FCL 2.245(b)</b>

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment. The editorial will be changed accordingly.

comment

3339

comment by: *john daly*

In the table at paragraph 3, reference is made to JAR 27 and 29. Should this not be CS 27 and 29?

response

*Accepted*

Reference to CS 27-29 added.

comment

3500

comment by: *FOCA Switzerland*

Subpart H  
AMC No 2 to FCL.725 (a)

Proposal

to replace by same structure and tables as in JAR-FCL (H)

response

*Noted*

The Agency considers that the layout and tables are adequate.

comment

3607

comment by: *Susana Nogueira*

Replace this AMC layout by the same structure and tables as in JAR-FCL 2.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to comment no 3500 above.

comment

3719

comment by: *DGAC FRANCE*

AMC 2 to Part FCL 725 (a)  
Extend privileges on same type

Not taken in account by JARs.

Without any particular requirements, the applicant already holding a type

rating in SP or MP have to undergo a training of 5 hours before his proficiency check in the opposite role, that is too much.

Additional types

The flight instruction (excluding skill test) should comprise :

Helicopter types	In Helicopter	In Helicopter and FSTD associated training Credits
MPH to MPH	5 hrs	Using FS C/D: At least 1 hr helicopter and at least 6 hrs total Using FTD 2/3: At least 2 hr helicopter and at least 5 hrs total
<b>Extend privilege on the same type rating From SPH to MPH* or, From MPH to SPH</b>	<b>2 hrs</b>	<b>N/A</b>

\* *except for initial MPH issue*

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment. The Agency considers it necessary to add the provision to your proposal to do part of the training also in a FFS. Please refer to the amended text for further details.

comment **3892**

comment by: *Luftfahrt-Bundesamt*

AMC No 2 to FCL.725 (a):

Editorial: In item 3 SPH should be added as shown:

- Row 2: SPH SEP (H)
- Row 3: SPH SET (H) under ...
- Row 4: SPH SET (H) at or ...

This AMC includes references to JAR-FCL 2 under item 4. Does this make sense or should these parts be referenced to APP 11?

response *Partially accepted*

1/ Not accepted as the Agency does not consider the proposed change appropriate.

2/ Thank you for providing this comment. Please also see comment no 3299 above.

comment **4442**

comment by: *Bond Offshore Helicopters*

3. MPH row column headed "In helicopter and FSTD associated training credits" Last line: using FTD 2/3: At least ~~6~~ **4** hours helicopter, and at least 12 hours total.

Justification:

4 hours is the correct figure as published in JAR-FCL 2 Amendment 6 issued 01.02.07. There were typographical errors introduced into earlier FCL-2

	<p>amendments, which have probably been reflected in the EASA NPA, but the Am 6 version is correct as originally decided in the JAA LSST(H) committee.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 1422.</p>
comment	<p>4443 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Bond Offshore Helicopters</i></span></p> <p>There is no minimum training stated for extension of the IR(H) to further types. The tables in 3 and 4 relate to the type rating training only. If IR(H) privileges are required on type, training must still be given to cover the items in the Part FCL type training/skill test/proficiency check schedule Section 5, and it would be advisable to state a minimum training time requirement for clarity.</p> <p>Justification: JAR-FCL 2 contained the following statement relating to the instrument training requirements and this should be used to form the basis of an amendment to this AMC. The last line will either need to reflect the correct Part FCL rule (although we understand it is permissible to refer to the rule in an AMC), or show the minimum training which is 5 hours in this case. We have amended the text accordingly:</p> <p><b> Holders of an IR(H) wishing to extend the IR(H) to further types shall have additionally two hours flight training on type by sole reference to instruments according to IFR which may be conducted in a FS C/D or FTD 2/3. Holders of a SE IR(H) wishing to extend the IR privileges to a ME IR(H) for the first time shall <del>comply with JAR-FCL 2.240(a)(4)</del> complete at least 5 hours training.</b></p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 1423.</p>
comment	<p>4684 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Héli-Union</i></span></p> <p>3. MPH row column headed "In helicopter and FSTD associated training credits" Last line: using FTD 2/3: At least <del>6</del> 4 hours helicopter, and at least 12 hours total.</p> <p>Justification: 4 hours is the correct figure as published in JAR-FCL 2 Amendment 6 issued 01.02.07. There were typographical errors introduced into earlier FCL-2 amendments, which have probably been reflected in the EASA NPA, but the Am 6 version is correct as originally decided in the JAA LSST(H) committee.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 1422.</p>
comment	<p>4685 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Héli-Union</i></span></p>



There is no minimum training stated for extension of the IR(H) to further types. The tables in 3 and 4 relate to the type rating training only. If IR(H) privileges are required on type, training must still be given to cover the items in the Part FCL type training/skill test/proficiency check schedule Section 5, and it would be advisable to state a minimum training time requirement for clarity.

Justification:

JAR-FCL 2 contained the following statement relating to the instrument training requirements and this should be used to form the basis of an amendment to this AMC. The last line will either need to reflect the correct Part FCL rule (although we understand it is permissible to refer to the rule in an AMC), or show the minimum training which is 5 hours in this case. We have amended the text accordingly:

**Holders of an IR(H) wishing to extend the IR(H) to further types shall have additionally two hours flight training on type by sole reference to instruments according to IFR which may be conducted in a FS C/D or FTD 2/3. Holders of a SE IR(H) wishing to extend the IR privileges to a ME IR(H) for the first time shall ~~comply with JAR-FCL 2.240(a)(4)~~ complete at least 5 hours training.**

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 1423.

comment *4810*

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

Proposition: To replace by same structure and tables as in JAR-FCL (H) (expect comment from Norway)

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 1423.

comment *4905*

comment by: *HUTC*

3. MPH row column headed "In helicopter and FSTD associated training credits" Last line:  
using FTD 2/3: At least ~~6~~ 4 hours helicopter, and at least 12 hours total.

Justification:

4 hours is the correct figure as published in JAR-FCL 2 Amendment 6 issued 01.02.07. There were typographical errors introduced into earlier FCL-2 amendments, which have probably been reflected in the EASA NPA, but the Am 6 version is correct as originally decided in the JAA LSST(H) committee.

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 1422.

comment *4906*

comment by: *HUTC*

There is no minimum training stated for extension of the IR(H) to further types. The tables in 3 and 4 relate to the type rating training only. If IR(H) privileges are required on type, training must still be given to cover the items in the Part FCL type training/skill test/proficiency check schedule Section 5, and it would be advisable to state a minimum training time requirement for clarity.

**Justification:**

JAR-FCL 2 contained the following statement relating to the instrument training requirements and this should be used to form the basis of an amendment to this AMC. The last line will either need to reflect the correct Part FCL rule (although we understand it is permissible to refer to the rule in an AMC), or show the minimum training which is 5 hours in this case. We have amended the text accordingly:

**Holders of an IR(H) wishing to extend the IR(H) to further types shall have additionally two hours flight training on type by sole reference to instruments according to IFR which may be conducted in a FS C/D or FTD 2/3. Holders of a SE IR(H) wishing to extend the IR privileges to a ME IR(H) for the first time shall ~~comply with JAR-FCL 2.240(a)(4)~~ complete at least 5 hours training.**

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 1423.

comment *5160*

comment by: *CAE*

AMC No. 2 to FCL.725 (a)

The number of flight time hours allowed on FSTDs for the purpose of helicopter type ratings varies from 6 to 10 hours representing 50% to 83% FSTD usage. These percentages are lower than what is acceptable for aeroplane type ratings which credit FSTD's up to 100%. Suggested wording would be to modify these hours to allow up to 100% training to proficiency on FSTDs.

response *Not accepted*

At this time the Agency does not intend to change the provisions related to FSTD training from what was described in JAR-FCL.

comment *5404*

comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

**Comment:**

There is no AMC to FCL.725 on flight training for a type rating in aeroplanes and powerlift. ECA considers that AMC 2 to FCL.725 (a) must be an appendix, not an AMC due to the relevance and importance of this course, mainly designed for commercial transportation. We haven't even seen the course for the type ratings in aeroplanes.

There is an appendix for the course for additional training for high performance aircraft (appendix 10), but no appendix for the course for type rating of commercial aeroplanes. This is contradictory and there is no safety justification for this.

An appendix reflecting the old Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.261(a) is missing.

response *Noted*

The content of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.261 (a) has either been included in FCL.725, or been merged with the content of AMC FCL 1.261(a) and included in AMC No 1 to FCL.725(a). The Agency has conducted an editorial review, to ensure that none of the items in the Appendix to JAR-FCL 1.261 (a) are missing.

The Agency does not agree that the detailed content of the course needs to be in an Appendix, and considers that the AMC as proposed is adequate.

comment

5470

comment by: CAA Belgium

Editorial: In item 3 SPH should be added as shown:

Row 2: SPH SEP (H)

Row 3: SPH SET (H) under ...

Row 4: SPH SET (H) at or ...

This AMC includes references to JAR-FCL 2 under item 4.

Does this make sense or should these parts be referenced to APP 11?

response

*Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 3892.

comment

6209

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC No 2 to FCL.725 (a)

**Page No:**

374 of 647

**Comment:**

Paragraph 1&2 of table still uses JAR FCL references.

**Justification:**

Consistency – use EASA reference

**Proposed Text:**

Replace JAR FCL 2.245 reference with Appendix 11.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 3339.

comment

6211

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC No 2 to FCL.725 (a)

**Page No:**

374 of 647

**Comment:**

This information is only related to helicopters and therefore a new paragraph FCL.725(H) is required to guide the reader to this information.

**Justification:**

Consistency - With FCL 725(A) and ease of use as this is not oblivious where to find this helicopter specific information.

**Proposed Text:**

New paragraph

	FCL.725(H) Flight Instruction for the issue of a type rating helicopter. An applicant shall complete a training course at an approved training organisation	
response	<i>Not accepted</i>	Thank you for providing this comment. The Agency considers that there is no need for a specific paragraph on helicopters just to repeat what is already covered in FCL.725 (a), which is a general paragraph, applicable to all categories of aircraft.
comment	6212	comment by: UK CAA
	<p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC No 2 to FCL.725(a)</p> <p><b>Page No*:</b> 374/375 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> No mention of holders of an IR(H) wishing to extend the IR(H) to further types shall additionally have 2 hours on type by sole reference to instruments. (see App 1 to JAR-FCL 2.261(b) 2 &amp; 3)</p> <p>Table under paragraph 4 refers to JAR-FCL</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Clarification of existing JAR-FCL 2 requirements</p>	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 1423.
comment	7180	comment by: CHC Europe EASA Ops Team - representing 550 pilots across Europe
	<p>3. MPH row column headed "In helicopter and FSTD associated training credits" Last line: using FTD 2/3: At least <del>6</del> 4 hours helicopter, and at least 12 hours total.</p> <p>Justification: 4 hours is the correct figure as published in JAR-FCL 2 Amendment 6 issued 01.02.07. There were typographical errors introduced into earlier FCL-2 amendments, which have probably been reflected in the EASA NPA, but the Am 6 version is correct as originally decided in the JAA LSST(H) committee</p>	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 1422.
comment	7184	comment by: CHC Europe EASA Ops Team - representing 550 pilots across Europe
	There is no minimum training stated for extension of the IR(H) to further types. The tables in 3 and 4 relate to the type rating training only. If IR(H) privileges are required on type, training must still be given to cover the items in the Part FCL type training/skill test/proficiency check schedule Section 5,	

and it would be advisable to state a minimum training time requirement for clarity.

Justification:

JAR-FCL 2 contained the following statement relating to the instrument training requirements and this should be used to form the basis of an amendment to this AMC. The last line will either need to reflect the correct Part FCL rule (although we understand it is permissible to refer to the rule in an AMC), or show the minimum training which is 5 hours in this case. We have amended the text accordingly:

**Holders of an IR(H) wishing to extend the IR(H) to further types shall have additionally two hours flight training on type by sole reference to instruments according to IFR which may be conducted in a FS C/D or FTD 2/3. Holders of a SE IR(H) wishing to extend the IR privileges to a ME IR(H) for the first time shall ~~comply with JAR-FCL 2.240(a)(4)~~ complete at least 5 hours training.**

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 1423.

comment *7910*

comment by: *DHV*

In the row column headed "In helicopter and FSTD associated training credits" it is **mandatory** to ad FFS A/B, or better to delete any level and list the general categories FFS and FTD only!.

[Justification: it is not appropriate to accept credits using an FTD 2/3 and not to give credits when using higher qualified FFS level A/B devices. The amount of credit can be given up to a certain value and will be based on the individual FSTD equipment and quality, e.g a "low budget" FTD 2 device without motion should not get more credits then a FFS level B with motion and a complete, highly sophisticated equipment! The final amount of credits depend on the respective FSTD qualification level given during the aviation authorities "onsite evaluation and acceptance" anyway. Therefore only the catagories i.e. FFS & FTD should be listed!

response *Noted*

At this time the Agency does not intend to deviate from the FSTD related provisions in JAR-FCL. However, the Agency already has in its rulemaking programme a task that will deal with the introduction of the amendments to the ICAO manual on FSTDs. This task will also review Part-FCL for consistency and will re-assess the crediting provisions.

comment *7927*

comment by: *ADAC Luftrettung GmbH*

In the row column headed "In helicopter and FSTD associated training credits" it is **mandatory** to ad FFS A/B, or better to delete any level and list the general categories FFS and FTD only!.

[Justification: it is not appropriate to accept credits using an FTD 2/3 and not to give credits when using higher qualified FFS level A/B devices. The amount of credit can be given up to a certain value and will be based on the individual FSTD equipment and quality, e.g a "low budget" FTD 2 device without motion should not get more credits then a FFS level B with motion and

a complete, highly sophisticated equipment! The final amount of credits depend on the respective FSTD qualification level given during the aviation authorities "onsite evaluation and acceptance" anyway. Therefore only the categories i.e. FFS & FTD should be listed!

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 7910.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart H: Class and Ratings - AMC to FCL.740(b)(1) Renewal of class and type ratings – refresher training**

p. 375

comment 1227

comment by: *Ryanair*

**AMC to FCL.740(b)(1) (1.2) (Page 375)**

**Comment** It is noted that the measures in this AMC are more flexible when the lapsed period is short and this is welcome. However in other ways it is more restrictive: -

1. The time bands in some cases are relatively wide (Longer than one year but shorter than 3 years). This requires the same training and checking for a lapse of 18 months as a lapse of 36 months - a period twice as long.
2. A full type rating is required after 3 years whereas in JAR FCL this was required only after a lapse of 5 years.

**Proposed Alternative Means of Compliance: -**

**AMC to FCL.740(b)(1) (1.2) (Page 375)** as presented in the NPA with the following alteration: -

1.2 the amount of lapsed time since the expiry of the validity period of the rating. The amount of training needed to reach the desired level of proficiency should increase with the time lapsed. In some cases, after evaluating the pilot, and when the time lapsed is very limited (less than 3 months), the training organization may even determine that no refresher training is necessary. The following table can be taken as guidance when determining the required refresher training.

Rating expired up to:	Theoretical Training	Simulator Training and Checking
3 Months	Nil	As required
12 Months	Nil	4 hours training 4 hours checking
24 Months	One day refresher training	4 hours training 4 hours checking
36 Months	Two day refresher training & type written examination	8 hours training 4 hours checking
36 Months to 60 Months	Three day CBT course, One day Performance training and checking & type written examination	12 hours training 4 hours checking
More	Full Type Rating Course	Full course

than 60 Months		
-------------------	--	--

**Justification**

Ryanair has successfully trained pilots whose type rating had expired between 3 to 5 years. These pilots had typically allowed the B737 rating to expire as they were operating in an Airline on another type of Medium or Heavy aircraft type. All these crews are trained to proficiency in Ryanair. This was displayed during a LPC conducted by a TRE. We consider the three year limit to expired Type Ratings to be too restrictive and is not warranted given our experience of dealing with the existing 5 year limit.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for your input. At the moment, the Agency does not intend to include your proposal in the alternative means of compliance. You may present it to your competent authority for approval, or submit a separate rulemaking proposal to the Agency.

comment

1228

comment by: *Ryanair***AMC to FCL 740(b)(1)3****Comment**

The proposed AMC states that "the training organisation should give a certificate to the applicant, to be submitted to the authority when applying for the renewal." There does not appear to be any specified format for this certificate.

**Proposed Alternative Means of Compliance**

3. After successful completion of the training, the training organisation should give the completed LPC/OPC record to the applicant, to be submitted to the authority when applying for the renewal.

**Justification**

It will be preferable if EASA specify the nature of the Certificate and it seems sensible to have the Certificate and the LPC record one and the same document.

response

*Noted*

For the moment, the Agency does not intend to provide a standard certificate of completion for this course. This could be subject to a future rulemaking task.

In the meantime, you can, of course submit an alternative means of compliance to your authority, or use any format of certificate that you are currently using.

comment

1904

comment by: *French Army AVN. FTO*

When a pilot whose "multi engine type rating" is extended over 3 years and that is not the only one he has, the French Army Aviation FTO requests that **he only undergoes the training required for an additional ME TR.**

response

*Noted*

This is an AMC. This means that you can request your authority to approve an alternative means of compliance, as long as you can demonstrate that the

objective of the rule is met and that the same level of safety is achieved.

comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>2395</p> <p>Comment: Changes zare made from the JAR-FCL 1 requirements which are not justified according to existing practices and experience</p> <p>Proposal: amend 1.2 (c) and (d) to read:  (c) Expiry longer than 1 year but shorter than 5 years  (d) Expiry longer than 5 years</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 1227 above.</p>
comment	<p>2594</p> <p>comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></p> <p>§1.  Same remark and motivation as for FCL 625(c) §1 – page 361.  Replace "<i>approved training organisation</i>" by "<i>competent authority</i>".</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Your comment does not seem to refer to this AMC.  Competent authorities usually do not provide refresher training themselves.</p>
comment	<p>2595</p> <p>comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></p> <p>§1.2(b) and (c).  Necessity to impose the minimum duration of a training session.  Reason: 1) harmonization and 2) avoid unhealthy competition between FTO's.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment. The Agency does not consider it necessary at this moment to introduce such provisions. Please also refer to the response given to comment no 1227 above.</p>
comment	<p>3417</p> <p>comment by: <i>NACA</i></p> <p><b>AMC to FCL.740(b)(1) – 1.2 (b and c)</b></p> <p>The minimum duration of a training session should be stated.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 2595 above.</p>
comment	<p>3718</p> <p>comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></p> <p>AMC to Part FCL 740 (b) (1)</p>



In order to give more realistic training programme.  
If the applicant still hold a valid rating in the same helicopter "category" (ex MET or MPH), the renewal training program has to be considered as an additional type according to AMC N°2 to part FCL 725 (a).

AMC to Part FCL 740 (b) (1)

1.2 the amount of time lapsed since the expiry of the validity period of the rating. The amount of training needed to reach the desired level of proficiency should increase with the time lapsed. In some cases, after evaluating the pilot, and when the time lapsed is very limited (less than 3 months), the training organisation may even determine that no further refresher training is necessary. The following can be taken as guidance when determining the needs of the pilot:

(a) Expiry shorter than 3 months: no supplementary requirements.

(b) Expiry longer than 3 months but shorter than 1 year: a minimum of 2 training sessions.

(c) Expiry longer than 1 year but shorter than 3 years: a minimum of 3 training sessions in which the most important malfunctions in the available systems are covered.

(d) Expiry longer than 3 years: the applicant should again undergo the training required for the initial issue of the rating **or, in case of helicopter, the training required for the "additional type issue", according to other valid ratings held.**

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment. The amended text will be changed accordingly.

comment *5291*

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

AMC to Part FCL 740 (b) (1)

1.2 the amount of time lapsed since the expiry of the validity period of the rating. The amount of training needed to reach the desired level of proficiency should increase with the time lapsed. In some cases, after evaluating the pilot, and when the time lapsed is very limited (less than 3 months), the training organisation

may even determine that no further refresher training is necessary. The following can be taken as guidance when determining the needs of the pilot:

(a) Expiry shorter than 3 months: no supplementary requirements.

(b) Expiry longer than 3 months but shorter than 1 year: a minimum of 2 training sessions.

(c) Expiry longer than 1 year but shorter than 3 years:

a minimum of 3 training sessions in which the most important malfunctions in the available systems are covered.

(d) Expiry longer than 3 years: the applicant should again undergo the training required for the initial issue of the rating **or, in case of helicopter, the training required for the "additional type issue", according to other valid ratings held.**

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 3718 above.

comment	5312	comment by: <i>AEA</i>
<p><b>Comment:</b> This AMC is new. Different practices are agreed by NAAs.</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> Create a new AMC to FCL 740(b) (1) 1.2 the amount of time lapsed since the expiry of the validity period of the rating. The amount of training needed to reach the desired level of proficiency should increase with the time lapsed. In some cases, after evaluating the pilot, and when the time lapsed is very limited (less than 3 months), the training organisation may even determine that no further refresher training is necessary. The following can be taken as guidance when determining the needs of the pilot: (a) Expiry shorter than 3 months: no supplementary requirements. (b) Expiry longer than 3 months but shorter than 1 year: a minimum of 1 training session containing at least 3 take-offs and landings as PF. (c) Expiry longer than 1 year but shorter than 3 years: a minimum of 2 training sessions in which the most important malfunctions in the available systems are covered. (d) Expiry longer than 3 years: a minimum of 4 training sessions in which the most important malfunctions in the available systems are covered. At least 1 training session will be dedicated to visual take-offs and landings.</p>		
response	<i>Not accepted</i>	
<p>Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to the comments no 1227 and 3718.</p>		
comment	5414	comment by: <i>ECA- European Cockpit Association</i>
<p><b>Comment:</b> ECA recommends to define the amount of time a training session means.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> As for the comment on page 361, this AMC does not reflect how much time the sessions last (1 hour, 2, 4, 15 minutes?). Also, there is no difference between types of aeroplanes. We should differentiate between the renewal of class-rating for Single engine from renewal of an A-380 rating, as the amount of systems and emergencies to be reviewed are much more. The AMC needs to reflect much more training for complex aircraft (like type ratings for CAT). These trainings are the minimum trainings needed for small aircraft, but when talking about refreshment training for complex aircraft, it is not realistic to review all the systems, emergencies and normal procedures in just one session.</p>		
response	<i>Noted</i>	
<p>A new point has been added to say that the complexity of the aircraft should be taken into account.</p>		
comment	6577	comment by: <i>Icelandic CAA</i>
<p>Paragraph 2. It is suggested to add a condition at the end of the paragraph stating that the training programme proposed by the approved training organisation should be accepted by the competent authority.</p>		

response	<i>Partially accepted</i>
	The training programme needs to be detailed in the documented evidence that the pilot submits for renewal. This gives the authority the opportunity to verify it.
comment	6587 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>IAOPA Europe</i></span>
	For an expiry longer than 3 years the applicant should undergo the training required for initial issue of the rating. This is too heavy a requirement!  A refresher training flight with an FI is absolutely sufficient.
response	<i>Noted</i>
	Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the responses given to the comments no 1227 and 3718 above.
comment	7857 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span>
	FCL.740(b)(1) 1.2: Time limits seem to be too tight. New text proposal: ... relevant type or class of aircraft. The amount of time lapsed since the expiry of the validity period of the rating. The amount of training needed to reach the desired level of proficiency should increase with the time lapsed. In some cases, after evaluating the pilot, and when the time lapsed is very limited (less than 3 months), the training organisation may even determine that no further refresher training is necessary. The following may be taken as guidance when determining the needs of the applicant: <b>(a) Expiry for a period shorter than 1 year: a more detailed written or verbal theoretical knowledge examination relevant to the type or class of aircraft.</b> <b>(b) Expiry for longer than 1 year but shorter than 3 year: a more detailed written or verbal theoretical knowledge examination relevant to the type or class of aircraft and a minimum of 1 training session.</b> <b>(c) Expiry for longer than 3 year but shorter than 7 years: a more detailed written or verbal theoretical knowledge examination relevant to the type or class of aircraft and a minimum of 3 training sessions.</b> <b>(d) Expiry for longer than 7 years: the applicant should undergo the full training course for the issue of the relevant type or class of aircraft.</b>
response	<i>Not accepted</i>
	Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the responses given to comments 1227 and 3718 above.
comment	8256 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Wolfgang Lammingner</i></span>
	For an expiry longer than 3 years the applicant should undergo the training required for initial issue of the rating. This requirement does not fulfill the demands of the praxis! A refresher training with an FI is absolutely sufficient. This training should be oriented on the skills of the applicant, his experience on the type for which the rating is renewed and the experience in comparable types.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the responses given to the comments no 1227 and 3718 above.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart H: Class and Ratings - AMC to FCL.730.A - Requisites for pilots undertaking a zero flight time type rating (ZFTT) course** p. 376

comment *3501* comment by: *FOCA Switzerland*

Subpart H  
AMC to FCL.730.A

Delete whole paragraph

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment. The text will be changed accordingly.

comment *3608* comment by: *Susana Nogueira*

Delete this AMC.

Justification: Is not in requirements.

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 3501 above.

comment *4811* comment by: *CAA Belgium*

Delete whole paragraph

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 3501 above.

comment *5481* comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

Comment: delete the whole paragraph and put it in IR (see comment on page 36):

~~AMC to FCL.730.A~~

~~**Requisites for pilots undertaking a zero flight time type rating (ZFTT) course**~~

~~When a pilot is changing from a turboprop to a turbojet aeroplane or from a turbojet to a turboprop aeroplane, additional simulator training should be required.~~

Justification:

This requirement is a must and should not be left to the discretion of anybody.

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 3501 above.

comment	6214	comment by: UK CAA
	<p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC to FCL.730.A</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 376 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The AMC should specify what additional training is required.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> The AMC is open to interpretation and will result in differing standards being set across the EU community.</p>	
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>This sentence transfers what used to be included in the JARs. It was also left open there It is possible that in the future further guidance on the training will be provided.</p>	
comment	6637	comment by: Icelandic CAA
	<p>Whole paragraph to be deleted. The condition may apply in some instances but not all, and that is resolved during the training period if needed.</p>	
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 3501 above.</p>	
comment	7861	comment by: CAA Finland
	<p>Mistake in JAR-FCL: A pilot always needs a full type rating course (32h per crew on MPA). If a pilot happens to have previous experience on MPA, there is no reason why he/she should have 32h + additional hours. Whole AMC FCL.730.A shall be removed.</p>	
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 3501 above.</p>	

<b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart H: Class and Ratings - AMC to FCL.735.A Multi-crew co-operation course - aeroplanes</b>	p. 376-380
--	------------

comment	1277	comment by: Marduc Aeronautical Consults
	<p>AMC to FCL 735.a (MCC) exercise 10 to include as well TCAS/ACAS training</p>	
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please note that the text of this AMC has been completely reviewed. Please see reply to comment 2396 below.</p>	
comment	2396	comment by: Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International,

*IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

Attachment [#69](#)

Comment: This is not the wording previously agreed and endorsed in the JAAC. The LST accepted NPA FCL 36 including this new proposal for MCC

Proposal:

Replace AMC text as follows:

Competency is a combination of knowledge, skills and attitudes required to perform a task to the prescribed standard

The objectives of MCC training are to develop the technical and non-technical components of the knowledge, skills and attitudes required to operate a multi crew aircraft.

Training should comprise both theoretical and practical elements and be designed to achieve the following competencies:  
(Insert Table from NPA-FCL-36 enclosed as attachment)

response *Accepted*

Thank you for your comment and for pointing out this mistake. It is true that the text of the JAR-FCL AMC has been changed by NPA FCL-36. Text will be amended to reflect this change.

comment 5235 comment by: *CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority*

Add line in italics to paragraph 1 for consistency with suggested definition of MCC and to emphasise that MCC focus is on the integration of technical and non-technical skills.

1. The objectives of MCC training are optimum decision making, communication, division of tasks, use of checklists, mutual supervision, teamwork, and support throughout all phases of flight under normal, abnormal and emergency conditions.

*The training emphasises the development and integration of the technical and non-technical skills required to work as an effective team in a multicrew environment.*

response *Noted*

Please note that the text of this AMC has been completely reviewed. Please see reply to comment 2396 above.

comment 5859 comment by: *ANE (Air Nostrum) OPS QM*

To comply with FCL.735.A (a), (1) and (2), the AMC to FCL.735.A EXERCISES (10) states from a to k different exercises. Some of them can be conducted in an FTD as part of an approved course (a, b, c, f, g and j), but there is nothing concerning d, e, h, i, and k.

We think that this AMC should specify which exercises should be part of FCL.735.A (a) (1), and which should be part of FCL.735.A (a) (2).

response *Noted*

Please note that the text of this AMC has been completely reviewed.  
Please see also reply to comment 2396 above.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart H: Class and Ratings - AMC to FCL.735.H - Multi-crew co-operation course - helicopters** p. 380-383

comment 5240 comment by: *CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority*

Add line in italics to paragraph 1 on page 380 for consistency with suggested definition of MCC and previous comment on page 376 to emphasise that MCC focus is on the integration of technical and non-technical skills.

1. The objectives of MCC training are optimum decision making, communication, division of tasks, use of checklists, mutual supervision, teamwork, and support throughout all phases of flight under normal, abnormal and emergency conditions.

*The training emphasises the development and integration of the technical and non-technical skills required to work as an effective team in a multicrew environment.*

response *Noted*

Please note that the text of this AMC has been completely reviewed.  
Please see reply to comment 2396 in AMC to FCL.735.A

comment 5542 comment by: *Chris Gowers*  
Certificates would be better placed on a single page

response *Noted*

The Agency will conduct an editorial review of the format of the certificates.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart H: Class and Ratings - AMC to FCL.740.H - Revalidation and renewal of type ratings – helicopters** p. 384

comment 3502 comment by: *FOCA Switzerland*  
Subpart H  
AMC to FCL.740.

**To change wording: Helicopter have no classes**

response *Noted*

This AMC has been deleted as the result of a comment on FCL.740.H. This text has been added to the IR.

The reference to classes has been deleted.

comment 3609 comment by: *Susana Nogueira*  
Delete 'class'.

	Helicopters have no classes
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see reply to comment 3502 above.

comment	4814 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span> Helicopters have no classes
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see reply to comment 3502 above.

comment	6650 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Icelandic CAA</i></span> The reference to helicopter class should be deleted.
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see reply to comment 3502 above.

comment	6976 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA CZ</i></span> „class or“ should be omitted because only type rating is applicable.
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see reply to comment 3502 above.

comment	7864 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span> There are no class ratings on helicopters. Amended text proposal:  may be combined with the <del>class or</del> type rating proficiency check.
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see reply to comment 3502 above.

<b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart H: Class and Ratings - GM to FCL.720.PL - Experience requirements and pre-requisites for the issue of type ratings for the powered lift</b>	p. 384
--	--------

comment	6660 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Icelandic CAA</i></span> Consider rephrasing to avoid confusion.
response	<i>Noted</i> The Agency considers that the meaning is clear. A (PL) type rating does not give any credit to fly an aeroplane or a helicopter

<b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart I: Additional Ratings</b>	p. 385
--	--------



comment	435 Attachment <a href="#">#70</a> comment by: <i>Charles BAKER</i>
response	<i>Noted</i> Thank you for providing your opinion and the attachment with the detailed comments and the information about the UK system for teaching aerobatics.  However, as the same comment (attached document) was assigned already to another segment (Implementing Rules Subpart I General) most of the questions are answered and additional information already provided.  The main issues should be repeated here for clarification reasons:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- entry level has been kept but 120 launches as alternative added</li> <li>- 20 training flights as an alternative solution</li> <li>- syllabus of practical training will be changed (see the resulting text)</li> <li>- the Agency does not agree with your syllabus proposal because these are only very basic manoeuvres (except loop)</li> <li>- roll and loop will be kept also for aerobatic training on sailplanes</li> <li>- consequences for LPL or SPL instruction as described do not exist</li> <li>- definition of aerobatic in FCL.010 will be amended to allow stalling and spinning exercises during training without requiring the instructor to hold an aerobatic rating</li> <li>- loss of instructor competence cannot be seen as he/she will only not be any longer allowed to fly a loop without holding this aerobatic rating</li> </ul> Please see also the response provided to the comment No. 784 (BGA) in the appropriate segment for the AMC to FCL.800.

comment	3610 comment by: <i>Susana Nogueira</i> Am AMC for night qualification for balloon and airship needed.
response	<i>Noted</i> The Agency acknowledges your comment. This issue may be subject to future work, as part of a specific rulemaking task.

<p><b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart I: Additional Ratings - AMC to FCL.800 - Aerobatic Rating – Theoretical knowledge and flying training</b></p>	p. 385-386
---	------------

comment	195 comment by: <i>Aero-Club of Switzerland</i> Please delete chandelle and lazy eight.  According FAR23: Chandelle and lazy and eight are no aerobatic maneuvers.  The list 4.1 should read:  -spin
---------	--

response

-loop  
 -rudder roll (left & right)  
 -immelman (left & right)  
 -half cuban eight (left & right)  
 -hammerhead turn  
 -inverted flight

*Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency reviewed carefully all the comments received on the practical part of the training syllabus. It has to be recognised that depending on the system for aerobatic training (and competition) in the different Member States quite some different opinions do exist regarding the degree of difficulty which should be taught for this rating.

The Agency evaluated the different syllabus proposals and reached the following 3 conclusions in order to make it not too difficult:

1. There should be only one level of aerobatic rating
2. The syllabus of exercises should be the same for sailplanes and aeroplanes
3. The wording used for the exercise should be clearly characterise the content (using the official ARESTI code wording)

Reviewing the comments received from one specific Member State proposing just a very basic level of the exercises which is more an advanced pilot skill training (with the exemption of the loop) the Agency came to the conclusion that a more advanced ("intermediate") level of training should be provided. Based on the fact that the experience and training requirements in FCL.800 ask for 5 hours aerobatic training or at least 20 take-offs the Agency is of the opinion that the exercises should comprise at least the following training items:

- Chandelle
- Lazy Eight
- Rolls
- Loops
- Inverted Flight
- Hammerhead turn
- Immelman

Additional exercises as proposed by a lot of stakeholders (like: Half Cuban Eight, Split S, Quarter Clover, Inverted Loop, specific Rolls) might be added if the experience and training progress of the student pilot allows it but should not be a mandatory training item for this aerobatic rating.

As all the above mentioned, mandatory training items can be flown also with several sailplanes (also double-seaters) and as the aerobatic rating already in place in several Member States contains most of these exercises, the Agency believes that the amended training syllabus will represent now the right level in order to ensure a standardised and safe level of aerobatic instruction.

It should be added that the Agency agrees with your statement that the exercises "Chandelle" and "Lazy Eight" are differently classified in the Member States but as they are part of the training syllabus for quite a lot of countries the Agency decided to keep them in the syllabus.

Regarding your proposal to add the spin as an exercise, the Agency decided to keep the spin in the list of confidence manoeuvres and recoveries based on the fact that this exercise (fully developed spins) is not part of the basic training syllabus for some of the licences.

comment 300

comment by: *Bob Ellis*

I am an ex-Royal Air Force Pilot and would like to see creditation for the aerobatic training that I have received. Proposal Military pilots should be credited their fixed wing aerobatic training for the award of the Aerobatic Rating.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Part-FCL will not contain any requirement about the conversion of existing ratings or licences. The conversion of national licences will be covered in a separate document and will involve the Member States. As the requirement in FCL.800 does not foresee a crediting system for this specific case, it might be necessary to do the required 20 training flight on aircraft of the specific class or at least the three dual training flights required for the extension of the privilege to another class of aircraft.

comment 427

comment by: *BAeA Chairman*

Attachment [#71](#)

Some of the terminology used, e.g. "over the top manoeuvres", is non-standard. The syllabus and its introductory wording are ambiguous as to minimum content of an aerobatic rating. The list of manoeuvres does not take account of the limited rolling capabilities of most aerobatic sailplanes. Directed comments and suggested re-wordings are included in the attached document.

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your detailed comment and the attached working paper.

Please see also the response already provided to the same comment addressed to the rule text FCL.800.

The Agency agrees that the expression "over the top manoeuvres" has to be changed in order to make clear what is meant by this.

In addition to this the Agency would like to highlight that based on the comments received and some further discussions with aerobatic instruction experts, it was decided to keep the initial concept of an aerobatic rating which is clearly on a higher level than the proposed UK basic level. The reason for this is explained also in the response to comment No. 195 (Aero Club of Switzerland) in the same segment above and is based on the opinion that most of the exercises proposed (like the 45° climbing or diving or the 60° bank turn) are very basic training items which are mostly covered already during the normal flight training for the licence.

Regarding your comment on the exercise "rolls", the Agency checked again with gliding aerobatic training experts and came to the conclusion that most of

the sailplanes actually used for aerobatic training (Swift/ASK 21/several single seaters) are certified for rolls and inverted flight. Within the given time (5 hours or 20 flights) this can easily be taught.

Regarding your comment on 3.5. Emergency procedures, the Agency will not add "if worn" because this is an important item which should also be taught if no parachutes are worn during this training. It might be that (and in most Member States this is already the case) that the student pilot will use such a parachute later on when flying on his/her own responsibility - this is the reason why it should be a mandatory item for the theoretical syllabus. This does not mean that the licensing rules require to wear a parachute. But please be aware that the NPA containing the proposal for the OPS requirements (NPA 2009-02) contains a proposal for a requirement dealing with this issue.

The wording "if permitted" in item 4. will be deleted because the ATO has to confirm at the end of the training that the student pilot is able to fly all these exercises and achieves a safe and competent standard. If the certification of a certain aircraft does not allow to fly one of the required exercises, this exercise has to be flown with another aircraft.

As proposed by you, the Agency will reverse the order of the two sections 4.1. and 4.2. (confidence manoeuvres first).

comment

530

comment by: *FOCA Switzerland*

Subpart I  
AMC to FCL.800 Flying Training

Para 4  
Aerobatic maneuvers with regard to "loop and inverted loop" to be reviewed.

**It is important to have a clear definition of the figures ambiguous (may differ in the countries); Reference to catalogue ARESTI. Introduction of a separate superior instruction with specific figures strongly recommended.**

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the responses provided to the comments No. 195 (Aero Club of Switzerland) and No. 427 (BAeA Chairman) in the same segment above.

Regarding your proposal to check the wording used for the exercises "loops" and "inverted loops", the Agency decided to keep only the exercise "loops" which will allow the instructor to choose based on the experience of the student and the aircraft used for the training if an aileron roll, rudder roll or barrel roll will be instructed. The inverted loop was deleted from the program.

comment

551

comment by: *Norwegian Air Sports Federation*

The aerobatic rating should only be issued by an approved training organisation, with certified aerobatic instructors performing training according to approved training programs.

Flying Training should include first all the listed confidence manoeuvres and then all basic aerobatic manoeuvres. Inverted loop is definitely not a basic

manoeuvre, belonging to the category of advanced manoeuvres and requires far more experience and training to perform safely. Among the basic manoeuvres Cuban eight, reversed Cuban eight, slow roll, flick roll, stall turn and clover leaf is missing. The flying training must conclude with the student being able to fly a simple sequence.  
Experience show the training program requires a minimum of 10 flight hours.

response

**Noted**

Thank you for providing your opinion.

It must be clarified that as a general rule licences and ratings will not be issued or revalidated by an ATO. This is clearly the task of the competent authority (it might be given to specific examiners).

The ATO has (as already explained in the AMC) to issue only a certificate of satisfactory completion of the training for the purpose of licence endorsement. This system will not be changed.

Regarding your comments on the contents of the syllabus, please check the responses provided to the comments No. 195 (Aero Club of Switzerland) and No. 427 (BAeA Chairman) in the same segment above.

The Agency agrees that the inverted loop should be deleted. Your proposals for the additional manoeuvres (cuban eight, flick roll, clover leaf) were discussed but based on the decision to require only 5 hours or 20 flights of aerobatic training (most comments to the rule in FCL.800 asked for even less training) they should be kept as additional non-mandatory exercises for more advanced training or for the more experienced student pilots at the end of the training but not all as mandatory items for this basic training. As the term "at least" is used in subparagraph 4 of the AMC, the instructor is free to include more elements and exercises if necessary.

The Agency also agrees that the training should conclude with the student being able to fly solo (under supervision) a simple sequence. The Agency will add a sentence saying that the student pilot when having completed the aerobatic training should be able to perform a solo flight containing a simple sequence of aerobatic manoeuvres.

comment

784

comment by: *British Gliding Association*

AMC to FCL 800  
(Page 385)

*Comment: The exercises in this part of the AMC are drawn from a power flying background and are, in many cases, not appropriate for sailplanes. We suggest an improved text which is more applicable for sailplane pilots wanting to learn basic aerobatics safely.*

**Title sentence to read:**

***Aerobatic Rating - Theoretical knowledge, flying training, and sailplane proficiency check***

***Additional paragraph:***

***3(S) Sailplanes only. Contents of the proficiency check for the issue of an aerobatic rating.***

***The applicant should demonstrate the ability to fly, safely, the***

*manoeuvres specified in 4.1(S) in a linked sequence:*

**FLYING TRAINING**

**Add two paragraphs:**

**4.(S) The exercises of the aerobatic flying training syllabus specified in 4.1(S) must be taught, and practiced until the student is safe and competent, in a sailplane which permits these maneuvers. The holder of an aerobatic rating may not perform any other manoeuvre unless s/he has satisfied a flight instructor that s/he is competent to do so.**

**4.1(S)**

- 45deg climbing and diving lines

- Chandelle

- Loop

- 2g turn

**Note: we are content with the Theoretical Knowledge and Confidence manoeuvre requirements.**

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the responses provided to the comments No. 195 (Aero Club of Switzerland) and No. 427 (BAeA Chairman) in the same segment above.

The syllabus was changed in order to address the concerns that some of the exercises could not be flown with a sailplane. However, it should be pointed out that based on the comments received and some further discussions with aerobatic instruction experts, it was decided to keep the initial concept of an aerobatic rating which is clearly on a higher level than the proposed UK basic level. The reason for this is explained also in the response to comment No. 195 (Aero Club of Switzerland) and is based on the opinion that most of the exercises proposed by you (like the 45° climbing or diving lines or the 60° bank turn) are very basic training items which are mostly covered already during the normal flight training for the licence. There is no need to create a specific sub-section for the aerobatic training in sailplanes.

It is obvious that the exercises have to be flown with an aircraft certified for this purpose.

comment

807

comment by: *Robert Cronk*

As previously mentioned at FCL.800 p 42, for sailplanes the negative G figures are very advanced manoeuvres, beyond the capability of most sailplanes, and the glider pilot will wish to learn and become competent in the simple Positive G figures only.

A restricted aerobatic rating for sailplanes should be available, which permits the holder (having demonstrated competence) to fly 45 degree climbing & diving lines, chandelle, loop, and 2 g turn.

Should the sailplane pilot wish to learn advanced sailplane aerobatics, the full aerobatic rating as set out would then be available as a later upgrade.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the responses provided to the comments No. 195 (Aero Club of

Switzerland) and No. 427 (BAeA Chairman) in the same segment above.

The Agency has decided not to introduce 2 different levels of aerobatic ratings. There will be only one in the future. Based on this, more advanced aerobatics can be trained later on but without a specific syllabus or requirement.

The exercises "Loops" and "Chandelle" will be included in the training program but for 45° diving or descending lines and 2 g turns no specific aerobatic training is needed. The exercise "Steep Turns" is already incorporated.

comment 808

comment by: *Robert Cronk*

re para 4, this is more like it - I like the provision that it should be 'repeated as necessary until the applicant achieves a safe and competent standard'. This is what is important, NOT the prescriptive minimum number of hours suggested at FCL.800 at p 42.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency would like to introduce a more competency based approach but this has then clearly to be linked with an assessment of competence (skill test normally) at the end of the training. As it was decided not to introduce such a skill test and the evaluation of the existing requirements and the input received from authorities and training experts clearly asked for a certain minimum amount of training received the Agency will keep the "5 hours or 20 training flights" requirement in FCL.800.

comment 1089

comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

**Comment:**

Delete "if permitted". If the aeroplane is not permitted to perform all exercises that are required for an aerobatic rating, it shall not be used.

**Proposal:**

Delete the words in brackets: (if permitted).

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency fully agrees with your comment and will change the text accordingly.

comment 2015

comment by: *Swiss Pilot School Association*

Please delete chandelle and lazy eight.

Nach FAR23 sind Chandelle und lazy eight keine Kunstflugmanöver.

Die Liste 4.1 müsste lauten:

- spin
- Loop

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- rudder roll (left &amp; right)</li> <li>- immelmann (left &amp; right)</li> <li>- half cuban eight (left &amp; right)</li> <li>- hammerhead turn</li> <li>- inverted flight</li> </ul>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the responses provided to the comments No. 195 (Aero Club of Switzerland) and No. 427 (BAeA Chairman) in the same segment above.</p>

comment	<p><b>2086</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>RP Kassel</i></span></p> <p>Subpart I lists a number of additional ratings, which are in JAR-FCL not yet included. That is to be welcome.</p> <p>Additional national german ratings are still missing, e.g. cloud flying rating for sailplane or dusting and spraying flight rating for aircraft and helicopter in the agricultural sector. Under German law a right, once issued, can't be withdrawn. Suggestion: For licences to be transited a possibility remain these ratings, if they explicitly labeled as national.</p> <p>Question: Can the dusting and spraying flight rating for aircraft and helicopter in the future only be used a) with a special permission or b) without any additional authorization?</p> <p>Suggestion: a) The rules for the rating have to be define, b) Clarification, possibly in the CRD.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The proposed three additional ratings (compared with JAR-FCL) are based on an evaluation of the existing ratings in the different Member States. Based on this evaluation, the drafting group decided to develop at this stage only requirements for aerobatic-, towing-, mountain and night ratings.</p> <p>As there was no indication so far that further ratings are needed, the Agency will not introduce at this stage new elements which are not based on a proper safety assessment. However, it should be mentioned that the development of such a rating could be covered in the future by initiating an additional rulemaking task. As most of the proposed ratings will be used anyway only for commercial purposes the OPS requirements will provide the necessary framework as a system of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for each of the aerial work activities is envisaged.</p> <p>National ratings are not foreseen in the future.</p> <p>An additional task is already launched for the issue of qualifications for flying in IMC (see also the Explanatory Note for this NPA) which will contain the issue of cloud flying with sailplanes.</p>

comment	<p><b>2838</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Dave Sawdon</i></span></p> <p>The term "inverted loop" requires definition. If it refers to an outside loop this is an advanced manoeuvre which outside the envelope of a large number of</p>
---------	---



	<p>aerobatic aircraft (and instructors!). It must be removed. If it refers to an inside loop which starts from the inverted this should be clarified. An Aileron roll can mean a ballistic roll (little rudder and elevator input) or can mean a slow or axial roll. I suggest that it is edited to read: "Aileron roll (ballistic and axial)"</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the responses provided to the comments No. 195 (Aero Club of Switzerland) and No. 427 (BAeA Chairman) in the same segment above.</p> <p>The "inverted loop" will not be kept in the training program and the exercise "rolls" will be left open for the instructor to decide which kind of roll should be trained (taking into account the type of aircraft and the experience of the student).</p>
comment	<p><b>3594</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Swiss Power Flight Union</i></span></p> <p>Please delete chandelle and lazy eight.</p> <p>According FAR23: Chandelle and lazy and eight are no aerobatic maneuvers.</p> <p>The list 4.1 should read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-spin</li> <li>-loop</li> <li>-rudder roll (left &amp; right)</li> <li>-immemmann (left &amp; right)</li> <li>-half cuban eight (left &amp; right)</li> <li>-hammerhead turn</li> <li>-inverted flight</li> </ul>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the responses provided to the comments No. 195 (Aero Club of Switzerland) and No. 427 (BAeA Chairman) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p><b>3611</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Susana Nogueira</i></span></p> <p>Paragraph 4.1 Aerobatic maneuvers with regard to 'Loop and inverted loop' should be reviewed.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response provided to the comment No. 530 (FOCA Switzerland) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p><b>4162</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Claudia Buengen</i></span></p>

	<p>additional ratings: aerobatic rating</p> <p>most glider pilots in the UK are not interested in the full aerobatic exercise range. Currently basic aerobatics can be taught by club instructors, I would like to see a provision for this practice included.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the responses provided to the comments No. 195 (Aero Club of Switzerland) and No. 427 (BAeA Chairman) in the same segment above.</p> <p>Instructors providing training for this rating can be "club instructors" or other instructors (e.g. of an commercial ATO). The main issue is not if the ATO is a club or not but that the instructor is holding the aerobatic rating and is experienced enough to provide this training contained in the syllabus (see also the privileges of an instructor - e.g. FCL.905.LAFI).</p> <p>The Agency has chosen only a basic aerobatic training syllabus. More advanced training can be provided in additional courses or at the end of the training but these exercises will not be mandatory.</p>
comment	<p>4210 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Deutscher Aero Club (DAeC)</i></span></p> <p>Comment: As the approved training organisation shall have the responsibility to evaluate the satisfactory completion of the training by the applicant, it is an unnecessary additional requirement to perform the endorsement of the licence by anyone. DAeC interprets, that in this context the competent authority is meant.</p> <p>Proposed changes: The licence endorsement for the successful completion of the aerobatic training shall be performed by the responsible approved training organisation. Justification: The proposed procedure avoids additional bureaucratic and financial burden.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response provided to the comment No. 551 (Norwegian Airsports Federation) in the same segment above.</p> <p>Additionally, it should be pointed out that the system chosen (no validity - no revalidation procedures) will already lead to a very low level of administrative and financial burden as only once the rating must be entered in the licence. This has to be done by the competent authority (see FCL.015).</p>
comment	<p>4212 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Deutscher Aero Club (DAeC)</i></span></p> <p>Comment: Add to paragraph 4.1 Inverted flight</p>

Stall turn

Justification:

It is recommended to add the manoeuvres "Inverted flight" and "Stall turn" to the list.

Ability to fly inverted safely is elementary to perform rolling manoeuvres. It should be a requirement for the aerobatic rating whenever the respective aircraft is certified to perform inverted flight. Stall turns are among the most common aerobatic figures and should be included in the aerobatic instruction whenever possible.

Delete from paragraph 4.1:

Inverted loop

Justification

Inverted loops should be deleted as such manoeuvres belong to the category of "Unlimited" aerobatic figures. Inverted loops are far beyond the airworthiness limitations (envelope) of gliders used for basic aerobatic training. Due to the health hazard performing such an extreme figure with a high load factor (-3.5 g) over a long time period (> 20 sec) is not reasonable to implement this in to basic aerobatic training.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees with your proposal and will add the two following exercises to the syllabus:

- Inverted flight
- hammerhead turn

The Agency also agrees with your proposal to delete the "inverted loop". The training program has been amended and some other changes were introduced.

Please see also the responses provided to the comments No. 195 (Aero Club of Switzerland) and No. 427 (BAeA Chairman) in the same segment above.

comment

4388

comment by: *DC-AL*

The manoeuvre described as a 'Chandelle' is open to differing interpretations, it should be described exactly if it is to be included. Similarly the Split S and the Immelmann are not universally understood.

I strongly believe the confidence manoeuvres should be placed in the position of priority - before the aerobatics themselves in the syllabus.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the responses provided to the comments No. 195 (Aero Club of Switzerland) and No. 427 (BAeA Chairman) in the same segment above.

Regarding the naming the terms used "Immelmann" (half loop - half roll) seems to be well known and accepted. As several comments asked to delete the "Split S" (half roll - half loop), the Agency agrees and will take it out. There is no longer the need to further explain this exercise.

comment

4619

comment by: *Deutscher Aero Club*

AMC to FCL 800

Comment: The exercises in this part of the AMC are drawn from a power flying background and are, in many cases, not appropriate for sailplanes. We suggest an improved text which is more appropriate to sailplane pilots wanting to learn basic aerobatics safely.

EGU Proposal:

Title sentence to read:

Aerobatic Rating - Theoretical knowledge, flying training, and sailplane proficiency check

Additional paragraph:

3(S) Sailplanes only. Contents of the proficiency check for the issue of an aerobatic rating.

The applicant should demonstrate the ability to fly, safely, the manoeuvres specified in 4.1(S) in a linked sequence:

FLYING TRAINING

Add two paragraphs:

4.(S) The exercises in the aerobatic flying training syllabus specified in 4.1(S) must be taught, and practised until the student is safe and competent, in a sailplane which permits these manoeuvres. The holder of an aerobatic rating may not perform any other manoeuvre unless s/he has satisfied a flight instructor that s/he is competent to do so.

4.1(S) - 45deg climbing and diving lines

- Chandelle

- Loop

- 2g turn

Note: we are satisfied with the Theoretical Knowledge and Confidence manoeuvre requirements.

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency has to admit that the two comments sent by your organisation assigned to this segment created some irritation.

Your comment No. 4212 proposes to include "Inverted Flight" and "Stall Turns" but with this comment which is clearly a copy of the standard BGA Comment No. 784 (and many more comments based on this comment) in the same segment above you are introducing a training program on a much lower basic level.

Please study the responses already provided to your comment No. 4212 and to the BGA comment No. 784.

comment

4620

comment by: *Deutscher Aero Club*

AMC FCL.800 Aerobatic rating (b)

Comment: As the approved training organisation shall have responsibility for evaluating the satisfactory completion of the training by the applicant, it is an unnecessary additional requirement for anyone else to perform the endorsement of the licence. EGU interprets, that in this context, the competent authority is meant.

	<p>EGU Proposal: The licence endorsement for the successful completion of aerobatic training shall be performed by the responsible, approved training organisation.</p> <p>Justification: The proposed procedure avoids additional bureaucratic and financial burden.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p>
	<p>Please see the response already provided to your comment No. 4210 in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p><b>4816</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p>Para 4.1 Aerobatic maneuvers with regard to "Loop and Inverted loop" to be reviewed</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response provided to the comment No. 530 (FOCA Switzerland) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p><b>4923</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>George Knight</i></span></p> <p>(Page 385)</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> These proposals seem more relevant to power flying aerobatics than to gliding – particularly since most sailplanes cannot (i.e. are not permitted to do so by the flight manual) execute the majority of manoeuvres listed. For sailplane pilots wanting to learn the basic aerobatics that can be performed in most sailplanes safely the following alternative rule is suggested...</p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> Under the title "<i>Aerobatic Rating - Theoretical knowledge, flying training, and sailplane proficiency check</i>" add: "3(S) Sailplanes only. The contents of the proficiency check for the issuing an aerobatic rating. The applicant should demonstrate the ability to fly, safely, the manoeuvres specified in 4.1(S) in a linked sequence."</p> <p>Under the title "<i>FLYING TRAINING</i>" two additions: "4.(S) The exercises of the aerobatic flying training syllabus specified in 4.1(S) must be taught, and practiced until the student is safe and competent, in a sailplane which permits these manoeuvres. The holder of an aerobatic rating may not perform any other manoeuvre unless s/he has satisfied a flight instructor that s/he is competent to do so."</p> <p>"4.1(S) 45deg climbing and diving lines Chandelle Loop 2g turn"</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p>

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to the comment No. 784 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment

5545

comment by: *Chris Gowers*

Page 386 Para 4.1 "Rudder Roll "requires definition. This term could refer to a slow roll, a flick roll or a snap roll. Rudder roll is not a term in general use except in the shipping industry, when rudder inputs can be used for stabilizing ships.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your comment.

The Agency agrees with your comment and has changed the term to read only "rolls". The instructor will decide based on the experience of the student and the aircraft used which roll manoeuvre should be taught.

comment

5548

comment by: *Chris Gowers*

Para 4.1 Add, "Slow Roll" and "Stall Turn"

Please note the previous suggested change of making this course 8 hours long.

response

*Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees with your proposal and will add/change the list of exercises to include:

- rolls
- hammerhead turns

which should reflect also your proposal.

The required minimum amount of training is established in the rule text for FCL.800 and the Agency will keep the "5 hours - 20 training flights". However, the Agency is aware that certain students might need more training than the above mentioned amount of flight time. It is the responsibility of the ATO to decide on this and the Agency does not see a need to raise the required amount of training as proposed by you and some other stakeholders.

comment

5598

comment by: *Belgian Gliding Federation*

AMC to FCL 800

*Comment: The exercises in this part of the AMC are drawn from a power flying background and are, in many cases, not appropriate for sailplanes. We suggest an improved text which is more appropriate to sailplane pilots wanting to learn basic aerobatics safely.*

**Proposal:**

**Title sentence to read:**

**Aerobatic Rating - Theoretical knowledge, flying training, and sailplane proficiency check**

**Additional paragraph:**

**3(S) Sailplanes only. Contents of the proficiency check for the issue of an aerobatic rating.**

**The applicant should demonstrate the ability to fly, safely, the manoeuvres specified in 4.1(S) in a linked sequence:**

**FLYING TRAINING**

**Add two paragraphs:**

**4.(S) The exercises in the aerobatic flying training syllabus specified in 4.1(S) must be taught, and practised until the student is safe and competent, in a sailplane which permits these manoeuvres. The holder of an aerobatic rating may not perform any other manoeuvre unless s/he has satisfied a flight instructor that s/he is competent to do so.**

**4.1(S)**

- 45deg climbing and diving lines
- Chandelle
- Loop
- 2g turn

Note: we are satisfied with the Theoretical Knowledge and Confidence manoeuvre requirements.

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to the comments No. 784 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment

5599

comment by: *Belgian Gliding Federation*

*AMC FCL.800 Aerobatic rating (b)*

Comment: As the approved training organisation shall have responsibility for evaluating the satisfactory completion of the training by the applicant, it is an unnecessary additional requirement for anyone else to perform the endorsement of the licence. EGU interprets, that in this context, the competent authority is meant.

**Proposal:**

**The licence endorsement for the successful completion of aerobatic training shall be performed by the responsible, approved training organisation.**

Justification: The proposed procedure avoids additional bureaucratic and financial burden.

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to the comment No. 551 (Norwegian Airsports Federation) in the same segment above.

Additionally, it should be pointed out that the system chosen (no validity - no

revalidation procedures) will already lead to a very low level of administrative and financial burden as only once the rating must be entered in the licence. This has to be done by the competent authority (see FCL.015).

comment

6007 comment by: *French Fédération Française Aéronautique groups the 580 French powered flying aer-clubs and their 43 000 private pilots*

FFA and its aerobatic pilots propose to replace the present § 4.1 by the following text :

**4.1 Aerobatic manoeuvres**

- *Lazy Eight,*
- *Roll (slow roll, hesitation roll, flick roll and barrel roll)*
- *Loop,*
- *Loop and roll (Immelmann, half Cuban eight, reverse half Cuban eight),*
- *Stall turn,*
- *Inverted flight (Level and turns).*

**Justification:** First, it seems necessary to name the aerobatic figures using basic names well known by everybody, and, second, to harmonize the terminology.

response

*Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the responses provided to the comments No. 195 (Aero Club of Switzerland) and No. 427 (BAeA Chairman) in the same segment above.

The Agency has modified the training syllabus based on all the input received. It seems that most of your proposals have been introduced. The Agency does not intend to name specific rolls as this would create some problems for the sailplane community and specific rolls seem to be classified as more advanced manoeuvres. For the term "stall turn" the term "hammerhead turn" is used. "Inverted flight" will be included.

comment

6040

comment by: *Phil King*

The NPA doesn't provide an appropriate syllabus for gliders. I support the BGA proposal:

*Title sentence to read:*

*Aerobatic Rating - Theoretical knowledge, flying training, and sailplane proficiency check*

*Additional paragraph:*

*3(S) Sailplanes only. Contents of the proficiency check for the issue of an aerobatic rating. The applicant should demonstrate the ability to fly, safely, the manoeuvres specified in 4.1(S) in a linked sequence:*

*FLYING TRAINING*

*Add two paragraphs:*

*4.(S) The exercises of the aerobatic flying training syllabus specified in 4.1(S) must be taught, and practiced until the student is safe and competent, in a sailplane which permits these maneuvers. The holder of an aerobatic rating may not perform any other manoeuvre unless s/he has satisfied a flight instructor that s/he is competent to do so.*

*4.1(S)*

*- 45deg climbing and diving lines*



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chandelle</li> <li>- Loop</li> <li>- 2g turn</li> </ul>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response provided to the comment No. 784 (BGA) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p><b>6065</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Martyn Johnson</i></span></p> <p>I have no particular expertise in sailplane aerobatics.</p> <p>However, having read the British Gliding Association's response, I support that.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your comment stating that you have no specific expertise in aerobatic flying.</p> <p>Please study the response provided to comment No. 784 (BGA) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p><b>6388</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DSvU</i></span></p> <p>FCL.800</p> <p>Comment: There is no need for an aerobatic rating for common glider pilots. As long as an aircraft is flown within the flight envelope it should be considered as "normal flight". Only for instructing an aerobatic rating should be needed.</p> <p>Proposal: Delete the whole paragraph</p> <p>Justification: During at least the last 40 years only one has damaged a glider in DK by aerobatic. An aerobatic rating is not required in the current ICAO regulation for glider pilots, and it seems to be an overregulation.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>However, the Agency does not agree.</p> <p>Please see the responses already provided to the comments received on the rule text in the appropriate segment. Based on the evaluation of the existing ratings in Europe, the experts involved in the drafting decided to introduce a standardised aerobatic rating.</p> <p>As such a rating with standardised training and qualified instructors will help to achieve that these pilots will reach a competent and safe level the Agency strongly believes that it should be introduced.</p>

On the other hand, the Agency would like to clarify that it would be also helpful if most of the instructors would hold also an aerobatic rating but that to require such a rating as a pre-requisite for attending the instructor course seems to be a kind of over-regulation at this stage. This might be discussed in a future rulemaking task.

comment

6699

comment by: *Croft Brown*

AMC to FCL 800  
(Page 385)

Comment: The exercises in this part of the AMC are drawn from a power flying background and are, in many cases, not appropriate for sailplanes. We suggest an improved text which is more applicable for sailplane pilots wanting to learn basic aerobatics safely.

Title sentence to read:

Aerobatic Rating - Theoretical knowledge, flying training, and sailplane proficiency check

Additional paragraph:

3(S) Sailplanes only. Contents of the proficiency check for the issue of an aerobatic rating.

The applicant should demonstrate the ability to fly, safely, the manoeuvres specified in 4.1(S) in a linked sequence:

FLYING TRAINING

Add two paragraphs:

4.(S) The exercises of the aerobatic flying training syllabus specified in 4.1(S) must be taught, and practiced until the student is safe and competent, in a sailplane which permits these maneuvers. The holder of an aerobatic rating may not perform any other manoeuvre unless s/he has satisfied a flight instructor that s/he is competent to do so.

4.1(S)

- 45deg climbing and diving lines
- Chandelle
- Loop
- 2g turn

Note: we are content with the Theoretical Knowledge and Confidence manoeuvre requirements.

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to the comment No. 784 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment

6977

comment by: *CAA CZ*

item 4

It is not clear if in the case, when training aeroplane which can provide all required training tasks is not available, is possible to enter aerobatic qualification on the licence with appropriate limitation.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your comment.

The Agency agrees that the term in brackets saying "if permitted" must be

deleted as the clear aim is that the student pilot has to achieve a safe and competent level which will allow him/her to perform all the mentioned exercises.

As there will be no limited aerobatic rating or different levels of aerobatic ratings, this has to be made clear. With the certification of satisfactory completion of the instruction for the purpose of licence endorsement which has to be sent by the ATO to the competent authority this has to be confirmed.

The Agency will delete the term: "if permitted".

comment

7363

comment by: *Anja Barfuß*

I miss the rating for flying IMC with sailplane. In some areas the weather condition and airspace result in the need to fly below VFR rules. If the sailplane is equipped for this there is it should be possible.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

It was indicated in NPA 2008-17a (Explanatory Note) that this issue is currently being discussed in a separate Rulemaking task, FCL.008.

The comments received on A-NPA 14-2006 and on this NPA dealing with the issue of the Cloud Flying Rating will be taken into account by this working group. The task FCL.008 will result in an NPA which will be submitted to public consultation, and on which you will be able to make your comments.

comment

7646

comment by: *Mike Armstrong*

Page 385 of 647 AMC to FCL 800

I repeat some of my comments on Page 42 of 647 FCL800 and themn continue with additional suggestions:

*"I am a self taught aerobatic glider pilot who took some advice from experienced aerobatic pilots before attempting manoeuvres. My skill set now includes inverted flight, slow rolls, stall turns together with the usual semi-aerobatic class of manoeuvres such as stalls, spins, loops, wing overs. I have never damaged an aircraft while doing any of the above and have trained others to safely achieve the same proficiency.*

*The regulation proposed seems unnecessary for sailplanes where most pilots only wish to do some recreational semi aerobatic manoeuvres anyway."*

I would propose that there are separate **semi aerobatic** (positive g manoeuvres only) and **fully aerobatic** ratings for sialplanes. For the full rating I would propose that individual manoeuvres/elements can be added as endorsements to the rating when competence is achieved. For example inverted and flat spins may be achievable in a very small number of sailplanes but I am not aware of many of those that are certified for them - I have inadvertently entered a flat spin in a sailplane not certified for the manoeuvre.

Different levels of syllabus would be required for semi aerobatic and fully aerobatic licences and indeed for powered aircraft. A number of the topics

listed under the regulation are not relevant to sailplanes (for example, engine limitations). Perhaps a table of syllabus topics with columns where the relevance to a particular category of aircraft would be an appropriate way of resolving this with advice from experienced power and sailplane aerobatic instructors.

Alternatively I would propose a rating based on semi aerobatic manoeuvres and appropriate syllabus with the facility for endorsements covering additional individual advanced manoeuvres (or groups of manoeuvres) when training and competence have been achieved.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see also the response already provided to your comment on the rule text for FCL.800.

Firstly, it should be clarified that the Agency does not agree that aerobatics should be taught by using a certain kind of "self-teaching" method. Based on the specific skills and the experience needed to fly aerobatics, the Agency will not allow such a system will not work in most cases. If a pilot with the prerequisites required (meaning 40 hours on sailplanes) would start to train himself/herself for a "roll" or a "hammerhead turn" in most cases, there would be a high risk that problems or even accidents will occur. This is the reason why an aerobatic rating for sailplanes will be kept.

Regarding your proposal to add an additional level of aerobatic rating for powered flying, the Agency does not agree and will introduce only one level which will allow to fly the necessary basic manoeuvres. If a pilot is interested to build up his/her abilities and skills this can be done on a familiarisation basis based on the training already received for this rating. The terms "semi" and "full" aerobatic training seem to be more related to the competition level of aerobatics and should be regulated by the aviation bodies themselves. From the licensing side this level proposed seems to be suitable and sufficient.

comment *8037*

comment by: *Andy Balkwill*

Much of this section looks to be relevant to powered aircraft but not gliders and it should be given further consideration.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to the comment No. 784 (BGA) in the same segment above.

comment *8112*

comment by: *European Sailplane Manufacturers*

The list of manoeuvres is not really suited to sailplane aerobatics.

Here inverted flight is very important whereas inverted loops are mostly not allowed or possible.

The AMC should be accordingly amended.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the responses provided to the comments No. 195 (Aero Club of Switzerland) and No. 427 (BAeA Chairman) in the same segment above.

The training syllabus has been changed in order to address the needs of all aircraft categories.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart I: Additional Ratings - AMC to FCL.850 - Towing Rating – Theoretical knowledge and flying training**

p. 386-388

comment

29

comment by: *British Gliding Association*

Page 386

AMC to FCL 805 Towing

NPA Proposal

3.1 - - "Specific sailplane towing safety procedures"

*Comment:*

*This wording might result in tow pilots being qualified to tow certain sailplane types only. This is completely unnecessary and in any case would be unmanageable. Remove the word specific.*

**BGA Proposal*****Revised wording:******- - Sailplane towing safety procedures***

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.

Although the reasoning behind and the general aim of your comment is understood, the Agency could not follow your logic drawing such a conclusion out of your interpretation of the wording used.

As you certainly know, the text of an AMC will never result in a certain specific qualification (here your assumption that a towing pilot could be qualified to tow only certain sailplane types) which is not mentioned or regulated in the appropriate rule text. FCL.805 clearly does not foresee any additional qualification or specific endorsement but definitely only one towing rating for all the tugs used within a class (e.g. SEP) and certainly also for all the gliders/sailplanes launched. If such sailplane specific items would exist which would make necessary a specific qualification for a certain group of sailplanes (e.g. double seater - single seater/with flaps or without/with water or without), then this would have been mentioned in the training requirements (Implementing Rules) which is not the case.

As this wording here is only one sub-item in the AMC under the item "sailplane towing techniques", the Agency has problems to follow your logic. It must be asked how such a sub-item of the theoretical knowledge syllabus should result in such a limitation of the privileges.

However, in order to address your concerns the Agency will change the wording to read:

- Safety procedures

The same wording was proposed for the banner towing theoretical knowledge but the Agency does not intend to change it in 3.2.

comment 809

comment by: *Robert Cronk*

These comments are again made on the basis of my extensive experience as a sailplane tow pilot.

re para (2) - the 'approved training organisation' will almost always need to be the particular gliding club at which the towing normally takes place. Every club is already well sorted in terms of training their new tug pilots. It will not be practical for an 'approved training organisation' to be other than a gliding club, or there will be no tows to do!

re 3.1 - no issues.

re 4.1 - agreed, re 'repeated as necessary until the student achieves a safe and competent standard' - that is the key, NOT the prescriptive and impractical minimum hours requirement set out at FCL.805 on p 42. re 'descending during launch', that is extremely rare - the whole purpose of the launch being to climb! - but descends during a cross-country tow may arise. This would however usually be taught when the new tug pilot has rather more experience; they will not generally be undertaking cross country tows until they have good experience of towing for local launches.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Regarding your comment on the ATO, the Agency does not understand the meaning behind. A club can be an approved training organisation (ATO) but a commercially operating flying school can also be an ATO offering training for the towing rating. The Agency cannot see a problem with this.

As to your comment on the "descending on tow" again the Agency could not figure out what your proposal is asking for. The Agency is aware that this procedure:

- is rarely used
- can be necessary (mostly during cross-country launches)

The Agency cannot see a reason to exclude such a demonstration from the training as there might be no further chance to do some training on this issue and such a situation can occur at any time. Several countries have proposed to add also a landing on tow but the Agency decided not to introduce this exercise as a mandatory training item.

comment 948

comment by: *Colin Field (UK Glider Pilot)*

There should be no requirement at all for tow pilots to be qualified to tow any specific type of sailplane. For example, I own and fly a quite rare model of

glider (a Skylark 3), and if this requirement were enforced, I would find it very difficult to fly at other clubs which have not seen my glider before.

Also, it raises the question how this endorsement could be given, since many clubs do not have access to a 2-seat towplane which could be used to achieve this.

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

Your comment seems to be based on a misinterpretation of the standard BGA comment for this segment. As such a rating or endorsement for specific "types" of sailplanes (by the way: there are no "types" of sailplanes because the Agency considers all sailplanes to be one class) was never proposed, the Agency is not able to provide a substantiated response.

Please read again the original BGA comment and the response provided (No. 29 in the same segment above) and you will discover that the BGA is only commenting on a wording (or editorial) issue.

comment

3974

comment by: *Ulster Gliding Club*

Paragraph 3.1  
*specific sailplane towing safety procedures*

It is unclear what 'specific' means in this context, and what its effect is.

'specific' does not appear to add anything useful. It should be removed or clarified (cf. para. 3.2 'specific banner towing safety procedures' and para. 4.2 'specific banner towing safety procedures', the latter of which has no counterpart in para. 4.1)

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.  
Please see the response provided to comment No. 29 (BGA).

comment

4164

comment by: *Claudia Buengen*

As stated by the BGA, a more flexible syllabus is required here to ensure clubs have enough tow pilots who actually know how to tow a sailplane, i.e. possibly glider pilots with a power rating.

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.  
Please see the response provided to comment No. 29 (BGA).

The meaning behind your statement that a "more flexible syllabus is required" is not understood. As you are not providing any proposal or example in which way the syllabus should be made more flexible it seems to be based on a misinterpretation of the BGA comment. Please see also the resulting text for this AMC in order to get a clear picture what level of flexibility is already proposed.

comment	<p>4622 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Deutscher Aero Club</i></span></p> <p>AMC to FCL 850 Towing 3.1 - - "Specific sailplane towing safety procedures" Comment: This wording might result in tow pilots being qualified to tow certain sailplane types only. This is completely unnecessary and, in any case, would be unmanageable. Remove the word specific. EGU Proposal: Revised wording leaving out the word 'specific': - - Sailplane towing safety procedures</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your opinion. As this is a copy of the BGA comment, please see the response provided to comment No. 29.</p>
comment	<p>4871 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>AOPA Switzerland</i></span></p> <p>Landing with tow rope connected may damage the aircraft and/or components. It also creates a hazard for airfield infrastructure as well as for persons and/or equipments in the vicinity. Such manoeuvres should be simulated only.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The Agency has understood your concerns and agrees that such a procedure if not properly flown and prepared might cause an additional hazard / risk. On the other hand such a procedure is being used in several Member States and could also happen if for example the release for the tow would not work properly or if the drum (electrical system for pulling in the rope) would be blocked.</p> <p>Based on the input received from the experts, this exercise will be kept.</p>
comment	<p>4932 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>George Knight</i></span></p> <p>Page 386, "<i>TOWING OF SAILPLANES</i>" 3.1 12th bullet, "<i>specific sailplane towing safety procedures</i>"</p> <p>Please remove the word 'specific' - it might have the unintended consequence that a tug pilot would be restricted to towing specific sailplane types.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your opinion. Please see the response provided to comment No. 29 (BGA).</p>
comment	<p>5066 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>George Knight</i></span></p> <p>P 387 Flying Training - Towing of Sailplanes</p> <p>4.1 bullet #2 "<i>360° circles on tow with a bank of 30° and more</i>"</p>



**Comment:**

I assume that it is intended that this exercise be completed with a sailplane on the end of the tow rope. Does EASA really think it wise to tow gliders at angles of bank exceeding 30 degrees (at glider speeds this is a rate 2 turn).

Propose:

~~"360° circles on tow with a bank of 30° and more~~

"360° circles on tow at safe angles of bank taking into account the experience of the sailplane pilot on tow"

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees that during normal launch procedures the tug pilot will not tow a glider with more than 20° of bank. This is the reason why this exercise is specifically mentioned as an add-on to the normal procedures. But based on the input received from the gliding experts when developing this practical training syllabus, the Agency strongly believes that a tug pilot and a glider pilot should be able to perform turns with 30° bank angle or even more.

In specific situations (e.g. to stay clear of another aircraft which was detected late or for entering a thermal) such a procedure with a higher bank angle as usual could be necessary.

The qualification and experience of the sailplane pilot during these exercises is an important topic but should not create a problem.

comment

5071

comment by: *George Knight*

p 387

Towing of Sailplanes 4.1

"descending during launch"

Comment

Launch is usually take to mean climbing. A better phrase would be "**descending on tow**".

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees and will use the same wording as already used in 3.1.

comment

5210

comment by: *Paul Morrison*

It is neither desirable nor manageable to have tow pilots qualified to undertake aerotows on specific glider types only.

response

*Noted*

Your comment seems to be based on a misinterpretation of the standard BGA comment for this segment. As such a rating or endorsement for specific "types" of sailplanes (by the way: there are no "types" of sailplanes because the Agency considers all sailplanes to be one class) was never proposed, the Agency is not able to provide a substantiated response.

Please read again the original BGA comment and the response provided (No.

29 in the same segment above) and you will discover that the BGA is only commenting on a wording (or editorial) issue.

comment 5600 comment by: *Belgian Gliding Federation*

AMC to FCL 850 Towing

3.1 - - "*Specific sailplane towing safety procedures*"

Comment:

This wording might result in tow pilots being qualified to tow certain sailplane types only. This is completely unnecessary and, in any case, would be unmanageable. Remove the word specific.

**Proposal:**

**Revised wording leaving out the word 'specific':**

**- - Sailplane towing safety procedures**

response *Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.

Please see the response provided to comment No. 29 (BGA).

comment 6309 comment by: *Jonathan Coote*

It is a joke to consider these two activities under the same rating! The towing of sailplanes requires a number of skills which are not required for banner-towing, and are (apparently!) only properly understood by the BGA. These include:

- Experience as a glider pilot, in order to achieve adequate awareness of the many issues which the towed glider may experience
- Tug pilots need to be able to take advantage of atmospheric conditions to deliver glider pilots to appropriate and safe release points in the most economic fashion (e.g. not flying through sinking air). This requires experience as a glider pilot
- There are a number of procedures by which the tug pilot communicates to the glider pilot, or vice versa, given certain eventualities. These are completely unnecessary for pilots towing banners.

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.

It seems that you are not commenting on this AMC because the contents for the sailplane and banner towing are put clearly in different sections as the numbering clearly shows. Please check 3.1. and 3.2. or 4.1. and 4.2. and you will agree.

Not only the BGA is aware and has "properly understood" that there are indeed some differences between the instruction for towing banners and the training for towing sailplanes. This is exactly the reason why the training syllabus was divided in different separate sections. Putting the 2 towing ratings in one paragraph means not necessarily that the different skills needed are not recognised. This is exactly the reason why some of the prerequisites (flying hours) are so different (see rule text for FCL.805).

All the examples provided containing specific skills of the sailplane towing pilot

are well known and they are already properly addressed in this AMC material. Please study this AMC to FCL.805 and the Implementing Rules FCL.805 and you will discover the following exercises:

Regarding your bullet point 1:

5 familiarisation flights are envisaged and the Agency strongly believes that this amount of flights will ensure the adequate awareness needed

Regarding your bullet point 2:

This is more an economic than a safety related issue but it will clearly be addressed during the 10 training flights and the additional theoretical training ("specific launch procedures")

Regarding bullet point 3:

See AMC 4.1 and you will find the item "signals and communication during tow".

comment

6390

comment by: *DSvU*

FCL.805 (b)(3)

Comment:

Performing dual instruction is not always possible. In some cases the aeroplane is not a two-seater (PA-25 e.g.), or the power in some TMG's are not sufficient for towing a glider with one pilot and two persons in the TMG. This could very well create dangerous situations.

Proposal:

Change the paragraph to: 10 instruction flights, if possible under dual instruction, otherwise under supervision of an advisor with appropriate radio contact. The examiner should be a FI(S) and be the pilot of the towed sailplane too.

Justification:

This has worked very well in DK for the last 8 years, where the examiner has been a sailplane instructor with special rating, as pilot in the towed sailplane. It is important, that the sailplane pilot is so experienced, that no hazards occur to the tow pilot, therefore the examiner should be a FI(S) with appropriate rating and be the pilot of the towed sailplane too.

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment.

It seems that your comment should have been addressed to the segment containing the text of the Implementing Rules FCL.805. As this is the segment for the AMC material, please check also the responses provided in the appropriate segment and the resulting text.

It should be mentioned already that the text will be amended in order to allow also some solo flights under supervision. A minimum amount of flights with the instructor will be kept as it seems to be essential that the instructor is on board during the first towing instruction flights.

There will be no examiner as there is no skill test required. In addition to this, it must be added that the Agency does not envisage to develop a requirement

dealing with the qualification of the sailplane pilot to be towed during these exercises. The instructor providing this training as the responsible person for the whole operation will have to ensure (he/she will anyway take care of this) that for these training flights only experienced sailplane pilots will fly the sailplane. In addition to this the towing of different sailplanes (e.g. double-seater/single-seater/high performance sailplanes with water ballast/"old" designs requiring relatively slow towing speeds) could be very useful in order to be aware of the different towing techniques needed.

comment

6702

comment by: *Croft Brown*

Page 386  
 AMC to FCL 805 Towing  
 NPA Proposal  
 3.1 - - "Specific sailplane towing safety procedures"

Comment:

This might result in tow pilots being qualified to tow certain sailplane types only. This is completely unnecessary and in any case would be unmanageable. Remove the word specific.

Croft Brown endorses the BGA Proposal

Revised wording:

- - Sailplane towing safety procedures

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your opinion.  
 Please see the response provided to comment No. 29 (BGA).

comment

8197

comment by: *Andrew DELANEY***Tug pilot licensing**

I understand parts of the proposals are to regulate tug pilots for sailplanes. It is astounding that this has been lumped together with banner towing and clearly shows the author has no appreciation of tug / glider combinations. Towing a glider is very different to towing a banner. At my club tug pilots tend to be very experienced (often instructor level) glider pilots and their experience is very valuable in finding likely thermal sources and helping with training exercises associated with learning to aerotow. I imagine banner towing is fairly benign in comparison! The BGA makes very sensible proposals in regulating tug pilots. At my club our chief tug pilot is a captain with a major airline, he has thousands of hours flying experience and a great deal of time on gliders. Many other clubs have similar arrangements and to replace this experience with instruction from someone who may not have any glider experience at all would be a poor choice.

response

*Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.

It seems that you are not commenting on the AMC because the contents for the sailplane and banner towing are put clearly in different sections as the numbering clearly shows. Please check 3.1. and 3.2. or 4.1. and 4.2. and you will agree.

As your comment states that "the author has no appreciation of tug/glider

combinations" it should be clarified that this AMC which is a well balanced guide containing the training syllabus for the 2 towing ratings is based on an evaluation of the existing requirements and training manuals of different Member States.

As the licensing gliding experts were involved in the drafting, the Agency clearly disagrees with your conclusion. The Agency is also fully aware that there are some differences between towing a sailplane and towing a banner. This is the reason why the training syllabus was divided in separate sections. Putting the 2 towing ratings in one paragraph means not necessarily that the different skills needed are not recognised. This is also exactly the reason why some of the pre-requisites (flying hours) are so different (see rule text for FCL.805).

It must be pointed out that your general statement that "the BGA makes very sensible proposals in regulating tug pilots" does not really allow to provide a substantiated response. As this is an AMC which is not dealing with any qualifications of the tug pilot but with the training syllabus, please check the answers already provided to other BGA comments in a different segment.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart I: Additional Ratings - AMC to FCL.810 - PPL(H) Night Rating Course** p. 388-389

comment

3418

comment by: NACA

**AMC to FCL.810 .5 and .7 (exercise 1,2 and 3)**

1. Again it should be clearly stated which type of STD may be used.
2. We think it is not really necessary to train on a helicopter specific STD. In view of the requirements for a IR(H) modular training course (appendix 1/ section B.7(a)) where a FNPT1(H) or even (A) may be used this requirement seems to be overdone here.
3. To conduct each exercise in a helicopter in flight is quite often not possible (see 4). Considering the previous 5 hours PPL(H) instrument training it is probably sufficient to train 5 hours on a STD and cancel the actual flying.
4. Though small helicopters like the Hughes 300 are not equipped for instrument flying (no AI, VOR/DME or ADF) their HFM (Helicopter Flight Manual) does permit night flying under VFR.
5. As all this is **not** required for aeroplanes this whole AMC should be reconsidered, rewritten and amended.

response

*Noted*

The text in FCL.810(b) and this associated AMC is based on the corresponding requirements and AMC in JAR-FCL 2. It has been in place in its present wording since Amendment 1 to JAR-FCL 2. The Agency has considered your comments, and decided to make no changes to this established text at this time.

The integrity of the training course is also assured through the safety management system of the approved training organisation.

comment

3503

comment by: FOCA Switzerland

	<p>Subpart I AMC to FCL.810</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Night rating course for PPL (A) foreseen</b></li> <li>• <b>AMC for night rating for balloon also needed</b></li> </ul>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The structure of the requirements in FCL.810 for aeroplanes and helicopters, and this associated AMC, is based on the structure in JAR-FCL 1 (Aeroplane) and JAR-FCL 2 (Helicopter). The fact that there is no AMC for aeroplanes, as well as for the new categories of aircraft introduced with this NPA is due to the fact that no such AMC existed in JAR-FCL 1, and during the NPA the main concern of the Agency was to transfer the text that already existed, and to create a coherent system.</p> <p>The development of further AMC material could possibly be a future rulemaking task, if a need for such material should arise.</p>
comment	<p>3796 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></span></p> <p>FCL AMC to FCL810</p> <p>Courses for LPL (A)/ PPL(A), LPL(B)/BPL night rating should be developed as it has been done for PPL(H) night rating.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply to comment 3503 above.</p>
comment	<p>4818 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p>AMC for Night rating for balloon and airship needed</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply to comment 3503 above.</p>
comment	<p>5292 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></span></p> <p>FCL AMC to FCL810</p> <p>Courses for LPL (A)/ PPL(A), LPL(B)/BPL night rating should be developed as it has been done for PPL(H) night rating.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see the reply to comment 3503 above.</p>
comment	<p>6391 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DSvU</i></span></p> <p>FCL.810 (c)(3)</p> <p>Comment: The fact that in case of a LPL(S) or SPL pilot flying under VFR-conditions at night start and landing should take place on the same aerodrome seems not reasonable. Sailplane pilots are very well familiar with navigation.</p>

Proposal:  
Extend the syllabus with some training in navigation at night on TMG and delete (c)(3).

Justification:  
There is no reason to believe, that a holder of a LPL(S) or SPL should not be capable to navigate at night after appropriate training.

response *Noted*

Please see the reply to comment 924 on FCL.810(c).

comment

6664

comment by: *Icelandic CAA*

Night rating course is missing for aeroplane.

response

*Noted*

Please see the reply to comment 3503 above.

comment

6836

comment by: *CAA CZ*

Letter "(b)" should be added to clarify that this AMC relates only to the provisions of (b) of AMC FCL.810 **(b)**.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for your comment.

The text will be amended accordingly.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart I: Addition Ratings - AMC No 1 to FCL.815 - Mountain rating – Theoretical knowledge and flying training**

p. 390-392

comment

196

comment by: *Aero-Club of Switzerland*

Please change the columns from "Wheel rating" to "Wheel extension" and from "Ski rating" to "Ski extension".

Justification: In doing so, you follow our arguments stated earlier in FCL.815.

This kind of letters means = comments

**This kind of letters means** = text has to be deleted

**This kind of letters means** = replaced or accepted text

Mountain rating - Theoretical knowledge and flying training

<b>WHEEL RATING</b>	<b>SKI RATING</b>

has to be replaced everywhere in the column by

<b>Extension WHEEL</b>	<b>Extension SKI</b>
------------------------	----------------------

--	--

*Explanation:*

Logical adjustments to our requests in **FCL.815**

response

*Not accepted*

Thank your for providing your opinion.

Please see also the response already provided to your comment addressed in the segment for FCL.815.

It was agreed to follow your proposal for the text of the Implementing Rule and to use the wording: "the privileges of the initial rating may be extended....to either wheel or ski when...".

However, as the initial training for this rating cannot be called extension the wording used in the AMc should be as neutral as possible in order to use it for the initial training and also for the extensions. Therefore, it was decided to delete the term "rating" and to write only "wheel" and "ski" on top of the columns.

comment

476

comment by: *London Metropolitan University*

SPELLING ERROR

Para 1. delete Equipements and insert Equipment.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you. The text will be amended correspondingly.

comment

506

comment by: *Swiss glacier pilots association*

This kind of letters means = comments

**This kind of letters means** = text has to be deleted

**This kind of letters means** = replaced or accepted text

Mountain rating - Theoretical knowledge and flying training

<b>WHEEL RATING</b>	<b>SKI RATING</b>

has to be replaced everywhere in the column by

<b>Extension WHEEL</b>	<b>Extension SKI</b>

*Explanation:*

Logical adjustments to our requests in **FCL.815**

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response already provided to comment No. 196 (Aero Club of Switzerland) in the same segment above.



comment 1373 comment by: *Deutsche Gebirgpiloten Vereinigung DGPV*  
 AMC No1 zum FCL.815  
 Wo immer es vorkommt muss der Ausdruck „wheel rating“ mit „extension wheel“ und jener von „ski rating“ mit jenem von „extension ski“ ersetzt werden.

response *Not accepted*  
 Thank you for providing your opinion.  
 Please see the response already provided to comment No. 196 (Aero Club of Switzerland) in the same segment above.

comment 1660 comment by: *European Mountain Pilots*  
**AMC No 1 to FCL.815**  
**Mountain rating - Theoretical knowledge and flight training**  
 Wheel or ski "rating" has to be replaced by **EXTENSION WHEELS** and **EXTENSION SKIS**  
 (In accordance with our comments on FCL.815, Subpart I - Additional Ratings)

response *Not accepted*  
 Thank you for providing your opinion.  
 Please see the response already provided to comment No. 196 (Aero Club of Switzerland) in the same segment above.

comment 3504 comment by: *FOCA Switzerland*  
 Subpart I  
 AMC No 1 to FCL.815  
**Mountain rating instruction shall address and specify items for both activities, such as aeroplane and helicopter.**

response *Noted*  
 Thank you for providing your opinion.  
 Please see also the response provided to your comment on the Implementing Rule FCL.815.  
 The Agency will clarify that the mountain rating at this stage will be only for aeroplanes. A different mountain rating for helicopters should be developed within another rulemaking task at a later stage.

comment 3596 comment by: *Swiss Power Flight Union*

This kind of letters means = comments  
 This kind of letters means = text has to be deleted  
 This kind of letters means = replaced or accepted text

Mountain rating - Theoretical knowledge and flying training

<b>WHEEL RATING</b>	<b>SKI RATING</b>

has to be replaced everywhere in the column by

<b>Extension WHEEL</b>	<b>Extension SKI</b>

*Explanation:*  
Logical adjustments to our requests in **FCL.815**

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response already provided to comment No. 196 (Aero Club of Switzerland) in the same segment above.

comment **7250** comment by: *Vizepräsident OEGPV*

AMC No1 zum FCL.815

Wo immer es vorkommt muss der Ausdruck „wheel rating“ mit „extension wheel“ und jener von „ski rating“ mit jenem von „extension ski“ ersetzt werden.

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response already provided to comment No. 196 (Aero Club of Switzerland) in the same segment above.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart I: Addition Ratings - AMC No 2 to FCL.815 - Mountain rating – Skill Test** p. 392-393

comment **507** comment by: *Swiss glacier pilots association*

This kind of letters means = comments  
This kind of letters means = text has to be deleted  
This kind of letters means = replaced or accepted text

AMC No 2 to FCL.815  
 Mountain rating - Skill test

The skill test for the issue or the renewal of a mountain rating should contain the following elements: has to be replaced by

The skill test for the issue of a mountain rating should contain the following elements

Page 393

## 2. PRACTICAL SKILL TEST

During the flight test, two different sites from the departure airport should be used for recognition, approach, landing and takeoff. For the Ski Mountain Rating, one of the two different sites should be a glacier. has to be replaced by

During the flight test, two different sites from the departure airport should be used for recognition, approach, landing and takeoff. For the Ski Extension, one of the two different sites should be a glacier.

*Explanation:*

Logical adjustments to our requests in **FCL.815**

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

As the Agency decided only to delete the proposed mandatory proficiency check every third revalidation but to keep the system of revalidation in general there must be kept also a system of renewal. Following your proposal to delete the term for the renewal would mean that a pilot who is not able to fulfil the revalidation criteria has to do the training course again. The Agency does not agree and will keep the renewal procedure. The final wording of the AMC will be:

"The skill test for the issue or the proficiency check for the revalidation or renewal of a mountain rating..."

As for your second proposal, the Agency would like to point out that a pilot who passed the initial skill test for the mountain rating ski is not doing an extension. Therefore the wording proposed by you cannot be taken over. The text will be changed in order to address this as follows:

"For the mountain rating ski or the extension from wheel to ski, one..."

comment

1374

comment by: *Deutsche Gebirgpiloten Vereinigung DGPV*

AMC No 2 zu FCL.815  
Mountain rating - Skill test

Das Wort „renewal“ muss gestrichen werden

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response to comment No. 507 (Swiss Glacier Pilot Association) in the same segment above.

comment

1376

comment by: *Deutsche Gebirgpiloten Vereinigung DGPV*

AMC No 2 zu FCL.815

Praktische Prüfung Seite 393

Beim Prüfungsflug sollen auf 2 vom Abflugplatz verschiedene Landeplätze erkundet, und auf ihnen Anflüge, Landungen und Starts durchgeführt werden.

response	<p>Für die Prüfung mit Ski soll zumindest einer der Plätze ein Gletscherlandeplatz sein.</p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment but it seems that this is more or less a translation of the AMC text into German.</p> <p>For the decisions on the wording of this AMC please see the response to comment No. 507 in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p>1659 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Aero-Club of Switzerland</i></span></p> <p>2. Practical Skill Test: We propose to change the text of the Agency by</p> <p>"During the flight test, two different sites from the departure airport should be used for recognition, approach, landing and takeoff. For the ski extension, one of the two different sites shall be a glacier."</p> <p>Justification: This is what has to be done.</p> <p>This kind of letters means = comments  This kind of letters means = text has to be deleted  This kind of letters means = replaced or accepted text</p> <p>AMC No 2 to FCL.815  Mountain rating - Skill test</p> <p>The skill test for the issue or the renewal of a mountain rating should contain the following elements: has to by replaced by</p> <p>The skill test for the issue of a mountain rating should contain the following elements</p> <p>Page 393</p> <p>2. PRACTICAL SKILL TEST</p> <p>During the flight test, two different sites from the departure airport should be used for recognition, approach, landing and takeoff. For the Ski Mountain Rating, one of the two different sites should be a glacier. has to by replaced by</p> <p>During the flight test, two different sites from the departure airport should be used for recognition, approach, landing and takeoff. For the Ski Extension, one of the two different sites should be a glacier.</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i>  Logical adjustments to our requests in <b>FCL.815</b></p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response to comment No. 507 (Swiss Glacier Pilot Association) in the same segment above.</p>

comment	<p>1661 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>European Mountain Pilots</i></span></p> <p><b>AMC No 2 to FCL.815</b>  <b>2. Practical skill test</b>  During the flight test, two different sites from the departure site should be used for recognition, approach, landing and take-off. For the Mountain Rating Skis Extension, one of the two sites should be have a glacier.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response to comment No. 507 (Swiss Glacier Pilot Association) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p>3597 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Swiss Power Flight Union</i></span></p> <p>This kind of letters means = comments  This kind of letters means = text has to be deleted  This kind of letters means = replaced or accepted text</p> <p>AMC No 2 to FCL.815  Mountain rating - Skill test</p> <p>The skill test for the issue or the renewal of a mountain rating should contain the following elements: has to by replaced by</p> <p>The skill test for the issue of a mountain rating should contain the following elements</p> <p>Page 393</p> <p>2. PRACTICAL SKILL TEST</p> <p>During the flight test, two different sites from the departure airport should be used for recognition, approach, landing and takeoff. For the Ski Mountain Rating, one of the two different sites should be a glacier. has to by replaced by</p> <p>During the flight test, two different sites from the departure airport should be used for recognition, approach, landing and takeoff. For the Ski Extension, one of the two different sites should be a glacier.</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i>  Logical adjustments to our requests in <b>FCL.815</b></p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>Please see the response to comment No. 507 (Swiss Glacier Pilot Association) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p>3612 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Susana Nogueira</i></span></p> <p>Instruction for this rating shall adress to aeroplane and helicopter. Need specify items for both activities</p>

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, it seems that the comment should be addressed to another segment as this AMC is dealing with the skill test for the mountain rating but not with the training.

The training for the mountain rating is contained in AMC No.1. Please check the responses provided to the comments for that segment.

It was decided to postpone the development of a specific training syllabus for a helicopter mountain rating. This will be a future task.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 3886 ❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

### **FCL 820 & AMC FCL 820**

#### **Comment:**

Operators are presently performing test/verification flights e.g. after major maintenance operations or aircraft modifications. Each airline has their own qualified pilot for this purpose. Those pilots must follow a specific training course. Introduction of § FCL 820 create confusion. There should be clarification/definition of what is today known as "maintenance checks flights referred to in Regulation 2042/2003 Part M% § M.A.301, versus flight test.

**Question:** Would the case of verification flight after a modification belongs to Category 4 flight test?

**Proposal:** To avoid any ambiguity, it would be wise to include in GM material some clarification, so that Operators can identify easily what is meant by flight test versus maintenance check flights and the definitions of all flight test categories as finally approved from NPA 2008-20 Flight testing should be included as well. A matrix of flight categories and their associated required qualification/rating would be very useful. See tentative proposal attached.

-----

#### **Suggested guidance material for FCL .8/20**

• **Categories of flight tests are defined in Annex XII to Part 21 and may read as follows:**

(b) Categories of flight tests

Flight tests include the following four categories:

(1) Category One

- Initial flight(s) of a new type of aircraft or of an aircraft of which flight and/or piloting characteristics may have been significantly modified.
- Flights to investigate novel or unusual aircraft design features or techniques.
- Flights to determine or expand the flight envelope.
- Flights to determine the regulatory performances, flight characteristics and handling qualities in extreme conditions.

## (2) Category Two

- Flights done in the part of the flight envelope already opened and comprising manoeuvres, during which it is not envisaged to encounter flight and/or handling characteristics (performance and flying qualities) significantly different from those already known.
- Display flights and demonstration flights of a non-type-certificated aircraft.
- Flights conducted for the purpose of determining whether there is reasonable assurance that the aircraft, its parts and appliances are reliable and function properly.
- Training flights aimed at acquiring a flight test rating.

## (3) Category Three

- Flights performed prior to issuance of an individual certificate of airworthiness in order to establish the conformity of the relevant aircraft production to the approved type design.

## (4) Category Four

- Flights performed after embodiment of a new not yet approved design change which :
  - o does not require specific flight test skills;
  - o does not need an assessment of the general behaviour of the aircraft;
  - o does not change significantly the crew procedures; and
  - o does not need an assessment of the crew procedures when the new or modified system is operating.

**• Clarification with regards to test/ verification flights following maintenance or aircraft modifications**

- need to expand on classification of the flight and the required qualification/rating to perform such test/verification flight, which does not necessarily belong to Category 1 or 2, which are the sole ones currently described under FCL.820.

response

*Noted*

Maintenance check flights are not considered flight tests.

Please note that the definition of flight test categories will only be included in Part-21.

For further details on this issue, please see the CRD to NPA 2008-20.

comment

7254

comment by: *Vizepräsident OEGPV*

AMC No 2 zu FCL.815  
Mountain rating - Skill test

Das Wort „renewal“ muss gestrichen werden

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response to comment No. 507 (Swiss Glacier Pilot Association) in the same segment above.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart I: Addition Ratings - AMC to FCL.820 - Conduct of flight tests – Training course**

p. 393

comment

553

comment by: *Grob Aerospace GmbH*

1. The statement "110/120 flying hours on 15/25 different airplanes" is unclear. There must be minimum requirements, is this 110 or 120 flying hours, and is this 15 or 25 different airplanes? Proposal: Minimum 110 flying hours on minimum 15 different airplanes.
2. The statement "Bachelor of Sciences or equivalent University standards are usually requested from applicants" is unclear. Either an academic standard should be required or not required. Proposal: "Bachelor of Sciences or equivalent University standards are required."
3. It is unclear who will approve the syllabus of such a Flight Test training course; there should be an explicit statement that the course shall be approved by the EASA (or by the national authority if so desired).
4. The Condition 2 statement is vague, should state "shall last at least 15 weeks" (not "may last 15 weeks"), and "shall" (not "should") amount to 38 hours on 12 types of airplanes. The minimum hours of ground training should be specified like under condition 1.

response

*Noted*

Based on the comments received, and further input provided by flight test schools, the Agency has revised the text of AMC to FCL.820. Please see amended text.

comment

835

comment by: *Heiner Neumann (Test Pilot)*

Background:

I'm holding a Test Pilot rating class 2. I was the responsible Test Pilot for the following projects:

- Porsche: Flight Engine
- FFT: Eurotrainer
- FFT: Speed Canard
- Ruschmeyer: R90
- Extra: Extra 400
- Aquila: A210

Comments:

It's not defined whether a Category 1 course may include Condition 1 and 2. We believe that the higher Category 1 course should include the lower Category 2 course. That means in case of e. g. other CS-23 aeroplanes a 15 weeks course is sufficient to achieve the Category 1 and 2 rating.

Justification:

Experience of the last decades has shown that the training of Test Pilots can be conducted within 4 weeks including theoretical and practical training on at least 5 types of aeroplane.

Question:

"110/120 flying hours on 15/25 different airplanes"  
It's not clear to what the different figures are referred to.



response

*Noted*

Based on the comments received, and further input provided by flight test schools, the Agency has revised the text of AMC to FCL.820. Please see amended text.

comment

915

comment by: *Bernhard Zinser*

NPA 2008-17B suggests for Condition 2 a training course, that "... may last 15 weeks and the flying training should amount to 38 hours on 12 types of airplanes". Understanding NPA 2008-17B correctly a participant of such a course is allowed to perform flight test duties according Condition 2 without any further skill test by authorities.

How do authorities insure that the participant received adequate knowledge and skills to perform the relevant flight test duties? How is attendance monitored and how is the course's successful completion watched? Is there any skill test, examination or final test review integrated in the course to guarantee a homogenous and sufficient level of performance in the interest of flight safety? (comparable to the skill test for Experimental Flight Test Rating Class 2 as examination of theoretical knowledge and a practical flight test task evaluated by authorities and a test pilot).

Therefore a **final statement of the approved training organization about the successful course's completion must be the basis for EASA for test pilot's licensing or acknowledgement / documentation of the rating**.

Concerning test pilots and their role **for safety in aviation it must the vital interest of EASA**, not only to monitor the training organization, but mainly to control the "output" - namely **to control the level of knowledge and performance** of each single applicant!

response

*Noted*

Based on the comments received, and further input provided by flight test schools, the Agency has revised the text of AMC to FCL.820. Please see amended text.

comment

1161 ❖

comment by: *Pilatus*

#### A.1 Introduction

Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. have reviewed EASA Notice of Proposed Amendment (NPA) No.2008-17b and NPA No. 2008-20 and recognises the value in attempting to establish guidelines for flight test operations and to standardise the qualifications and experience of flight test crews. Pilatus is an EASA approved Part 21 Subpart-J Design Organisation under which flight testing is performed in accordance with a documented process very similar to that proposed by the NPA. However, Pilatus considers that the proposed regulation does not give sufficient credit for taking a balanced approach to the qualifications and experience of flight test crews operating in an existing safe and proven environment. Namely, to use highly qualified and experienced supervisors to monitor the activities of personnel with considerable type and role experience.

It is the assertion of this company that the proposed amendments will not, in all cases, have the effect of improving standards of practice in flight test, but indeed could have the opposite effect as outlined below. In addition this proposal may have a significant adverse effect on the proven and successful flight test activities currently conducted.

#### A.2 Categories of Flight Test

Categorising flight test into 4 broad categories is something that most personnel engaged in this vocation would agree upon, but difficulties emerge when attempting to place every type of flight test conducted at Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. into one or other of these categories. For example, specialised avionics test flights, which require pilots with appropriate military or civil experience, would in future need to be carried out by test crews with new qualifications but who may lack the appropriate role experience. That is why Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. believes that it is more appropriate to follow a balanced, supervisory approach where experience in the role and on type provides a more efficient and safe solution.

#### A.3 Categories of Aircraft/Engine Type

The NPA splits CS-23 aircraft into categories, to permit a structured approach to crew competence levels depending on the complexity of the aircraft to be tested. While this is considered a practical approach, the reason for placing CS-23 jet aircraft in a higher category than CS-23 turboprop aircraft (which can be more complex than turbojets/turbofans both mechanically and in terms of their effects on aircraft handling and performance) is not clear. There is no precedent in current test pilot training schools to suggest that testing of a jet-powered aircraft requires any greater qualification or training than testing of a turbo-prop powered aircraft. This differentiation would seem unreasonable, resulting in unnecessary restrictions for those testing jet-powered aircraft. It is suggested that a better split would be between single- and multi-engine aircraft (of whatever engine type) due to the additional testing required for multi-engine aircraft. This would better fit with paragraph 17 of the NPA, which states: "The competences and experience depend on the nature of the test and the complexity of the aircraft being tested: the more complex the test and the aircraft are, the higher the qualifications should be."

#### A.4 Flight Test Aircrew Training and Experience

This company has a proven track record of producing and certifying high quality aircraft, and has done so employing many individuals without the formal qualifications proposed in this NPA. Mandating such qualifications across the board, however, would prevent many members of the Pilatus flight test team from continuing their work, and will have considerable detrimental effects on the company's ability to conduct a high proportion of future flight tests.

It is considered that attendance of a "specific course" should not be the only acceptable means of satisfying the training and experience requirements for flight test crews. Introduction of the proposed amendment could result in individuals with the required formal qualification but far less experience on type replacing individuals with less qualification but significantly more experience on type. This would not necessarily represent an improvement in standards of flight test and safety, but could indeed represent the opposite.

Pilatus is an EASA approved Part 21 Subpart-J Design Organisation under which flight testing is performed in accordance with a documented process. The process is continuously audited and strictly supervised by a Head of Flight Test (FTE) with 25 years flight test experience and a Chief Experimental Test Pilot with all the qualifications required by the NPA. Therefore a suitable supervisory system is utilised with individuals of considerable experience and qualifications supervising the flight test process, as well as ongoing training in flight test related skills.

Flight test personnel are selected for a given task based upon their knowledge and suitability for that task. Training is provided as required by experienced Pilatus staff, external consultants or by attending an approved training course as considered appropriate.

It is suggested that alternative training for staff engaged in all types of testing could be accepted as follows:

- Internal training given by experienced staff who have a proven track record in the industry (and who have been approved by the national authority) should be permitted.
- Experience in flight testing of similar aircraft, either within the company or from previous appointments, should be taken into consideration (including in-house training for all types of aeroplanes). It may be necessary to approve these on a case-by-case basis to ensure that the training received is appropriate to the task to be undertaken. This would also apply to any external crew brought in to carry out an assessment, and could be administered using the Permit to Fly procedure.

The test pilot or FTE must be sufficiently experienced to cope with normal and emergency situations. To cover this, flying currency in the same class of aeroplane as that to be tested, should be maintained (including recent experience of manoeuvres similar to those to be tested). Relevant training (including aeromedical, safety equipment, ejection seat and survival training) as appropriate to the aircraft to be tested should be provided and the aircrew member must be physically fit to the level required to fly in the test aeroplane. Guidelines on acceptable levels of training and timescales for currency (both flying currency and aeromedical/survival training) should be drawn up and publicised.

#### A.5 Specifications for test pilot school courses

Pilatus personnel have undertaken short courses at the various recognised test pilot schools. In some cases these courses do not comply with the seemingly arbitrary requirements set by NPA-17b. In particular the requirement to fly 12 different fixed-wing types during a 15 week course seems quite unreasonable. It is reasonable to suggest that more experience on a far fewer number of aircraft similar to those under test at the test pilots company is more appropriate from an efficiency and safety point of view.

The intention of the 10 month course (required for condition 1 experimental flight test in the NPA) at these schools must also be considered. This course is offered with the intention of training government-sponsored test crews to carry out all possible future government test programmes, and as such offers significant training in such subjects as fly-by-wire flight control systems and transonic handling characteristics. Such training would clearly represent an unnecessary waste of time and money for a commercial organisation such as Pilatus Aircraft Ltd.

#### A.6 Conclusion

Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. flight test personnel will, at one stage or other, be involved in every type of flight test as defined in the proposed amendment. This company takes a responsible and balanced approach to its flight test personnel, as it would be prohibitively expensive to employ exclusively graduate test pilots and graduate flight test engineers from the 5 recognised schools. Pilatus believes that a balanced approach to crew experience, combined with on-the-job training, and appropriate specialised training, and

defined and proven practice and process would meet the intent of the NPA and enhance flight safety with an acceptable level of investment without significant financial burden on the industry. Therefore Pilatus can not agree to the content of this NPA and specifically opposes the requirements set forth in A.3, A.4 and A.5.

response *Noted*

Please see reply to the same comment you have made to FCL.820.

comment *1414*

comment by: *Thielert Aircraft Engines*

The "other CS-23" aircraft include by definition aircraft types ranging from simple light single reciprocating engine aircraft (eg. Robin DR400 MTOW 900 kg) up to high performance twin turboprop-engine aircraft (e.g. Beech 200, MTOW 12500 lbs).

To avoid creating an undue burden on small organisations an additional category should be created for aircraft not exceeding 2000 kg MTOW. For this aircraft category alleviated flight crew qualification requirements should be defined.

Current LBA procedure and guidance allows that cat. 1 and 2 flight test on aircraft up to 2000 kg MTOW may be performed by pilots having following qualification:

- CPL, or PPL + 600 hrs PIC
- Aerobatic rating
- being instructed theoretically and practically by a test pilot over a period of approximately 12 month

To provide the necessary flexibility, the flight crew qualification requirements should be controlled under the Permit to Fly or DO FTOM in order to anticipate project specifics.

response *Noted*

Please see the reply to your comment 1412 on FCL.820, and the amended text of that paragraph.

comment *1584*

comment by: *Diamond Aircraft Ind. GmbH*

AMC to FCL.820

Condition 1:

IS: "For CS-25 aircraft; jet aeroplanes certified to CS-23, CS-23 Commuter Category aircraft, ..."

SHOULD BE: "For CS-25 aircraft; aircraft above 2721kg (6000 lbs) certified acc. to CS-23, CS-23 Commuter Category aircraft, ..."

Justification:

The behaviour and characteristics of light aircraft are different to heavy or large aircraft. The difference in propulsion (jet, turbine or piston) is for small aircraft not so significant, that different education levels for test pilots/engineers is necessary. In the today existing 15 weeks course, the module "jet propulsion" is already integrated, so the pilots have been trained

	<p>on different types of propulsion. To fly a light jet, the endorsement in jet propulsion is required even for a very experienced piston test pilot anyhow, so there is no need for the 10 months course for light aircraft.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 832 to FCL.820, as well as the amended text for that paragraph.</p>

comment	<p>1921 comment by: <i>MT-Propeller Entwicklung GmbH - DOA EASA 21J.020</i></p> <p>AMC to FCL.820 The main concerns of existing flight test crews are that their flight qualifications and their experimental flight rating (e.g. LBA TB-1 and TB-2) which were hard to obtain, and which were very expensive, must be retained without any cut back on. Therefore the grandfather rules are very interesting but unfortunately these grandfather rules are not listed in this NPA. Speaking for the German flight test pilots, LBA TB-1 rated pilots should be allowed to continue doing CAT 1 and CAT 2 incl. Condition 1 and 2 flight tests and LBA TB-2 rated pilots should be allowed to continue doing CAT 1 and CAT 2 incl. Condition 2 flight tests without joining again these very expensive training courses.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>In what regards transition measures, please see the draft cover regulation published with this CRD. The Agency's intention is that no pilot will lose its current privileges.</p>

comment	<p>2473 comment by: <i>NAA-PL</i></p> <p>Proposed text:</p> <p>Condition 1: For CS-25 aircraft; jet aeroplanes certified to CS-23, CS-23 Commuter Category aircraft; and CS-27 and CS-29 rotorcraft, the training should cover Performance; Handling Qualities; Systems and Test management and can be outlined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For fixed wing test pilots: duration <del>40</del> 6 months; <del>500</del> 400 hours of ground training; <b>about 70</b> <del>110/120</del> flying hours on about <b>15</b> <del>15/25</del> different aeroplanes <b>of different flight characteristics.</b></li> <li>- For rotorcraft test pilots; duration <del>40</del> 6 months; <del>500</del> 400 hours of ground training; <b>about 70</b> <del>110/120</del> flying hours on 4 to 10 rotorcraft <b>of different flight characteristics.</b></li> <li>- Bachelor of Sciences or equivalent University standards are usually requested from applicants</li> <li>- Not less than 2 years experience as Class 2 Test Pilot.</li> </ul> <p>Condition 2: This condition requires a significant amount of flight experience, in accordance to the task and requires training for testing activities, the amount of which should be specifically adapted to the tasks. Such courses may last 15 weeks and the training should amount to <b>about 40</b> <del>38</del> hours <b>and:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- on <del>12</del> 8 types of aeroplanes – <b>for fixed wing pilots:.</b></li> <li>- <b>on 3 types of rotorcraft – for rotorcraft test pilots.</b></li> </ul>
---------	---

response

*Noted*

Based on the comments received, and further input provided by flight test schools, the Agency has revised the text of AMC to FCL.820. Please see amended text.

comment

2507

comment by: *NAA-PL*

**Our comment to above proposals**

- 1) Our general position is that the first objective should be: increasing of safety, the second decreasing of costs and the third harmonization of qualifications.
- 2) Our experience confirms, that dividing top test pilots into two classes with additional requirement for class 1 to have some years of experience as test pilots class 2 is very useful and allows to decrease additional training for those who pretend to class 1.
- 3) Now service life of contemporary planes approaches to 30 to 40 years. Due to harmonized certification requirements, flight characteristics became more similar.
- 4) Even airline pilots are retiring having on their account about 3 to 5 types. Alike is with military pilots, which are retiring mostly earlier.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for your input.

comment

2525

comment by: *ETPS CI*

AMC to FCL.820 - Conduct of flight tests – Training course (page 393)

The content of the course should vary taking into account the type of aircraft. The following table provides an overview of the different types of course

<b>Categories of flight test Aircraft</b>	<b>Category 1</b>	<b>Category 2</b>
<b>CS25; CS23 jets and CS23 Commuters</b>	<i>Condition 1</i>	<i>Condition 2</i>
<b>Other CS23</b>	<i>Condition 2</i>	<i>Condition 2</i>
<b>CS27</b>	<i>Condition 1</i>	<i>Condition 2</i>
<b>CS29</b>	<i>Condition 1</i>	<i>Condition 2</i>

*Condition 1:*

*For CS25 aircraft; jet aeroplanes certified to CS23, CS23 Commuter Category aircraft; and CS27 and CS29 rotorcraft, the training should cover Performance; Handling Qualities; Systems and Test management and can be outlined as follows:*

*For fixed wing test pilots: duration 10 months; 500 hours of ground training; 110/120 flying hours on 15/25 different airplanes.  
For rotorcraft test pilots: duration 10 months; 500 hours of ground training; 110/120 flying hours on 4 to 10 rotorcraft  
Batchelor of Sciences or equivalent University standards are usually requested from applicants.*

*Condition 2:*

*This condition requires a significant amount of flight experience, in accordance to the task and requires training for flight testing activities, the amount of which should be specifically adapted to the tasks. Such courses may last 15 weeks and the flying training should amount to 38 hours on 12 types of airplanes.*

**Comment 6:** The definition of this course is simply inadequate. All other rating AMCs have a detailed syllabus defined. ETPS strongly recommend that EPNER and ETPS help define a minimum acceptable syllabus for:

- a) Condition 1 (CS25; CS23 jets and CS23 Commuters)
- b) Condition 1 (CS27 and CS29 rotorcraft)
- c) Condition 2 (CS25; CS23 jets and CS23 Commuters)
- d) Condition 2 (Other CS23)
- e) Condition 2 (CS27 and CS29 rotorcraft)

The syllabus should define in detail, mandatory requirements in line with other ratings and minimum acceptable:

- a) Entry standard (defined by academic qualification or entry exams and flying experience)
- b) Duration
- c) Types flown on course (defined in some cases by number of engines and MTOW)
- d) Types on which a pilot in command qualification is gained (defined in some cases by number of engines and MTOW)
- e) Total hours flown on course (including maximum allowable FSTD hours that may be substituted)
- f) Total ground training hours
- g) Method of establishing competency on completion of course or element of course

**Comment 7:** There is similarly no definition of the training required to transition from one category to a higher category. For example, how would a pilot qualified to category 2 standard gain a category 1 standard? These courses require definition in similar detail as above.

response *Noted*

Based on the comments received, and further input provided by flight test schools, the Agency has revised the text of AMC to FCL.820. Please see amended text.

comment 2554

comment by: Airbus

**THIS COMMENT IS SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF ASD**

**AFFECTED PARAGRAPH:**

**AMC to FCL.820 – Conduct of flight tests – Training course**

**PROPOSED CHANGE:**

The content of the course should vary taking into account the type of aircraft. The following table provides an overview of the different types of course

Categories of flight test Aircraft	Category 1	Category 2
CS-25; CS-23 jets and CS-23 Commuters	Condition 1	Condition 2
Other CS-23	Condition 2	Condition 2
CS-27	Condition 1	Condition 2
CS-29	Condition 1	Condition 2

## Condition 1:

For CS-25 aircraft; jet aeroplanes certified to CS-23, CS-23 Commuter Category aircraft; and CS-27 and CS-29 rotorcraft, the training should cover Performance; Handling Qualities; Systems and Test management and can be outlined as follows:

- For fixed wing test pilots: ~~duration 10 months; 500~~ 300 hours of ground training; ~~110/120 at least 90~~ flying hours on ~~15/25 different airplanes a substantial number of representative aircraft featuring different pilot interfaces and/or handling qualities. Credit may be granted by the competent Authority for previous flight test experience or training course.~~
  - For rotorcraft test pilots: ~~duration 10 months; 500~~ 300 hours of ground training; ~~110/120 at least 80~~ flying hours on ~~4 to 10 rotorcraft a substantial number of representative aircraft featuring different pilot interfaces and/or handling qualities. Credit may be granted by the competent Authority for previous flight test experience or training course.~~
- ~~Batchelor of Sciences or equivalent University standards are usually requested from applicants.~~

## Condition 2:

This condition requires a significant amount of flight experience, in accordance to the task and requires training for flight testing activities, the amount of which should be specifically adapted to the tasks. Such courses ~~may last 15 weeks and the should include~~ flying training ~~should~~ amounting to ~~38 at least~~ 30 hours on ~~12 types of airplanes a substantial number of representative aircraft featuring different pilot interfaces and/or handling qualities.~~

**JUSTIFICATION:**

Our proposed changes result from analysis of European industry's current best



response

*Noted*

Based on the comments received, and further input provided by flight test schools, the Agency has revised the text of AMC to FCL.820. Please see amended text.

comment

2688

comment by: *Alenia Aeronautica*

Comments are included (amended text and associated justification written in red) in the attached file "Alenia Aeronautica comments to NPA 2008-17.pdf".

**AFFECTED PARAGRAPH:**

**AMC to FCL.820 – Conduct of flight tests – Training course**

**A**

**PROPOSED CHANGE:**

The content of the course should vary taking into account the type of aircraft. The following table provides an overview of the different types of course

Categories of flight test Aircraft	Category 1	Category 2
CS-25; CS-23 jets and CS-23 Commuters	Condition 1	Condition 2
Other CS-23	<del>Condition 2</del> Condition 1	Condition 2
CS-27	Condition 1	Condition 2
CS-29	Condition 1	Condition 2

Condition 1:

For CS-25 aircraft; jet aeroplanes certified to CS-23, CS-23 Commuter Category aircraft; and CS-27 and CS-29 rotorcraft, the training should cover Performance; Handling Qualities; Systems and Test management and can be outlined as follows:

- For fixed wing test pilots: duration 10 months; 500 hours of ground training; 110/120 flying hours on 15/25 different airplanes
- ~~Previous flight test experience in other flight testing categories and/or not approved training centers is not to be considered a valid flight activity to reduce test pilot training courses duration/content.~~
- ~~Flight testing relative to multicrew aircraft must have pilot equally rated or overrated for the specific class.~~
- For rotorcraft test pilots: duration 10 months; 500 hours of ground training; 110/120 flying hours on 4 to 10 rotorcraft
- ~~Batchelor of Sciences or equivalent University standards are usually requested from applicants.~~

Condition 2:

This condition requires a significant amount of flight experience, in accordance to the task and requires training for flight testing activities, the amount of which should be specifically adapted to the tasks. Such courses may last 15 weeks and the flying training should amount to 38 hours on 12 types of

airplanes.

- Previous flight test experience in other flight testing categories and/or not approved training centers is not to be considered a valid flight activity to reduce test pilot training courses duration/content.
- Flight testing relative to multicrew aircraft must have pilot equally rated or overrated for the specific class

**JUSTIFICATION:**

- Our proposed changes result from analysis of Alenia Aeronautica current best practices and experience on fixed wing experimental and engineering flight testing.
- Considering that the flight testing qualification is linked to the licence and calls for quality and standardization, duration (of the order of one year) and content of test pilot course should absolutely be preserved; this will contribute to assure standardization within the different approved training centres, students full dedication and high quality results.
- Since the training for Cat.1 and Cat.2 is both general and specifically related to the category of flight testing that the pilot is certified to perform, flight testing experience in other less demanding categories (3 or 4) and/or "uncontrolled" industry training flights does not necessarily replace the specific training of officially approved courses. In addition, this fact would introduce uncontrolled variables on the well established training outlines typical of the current qualified test pilot schools.
- In Cat 1 and Cat 2 multicrew aircraft flight testing, the associated very high technical content and workload requires equivalent background and skill; for this reason both pilots must be equally rated, so Cat. 1 flights should be flown by 2 "condition 1" pilots etc.
- For CS-23 aircraft, should be applied the same rules as the other bigger categories due to the absolutely similarity in the expertise and skill (if not even more) required on flight testing.

response *Noted*

Based on the comments received, and further input provided by flight test schools, the Agency has revised the text of AMC to FCL.820. Please see amended text.

comment

2972

comment by: *Polish Aviation Authority, Aviation Technical Department*

NPA text:

Condition 1:

For CS-25 aircraft; jet aeroplanes certified to CS-23, CS-23 Commuter Category aircraft; and CS-27 and CS-29 rotorcraft, the training should cover Performance; Handling Qualities; Systems and Test management and can be outlined as follows:

- For fixed wing test pilots: duration 10 months; 500 hours of ground training; 110/120 flying hours on 15/25 different aeroplanes.
- For rotorcraft test pilots; duration 10 months; 500 hours of ground training; 110/120 flying hours on 4 to 10 rotorcraft.

- Bachelor of Sciences or equivalent University standards are usually requested from applicants.

Proposed text:

Condition 1:

For CS-25 aircraft; jet aeroplanes certified to CS-23, CS-23 Commuter Category aircraft; and CS-27 and CS-29 rotorcraft, the training should cover Performance; Handling Qualities; Systems and Test management and can be outlined as follows:

- For fixe wing test pilots: duration ~~40~~ 6 months; ~~500~~ 400 hours of ground training; **about 70** ~~110/120~~ flying hours on about **15** ~~15/25~~ different aeroplanes **of different flight characteristics**.
- For rotorcraft test pilots; duration ~~40~~ 6 months; ~~500~~ 400 hours of ground training; **about 70** ~~110/120~~ flying hours on 4 to 10 rotorcraft **of different flight characteristics**.
- Bachelor of Sciences or equivalent University standards are usually requested from applicants
- Not less than 2 years experience as Class 2 Test Pilot.

response *Noted*

Based on the comments received, and further input provided by flight test schools, the Agency has revised the text of AMC to FCL.820. Please see amended text.

comment

2973

comment by: *Polish Aviation Authority, Aviation Technical Department*

NPA text:  
Condition 2:

This condition requires a significant amount of flight experience, in accordance to the task and requires training for testing activities, the amount of which should be specifically adapted to the tasks. Such courses may last 15 weeks and the training should amount to 38 hours on 12 types of airplanes.

Proposed text:  
Condition 2:

This condition requires a significant amount of flight experience, in accordance to the task and requires training for testing activities, the amount of which should be specifically adapted to the tasks. Such courses may last 15 weeks and the training should amount to **about 40** ~~38~~ hours **and:**

- on ~~12~~ 8 types of aeroplanes – **for fixed wing pilots:**
- **on 3 types of rotorcraft – for rotorcraft test pilots.**

response *Noted*

Based on the comments received, and further input provided by flight test schools, the Agency has revised the text of AMC to FCL.820. Please see amended text.

comment

3457

comment by: *Boeing*

**Boeing Commercial Airplanes comments re:  
NPA 2008-17b**

Page: 393

Paragraph: AMC to FCL.820 - *Conduct of flight tests - Training course*

If EASA determines that proposed paragraph FCL.820 (Flight tests) is to be retained, and if the proposed text of paragraph FCL.820(a)(2) is retained as written in the NPA, then the AMC to FCL.820 must be revised. Boeing considers that the EASA proposed AMC to FCL.820 is not reflective of Industry best practices.

Boeing requests the following alternative wording be used to meet an equivalent level of safety of the originally proposed wording:

**"AMC to FCL.820**

***Conduct of flight tests - Training course***

***Category 1 and 2 flight tests require training for flight testing activities prior to acting as PIC for these category flights.***

- ***Pilots acting as PIC for Category 1 and 2 flight tests may be trained and qualified by a variety of methods by operator organizations (airlines, maintenance providers, and manufacturers). These methods include internal training programs that include acting as SIC while receiving training on actual Category 2 flights. Test pilot training and qualification may also be accomplished at military and civilian test pilot schools or at ATOs offering training relevant to the flight tests required for civil aircraft certification.***
- ***Flight training and qualification of SIC pilots as PICs for Category 2 test flights may be conducted during actual Category 2 flights on multi-piloted aircraft by a PIC qualified to conduct the relevant flight test activities.***
- ***Operator (manufacturer, airline, and maintenance facility) pilots actively working as test pilots on the date the NPA becomes law are considered meeting the training requirements of this paragraph and are permanently exempt from any FCL.820 formal training course requirement.***
- ***Regulatory agency (EASA, FAA, Transport Canada, etc) pilots and their Designated Engineering Representative or Authorized Representative (DER or AR), pilots are exempt from the training provision of FCL.820."***

-----  
**JUSTIFICATION:** Manufacturers, airlines, and maintenance organizations are currently performing test/verification flights that will be classified by EASA as Category 1 and 2 Flight Test. Pilots currently conducting these operations are trained and qualified by a variety of methods by these organizations or by previous academic and flight experience. Both formal courses and manufacturers' training programs have proven valid and meet the needs of industry and regulating agencies. The AMC's scorecard requirement for duration/ground training hours/flight hours and experience on multiple aircraft types is not needed and does not reflect an understanding of Industry best practices. What is important is ensuring that a test pilot is trained in some manner or has prior relevant experience. The revised AMC must acknowledge that flight test training needs can be met in several ways. This non-specified approach is cost-effective and focuses organizational training resources on specific tests on specific models of aircraft as needed.

	<p>It is Boeing's position that, as part of any final AMC, operator, regulatory, and Designated Engineering Representative pilots actively working as test pilots should explicitly be considered trained and permanently exempt from any formal training course requirement. Requiring training by an ATO or other time- based training scheme for practicing test pilots is unnecessary and disruptive. Our proposed revision to the AMC to FCL.820 should also be adopted to provide operators a flexible, cost-effective alternative means of compliance for test pilot training.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Based on the comments received, and further input provided by flight test schools, the Agency has revised the text of AMC to FCL.820. Please see amended text.</p>
comment	<p><b>4008</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></span></p> <p>AMC to FCL 820 conduct of flight tests - Training course</p> <p>Training flight test program should be given and as detailed as in the other training programs given in that NPA.</p> <p>we propose the following modification :</p> <p>Condition 1: For CS25,aircraft; jet aeroplanes certified to CS23,CS23Commuter Category aircraft; and CS27 and CS29 rotorcraft, the training should cover Performance; Handling Qualities; Systems and Test management and can be outlined as follows:</p> <p>For fixed wing test pilots: duration 10 months; <b>400</b> hours of ground training; 110/120 flying hours on 15/25 different airplanes.</p> <p>For rotorcraft test pilots: duration 10 months; <b>400</b> hours of ground training; 110/120 flying hours on 4 to 10 rotorcraft</p> <p>Batchelor of Sciences or equivalent University standards are usually requested from applicants.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Based on the comments received, and further input provided by flight test schools, the Agency has revised the text of AMC to FCL.820. Please see amended text.</p>
comment	<p><b>4365</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Walter Gessky</i></span></p> <p><b>1. Conduct of flight tests – Training course</b> Delete the table and text: <del>The content of the course should vary taking into account the type of aircraft. The following table provides an overview of the different types of course</del> Delete the table. Justification:</p>

The table should be deleted because the definition for conditions and categories is a type certification issue and shall be regulated in part 21. The required information is included in the rule, because CS-25 airplane flight test can only be done by a FTP when rated under condition 1.

response *Noted*

Based on the comments received, and further input provided by flight test schools, the Agency has revised the text of AMC to FCL.820. Please see amended text.

comment

4366

comment by: *Walter Gessky*

**1. Condition 1:**

Change the following:

~~For CS25 aircraft; jet airplanes certified to CS23, CS23 Commuter Category aircraft; and CS27 and CS29 rotorcraft, The training should~~ **take into account the aircraft category** ~~and should cover Performance; Handling Qualities; Systems and Test management~~ and can be outlined as follows:

For fixed wing test pilots: duration 10 months; 500 hours of ground training; 110/120 flying hours on 15/25 different airplanes.

For rotorcraft test pilots: duration 10 months; 500 hours of ground training; 110/120 flying hours on 4 to 10 rotorcraft

Bachelor of Sciences or equivalent University standards **or an engineering degree or equivalent experience** are usually requested from applicants.

Justification:

Condition 1 is defined in the rule itself (is mandatory, therefore has to be part of the rule).

Reference to the trainings syllabus transferred to the rule (this is the minimum content – mandatory).

An adequate engineering degree or equivalent experience should be added, because national engineer degrees or adequate experience provides an equivalent or better basic than a Bachelor of Science for flight tests.

**2.**

response *Noted*

Based on the comments received, and further input provided by flight test schools, the Agency has revised the text of AMC to FCL.820. Please see amended text.

comment

4367

comment by: *Walter Gessky*

**1. Content of training:**

More detailed information with regard to theoretical knowledge; practical flight training, examination and practical skill test are missing.

This has to be added for a consistent implementation of the rule.

Walter Geßky

Ministry of Transportation, Innovation and Technology

response *Noted*

Based on the comments received, and further input provided by flight test schools, the Agency has revised the text of AMC to FCL.820. Please see

amended text.

comment

5486

comment by: CEV. France

CEV Comment n°5

CEV Proposal

AMC to FCL.820

Conduct of flight tests- Training course

The content of the course should vary taking into account the type of aircraft. The following table provides an overview of the different types of course

Condition 1:

For CS25,aircraft; jet aeroplanes certified to CS23,CS23Commuter Category aircraft; and CS27 and CS29 rotorcraft, the training should cover Performance; Handling Qualities; Systems and Test management and can be outlined as follows:

For fixed wing test pilots: duration 10 months; **400** hours of ground training; 110/120 flying hours on 15/25 different airplanes.

For rotorcraft test pilots: duration 10 months; **400** hours of ground training; 110/120 flying hours on 4 to 10 rotorcraft

Bachelor of Sciences or equivalent University standards are usually requested from applicants.

Condition 2:

This condition requires a significant amount of flight experience, in accordance to the task and requires training for flight testing activities, the amount of which should be specifically adapted to the tasks. Such courses may last 15 weeks and the flying training should amount to 38 hours on a **substantial number of appropriate aircraft.**

CEV/EPNER proposal for flight test training program hereafter:

CEV/EPNER proposed mandatory exercises for Flight Test Conditions 1 and 2 courses

FIXED WING (CS 25, CS23 jets and Commuters) CONDITION 1 Bachelor of Science (Pilots) Master of Science (Engineers) 1200 flight hours including 400 as a captain, current CPL IR 10 months 60 flights including <b>15 solo flights</b> – 100 flight hours – 5 flight test reports 10 different aircraft 400 ground lectures	HELICOPTERS (CS 27, CS 29) CONDITION 1 Bachelor of Science (Pilots) Master of Science (Engineers) 1200 flight hours including 400 as a captain, current CPL IR 10 months 90 flights including <b>20 solo flights</b> – 100 flight hours - 5 flight test reports 5 different helicopters 400 ground lectures
Theoretical training	Theoretical training
Theoretical exam : Aerodynamic	Theoretical exam : Aerodynamic
Theoretical exam : Handling Qualities	Theoretical exam : Handling Qualities
Theoretical exam : Engines	Theoretical exam : Engines

Theoretical exam : Measurements and Flight Test Instrumentation	Theoretical exam : Measurements and Flight Test Instrumentation	
Flight Test Techniques and in-flight training	Flight Test Techniques and in-flight training	
Performance : Stabilisation-Tower fly-by ( <i>Flight test report</i> )	Performance : Stabilisation	
Performance : Climb twin engine	Performance : Air speed calibration ( <i>Flight test report</i> )	
Performance : Take Off Turboprop OEI	Performance : Hovering	
Performance : Take Off Turbofan OEI	Engine : Digital engine governing	
Engine : Turboprop limitation and relight envelope	Engine : Free turbine engine evaluation	
Engine : Turbofan limitation and relight envelope	Handling Qualities : Static stability	
Handling Qualities : HQR and Flight controls characteristics	Handling Qualities : Static stability	
Handling Qualities : Longitudinal Handling Qualities	Handling Qualities : Manœuvrability ( <i>Flight test report</i> )	
Handling Qualities : Longitudinal manoeuvre stability	Handling Qualities : Dynamic stability	
Handling Qualities : Take-Off twin turboprop	Handling Qualities : Maniability ( <i>Flight test report</i> )	
Handling Qualities : Take-Off twin turbofan	Handling Qualities : ADS 33	
Handling Qualities : Lateral-Directional Handling Qualities	Handling Qualities : Tethering rotor assessment	
Handling Qualities : Handling Qualities Evaluation ( <i>Flight test report</i> )	Handling Qualities : Rigid rotor assessment	
Handling Qualities : Variable stability demo flights	Systems : Navigation Management System	
Handling Qualities : Stalls ( <i>Flight test report</i> )	Systems : Auto pilot	
Handling Qualities : Spins	Systems : Night Vision Goggles	
Handling Qualities : VMCa	Systems : Glass cockpit evaluation ( <i>Flight test report</i> )	
Miscellaneous : High speed certification test	Miscellaneous : Height/Velocity envelope	
Systems : Glass cockpit evaluation ( <i>Flight test report</i> )	Miscellaneous : Category A clear area procedure	
Systems : EGPWS	Miscellaneous : Vibrations and rotor adjustments	



Systems : TCAS	Miscellaneous : Autorotations	
Final Evaluation Exercise ( <i>Flight test report</i> )	Final Evaluation Exercise ( <i>Flight test report</i> )	
Final in-flight test	Final in-flight test	
FIXED WING (CS 25, CS23 jets and Commuters) CONDITION 2 Bachelor of Science (Pilots) Master of Science (Engineers) 1200 flight hours including 400 as a captain, current CPL IR 5 months 35 flights including 8 solo flights – 50 flight hours -3 flight test reports 7 different aircraft 200 ground lectures	HELICOPTERS (CS 27, CS 29) CONDITION 2 Bachelor of Science (Pilots) Master of Science (Engineers) 1200 flight hours including 400 as a captain, current CPL IR 5 months 40 flights including 8 solo flights – 50 flight hours - 3 flight test reports 4 different helicopters 200 ground lectures	
Theoretical training	Theoretical training	
Theoretical exam : Aerodynamic	Theoretical exam : Aerodynamic	
Theoretical exam : Handling Qualities	Theoretical exam : Handling Qualities	
Theoretical exam : Engines	Theoretical exam : Engines	
Theoretical exam : Measurements and Flight Test Instrumentation	Theoretical exam : Measurements and Flight Test Instrumentation	
Flight Test Techniques and in-flight training	Flight Test Techniques and in-flight training	
Performance : Stabilisation-Tower fly-by	Performance : Stabilisation	
Performance : Climb twin engine ( <i>Flight test report</i> )	Performance : Air speed calibration	
Performance : Take-Off twin turboprop	Performance : Hovering ( <i>Flight test report</i> )	
Handling Qualities : Longitudinal Handling Qualities	Engine : Digital engine governing	
Handling Qualities : Lateral-Directional Handling Qualities	Engine : Free turbine	
Handling Qualities : Stalls	Handling Qualities : Static and dynamic stability	
Systems : Glass cockpit evaluation ( <i>Flight test report</i> )	Systems : Glass cockpit evaluation ( <i>Flight test report</i> )	
Systems : Radionavigation instruments qualification and Integrated Avionics	Systems : Autopilot	
Systems : EGPWS	Systems : Navigation Management System	
Systems : TCAS	Miscellaneous : vibration and rotor	

	adjustment	
Final Evaluation Exercise ( <i>Flight test report</i> )	Final Evaluation Exercise ( <i>Flight test report</i> )	
Final in-flight test	Final in-flight test	
LIGHT AIRCRAFT (CS 23 excepted Jets and Commuters, CS 22) FLIGHT TEST COURSE – CONDITION 1 Bachelor of Science (Pilots) Master of Science (Engineers) 1200 flight hours, current CPL IR 5 months 35 flights including 8 solo flights – 50 flight hours -4 flight test reports 7 different aircraft 200 ground lectures	LIGHT AIRCRAFT (CS 23 excepted Jets and Commuters, CS 22) FLIGHT TEST COURSE – CONDITION 2 Bachelor of Science (Pilots) Master of Science (Engineers) 1200 flight hours, current CPL IR 2 months 15 flights including – 20 flight hours – 2 flight test reports 3 different aircraft 60 ground lectures	
Theoretical training	Theoretical training	
Theoretical exam : Aerodynamic	Theoretical exam : Aerodynamic	
Theoretical exam : Handling Qualities	Theoretical exam : Handling Qualities	
Theoretical exam : Engines	Theoretical exam : Engines	
Theoretical exam : Measurements and Flight Test Instrumentation	Theoretical exam : Measurements and Flight Test Instrumentation	
Flight Test Techniques and in-flight training	Flight Test Techniques and in-flight training	
Performance : Stabilisation-Tower fly-by ( <i>Flight test report</i> )		
Performance : Climb	Performance : Climb ( <i>Flight test report</i> )	
Engine : Limitation and relight envelope	Handling Qualities : Longitudinal Handling Qualities	
Handling Qualities : HQR and Flight controls characteristics	Handling Qualities : Lateral-Directional Handling Qualities	
Handling Qualities : Longitudinal Handling Qualities	Handling Qualities : Stalls	
Handling Qualities s : Longitudinal manoeuvre stability	Handling Qualities : Spins	
Handling Qualities : Lateral-Directional Handling Qualities	System s: Glass cockpit evaluation ( <i>Flight test report</i> )	
Handling Qualities : Handling Qualities Evaluation ( <i>Flight test report</i> )	Final in-flight test	
Handling Qualities : Stalls ( <i>Flight test report</i> )		

Handling Qualities : Spins		
Miscellaneous : High speed certification test		
System s: Glass cockpit evaluation ( <i>Flight test report</i> )		
Systems : TCAS		
Final Evaluation Exercise ( <i>Flight test report</i> )		
Final in-flight test		

response

*Noted*

Based on the comments received, and further input provided by flight test schools, the Agency has revised the text of AMC to FCL.820. Please see amended text.

comment

5748

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

FCL.820 Flight tests Conduct of flight tests – training course & AMC

**Page No:**

43 & 393

**Comment:**

If the intent is for EASA to require a test pilot ‘qualification’, is it also the intent that some form of currency training requirement or examination is also going to be required? If so, this has not been specified.

**Justification:**

The intent of the proposals should be clarified.

response

*Noted*

Please see reply to your comment 5742 to FCL.820, with the same content.

comment

5752

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

FCL.820 Flight tests Conduct of flight tests – training course & AMC

**Page No:**

43 & 393

**Comment:**

The principle of establishing a standard for test pilot training and qualifications across Europe is supported. However the practical implications of such an initiative are wide ranging and need to be considered more fully.

There are four principle military schools worldwide: ETPS, EPNER, USNTPS, (Paxtuxent River) and USAF TPS (Edwards - though this does not cover any rotorwing training). The syllabi of each of the 4 schools for their “Graduate” (10-12 month) course is almost entirely focussed on military evaluation, and the cost is so high (approx £½m to £1m for fixed wing)) that practically only government agencies can afford to fund candidates on them.

An equivalent course, dedicated to civil certification techniques would be similarly prohibitively expensive, and be beyond the reach of most if not all of

the candidates, to the extent that it would not be viable.

As an alternative to these routes to approval, a formal training course to a syllabus specified by EASA may be the way ahead. The entry requirements might be determined as being a graduate of a suitable course (such as one of the established military schools) followed by a period of flight test experience. The final bench marking would need to be completion of an EASA Flight Test course and passing an assessment on completion.

**Justification:**

The practicalities and costs associated with complying with the proposed requirements would be prohibitive. An alternative means of achieving a similar objective need to be considered.

response *Noted*

Please see reply to your comment 5751 to FCL.820, with the same content.

comment

7258

comment by: *Vizepräsident OEGPV*

AMC No 2 zu FCL.815

Praktische Prüfung Seite393

Beim Prüfungsflug sollen auf 2 vom Abflugplatz verschiedene Landeplätze erkundet, und auf ihnen Anflüge, Landungen und Starts durchgeführt werden. Für die Prüfung mit Ski soll zumindest einer der Plätze ein Gletscherlandeplatz sein.

response *Noted*

Your comment refers to FCL.815. Please see replies to comments on that segment.

comment

7855

comment by: *FAA*

**Comment:** The training requirements outlined in AMC to FCL.820 appear to be excessive. They will costly to implement for training organizations and manufacturers. The suggested requirements would require training organizations to modify their curricula and, possibly, add equipment; the existing schools may be unable or unwilling to adopt these changes. In addition, the cost per student would also be greatly increased. Industry sources estimate the cost to meet the training requirements outlined in the AMC to FCL.820 to be approximately \$1.25M per student. As a result, the NPA may have the unintended consequence of creating a shortage of qualified test pilots.

**Proposed change:** Reduce the requirements to more reasonable levels.

response *Noted*

Based on the comments received, and further input provided by flight test schools, the Agency has revised the text of AMC to FCL.820. Please see amended text.

comment

8128

comment by: *Southern Cross International*

*Regarding the training requirements for Category 1 and 2 flight test credit should be granted by the competent Authority for previous flight test experience or training course(s) received before the introduction date of this Part.*

response *Noted*

Based on the comments received, and further input provided by flight test schools, the Agency has revised the text of AMC to FCL.820. Please see amended text.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors**

p. 394

comment *301*

comment by: *Bob Ellis*

I am an ex\_Royal Air Force Qualified Flying Instructor (A2 Basic Flying) with over 700 instructional hours. It appears from the NPA that I have no credit for this experience.

Proposal. Creditaion should be give to ex-military Qualified Flying Instructors for all or part of the requirements contained in Subpart 3 Instructors depending on previous experience.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Provisions on the conversion of military qualifications and training into Part-FCL qualifications have been included in the Cover Regulation. Please see text as published with this CRD.

comment *2994*

comment by: *Julia WILKINSON*

As we will obviously need more Instructors than ever before, given all these new regulations, the last thing we need is to put people off applying. But this rule will do just that - 30 hours classroom training is simply too much in one go. Why not break it down, at least, so that they have to do 15 hours to start with (to allow instructing up to a certain limit), then some practical instruction, then another 15 hours? This would at least enable them to put their classroom instruction into practice more quickly and give the ballooning community 'access' to instructors more quickly and efficiently.

It would also make more sense for both types of instructor (LAFI and FI) to instruct for both licences, LPL and BPL (note the need for as many instructors as possible with all these new regulations). The only difference would be that FIs can be paid.

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.

However, our proposals already include a new category of instructor, with less stringent requirements and more limited privileges than the FI: the LAFI. The Agency sees no need to include further categories of instructors, with even more limited privileges or less stringent requirements.

comment	6667	comment by: <i>Kevin Ison</i>
	LAFI & FI should both be allowed to instruct for both LPL & BPL, the only difference should be an FI can be paid and a LAFI cannot.	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	<p>Thank you for providing your comment.</p> <p>The general principle is that an instructor shall hold at least the licence for which instruction is being provided. This means a licence with at least the same privileges. The holder of an LAFI certificate who holds an LPL has lower privileges than the FI holding a PPL (or an SPL/BPL in the case of sailplanes and balloons). Furthermore, the prerequisites and the content of the training course for the LAFI(A) and (H) and the FI(A) and FI(H) are different. Therefore, the LAFI cannot provide instruction for a PPL.</p> <p>Due to the fact that the prerequisites and the content of the training course for the LAFI(S) and LAFI(B) are exactly the same the Agency will incorporate an additional requirement which provides appropriate credits for LAFI(S)/(B) holders who apply for the FI(S)/(B) certificate.</p> <p>The proposed Implementing Rules already contain a requirement which will allow the FI to provide flight instruction for the LPL. See FCL.905.FI (a).</p>	
comment	6672	comment by: <i>Icelandic CAA</i>
	<p>It is proposed to: Delete paragraph (a) and add MCCI(H) to the list.</p>	
response	<i>Partially accepted</i>	
	MCCI(H) added to AMC to FCL.900.	
comment	6951	comment by: <i>Roger B. Coote</i>
	<p>Training of instructors is currently the BGA's responsibility. We support the BGA's proposals for continuation of the present system, subject to endorsements, as appropriate.</p>	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	Please see reply to comment 2994 above.	
comment	8143	comment by: <i>AOC holder. High Adventure Balloon Flights</i>
	<p>Page 45 – 53 &amp; 394 – 395 EASA Proposals for Instructors</p> <p>The existing UK training system is much more practical than the proposed. 30 hours of classroom teaching prior to practical instruction is likely to be a real disincentive to new applicants for Instructor rating. Perhaps if the time was to be split to allow earlier practical training the disincentive would be removed.</p>	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	Thank you for providing your opinion.	

Please see reply to comment 2994 above. It has to be highlighted that the 30 hours theoretical knowledge instruction could be split in two or more parts and that the practical training required could be provided in between.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC to FCL.900 - Instructor certificates** p. 394

comment 2 comment by: ADAC Luftrettung GmbH

There is a MCCI training course for helicopters applicants according to FCL.915.MCCI (A) (2)

Therefore AMC to FCL.900 1 General 1.1 g) should be changed as follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

g) Multi Crew Co-operation instructor certificate - Aeroplanes (MCCI(A)) **and Helicopters (MCCI(H)).**

\*\*\*\*\*

response *Accepted*

Text has been amended accordingly.

comment 531 comment by: FOCA Switzerland

Subpart J  
AMC to FCL.900  
1 General

Editorial  
Para 1.1 **(a) to be deleted completely**  
**(g) add: MCCI (H)**

Para 1.2 **Change as follows:**  
**For categories a) to e) and for i) /instead f**

response *Partially accepted*

1.1  
MCCI(H) added.  
LAFI category will be kept.

1.2  
Text amended accordingly.

comment 821 comment by: OAA Oxford

Clarification required: 1.2 Requirements for (f) confused

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 531 above.

comment 2629 comment by: Dieter Lenzkes

1.2 For categories a) to e) **and for f)** the applicant needs to hold a pilot licence. For categories **f)** to h) no licence is needed, only an instructor certificate comment

f) wird zweimal für unterschiedliche Bedingungen erwähnt. Vermutlich Schreibfehler.

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 531 above.

comment 2794

comment by: *David COURT*

The title LAFI is not consistent with the licence name. Should it not be LFI (Leisure Flying Instructor) if the licence is to be called LPL?

Or use LAFI and LAPL for consistency.

response *Noted*

Please note that the LPL has been changed to LAPL.

Please see justification in the comments on Subpart B and in the explanatory note.

comment 2828

comment by: *CAE*

AMC to FCL.900 (2)

Best option would be to insert verbiage indicating full recognition of another ICAO member states license or rating.

The second best option would be to insert the contents of JAR-FCL 1.300 at end of section.

Reference comment #2826

response *Not accepted*

Please see replies to comments on FCL.900 and the amended text.

comment 2941

comment by: *Robert WORSMAN*

A FI or LAFI should be able to instruct on either a LPL or a BPL, the only distinction between the FI and LAFI is that the FI should be able to pay for their services. It just doesn't make sense to have two classes of instructor performing an identical set of instruction.

Have these rules been thought through - it does not appear so? Are these rules being rushed through due to a time limit - it appears so?

Please go away and revise these rules and then present something sensible and logical for us to comment on.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your comment.



The general principle is that an instructor shall hold at least the licence for which instruction is being provided. This means a licence with at least the same privileges. The holder of an LAFI certificate who holds an LPL has lower privileges than the FI holding a PPL (or an SPL/BPL in the case of sailplanes and balloons). Furthermore, the prerequisites and the content of the training course for the LAFI(A) and (H) and the FI(A) and FI(H) are different. Therefore, the LAFI cannot provide instruction for a PPL.

Due to the fact that the prerequisites and the content of the training course for the LAFI(S) and LAFI(B) are exactly the same, the Agency will incorporate an additional requirement which provides appropriate credits for LAFI(S)/(B) holders who apply for the FI(S)/(B) certificate.

The proposed Implementing Rules already contain a requirement which will allow the FI to provide flight instruction for the LPL. See FCL.905.FI (a).

comment 3400 comment by: NACA

**AMC to FCL.900 (1.2)**

Should read: ... for categories a) to e) and for i) the applicant ...

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 531 above.

comment 3561 comment by: Rory Worsman

These levels are not required for ballooning. It is overly complex. Allow FI and LAFI to instruct both LPL and BPL.  
Some common sense is required here. Allow FI to charge for their services.

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 2941 above.

comment 3613 comment by: Susana Nogueira

Paragraph 1.1 (a)  
Delete completely.

response *Not accepted*

Please see reply to comment 531 above.

comment 3614 comment by: Susana Nogueira

Paragraph 1.1 (g)  
Add: MCCI(H)

response *Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 531 above.

comment 3615 comment by: Susana Nogueira

	Paragraph 1.2 Change to read: 'For categories a) to e) and <b>for i)</b> the applicants...
response	<i>Accepted</i> Please see reply to comment 531 above.
comment	<b>3894</b> comment by: <i>Luftfahrt-Bundesamt</i> AMC to FCL.900: Are there any reasons that MCCI (H) is not included in the whole document?
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see reply to comment 531 above.
comment	<b>4010</b> comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i> AMC to FCL 900 Instructor certificates  Add a flight test rating instructor in § 1.1 of 1. General of this AMC See New Section 11 FTRI to Subpart J  AMC to FCL 900 Instructor certificates 1. General 1.1. Nine instructor categories are recognised a)..... b).... ..... i) ..... <b><u>j) flight test rating instructor certificate</u></b>
response	<i>Accepted</i> Text has been amended accordingly.
comment	<b>4199</b> comment by: <i>Bristow Academy</i> AMC to FCL.900 Para 1.1 g)  Has a MCCI (H) been overlooked?
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see reply to comment 531 above.
comment	<b>4509</b> comment by: <i>Irish Aviation Authority</i> <b><i>[Proposal: To amend the following AMC to bring it in line with the proposed amendments to Subpart J, Appendix 12 and with other wording already existing in the NPA.]</i></b>

**AMC to FCL.900****Instructor certificates** [*Should be amended as follows.*]

## 1 General

## 1.1 Eight instructor categories are recognised:

- a) Flight instructor certificate – aeroplane (FI(A)), helicopter (FI(H)), powered-lift (FI(PL)), airship (FI(As)), sailplane (FI(S)), balloon (FI(B));
- b) Type rating instructor certificate – aeroplane (TRI(A)), helicopter (TRI(H)), powered-lift (TRI(PL));
- c) Class rating instructor certificate – aeroplane (CRI(A));
- d) Instrument rating instructor certificate – aeroplane (IRI(A)), helicopter (IRI(H)), airship (IRI(As)) ;
- e) Synthetic flight instructor certificate – aeroplane (SFI(A), helicopter (SFI(H));
- f) Multi Crew Cooperation instructor certificate Aeroplanes (MCCI(A));
- g) Synthetic training instructor certificate – aeroplane (STI(A)), helicopter (STI(H));
- h) Mountain rating instructor certificate – (MI).

1.2 For categories a) to d) and for h) the applicant needs to hold a pilot licence. For categories e) to g) no licence is needed, only an instructor certificate.

1.3 A person may hold more than one instructor certificate.

response *Not accepted*

The LAFI needs to continue to be mentioned.  
As an additional category the flight test instructor will be introduced.

comment

4820

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

Para 1.1 (a) to be deleted completely  
(g) add: MCCI (H)  
Para 1.2 Change as follows: for categories a) to e) and for i) (*instead f*) the ...

response

*Partially accepted*

Please see reply to comment 531 above.

comment

4853

comment by: *Flight Training Europe*

Page 394 AMC to FCL.900, 1, 1.2

Incorrect paragraph numbering, change sub-paragraph 1.2 to read:

**For categories a) to e) and for i) the applicant needs to hold a pilot licence. For categories f) to h) no licence is needed, only an instructors certificate.**

response

*Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 531 above.

comment

5471

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

response	<p>Are there any reasons that MCCI (H) is not included in the whole document?</p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 531 above.</p>
comment	<p><b>5490</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CEV. France</i></span></p> <p>CEV Comment n°6</p> <p>CEV Proposal: AMC to FCL.900 Instructor certificates 1 General 1.1 <b><u>Ten</u></b> instructor categories are recognised: a) Light aircraft flight instructor certificate – aeroplane (LAFI(A)), helicopter (LAFI(H)), sailplane LAFI(S), balloon (LAFI(B)); b) Flight instructor certificate – aeroplane (FI(A)), helicopter (FI(H)), poweredlift (FI(PL)), airship (FI(As)), sailplane (FI(S)), balloon (FI(B)); c) Type rating instructor certificate – aeroplane (TRI(A)), helicopter (TRI(H)), poweredlift (TRI(PL)); d) Class rating instructor certificate – aeroplane (CRI(A)); e) Instrument rating instructor certificate – aeroplane (IRI(A)), helicopter (IRI(H)), airship (IRI(As)) ; f) Synthetic flight instructor certificate – aeroplane (SFI(A), helicopter (SFI(H)); g) Multi crew Cooperation instructor certificate Aeroplanes (MCCI(A)); h) Synthetic training instructor certificate – aeroplane (STI(A)), helicopter (STI(H)); i) Mountain rating instructor certificate – (MI).</p> <p><b><u>j) Flight test rating instructor certificate- (FTRI (A), FTRI (H))</u></b></p> <p>1.2 For categories a) to e) and for f) the applicant needs to hold a pilot licence. For categories f) to h) no licence is needed, only an instructor certificate. 1.3 A person may hold more than one instructor certificate.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 4010 above.</p>
comment	<p><b>5799</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Civil Aviation Training Europe</i></span></p> <p>A provision is missing for accepting non JAA instructor licenses. For example FAA instructors wishing to train in a JAA FTO.</p> <p>There is a potential market for JAA FTOs e.g. in the US for flight training.</p> <p>Provision should be made to enable the FTOs to judge the skills of a non JAA instructor. Then to issue a training concept to bridge for EASA F(I) priviligdes.</p>

Adapting the Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.300 would be the easiest way for the authorities..

response

*Not accepted*

Please see replies to comments on FCL.900 and the amended text.

comment

6169

comment by: *Bristow Academy*

Comment

Suggest additional paragraph 2.4 to continue the provisions of JAR-FCL 1.055/2.055 and appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.305

AMC to FCL.900

2 Special Conditions

2.1

2.2

2.3

**2.4**

***a) Instructors seeking to instruct for an EU licence outside a Member State, including instruction for class, type and instrument ratings shall***  
***(i) Hold at least a CPL and ratings issued in accordance with ICAO Annex 1 required by the respective non EU State for the instruction to be given on aircraft registered in that state;***

***(ii) Have completed at least 500 hours of flight time as a pilot of which at least 200 hours shall be as a flight instructor relevant to the intended training to be given and meet the experience requirements of FCL.905.FI as appropriate;***

***(iii) Have completed in accordance with Part FCL the approved relevant course(s) of theoretical and flight training. The course may be modified, as approved by the relevant Authority, taking into account the previous training and experience of the applicant but shall comprise at least 30 hours of ground instruction and 15 hours of dual flight instruction performed by a flight instructor holding an EU licence and certificate in accordance with FCL.905.FI (j);***

***(iv) Have passed the Skill Test set out in FCL.935.FI;***

***(v) The validity period of the certificate and authorisation is 3 years;***

***(vi) Revalidation or renewal of any certificate and Authorisation issued in accordance with (i) to (iv) shall be in accordance with FCL.940.FI.***

***(b) The authorisation will be restricted as follows:***

***(i) No instruction for the issue of any instructor ratings;***

***(ii) No instruction within a EU Member State;***

***(iii) Instruction to students only who have sufficient knowledge of the language in which instruction is given;***

***(iv) No instruction for MCC training***

response

*Not accepted*

Please see replies to comments on FCL.900 and the amended text.

comment

6215

comment by: *UK CAA***Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL.900

**Page No:**

394

**Comment:**

Category f) appears to need or not need a licence.

**Justification:**

Typographical error

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Decide whether an SFI does or does not need a licence and amend accordingly.

response

*Noted*

Please see reply to comment 531 above.

comment

6216

comment by: *UK CAA***Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL.900

**Page No:**

394 of 647

**Comment:**

There is no mention of whether category (i) requires a licence or only a instructor certificate. Category f is mentioned twice.

**Justification:**

Consistency.

**Proposed Text:**

Amend AMC FCL.900 1.2

For categories a) to e) **and i)**....

response

*Accepted*

Please see reply to comment 531 above.

comment

6393

comment by: *DSvU*

FCL.905.LAFI (b) and (f)

**Comment:**

The privileges are to conduct flight instruction for....

LPL, LAFI.

**Proposal:**

Change to instruction for.. to:

LPL(S), SPL and

LAFI(S) and FI(S)

**Justification:**

Since the instructor course and requirements for a LAFI(S) and FI(S) is equal

	(except for the medical), the privileges should be the same.
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 2941 above.</p>
comment	<p>6395 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DSvU</i></span></p> <p>FCL.910.LAFI FCL.910.FI</p> <p>Comment: The LAFI(S) and FI(S) shall during the first 15 hr/50 launch as instructor be supervised of a LAFI(S) or FI(S) nominated by the training organisation</p> <p>Proposal: Change "nominated by the training organisation" to " a non restricted LAFI(S) or FI(S)".</p> <p>Justification: When a LAFI(S) or FI(S) no more is restricted, he/she is fully qualified to supervise the new LAFI(S) or FI(S).</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 2941 above.</p>
comment	<p>6396 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>DSvU</i></span></p> <p>FCL.915.FI (a)</p> <p>Comment: Have passed a specific pre-entry flight test with an FI qualified in accordance with FCL.905.FI(j).</p> <p>Proposal: Change to "Have passed a specific pre-entry flight test with a FI(S).</p> <p>Justification: There is no need to do so, the instructor course for FI(S) is equal to the course for a LAFI(S).</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>However, it seems that your comment is addressed to the wrong segment as this AMc is dealing with the different instructor certificates. Please check the responses provided to the appropriate segments.</p> <p>The Agency does not see a need to specify the category of instructor as the pre-entry flight test for an FI can only be done by an FI and not by a LAFI. Please see the general requirement in FCL.915.</p>
comment	<p>6621 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Austro Control GmbH</i></span></p>

	<p>Comment: Editorial change</p> <p>Proposed Text: 1.2 For categories a) to e) and for <del>f)</del> <b>i)</b> the applicant needs to hold a pilot licence. For categories f) to h) no licence is needed, only an instructor certificate.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 531 above.</p>
comment	<p>6839 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAA CZ</span></p> <p>AMC FCL.900, para. 1.2 Letter f) in the text should be corrected to i) (Mountain rating Instructor) – "For categories a) to e) and for <b>i)</b> the applicant...". Category f) is stated in the second sentence of this paragraph.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 531 above.</p>
comment	<p>6979 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAA CZ</span></p> <p>AMC to FCL.900 1.1 g) Missing <b>MCCI (H)</b> (see FCL.915.MCCI (b)(2), page 60) should be added.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 531 above.</p>
comment	<p>6993 <span style="float: right;">comment by: Darragh OWENS</span></p> <p>, as proposed in FCL 905.FI NPA-2008-17b, provides that an FI may instruct for the issue of:</p> <p>(h) an IR in the appropriate aircraft category, provided that the FI has: (1) At least 200 hours flight time under IFR, of which up to 50 hours may be instrument ground time in a FFS, an FTD 2/3 or FNPT II</p> <p>This is in conformance with existing JAR-FCL requirements.</p> <p><u>We propose,</u></p> <p>however, that the requirement FCL 905.FI of 200 hours flight time under IFR be reduced to 100 hours, or else be met by equating one hour under actual or simulated IFR to four hours flight time under IFR.</p> <p><u>Justification:</u></p> <p>For a person who wishes a career as a professional flight instructor the requirement of 200 hours is overly onerous and costly. If an individual acquires those hours in paid employment as a commercial pilot, not instructing, then he or she is unlikely to return to the instructional community, and in practice</p>



	<p>rarely does so.</p> <p>The flight training industry is thus being deprived (and will continue to be so under the new legislation) of dedicated career flight instructor at the level of instrument rating instructor.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see replies to comments to FCL.905.FI</p>

comment	<p>7339 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ECOGAS</i></span></p> <p>Current wording: 1.2 "For categories (a) to (e) and for (f) the applicant needs to hold a pilots licence. For categories (f) to (h) no licence is needed, only an instructors certificate"</p> <p>Issue: (f) is in both groups</p> <p>Suggestion: Delete one instance of (f) in para 1.2</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 531 above.</p>

comment	<p>7866 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span></p> <p>General comment: There is a need for harmonized markings on licence. Especially instrument rating and instructor privileges are marked differently. As an example: FI that extends in the middle of his 3 year FI period privilege to instruct for IR and ME-CR: What are the markings on licence? Only FI and he/she shall know his/her privileges or FI+IRI+CRI-ME on same date or FI expiring earlier than the others. This comment to clarify comment in AR/OR.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>It is clear from the text of FCL.015 that any extension of privileges needs to be mentioned in the licence/certificate.</p>

<p><b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC to FCL.920 - Instructor competencies and assessment</b></p>	<p>p. 394-395</p>
--	-------------------

comment	<p>2878 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>richard benham</i></span></p> <p>I would strongly suggest that the proposal for this LAFI course be modified from the current proposal - surely if it is broken into smaller chunks, it would be possible for an instructor to train future pilots to certain levels after just 15 hours or so of classroom training (e.g. could train certain aspects, but still not authorise a solo balloon flight - this would be allowed after completing the further and final 15hrs of suggested training).</p> <p>If you try to get a continued and growing band of instructors, but implement</p>
---------	---

this LAFI training in one whole chunk of 30 hrs, I would be personally GREATLY DISCOURAGED from doing it - trying to get 30hrs currently with work and life balance before I could do ANY authorisation at all would be difficult and I wouldn't be able to put back into the sport, what I have got out so far.

It would appeal to me more if I wanted to become an instructor, to do 2 or 3 equal chunks and give me authority for certain aspects at each gate point of 10 or 15 hours.

If not, even more new entrants to the sport hobby will be prevented from taking it up due to Instructor red tape and the sport will die out in the UK.

r.benham

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, it seems that the comment should have been addressed to another segment. FCL.930.LAFI contains all the requirements for the training course to become a LAFI.

For the LAFI(B) 30 hours of theoretical knowledge instruction are required but nothing is said about the way how these 30 hours are provided.

Please see all the responses already provided to the comments on FCL.930.LAFI dealing with the same issue. Nothing prevents the ATO from offering this theoretical instruction in several smaller chunks.

comment **2940**

comment by: *Robert WORSMAN*

Ironic but your very own proposal on training of instructors is completely contradicted by you view on how training should be carried out.

You should not enforce 30 hrs of classroom training as proposed. Any classroom training should be split up and instructors should be able to instruct up to a certain level.

Very much following the guidelines set out here.

Your current proposal will not encourage, will not assess, will not monitor and will not evaluate.

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.

Please see the response provided to comment No. 2878 (R. Benham) in the same segment above.

A second level of instructors with restricted privileges (e.g. only basic training) will not be introduced.

comment **3560**

comment by: *Rory Worsman*

The training is not attractive to those people most required to instruct - skillfull flyers. You appear to be deveoping a system for acedemics that will attract acedemics - and not practical skill fully flyers.

response	<p>You'll end up with acedemics that can teach but have no aptitude to fly and no common sense. This is NOT what is required of an instructor.</p> <p>You need a system that encourages practical flyers with experience and then gradually enhance and encourage their teaching skills. I propose you allow instructors to instruct on 10 to 15 hrs classroom work, allow then to instruct up to solo level.</p> <p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your comment.</p> <p>Please see the responses provided to comments No. 2878 (R. Benham) and No. 2940 (R. Worsman) in the same segment above.</p>
comment	<p><b>3893</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Luftfahrt-Bundesamt</i></span></p> <p>AMC to FCL.920:</p> <p>See our comment on FCL.920.</p>
response	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>See our reply to your comment on FCL.920.</p>
comment	<p><b>5076</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>George Knight</i></span></p> <p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>This section is overly biased towards the instructor competencies for training commercial pilots. Threat and error management and CRM have little relevance to a microlight or sailplane or, indeed, many other recreational single pilot environments.</p> <p>The performance standards again are biased towards full time training courses lasting weeks or months. This will not be true for recreational licences.</p> <p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>Please produce a simplified and more relevant proposal for instructors teaching only for recreational licences.</p>
response	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>The Agency agrees that CRM may not be relevant for a single-pilot environment, but TEM is.</p> <p>Please note that this is an AMC, which allows that more tailored training programmes are produced, as long as the objectives of the rule and an adequate level of safety are maintained.</p>
comment	<p><b>5247</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority</i></span></p> <p><b>AMC to FCL.920</b></p> <p><b>Instructor competencies and assessment</b></p> <p>1 Training should be both theoretical and practical. Practical elements should include the development of specific instructor skills, particularly in the area of</p>

teaching and assessing threat and error management and CRM.

Comment:

Threat and error management skills are only part of the Non-technical Skills required for competence and should be defined as such. for consistency with previous comments

**Proposal:** amend to read:

**Instructor competencies and assessment**

1 Training should be both theoretical and practical. *Practical elements should include the development of specific instructor skills, particularly in the area of teaching and assessing Non-technical Skills such as threat and error management and CRM.*

response

*Not accepted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.  
We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

5960

comment by: ENAC TLP

The draft does not prescribe any training requirements or the competency standards that an Examiner or an Instructor should demonstrate in the area of non-technical/CRM skills and TEM assessment. This will lead to the possibility of poor practical training in this area and misapplication of the assessment process due to subjectivity, bias, and poor inter-rater reliability that will undermine confidence in licensing rules and diminish the training value of assessment.

**Needs** training or competence requirements for Instructors and Examinersf in the area of Non-technical/CRM Skills and TEM assessment .

**Proposal:**

Under the label of Human Performance contained in syllabiFlightcrew must be trained in the concepts, use and application of NTS in support to TEM, CRM and Airmanship. Examiners and Instructors shall undergo specific training in the use of a behavioral marker system for the purpose of non-technical skills assessment. Examiners shall demonstrate competence in the assessment of non-technical skills to the relevant competent authority as part of the Instructor rating and Examiner authorisation process.

**AMC to FCL.920 Instructor competencies and assessment**

**Page 394-395**

to be modified as follows (*italic*)

1. Training.....omissis.....particularly in the area of teaching and assessing *TEM, CRM and NTS*
2. ....omissis.....

*Table 4th row*

<b>Competence</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Knowledge</b>
Integrate TEM/CRM/NTS	Makes TEM/CRM and NTS links with technical training	Human Factors, TEM/CRM/NTS

response *Not accepted*

Please see reply to comment 5247 above.

comment

6217

comment by: *UK CAA*

**Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL.920

**Page No:**

395 of 647

**Comment:**

Integration of TEM, CRM, Human Factors is required to be assessed. However only Human factors is included at Item 7 of the Teaching and Learning Syllabus for Instructors.

**Justification:**

Clarification/Standardisation

**Proposed Text:**

Include Item 7(a) TEM and 7(b) CRM with all the relevant enabling objectives into the T&L Syllabus at AMC FCL930 LAFI.

response

*Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

TEM will be added to the LAFI course. CRM at this stage does not seem to be relevant for the LAFI, which will be teaching fundamentally in a single-pilot environment.

comment

6318

comment by: *Jonathan Coote*

This syllabus should be a suggestion (i.e. not mandatory) with the British Gliding Association able to tailor the process for maximum effectiveness for the training of gliding instructors. While these issues are important, the way in which they are addressed should be flexible and not point-by-point to avoid incurring any unnecessary constraints on the development of appropriate training programs. With strictly limited resources available to this sport, inefficiencies should be avoided, whilst ensuring that an appropriate process is developed.

response

*Noted*

Please note that this is an AMC, which allows that more tailored training programmes are produced, as long as the objectives of the rule and an adequate level of safety is maintained.

comment

7228

comment by: *UK CAA*

**Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL.920 para 1

**Page No:**

394 of 647

**Comment:**

The instructor skill can be integrated with the use of non-technical skills.

**Justification:**

Consistency

**Proposed Text:**

**(if applicable)**

Delete all after "...instructor skills "and insert "*particularly in the area of non-technical skills*".

response

*Not accepted*

Please see reply to comment 5247 above.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC  
No 1 to FCL.925 - MPL Instructor Course**

p. 395-397

comment

1957

comment by: *Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch*

**Important area of skill and knowledge missing**

Proof:

1) Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations call for the knowledge of " non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors."

Tis is NOT ""threat and error management"!

2) §(16) of the Basic Regulations principles claim for a "promotion of a "culture of safety"

3) "threat and error management" is a special approach and methodology not accepted by all. More modern and general accepted techniques exist (see my comments on TEM, definitions error and error management and the Basic Regulations of the EC.

Proposal:

Replace

10. Application of the principles of threat and error management and CRM principles to training

With

10. Application of the principles of non-technical skills and CRM principles to training

response

*Not accepted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

6662

comment by: *Kevin Ison*

30 hours classroom training will discourage some people from applying.  
Please split this down to 2x15 Level 1&2

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, it seems that the comment should have been addressed to another

segment. FCL.930.LAFI contains all the requirements for the training course to become a LAFI. This segment is dealing with the MPL instructor course.

For the LAFI(B) 30 hours of theoretical knowledge instruction are required but nothing is said about the way how these 30 hours are provided.

Please see all the responses already provided to the comments on FCL.930.LAFI dealing with the same issue. Nothing prevents the ATO from offering this theoretical instruction in several smaller chunks.

comment

7229

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC No 1 to FCL.925 para 2 Table

**Page No:**

396 of 647

**Comment:**

The instructor skill can be integrated with the use of non-technical skills.

**Justification:**

Consistency

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**Column 1 - Delete "Integrate TEM/CRM" and Insert "*Integrate NTS*"

Column 2 – Delete "Makes TEM/CRM links.." and Insert "Makes Non-Technical Skills links.."

Column 3 – Delete "...TEM/CRM" and Insert "*NTS*"

response

*Noted*

Please see reply to comment 1957 above.

comment

7231

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC No 1 to FCL.925 para 2

**Page No:**

395 of 647

**Comment:**

The instructor skill can be integrated with the use of non-technical skills.

**Justification:**

Consistency

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**Delete all after "...instructor skills "and insert "*particularly in the area of non-technical skills*".

response

*Noted*

Please see reply to comment 1957 above.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - GM to FCL.925 - MPL Instructors**

p. 397-398

comment

5539

comment by: R Gyselynck

Balloon instructors - After 15 hours classroom training an instructor should be able to start training students. After a further 15 hours they should then be able to complete training to the full syllabus

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, it seems that the comment should have been addressed to another segment. FCL.930.LAFI contains all the requirements for the training course to become a LAFI. This segment is dealing with the MPL instructor course.

For the LAFI(B) 30 hours of theoretical knowledge instruction are required but nothing is said about the way how these 30 hours are provided.

Please see all the responses already provided to the comments on FCL.930.LAFI dealing with the same issue. Nothing prevents the ATO from offering this theoretical instruction in several smaller chunks.

The Agency does not agree with your proposal and proposes to study the AMC material containing the contents of an instructor course. As the quality of the instructor is one of the main elements for a high level of safety the proposed training syllabus for the balloon instructor cannot be completed within only 15 hours of theory. The Agency strongly believes that it needs more than one weekend training to start with providing flight instructions. This is the reason why at least three training flights (as instructor candidate) have to be done with or under the supervision (taking a "real" student with them) of an experienced instructor. No limited instructor sub-category is envisaged.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC to FCL.930.LAFI Light - Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course**

p. 398-401

comment

1860

comment by: *Reinhard Weihermueller*

- 125 h Theorieausbildung ist zu lange, kann ein Vereinsflugelehrer nebenberuflich nicht leisten
- 30 h Flugausbildung ist zu lange, die hohen Kosten schrecken junge Piloten von der Fluglehrerausbildung ab

response

*Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Your first proposal is dealing with the requirement for 125 hours theoretical knowledge during the FI course. For the LAFI different minimum requirements were proposed (see FCL.930.LAFI). Based on the comments received, the Agency decided to align the theoretical knowledge requirements of the different instructor certificates. For the LAFI a standard element of 25 hours teaching and learning will be required and an additional amount of 50 hours theoretical knowledge instruction.

The second comment is aiming on a reduction of the required flight training for the LAFI(A). The Agency reviewed all the comments received on this issue very carefully and came to the conclusion that the economical reasons mentioned should not influence at all the decision on the minimum training requirements for the LAFI. As the quality of the training provided by these LAFIs will be the



basic element for the level of safety of the future generation of LPL pilots, the Agency will not use any economical/financial reasons to decide on the minimum flight training. Based on this the AMC containing the training syllabus should not be reduced and a certain corresponding minimum amount of practical training during such a course should be required.

Based on all the comments received (a huge amount of comments is asking for a reduction and only a few are proposing to align them with the FI requirements/see also the responses provided to FCL.930.LAFI), the Agency reviewed the syllabus for the training course and came to the conclusion that the required amount of total flight time can be reduced slightly to 12 hours but will include an additional exercise in order to address the comments received on the proposed pre-requisite "instrument instruction" in FCL.915.LAFI. This exercise will ask for an instruction of at least one hour by reference solely to instruments including the completion of a 180° turn.

As all these proposed numbers are minimum figures using the term "at least" the ATO might ask for additional training if necessary for a certain LAFI candidate in order to reach the required level of competence and experience. The option for flight instruction provided in an FSTD will be reduced to only one hour in order to ensure a certain minimum flight time in an aeroplane.

comment

2596

comment by: CAA Belgium

**To be completely deleted. Instructor ratings should NOT be of a lower level than required by ICAO. Annex 1 FI requirements must be imposed.**

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion. The Agency has decided to keep this AMC. Please refer to the response given to comment no 1860 above.

comment

2611

comment by: Tony KNIGHT

**There is obviously a need for 'qualified' BBAC instructors, but why would EASA think that they know how to train an instructor of hot air ballooning if they demonstrate an appalling lack of knowledge about hot air ballooning in general. The world's first passenger carrying flights of any sort were in hot air balloons, not aeroplanes. To encourage new instructors (of any age), we should be basing their qualification on their knowledge and experience.**

**Having what amounts to a five day (6 hours per day) course is just not necessary and will alienate potentially good candidates. As most people begin their balloon flying as a non commercial activity, a weeks course would be restrictive and costly. Who will run such courses as there are no current instructors who have actually such a course. Again, this sounds like EASA pulling figures out of the air with absolutely no knowledge of what they are doing.**

**Currently, the BBAC has a Training Officer who runs training days that seem to fulfil the requirement of producing good instructors. Why do you want to change a system that works apart from keeping bureaucrats in jobs? If the BBAC were to reorganise their instructor days to a single weekend (maybe 16 hours), I believe that what needs**

**to be taught in theory will be well covered.**

**Reinforcing my comments on age, I believe that EASA must not KILL off EXPERIENCE! Many of our instructors will be of a senior age with oodles of experience. This must not be lost under a pile of bureaucratic nonsense, but must be preserved and passed on to future aeronauts with an intent of keeping our sport alive and safe.**

**Finally, there is no need to have two different types of instructor as all flying requires the same training in the most part. Any instructor should be able to train any PUT with the only difference being whether or not they are licenced to charge for their services. Many currently do not, even though they could exercise that right.**

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see also the responses to the comments No. 1214 (J. Dean) and to No. 2517 (A. Kaye) in the IR part of the CRD.

A staged process of classroom teaching is already foreseen as the flight training in the balloon (always with an experienced LAFI or FI on board) should be provided in parallel if possible. The Agency does not understand why the system proposed in your comment should not work with the requirements proposed. After receiving a certain amount of theoretical knowledge instruction, discussing the main elements of the instructing techniques and the contents of the syllabus, the LAFI or FI(B) providing the training will organise the first training flights. As the LAFI candidate has never instructed before, the LAFI/FI providing the training will follow the training syllabus contained in the AMC simulating a student pilot or asking a "real" student pilot to act as the student pilot during these flights. At least three flights are foreseen during this training period.

The Agency does not agree to create an additional level of instructors under supervision after having reached a certain amount of training during the course as the whole training syllabus has to be completed and the skill test to be passed before acting as an instructor.

comment *2644*

comment by: *Martin Rowlands*

In order to be an Balloon Pilot Instructor, evidence of instructing ability, through successful students, is a better model than requiring potential Instructors sit through 30 hours of classroom teaching on the theory of teaching. Such classrooms will be a deterrent to potential applicants.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 2611 above.

comment *2761*

comment by: *Jamie Campbell*

This is too much classroom time for a qualification that is going to become so crucial. This needs to be broken down into two or three parts allowing people to instruct at different levels. the licence requirements could then be broken down.

Why not introduce a one day course to obtain the qualification of trainer or junior instructor. This person can then be responsible for say 50% of any students training. Once they have given say 20hrs of training flights they can then have a further one day training course and possibly even a practical test, but allow people to get there slowly.

This has to remain a hobby for people if it is to continue to be accessible, therefore progression to instructor level needs to be able to fit in around people's daily lives and not take too long before they can start helping others to learn.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

It seems that you are referring to the requirement in (b)(1) asking for 30 hours of theoretical instruction and instructional techniques. This proposal was based on an evaluation of the existing national requirements for instructor courses in different Member States and it was supported by the experts.

It seems also that your comment is based on a misinterpretation when you state: "a trainee instructor who attends one 30 hour classroom session, not having done any prior instructing ...". The proposed concept is not asking for 30 hours theory without any practical flight training on the instructional techniques (in the aircraft). Subparagraph (b)(2) clearly asks for some dual flight training in parallel. The requirement was kept so "open" in order to allow the different systems of courses actually in place in the Member States. The 30 hours theoretical knowledge instruction and instructional techniques can be provided as separate theory days on weekends followed by a flight training day during weekends or the ATO might also choose to offer a one- or two-week course with daily theory lessons and flight training in parallel. The Agency does not see any problem with this requirement.

However, it must be mentioned at this stage that an editorial mistake was made when asking for only 30 hours of theoretical instruction and including the instructional techniques. As FCI.915 (c) provides a general credit for the teaching and learning skills, the module of 25 hours lessons on instructional techniques (teaching and learning) must be introduced also for the LAFI(S).

Based on the comments received, the Agency will introduce the 25 hours also for the LAFI(S) and (B) which means that the LAFI(S) course will contain 55 hours theory in total.

comment 2795

comment by: *David COURT*

The syllabus is good but I would like to see the 30 hours of theoretical knowledge split into two 15 hour courses. After the first 15 hours the trainee Instructor would be allowed to instruct to a limited level under the supervision of a full instructor.

After completion of the second half of the theoretical knowledge they would be allowed to instruct the full syllabus.

This will allow new Instructors to mix classroom theory with practical instruction. This then allows the trainee instructor to put the classroom work into context.

There are also some good potential instructors who would be reluctant to apply due to the high commitment of time and expense to complete the full course before they could teach a single student.

Splitting the course into two will allow them to train to a limited level. One suggestion would be to allow them to refresh exercises with a student rather than introducing new ones.

This time spent under supervision of a senior Instructor should also count towards the 15 hours of restricted privileges referred to in FCL 910.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 2761 above.

comment

**2866**

comment by: *Richard Allan*

As far as balloons are concerned

The proposal to have to do 30 hours of classroom training is surly excessive. 15 hours is a far more realistic period of time. If all instruction had to be with an instructor there will be a severe shortage if this (30 hours) is approved

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 2611 above.

comment

**2877**

comment by: *richard benham*

I would strongly suggest that the proposal for this LAFI course be modified from the current proposal - surely if it is broken into smaller chunks, it would be possible for an instructor to train future pilots to certain levels after just 15 hours or so of classroom training (e.g. could train certain aspects, but still not authorise a solo balloon flight - this would be allowed after completiing the further and final 15hrs of suggested training).

If you try to get a continued and growing band of instructors, but implement this LAFI training in one whole chunk of 30 hrs, I would be personally GREATLY DISCOURAGED from doing it - trying to get 30hrs currently with work and life balance before I could do ANY authorisation at all would be difficult and I wouldn't be able to put back into the sport, what I have got out so far.

It would appeal to me more if I wanted to become an instructor, to do 2 or 3 equal chunks and give me authority for certain aspects at each gate point of 10 or 15 hours.

If not, even more new entrants to the sport hobby will be prevented from taking it up due to Instructor red tape and the sport will die out in the UK.

r.benham

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to

comment no 2611 above.

comment **3022** comment by: *Richard ALLEN*

Part 1 LAFI(B) certificate - 30 hours seems a significant amount of time concentrating on the theory of teaching and learning, rather than reducing this somewhat and including the theory relating to flying the relevant aircraft, in this case a balloon.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 2611 above.

comment **3217** comment by: *Susana Nogueira*

Delete totaly AMC 930.

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment.  
However, the Agency will keep the AMC to FCL.930.LAFI.  
Please refer to the response given to comment no 2596 above.

comment **3234** comment by: *Richard Sargeant*

The proposal envisages some 30 hours of classroom-based instruction emphasising teaching skills rather than ballooning skills (which candidates should already possess to a high level!) and I broadly agree with this. Teaching is an ability that does not come naturally to all. However, bearing in mind the absolute simplicity of balloons compared to other forms of aviation and that fact that it is primarily a leisure activity, 30 hours (a full working week!) is a very daunting chunk to swallow in a single chunk. Many otherwise interested balloon pilots might be put off by this requirement. If there are few instructors available then our sport will slowly wither and die for lack of new pilots.

I would prefer to see a system where an instructor who has completed, say half of the 30 hour requirement may instruct with limitations, but would have to complete the full 30 hours before being able, for example, to authorise solo flights by a trainee. My proposal would mirror more closely the current UK practice which has resulted in highly satisfactory standards, whilst also acknowledging the desire to improve teaching skills of instructors.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 2611 above.

comment **4163** comment by: *Medical Officer BBAC*

As flight instructors have in the past been instructed while gaining their license they will have an understanding of what is required to be taught without necessarily needing many hours of learning and teaching processes. This will demotivate many talented candidates.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion. For further details, please also refer to the response given to comment no 2611 in this segment.

comment 4538 comment by: *Irish Aviation Authority*

**[Proposal: To amend the following AMC to bring it in line with the above amendments to Subpart J, Appendix 12 and with other wording already existing in the NPA.]**

**AMC to FCL.930.LAFI**

**Light Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course** *[Should be deleted]*

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment No. 2596 in the same segment above.

comment 4857 comment by: *Flight Training Europe*

Page 401 AMC to FCL.930.LAFI Part 2 A

Under "Air Exercises" It states that – "The air exercises are similar to those used for the training of LPL but with additional items designed to cover the needs of a flight instructor". The exercise numbering of the "Long Briefings and Air Exercises" (page 404) are different to those of the exercises of the Basic LPL and LPL; and, therefore unnecessarily confusing for a new instructor. The exercise number for all fixed wing pilot training and fixed wing instructor training should be aligned. **Recommend renumbering the LAFI Syllabus to align it with the numbering of the "Long Briefs and Air Exercises" for the Flight Instructor Syllabus (page 473) and where necessary omit the exercise contents stating – "not to be taught for the LAFI".**

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment.

The Agency will revise the syllabus for the LAFI and the FI training course in order to align the numbering and the content of the syllabus with the syllabus for the LAPL basic training and the PPL training. Your proposal will be taken into consideration when drafting the final text.

comment 5551 comment by: *Chris Gowers*

AMC to FCL.930.LAFI Delete this paragraph and all references to LAFI. There should only be one level of qualification and competency for a FI

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment.

Please refer to the response given to comment No. 2596 in the same segment above.

comment 5670 comment by: *Geschäftsführer Luftsportverband RP*

Zu Recht schreiben Sie gleich am Anfang:

all the subject detail contained in the Ground and Flight Training Syllabus .....should already be known by the applicant.

Der Anwärter hat in einer relativ kurzen Zeit seine Flugstunden gesammelt, um Fluglehrer zu werden. Er hat ein hohes Maß an Können und hat sich vorbereitet. Der eigentliche fliegerische Teil dient nur noch zur Vervollkmmnung vom rechten Sitz aus. Das läßt sich für den LAFI in der von uns vorgeschlagenen Mindestflugzeit von 5 Std erreichen. Wohlgemerkt, es ist eine Mindestangabe und der Erfolg wird durch die Flugprüfung festgestellt. Es wird aber von Anfang an vermieden, dass ein hoher Kostenfaktor die Lehrerausbildung im Luftsport unterbindet.

Die hohen Anforderungen im Augenblick für den JAR-FCL-Lehrer führen ja zur Zeit nachvollziehbar zur quasi Auflösung jeglicher zukünftiger Vereinsschulung im motorgetriebenen Bereich.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer also to the response given to comment No. 1860 in the same segment above.

Regarding the mentioned proposal for a reduction of the training syllabus to only 5 hours of flight instruction, please see the response already provided to your comment on the same issue in the segment for FCL.930.LAFI. The Agency does not agree that 5 hours training would be sufficient but will require at least 12 hours of flight training.

comment 6173

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL.110.A and AMC to FCL.930.LAFI

**Page No:**

224/398

**Comment:**

Exercise Numbers are different from those at AMC to FCL.110.A 2 1

**Justification:**

**Proposed Text:**

**(if applicable)**

Amend AMC to FCL.110.A to match PPL and LAFI exercises.

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing this comment.

The Agency will revise the syllabus for the LAFI and the FI training course in order to align the numbering and the content of the syllabus with the syllabus for the LAPL basic training and the PPL training. Your proposal will be taken into consideration when drafting the final text.

comment 6679

comment by: Icelandic CAA

It is proposed to remove this AMC since the LAFI requirements are not in accordance with ICAO Annex 1 standards.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 2596 above.

comment	<p>7099</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>Peter Holland</i></p> <p>AMC to FCL930.LAFI</p> <p>Surely LAFI should be taken only from PPL holders not LPL holders!?</p> <p>Otherwise what is the difference between holding an LPL or a PPLI?</p> <p>At FCL.200.A &amp; FCL.200.H - PPL(A/H) Privileges it clearly states that a PPL may only receive remuneration when providing instruction for the LPL or PPL. This same privilege is NOT given in FCL.100.A nor FCL.100.H - LPL(A/H) Privileges.</p> <p>Also, why restrict a LAFI to instruction for LPL only? Why not include PPL as well even if limited to weight/capacity? If a student starts training for an LPL but part way through decides to go for the full PPL, a LAFI conducting the training and having built a rapport with that student would have to stand down. Also, according to the current wording, all training gained under the LAFI would be voided and the student would have to start over again - this will not encourage potential students to opt for the LPL route, particularly on helicopters!!</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>7099.1 Thank you for providing your opinion. Please remember that also an LPL holder is allowed to train as an LAFI, the only difference to a PPL holder is that he is not allowed to give training for remuneration.</p> <p>7099.2 Thank you for this comment. The Agency has no intention to refrain from fulfilling FCL.915 which states that every instructor has to hold the licence for which he or she is giving training.</p>
comment	<p>7233</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>UK CAA</i></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC to FCL.930.LAFI Part 1 section 7</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 400 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The instructor should be aware of the requirements of NTS training but he needs to be taught them if he isn't.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Consistency</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Add a new requirement; <i>"Non-Technical Skills"</i></p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment. The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, in a separate rulemaking task. We suggest that you submit a rule-making proposal on this issue to the Agency.</p>



comment	<p>7438</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>Jaime Stewart</i></p> <p>As regards hot-air balloons, the BBAC preference is that the instructor training course should be broken down so that rather than having to undergo 30 hours of classroom study concentrating on theory of teaching and learning, applicants should undertake 15 hours of classroom work, after which they would be permitted to train PUTs to a certain level, and then do another 15 hours in the classroom before being allowed to train to a higher level.</p> <p>This BBAC suggestion is appropriate, since 30 hours in a classroom focusing on theory of teaching and learning rather than theory of ballooning is disincentivising for potential instructors. Different people learn and teach in different ways, and the old adage springs to mind - "Tell me and I'll forget; show me and I'll remember; involve me and I'll understand." Although an element of classroom theory is clearly necessary the efficacy of such intense concentration on it is arguable in this kind of subject.</p> <p>The division into 2 types of instructor and only allowing one (FI) to instruct for the BPL also complicates matters unnecessarily. The difference should only be that whereas an FI can be paid, a LAFI cannot.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 2611 above.</p>
comment	<p>7519</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>Graham PHILPOT</i></p> <p>For Balloon category this regeme is excessive and will not improve flying safety. A maximum of two instruction flights observed by an Examiner should be adequate for someone to start giving instruction, the ultimate quality check is done by the Examiner in the 'Flight Test'.</p> <p>This seems to be following the addage "The aircraft doesn't fly until the weight of the paperwork equals the weight of the aircraft" or people trying to create jobs and restrict GA flying in all categories</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 2611 above.</p>
comment	<p>7705</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>BBAC 6824</i></p> <p>Balloon Instructors.</p> <p>The number of hours of classroom instruction is excessive. Some training of PUTs should be allowed as part of the course, mid-way through the classroom training. This way, the trainee instructor can return to the course with constructive feedback for practical improvement.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 2611 above.</p>

comment	7706	comment by: <i>BBAC 6824</i>
	Balloon instructors: There is no reason why a LAFI and FI cannot instruct for both LPL and BPL.	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 2611 above.	
comment	7977	comment by: <i>Graham HALLETT</i>
	The need for a mandatory 30 hours of classroom time for theoretical knowledge and instructor techniques for the LAFI(B) seems excessive. Moreover, there seems no method for recognition of any existing knowledge that applicants (for any instructor rating) may have. Surely, providing they can demonstrate they have the requisite knowledge, this should be sufficient.	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	Thank you for providing this comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 2611 above.	
comment	8303	comment by: <i>Paul Mc G</i>
	Flight instruction for the leisure pilot (sailplanes) and the Sailplane pilot licence P 40 -441 AMC TO FCL.930.LAFI Light Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course PART 2 C. Sailplanes	
	The exercise numbers do not match	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	Thank you for providing your opinion.	
	The Agency agrees that the numbering of the syllabus for the basic training (LPL/SPL) was different from the one used for the LAFI(S) and FI(S) course. This was mainly based on the fact that the exercises stalling and spinning were differently treated.	
	Reviewing all the comments received and taking also into account the input received from the sailplane licensing experts, the Agency decided to stay with the proposal and not to introduce fully developed spins for the basic training of the sailplane pilot (LAPL(S) and SPL). The Agency will therefore keep the exercise "fully developed spins" only for the LAFI and FI. In order to follow your proposal and to align the syllabus for the licence and the syllabus for the instructor course, the Agency will add the item "fully developed spins" in exercise 10.	
	The numbering of the LAPL(S) syllabus and the LAFI syllabus will be aligned.	

<b>Flight Instruction Syllabus Contents - A. Aeroplanes</b>
---

comment	5199	comment by: Paul Morrison
---------	------	---------------------------

The proposal requires that pupils must be taught the correct procedure for a safe parachute landing. Unless the club has suitably qualified instructors or has a training arrangement with a parachute centre, how can this be complied with and will at the very least, result in an increase in costs.

response	Noted
----------	-------

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the Agency cannot see a problem with the content of this exercise as every LAFI(S) or FI(S) will receive the necessary knowledge during the instructor course to provide this instruction exercise. The Agency is of the opinion that if a parachute is used (and this is the case in most Member States in sailplanes), the student pilots should receive training in order to know how to use such a safety device and how to land safely with the parachute.

comment	6220	comment by: UK CAA
---------	------	--------------------

**Paragraph:**  
**AMC to FCL.930.LAFI Part 2 A**

**Page No:**  
 402

**Comment:**  
 11A appears to be missing.

**Justification:**  
 Note is inconsistent with list of exercises.

**Proposed Text:**  
**(if applicable)**  
 What is 11A? Does it need to be added?

response	Not accepted
----------	--------------

The Agency acknowledges your comment. Please remember that in the training syllabus for LPL(A) there is no exercise 11A foreseen only exercise 11. For the helicopter, the contents of exercise 11A are included into exercise 11 of the LAFI Syllabus.

comment	6222	comment by: UK CAA
---------	------	--------------------

**Paragraph:**  
 AMC to FCL.930.LAFI

**Page No:**  
 419

**Comment:**  
 LPL Exercise 17C – GPS/VDF is not in LAFI syllabus.

**Justification:**  
 LAFIs must be taught to teach all LPL exercises.

**Proposed Text:**  
**(if applicable)**  
 Add Ex 18C GPS/VDF to long brief and air exercise syllabus.

response	Accepted
----------	----------

Thank you for providing this comment.  
The Agency agrees that this exercise is missing. Your proposal will be taken into consideration when drafting the final text.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC to FCL.930.LAFI Light - Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course - p. 422-440 Flight Instruction Syllabus Contents - B. Helicopters**

comment 423 comment by: *Rod Wood*

Although IF is not part of the LAFI, the helicopter syllabus standard exercise numbering should be adopted thus Exercise 27 becomes Instrument Flying and Exercise 28 Night flying. Nevertheless see comment against LAFI/H instructors. There should be no such instructor category in helicopters. Only full PPL/H instructors should be considered as a minimum level FI(H) category.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your comment. Please refer to the response given to comment no 6564 in this segment.

comment 438 comment by: *Rod Wood*

Re-number Exercise 27 Night Flying to Exercise 28 Night flying. Introduce Exercise 27 Instrument Flying and after Not Applicable. Remove Downwind quickstops from exercise 21. This is a military exercise with no place in a syllabus at this level of competence.

response *Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment. Your proposal to renumber chapter 27 and to add a chapter 28 will not be necessary as there will be a major change on chapter 27. Therefore, please refer to the response given to comment no 6564 in this segment.

Your proposal to remove Downwind quick stops from exercise 21 will not be followed as those exercises are already part of the LPL(H) training syllabus and thus have to be trained also to the instructors.

comment 4214 comment by: *Bristow Academy*

The helicopter flight exercises for the LPL(H) and PPL(H) are the same, the syllabi differing in the instrument flying requirement.

For some reason, the wording of the courses for the LAFI(H) and the FI(H) are not the same. Under Exercise 4 of the LAFI(H) [page 424] the items under "BRIEFING" include "- the look out procedures". However, the equivalent item under Exercise 4 of the FI(H) [page 494] "look out procedures" is NOT included.

There are other examples of differences and it seems the two syllabi should be harmonised. Why are they not identical as it would have saved drafting time?

Exercise 27 (instrument flying) is not included in the LAFI(H) course and the 5 hours IF required for the PPL(H) is not required for the LPL(H). This would

	appear to be correct, however Exercise 28 (night flying) is included but 10 hours IF is required for the Night Rating.
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment.</p> <p>Concerning the look-out procedures, the experts who drafted the syllabus for the LAFI(H) considered it appropriate to add it to Exercise 4 whilst those procedures are included in the FI(H) Syllabus in Exercise 9 on page 497 (the FI(H) syllabus is based on the JAR-FCL wording).</p> <p>There are other differences between the Syllabus for the LAFI(H) and FI(H) which were necessary due to the different licences for which those instructors will give training. Some of them will be reconsidered when drafting the final text. Please refer also to the response given to comment No. 6564 in this segment. Exercises 27 and 28 will not be part of the LAFI syllabus.</p>

comment	<p>6564 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC to FCL.930 LAFI B Helicopters Ex27</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 422 &amp; 439</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> There is not a helicopter night rating for an LPL only a PPL (see FCL 810(b). Night training requires IF instruction prior to night flying and IF is not taught on the LPL or LAFI syllabus therefore night flying should not be included in this syllabus</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Clarification</p> <p><b>Proposed Text:</b> Remove references to night training.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment.</p> <p>The Agency agrees because the Night Rating described in FCL.810 clearly asks for a PPL as the basic licence for holding a night rating. This exercise should be taken out. The LAFI syllabus will be changed.</p>

comment	<p>6565 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC to FCL.930 LAFI B Helicopters Ex27</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 422 &amp; 439</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> There is not a helicopter night rating for an LPL only a PPL (see FCL 810(b). Night training requires IF instruction prior to night flying and IF is not taught on the LPL or LAFI syllabus therefore night flying should not be included in this syllabus</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Clarification</p> <p><b>Proposed Text:</b></p>
---------	--

	Remove references to night training.
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment. This seems to be a copy of your comment No. 6564, therefore please refer to the response to comment No. 6564 above.</p>
comment	<p>6586 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC to FCL.930 LAFI B Helicopters Ex 22 Nav Problems at low Heights and Poor Visibility</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 437</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Safety working groups in the UK identified that helicopters should consider a precautionary landing as an option in poor weather or visibility and this should be included in the PPL(H) syllabus. LLST(H) included this in NPA 25 to JAR FCL 2 and it is included in the EASA PPL(H). Therefore it should be included in the instructor syllabus.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Standardisation – With the elements to be taught on the PPL(H) syllabus. Safety</p> <p><b>Proposed Text:</b> Add new line: - appropriate recce procedures and choice of a precautionary landing area.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment. Your proposal will be taken into consideration when drafting the final text. The exercise item "precautionary landing" will also be added in the LAPL(H) syllabus.</p>

<p><b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC to FCL.930.LAFI Light - Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course -</b></p> <p><b>Flight Instruction Syllabus Contents - C. Sailplanes</b></p>	<p>p. 440-458</p>
---	-------------------

comment	<p>30 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>British Gliding Association</i></span></p> <p>Page 442 <b>EXERCISE 2 - PROCEDURE IN THE EVENT OF EMERGENCIES</b> BRIEFING <u>NPA Proposal</u> - explain the procedure for landing with a parachute...etc</p> <p><i>Comment:</i> <i>This would require access to a qualified parachute instructor.</i></p> <p><b><u>BGA Proposal</u></b> - explain how to obtain guidance for landing with a parachute...etc</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment.</p>

However, the Agency has not proposed to create such a category of "parachute instructor" and does not envisage doing so.

The item "explain the procedure for landing with a parachute" has to be done verbally and can be done by the sailplane instructor. This has to be seen in the context of the whole exercise. If you agree that the instructor should explain the bailout procedure, he/she should also tell the student pilot how to use a parachute (if worn) - otherwise it will be useless. As the landing is a part of this emergency action, it should be also explained.

If in your opinion such a "parachute instructor" is necessary for this verbal explanation of this procedure, nobody prevents the organiser of such an instructor course to invite such an expert. However, the future European system does not recognise such a specific instructor category. Every sailplane instructor will be able to provide this training and instruction.

The text will not be changed as this seems to be an essential item which should be kept.

comment

31

comment by: *British Gliding Association*

Page 444

NPA Proposal**Exercise 6 - BANKING AT MODERATE ANGLE - COORDINATION***Comment:**Exercise name is misleading.***BGA Proposal*****Exercise title should be:******Exercise 6 - CO-ORDINATED ROLLING TO AND FROM MODERATE ANGLES OF BANK*****Throughout*****References to 'straight and level flight' should be replaced with 'straight flight'*****BGA Proposal*****AIR EXERCISE***

...

***- rolling to a moderate angle of bank (20 to 30o) and returning to straight flight***

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees and will amend the text accordingly.

comment

33

comment by: *British Gliding Association***AMC to FCL.930.LAFI****Light Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course****C. Sailplanes***Comments:****1. There is a mis-match between the list, on page 440/1:***

**LONG BRIEFINGS AND AIR EXERCISES**

and the note on page 452:

**EXERCISE 13 - SOARING TECHNIQUES:**

"NOTE: If the weather conditions during the instructor training do not allow the practical training of soaring techniques, all items of the air exercises have to be discussed and explained during a long briefing exercise only."

2. In common with other maritime nations, the UK has several coastal gliding clubs where thermal flying is available only intermittently.

**BGA Proposal**

The list on page 440/1 should read:

**13 Soaring Techniques (if applicable during training and if possible at training site)**

**13A Thermalling**

**13B Ridge flying**

**13C Wave flying**

response

Partially accepted

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees and will amend the text accordingly.

However, it should also be mentioned that for the basic training of student pilots the Agency does not agree and considers that at least one of the three soaring techniques should be taught. "Thermalling" as one of the main elements of sailplane operations should be instructed if possible since it will be an important element for future activities of the pilot and there are certain safety-related procedures and techniques (e.g. joining a thermal/flying together with other sailplanes in a thermal/collision avoidance) which should be taught if possible not only by explaining and discussing them on a theoretical basis. Taking all the comments (but only from one Member State) into account, the Agency decided to allow also the training of one of the other soaring techniques instead. Please see the amended text in the AMC material for subpart B.

comment

34

comment by: *British Gliding Association*

page 456

**EXERCISE 18 - CROSS COUNTRY FLYING****NPA Proposal**

NOTE: If the weather conditions during the instructor training do not allow a cross country training flight the items of the air exercise have to be discussed and explained during a long briefing exercise only.

*Comment:*

*Safety data indicate that there is a need for instructors who teach and test for competency in outlandings to demonstrate a practical ability to do so.*

**BGA Proposal**

**Add a second sentence to the note:**

**Instructors may only teach or test the safe outlanding exercise after they have demonstrated a practical ability to do so.**

response

Partially accepted

Thank you for providing your opinion.



The Agency agrees and will amend the text accordingly (it will be added in the exercise 16 "Outlandings" but the term "or test" will be deleted).

comment

69

comment by: *British Gliding Association*

**AMC TO FCL.110.S AND TO FCL.210.S  
FLIGHT INSTRUCTION FOR THE LEISURE PILOT (SAILPLANE) AND THE  
SAILPLANE LICENCE (SPL)**

**3. SYLLABUS OF FLIGHT INSTRUCTION**

Exercise 10: Spin recognition and avoidance

Page 243

**&**

**AMC to FCL.930.LAFI**

**Light Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course**

**PART 2 C. Sailplanes**

Page 441

Note: Although exercise 11B is not required for the LPL course, it is a requirement for the LAFI course.

*Comment:*

*UK gliding experience is that full spinning must be included in each syllabus.*

*Proposal:*

*On page 243:*

*Exercise 10: Spin recognition and avoidance and developed spins*

- *safety checks*
- *stalling and recovery at the incipient spin stage (stall with excessive wing drop, about 45deg)*
- *Instructor induced distractions during the spin entry*
- *entry into fully developed spins*
- *recognition of full spins*
- *standard spin recovery*

*On page 441*

*Delete the note*

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The original proposal not to include the fully developed spin was based on the input received from gliding experts during the drafting phase. These experts informed the Agency that in certain training organisations (or even for certain instructor courses) no sailplane is available with full spinning characteristics.

Based on the fact that the Agency is fully aware of the importance of this exercise (taking into account the fact that stalling/spinning accidents still happen), this issue was discussed again with the licensing experts involved in the drafting. Based on this input, the Agency decided not to accept your proposal and keep the syllabus for the LAPL(S) and SPL training unchanged regarding this issue. The full spinning training will not be part of the basic training of a sailplane pilot but if sailplanes are used for training which allow such an exercise this training should be added. Please see the resulting text for the AMCs to Subpart B and read also the responses provided to the comments in the appropriate segments.

The additional note below the list of exercises for the LAFI training course will

be kept also.

See also response to comment No. 4273 in the same segment below and the responses provided in the segment for AMC to FCL.110.S and FCL.210.S.

comment **949** comment by: *Colin Field (UK Glider Pilot)*

It is absolutely vital to everyone yet to learn to fly, that the requirement for full familiarisation with spin avoidance, recognition and recovery is maintained before the solo standard can be reached. One needs only to look back at glider accident records over the last 10 years to see how many have been caused by inadvertant spinning, particularly on approach, or in turbulent conditions near a ridge.

If pupils are not fully taught about the dangers of spinning and how to avoid it, it will severely increase the number of spin-related accidents, and therefore drastically reduce safety.

response *Noted*

Please see response already provided to comment No. 39 (BGA).

comment **1364** comment by: *George Knight*

References to straight & level flight in gliders should be replaced with straight flight. Gliders are rarely able to maintain level flight.

response *Accepted*

Please see response already provided to comment No. 31 (BGA).

comment **1489** comment by: *Andrew Sampson*

Item 12 should include Bungy launch is available at the relevant location. Note many gliding clubs are "winch-only" or "aerotow only" and thus will not be able to offer training in both launch types.

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

As most all the flights during such an instructor course will be dual flights and the text for exercise 12 (page 449 of the NPA) clearly says that one of the four mentioned launch methods is sufficient, the Agency cannot see a need to include also the bungee launch.

It is questionable if a bungee launch is the right launch method to be taught during such an instructor course.

comment **2483** comment by: *derekheaton*

page 442  
Exercise 2

The instructor is not likely to have been specifically trained in parachute landing but he should be able to explain how to obtain guidance on landing with a parachute.

response	<i>Noted</i> Please see response already provided to comment No. 30 (BGA).
comment	2484 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>derekheaton</i></span> page 444 exercise 6 a better title would be "CO ORDINATED ROLLING TO AND FROM MODERATE ANGLES OF BANK"
response	<i>Accepted</i> Please see response already provided to comment No. 31 (BGA).
comment	2485 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>derekheaton</i></span> Page 456 Exercise 18 field (out ) landings have specific safety risks associated with them. Only Instructors who have the relevant experience of having carried out a successful field landing should be permitted to teach and test this aspect of cross country flying.
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see response already provided to comment No. 34 (BGA).
comment	3533 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>James Clarke</i></span> Instructors who teach and test for competency in outlandings must demonstrate a practical ability to do so themselves. This is not a skill that can be taught based on theory.
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see response already provided to comment No. 34 (BGA).
comment	4154 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Claudia Buengen</i></span> Exercise 2 - emergencies procedures:  While it is certainly helpful to know in theory how to bail out of a sailplane and how to use the parachute in an emergency, I would like to see more information on how this is going to be taught. If this training is based on a set of theoretical instructions that can be taught by gliding instructors to gliding instructors and students, then this is a sensible approach.  However, if a parachute instructor is required to teach these aspects of the training this would present insurmountable logistical problems and would increase the cost of glider pilot training.
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see response already provided to comment No. 30 (BGA).

comment	<p><b>4155</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Claudia Buengen</i></span></p> <p>Exercise 6: Banking at moderate angle. slightly misleading terminology. Suggestion: Rolling to and from a moderate angle of bank Also: Several misspellings of rudder as ruder.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see response already provided to comment No. 31 (BGA).</p>
comment	<p><b>4157</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Claudia Buengen</i></span></p> <p>Exercise 11 a and b - spinning</p> <p>I believe that as gliders often fly at speeds not far from their stall speeds, more comprehensive spin training is an essential part of the training syllabus and should be specified in detail.</p> <p>Suggestion: comprehensive, detailed spin training syllabus as currently taught by the BGA in the UK.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see response already provided to comment No. 69 (BGA).</p>
comment	<p><b>4158</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Claudia Buengen</i></span></p> <p>Exercise 13 A - Thermalling</p> <p>This may be difficult to achieve in a country like the UK where thermals are not always present, or in gliding clubs that rely on winch launches as their only launch method.</p> <p>Suggestion: This should not be included in the compulsory flying syllabus but with a theoretical briefing as an alternative training method.</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Please see response already provided to comment No. 33 (BGA).</p>
comment	<p><b>4159</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Claudia Buengen</i></span></p> <p>Exercise 13 B and C - Ridge flying and Wave flying</p> <p>This may be difficult to achieve in a lot of clubs due to their location and/or airspace restrictions.</p> <p>Suggestion: This should not be included in the compulsory flying syllabus but with a theoretical briefing as an alternative training method.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p>

However, it seems to be based on a misinterpretation as this is the syllabus only for the instructor course.

The Agency does not believe that an instructor course without any of the mentioned contents (wave/thermal/ridge) will contain all the necessary elements but you will find already a note under exercise 13 explaining that if the weather situation does not allow the practical training, all of these soaring techniques have to be discussed intensively.

comment

4273

comment by: *Graham Morris*

It is stated that the exercise 11B (Developed Spins Entry & Recovery) is not required for the LPL(Sailplanes) Course! I have been instructing in Sailplanes for over 30 years and regard this suggestion as Crimminaly Negligent! Please Refer to the well established instructing establishments in the European Member Countries and take advice from those suitably experienced in such matters.

response

*Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your response.

It should be clarified that this proposal (not to put the full spinning exercise in the SPL/LPL syllabus) was based on the input received during the drafting phase from gliding experts representing most of the Member States. These experts proposed not to include such an additional training item "fully developed spin" because of the fact that in certain training organisations or for certain instructor courses no sailplane is available to provide the full spinning exercise. The Agency was told that a decision to ask for such an additional mandatory exercise will cause additional burden and costs for these ATOs and that the exercises already included will sufficiently cover this issue.

The Agency is aware of the importance of the stalling and spinning exercises (being informed that stalling/spinning still is one of the main accident causes) and studied the comments (written by the BGA and copied by several other stakeholders but mainly from one Member State only) carefully and further discussed the issue with the experts during the review phase. Finally, it was decided not to accept this proposal and to require a full spinning training only for the instructor course. The syllabus for the SPL and LPL(S) will be kept unchanged and the additional note below the list of exercises for the LAFI training course will be kept.

Please see also the additional responses provided in the appropriate segment for the AMC to FCL.110.S and FCL.210.S.

comment

4393

comment by: *Paul SMITH*

The proposal is the instructors must teach the procedure for landing with a parachute. This would require a qualified parachute instructor at additional cost

response

*Noted*

Please see response already provided to comment No. 30 (BGA).

comment	<p>4624 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Deutscher Aero Club</i></span></p> <p>Page 442  EXERCISE 2 - PROCEDURE IN THE EVENT OF EMERGENCIES BRIEFING  - explain the procedure for landing with a parachute...etc  Comment:  This would require access to a qualified parachute instructor.</p> <p>EGU Proposal:  - explain how to obtain guidance for landing with a parachute...etc</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Please see response already provided to comment No. 30 (BGA).</p> <p>It should be mentioned that this verbal explanation to be given by the instructor during an instructor course is already a normal part of the instructor training in several countries (please check the "Methodik der Segelflugausbildung"). The Agency does not see the problem you are describing but the need that the student pilot receives this explanation given by his/her LAFI or FI(S).</p>
comment	<p>4627 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Deutscher Aero Club</i></span></p> <p>Page 444  NPA Proposa01  Exercise 6 - BANKING AT MODERATE ANGLE – COORDINATION  Comment:  Exercise name is misleading.</p> <p>EGU Proposal  Exercise title should be:  Exercise 6 - CO-ORDINATED ROLLING TO AND FROM MODERATE ANGLES OF BANK  Throughout  References to 'straight and level flight' should be replaced with 'straight flight'</p> <p>EGU Proposal  AIR EXERCISE  ...  - rolling to a moderate angle of bank (20 to 30°) and returning to straight flight</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see response already provided to comment No. 31 (BGA).</p>
comment	<p>4628 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Deutscher Aero Club</i></span></p> <p>AMC to FCL.930.LAFI  Light Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course  C. Sailplanes</p> <p>Comments:  There is a mis-match between the list, on page 440/1:  LONG BRIEFINGS AND AIR EXERCISES  and the note on page 452:</p>

	<p>EXERCISE 13 - SOARING TECHNIQUES:  "NOTE: If the weather conditions during the instructor training do not allow the practical training of soaring techniques, all items of the air exercises have to be discussed and explained during a long briefing exercise only."</p> <p>EGU Proposal  The list on page 440/1 should read:  13 Soaring Techniques (if applicable, during training and, if possible, at training site)  13A Thermalling  13B Ridge flying  13C Wave flying</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Please see response already provided to comment No. 33 (BGA).</p> <p>The Agency does not agree with your proposal that none of the soaring techniques should be taught if the weather does not allow it at a certain operating site but will allow that one of the three techniques will be taught.</p>
comment	<p>4930 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>George Knight</i></span></p> <p>Page 442 - last bullet-point exercise 2: "<i>explain the procedure for landing with a parachute in normal conditions and with a strong wind</i>"</p> <p>Glider pilots do not plan to use their 'chutes and very few instructors or glider pilots will have received appropriate training to teach landings - they simply hope to survive. (Probably only those who have undertaken recreational parachuting or with military backgrounds will have received such training.) In any case most emergency 'chutes in gliders are round and have very limited steering capabilities.</p> <p><b>Suggest:</b>  This point be either deleted or replaced with a suggestion that pupils may want to visit a parachuting school for further information on landings. (Even that is of limited value because virtually all parachute clubs use square canopies for both main and reserve rigs and will not be familiar with round chutes for glider pilots.)</p> <p>Glider pilots use round 'chutes because they are simple to use and do NOT need the training proposed. Square 'chutes can be lethal if used by untrained pilots.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Please see response already provided to comment No. 30 (BGA).</p>
comment	<p>5080 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>George Knight</i></span></p> <p>P 444  Exercise 6 - Objective</p> <p>Spelling of Rudder.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p>

Thank you for identifying this editorial mistake.

comment **5084** comment by: *George Knight*

P 445  
Exercise 7 Briefing  
**"-explain airspeed limitations (Vne)"**

**Propose**

Other limitations including max. manoeuvring speed, max. rough air and flap limiting speeds (many gliders have these) should be covered.

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees in general that all the mentioned items should be covered but will delete only "(Vne)" and will add "different" (in front of airspeeds) in order to make clear that all the different airspeed limitations should be explained.

comment **5086** comment by: *George Knight*

P 450  
Exercise 12 B

**Comment**

The briefing and exercise do not adequately address the case of the sailplane's air-brakes or tail parachute becoming open / deployed during an aerotow launch. This is not usually a cause for abandonment.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees that these and some other mishaps (like opening canopies) can cause an abandonment of the launch. As this is already covered in the air exercise mentioning "the procedure in case of abandonment", the Agency will add the item "reasons for launch abandonment and procedures".

comment **5091** comment by: *George Knight*

P 452  
Add  
Exercise 12 D - Bungee Launch

response *Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see the response provided to comment No. 1489 (A. Sampson) in the same segment above.

comment **5095** comment by: *George Knight*

P 455



Exercise 16 - Advanced Turning  
Objective.

**Comment**

30-40 degrees of bank is not a steep turn in a glider - this is the normal range of angles of bank for thermalling. A tight turn is between 45 and 60 degrees.

**Propose**

Rephrase to state **45-60** degrees

response

*Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, based on the fact that during the drafting phase the gliding experts requested not to put more than 45° bank in here, the Agency will follow your proposal only partly and will introduce 45° bank but not mention 60° bank. As this is only the minimum course content for the instructor course some additional exercises will be added anyway.

comment

5099

comment by: *George Knight*

Page 457  
Exercise 18  
-how to maintain track...

**Comment**

This seems to have come from the power world where aircraft fly in straight lines. Gliders rarely attempt to fly directly to a destination or turning point except when on final glide, they fly tactically towards areas of lift in the general direction of the next waypoint or their destination.

Propose.  
Re-phrase to "-how to perform a final glide"

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

As the final glide is clearly not meant here (because the title of this exercise is "In-Flight Navigation" and the "final glide" is already mentioned in exercise 18C), the proposed term is clearly not the right wording.

As "maintaining track" could also generally mean the track towards the next turning point (always new to be calculated from a certain position before leaving a thermal), the Agency does not see a real need for a change.

comment

5601

comment by: *Belgian Gliding Federation*

Page 442  
**EXERCISE 2 - PROCEDURE IN THE EVENT OF EMERGENCIES**  
**BRIEFING**  
- explain the procedure for landing with a parachute...etc

**Comment:**

*This would require access to a qualified parachute instructor.*

	<p><b><u>Proposal:</u></b>  <b>- explain how to obtain guidance for landing with a parachute...etc</b></p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Please see response already provided to comment No. 30 (BGA).</p> <p>It should be mentioned that this verbal explanation to be given by the instructor during an instructor course is already a normal part of the instructor training in several countries. The Agency does not see the problem but the need to provide the student with some information and explanation.</p>

comment	<p>5602 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Belgian Gliding Federation</i></span></p> <p><i>Page 444</i>  <u>NPA Proposal</u>  <b>Exercise 6 - BANKING AT MODERATE ANGLE - COORDINATION</b></p> <p>Comment:  Exercise name is misleading.</p> <p><b><u>Proposal</u></b>  <b>Exercise title should be:</b>  <b>Exercise 6 - CO-ORDINATED ROLLING TO AND FROM MODERATE ANGLES OF BANK</b>  <b><u>Throughout</u></b>  References to 'straight and level flight' should be replaced with 'straight flight'</p> <p><b><u>EGU Proposal</u></b>  <b>AIR EXERCISE</b>  ...  - rolling to a moderate angle of bank (20 to 30°) and returning to straight flight</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see response already provided to comment No. 31 (BGA).</p>

comment	<p>5603 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Belgian Gliding Federation</i></span></p> <p><b>AMC to FCL.930.LAFI</b>  <b>Light Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course</b>  <b>C. Sailplanes</b></p> <p>Comments:  There is a mis-match between the list, on page 440/1:  <b>LONG BRIEFINGS AND AIR EXERCISES</b>  and the note on page 452:  <b>EXERCISE 13 - SOARING TECHNIQUES:</b>  "NOTE: If the weather conditions during the instructor training do not allow the practical training of soaring techniques, all items of the air exercises have to be discussed and explained during a long briefing exercise only."</p> <p><b><u>EGU Proposal</u></b></p>
---------	---

***The list on page 440/1 should read:  
13 Soaring Techniques (if applicable, during training and, if possible, at training site)  
13A Thermalling  
13B Ridge flying  
13C Wave flying***

response *Partially accepted*

Please see response already provided to comment No. 33 (BGA).

comment

6050

comment by: *Phil King*

AMC to FCL.930.LAFI  
Light Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course  
PART 2 C. Sailplanes  
Page 441  
Note: Although exercise 11B is not required for the LPL course, it is a requirement for the LAFI course.

I would very likely have been killed in 1971 by spinning into a hillside while ridge soaring if I had been trained on this syllabus. I recovered from a full spin and avoided hitting the hillside by a margin of about 20m. My wife and brother-in-law have had similar near-death experiences. In my view it is essential to include recovery from a full spin in the syllabus. I support the BGA proposal:

*On page 441  
Delete the note*

response *Not accepted*

Please see response already provided to comment No. 69 (BGA).

comment

6068

comment by: *Martyn Johnson*

The list on page 440/1 should include Thermalling, ridge soaring, wave flying.

response *Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.

However, as all three are included in the list on page 441, the Agency does not understand the reasoning of this comment. It might be a copy of the BGA comment No. 33 in this segment but it is missing the point. Please check the response provided to that BGA comment.

comment

6659

comment by: *Oxford Gliding Club*

The proposal is the instructors must teach the procedure for landing with a parachute. This would require a qualified parachute instructor at additional cost.

response *Noted*

Please see response already provided to comment No. 30 (BGA).

It should be mentioned that this verbal explanation to be given by the

instructor during an instructor course is already a normal part of the instructor training in several countries. The Agency does not see the problem but the need to provide the student later with some information and explanation.

comment **6703** comment by: *Croft Brown*

Page 442  
 EXERCISE 2 - PROCEDURE IN THE EVENT OF EMERGENCIES  
 BRIEFING  
 NPA Proposal  
 - explain the procedure for landing with a parachute...etc  
 Comment:  
 This would require access to a qualified parachute instructor.  
 Croft Brown endorses the BGA Proposal  
 - explain how to obtain guidance for landing with a parachute...etc

response *Not accepted*

Please see response already provided to comment No. 30 (BGA).

It should be mentioned that this verbal explanation to be given by the instructor during an instructor course is already a normal part of the instructor training in several countries. The Agency does not see the problem but the need to provide the student with some information and explanation.

comment **6704** comment by: *Croft Brown*

Page 444  
 NPA Proposal  
 Exercise 6 - BANKING AT MODERATE ANGLE – COORDINATION  
 Comment:  
 Exercise name is misleading.  
 BGA Proposal  
 Exercise title should be:  
 Exercise 6 - CO-ORDINATED ROLLING TO AND FROM MODERATE ANGLES OF BANK  
 Throughout  
 References to straight and level flight should be replaced with straight flight  
 Croft Brown endorses the BGA Proposal  
 AIR EXERCISE  
 ...  
 - rolling to a moderate angle of bank (20 to 30o) and returning to straight flight

response *Accepted*

Please see response already provided to comment No. 31 (BGA).

comment **6706** comment by: *Croft Brown*

AMC to FCL.930.LAFI  
 Light Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course  
 C. Sailplanes

Comments:

1. There is a mis-match between the list, on page 440/1:

## LONG BRIEFINGS AND AIR EXERCISES

and the note on page 452:

## EXERCISE 13 - SOARING TECHNIQUES:

"NOTE: If the weather conditions during the instructor training do not allow the practical training of soaring techniques, all items of the air exercises have to be discussed and explained during a long briefing exercise only."

2. In common with other maritime nations, the UK has several coastal gliding clubs where thermal flying is available only intermittently.

Croft Brown endorses the BGA Proposal

The list on page 440/1 should read:

13 Soaring Techniques (if applicable during training and if possible at training site)

13A Thermalling

13B Ridge flying

13C Wave flying

response *Partially accepted*

Please see response already provided to comment No. 33 (BGA).

comment

6707

comment by: *Croft Brown*

page 456

## EXERCISE 18 - CROSS COUNTRY FLYING

NPA Proposal

NOTE: If the weather conditions during the instructor training do not allow a cross country training flight the items of the air exercise have to be discussed and explained during a long briefing exercise only.

Comment:

Safety data indicate that there is a need for instructors who teach and test for competency in outlandings to demonstrate a practical ability to do so.

Croft Brown endorses the BGA Proposal

Add a second sentence to the note:

Instructors may not teach or test the safe outlanding exercise until they have demonstrated a practical ability to do so.

response *Accepted*

Please see response already provided to comment No. 34 (BGA).

comment

6708

comment by: *Croft Brown*

AMC TO FCL.110.S AND TO FCL.210.S

FLIGHT INSTRUCTION FOR THE LEISURE PILOT (SAILPLANE) AND THE SAILPLANE LICENCE (SPL)

## 3. SYLLABUS OF FLIGHT INSTRUCTION

Exercise 10: Spin recognition and avoidance

Page 243

&

AMC to FCL.930.LAFI

Light Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course

PART 2 C. Sailplanes

Page 441

Note: Although exercise 11B is not required for the LPL course, it is a

requirement for the LAFI course.

Comment:

UK gliding experience is that full spinning must be included in each syllabus.

Proposal:

On page 243:

Exercise 10: Spin recognition and avoidance and developed spins

- safety checks

- stalling and recovery at the incipient spin stage (stall with excessive wing drop, about 45deg)

- Instructor induced distractions during the spin entry

- entry into fully developed spins

- recognition of full spins

- standard spin recovery

On page 441

Delete the note

response *Not accepted*

Please see response already provided to comment No. 69 (BGA).

comment

6730

comment by: *Diana King*

Exercise 2 - Procedure in the event of emergencies

Page 442

Comment:

It is impractical for a gliding instructor to be expected to have full competence to brief a student on landing with a parachute. The instructor should instead advise the student on where to find suitable guidance and information.

response *Noted*

Please see response already provided to comment No. 30 (BGA).

It should be mentioned that this verbal explanation to be given by the instructor during an instructor course is already a normal part of the instructor training in several countries. The Agency does not see the problem but the need that the student pilot receives this explanation (and not only information where to find such information on the Internet).

comment

7406

comment by: *David Chapman*

As mentioned before, full spin training is a basic element of competent sailplane pilots licence, no matter which specific qualification. This is not aerobatics.

response *Noted*

Please see response already provided to comment No. 69 (BGA).

comment

7841

comment by: *Dick Dixon*

See my previous comments regarding spin training in gliders. In my opinion it is vital as a protection for glider pilots following solo - and indeed for future gliding instructors - that they learn to recognise the symptoms of a developing and full spin and are therefore equipped to take rapid and decisive correct

	action should a spin inadvertently occur.
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see response already provided to comment No. 69 (BGA).
comment	<b>8039</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Andy Balkwill</i></span> I refer to my comment 8033 above regarding the importance of full spinning being included in training of glider pilots.
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see response already provided to comment No. 69 (BGA).
comment	<b>8300</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Paul Mc G</i></span> Although exercise 11B is not required for the LPL course, it is a requirement for the LAFI course. Why?  NPA Proposal Full spinning is not included But the BGA response is not bad. UK gliding experience and safety data is that full spinning must be included in each syllabus. The BGA is very keen to see the requirement for full spin training to be retained for LPL(S) & SPL! Exercise 10: Spin recognition and avoidance and developed spins - safety checks - stalling and recovery at the incipient spin stage (stall with excessive wing drop, about 45deg) - Instructor induced distractions during the spin entry - entry into fully developed spins - recognition of full spins - standard spin recovery but please add "spinning off the wire" and unusual situations.
response	<i>Not accepted</i> Please see response already provided to comment No. 69 (BGA).
comment	<b>8304</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Paul Mc G</i></span> Exercise 2 - procedure in the event of emergencies briefing NPA Proposal - explain the procedure for landing with a parachute...etc This would require access to a qualified parachute instructor so perhaps the gliding instructor could explain how to land with a parachute, even if it is better usually to glide down!
response	<i>Noted</i> Please see response already provided to comment No. 30 (BGA).  It should be mentioned that this verbal explanation to be given by the instructor during an instructor course is already a normal part of the instructor training in several countries. The Agency does not see the problem but the

need that the student pilot receives this explanation (and not only information where to find such information on the Internet).

comment

8305

comment by: *Paul Mc G*

There is a mis-match between the list, on page 440-1:  
 Long briefings and air exercises and the note on page 452:  
 Exercise 13 - soaring techniques:  
 If the weather conditions do not allow the practical training of soaring techniques what happens?  
 2. The UK has several coastal gliding clubs where thermal flying is available only intermittently.

response

*Noted*

Please see response already provided to comment No. 33 (BGA).

comment

8306

comment by: *Paul Mc G*

Exercise 18 - cross country flying  
 NPA Proposal  
 If the weather conditions during the instructor training do not allow a cross country training flight the items of the air exercise have to be discussed and explained during a long briefing exercise only.

BUT Safety data indicates that instructors who teach and test for competency in outlandings to demonstrate a practical ability so to do.

Or would the following be better

Instructors may only teach or test the safe outlanding exercise after they have demonstrated a practical ability to do so.

Instructors and Examiners have to be treated slight differently and these exercises really do need to be completed. It is probably assumed that more expert pilots moving into these areas already possess the required skills, but it is always possible that a candidate has never met a particular situation and teachers can imperil themselves and pupils in training and really another opportunity should be made available to ensure that the instructors and examiners do have the opportunity to skill themselves fully even if by alternative supervised and examined means?

response

*Noted*

Please see response already provided to comment No. 34 (BGA).

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC to FCL.930.LAFI Light - Aircraft Flight Instructor (LAFI) training course - p. 458-471  
 Flight Instruction Syllabus Contents - D. Balloons**

comment

2597

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

P470

AMC 940 LAFI (a)(2).

**To be completely deleted.****Instructor ratings should NOT be of a lower level than required by ICAO.****Annex 1 FI requirements must be imposed.**



response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, it seems that this comment should have been sent to another segment as this AMC is dealing with the content of the LAFI training course for balloons. As there are no specific ICAO requirements for the training course for balloon instructors, the Agency will not delete this AMC.

The AMC you are referring to is dealing with the refresher course for the LAFI. As it was decided to keep the LAFI certificate, the Agency will also keep this AMC.

comment

3023

comment by: *Richard ALLEN*

This collection of exercises for balloon tuition are sensible, well thought out, and include sufficient safety based information to give a well balanced training programme for a student pilot.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing this positive feedback.

comment

3799

comment by: *Klaus HARTMANN*

Bei den air exercises wird nur davon geschrieben, dass der student instructor unterrichtet werden soll und wie der student instructor dann erklären und vorführen soll. Der wesentlichste Punkt der praktischen Lehrerausbildung wird aber überhaupt nicht erwähnt: Der student instructor soll lernen den Schüler selbst fahren zu lassen statt während einer Ausbildungsfahrt nur selber alles vorzuführen. Der student pilot lernt nur durch selber tun, nicht durch Zusehen oder Zuhören. Selbst mit Anfängern in der ersten Ausbildungsfahrt kann der Lehrer das meiste verbal erklären und den Schüler selbst machen lassen. Diese am häufigsten auftretende Schwierigkeit bei student instructors, dass sie die student pilots nicht selbst fahren lassen wird hier nicht behandelt. In der Prüfung in Appendix 12 wird das aber gefordert mit einem simulierten (oder besser realen Schüler). Daher muß auch in der praktischen Ausbildung von student instructors gefordert werden, dass bei jeder Fahrt ein student pilot (simuliert oder besser real) an Bord sein muß um diesem die Erklärungen zu geben, seine Fragen zu beantworten, ihn fahren zu lassen, seine Fehler zu erkennen und verbal zu korrigieren, wenn nötig etwas vorzuführen und nur einzugreifen wenn Gefahren entstehen könnten. Wenigstens diese Hinweise und Forderungen sollten unbedingt dem 'Flight instruction syllabus contents' vorangestellt werden.

Bei der Ausbildung von instructors muß auch erwähnt werden, dass der Lehrer zu der Erklärung einer Vorgehensweise auch immer die Begründung für diese Vorgehensweise erläutern soll, um das Verständnis der Zusammenhänge herzustellen.

Flight instruction syllabus contents

D. Balloons

In 'Exercise 5: Inflation' wird nach 'cold inflation' der Punkt 'use of restraint line' genannt. Sehr oft sind die einzelnen Punkte nicht in der logischen Reihenfolge innerhalb einer exercise aufgeführt. Allerdings gehört 'use of restraint line' in die vorhergehende exercise 4 'assembly and layout'. (wie bei Kommentar zu AMC to FCL.110.B and to FCL.210.B)

In 'Exercise 11: Use of GNSS (if applicable)' unter 'briefing' und 'air exercise'. Hier sollte der Gebrauch des GPS grundsätzlich ausgebildet werden.

In 'Exercise 16: Landing in different wind conditions' ist kein passenger pre-landing briefing, wie es in AMC No 1 to FCL.205 B (c) Section 4 enthalten ist, aufgeführt. Auch hier sollen student instructors lernen, dass pre-landing briefings zur Ausbildung dazugehören. Daher sollte es auch hier aufgenommen werden.

Vor der Landung sollte der Naturschutz Beachtung finden und erwähnt werden.

In 'Exercise 17: Tethered flight hot air balloon' sollte ergänzt werden '(if tethered flight instructional qualification is required)' siehe Kommentar zu tethered flight in AMC to FCL.110.B and to FCL.210.B

In keiner exercise wird der Umgang mit Flüssiggas erwähnt, einem wichtigen Sicherheitsthema. Auch z.B. das Betanken der Flaschen sollte der Ausbilder ausbilden können und in einer exercise enthalten sein. Das Thema 'Betankung' und 'Umgang mit Flüssiggas' könnte zusammen mit 'regelmäßige Wartungsarbeiten am Ballon' in einer Exercise kombiniert werden (wie auch Kommentar zu AMC to FCL.110.B and to FCL.210.B).

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Regarding your first comment, the Agency agrees with your statement that one of the main elements of the practical training during such an instructor course will be the training to "act as instructor" and not as "pilot flying" which means that he/she should learn to give the student pilot the control of the balloon and to touch the burner or other systems only if verbal explanations or corrections are not suitable or helpful. The Agency tried to clarify this already in the first draft published by using the term: "how to analyse and correct errors" in each exercise. To make this even more clear, the Agency will add the term "of the student pilot" in each exercise.

Please check also the term used for describing the objectives. It says: "Furthermore, the student instructor should learn how to identify student errors and how to correct them properly".

The Agency decided to add the following additional explanation in the first part of this AMC:

"The instructor is normally taking over the role of the student pilot. In the case of the course for the LAFI(B) an additional person holding a BPL or LPL(B) licence or a student pilot for these licences may be on board in order to function as a student pilot under the supervision of the instructor." Based on this no further additional explanation is necessary to describe the way the instructor student should act as his/her role is defined clearly. Please take also into account that instructional techniques considerations are specifically mentioned.

Regarding your second comment concerning the item "use of the restraint line", the Agency agrees and will put it in exercise 4.

As to your comment on the GNSS, the Agency agrees and will make this training item mandatory.

Regarding exercise 16: the Agency will add the term "passenger pre-landing

briefing".

Exercise 17 was deleted from the LPL(B) and BPL syllabus and will be an additional extension of privileges (please see FCL.220.B). The Agency agrees that this extension should not be a mandatory pre-requisite for the instructor. The exercise will be treated the same way as the instructional qualification for the night rating.

The issue of re-fuelling was already addressed in your comment dealing with the BPL/LPL(B) syllabus. The Agency will not introduce a separate exercise for this but will add the item in exercise 1. Please see the resulting text.

comment

7870

comment by: *CAA Finland*

Exercise 19:

LAFI shall not be allowed to give night flight training. Exercise 19 shall be removed.

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, the Agency does not agree with your opinion as the LAFI when having done his/her night rating, having completed the training course for instructors and has passed the skill test should be able to provide training for the licence and also for the night rating. FCL.905.LAFI (d) clearly asks for a demonstration of the ability to instruct for this rating which will ensure that he/she is able to do it.

No justification is provided why the LAFI should not be allowed to provide this night instruction. The Agency will keep the privilege unchanged. This is the reason why the exercise will not be deleted from the training course.

comment

7902

comment by: *Svenska Ballongfederationen*

LAFI – D. Balloons

In exercises where the instructor student is flying it should be allowed to have a student pilot as a live training subject for the instructor student. This makes for a more realistic training exercise. Good flying weather should also be put to good use; therefore it also makes sense to train both the student pilot and the instructor student at the same time. We are not as fortunate with a lot of good weather up here in the northern parts of Europe as might be the case further down south so all opportunities are needed for training both student pilots and student instructors.

Skill tests and proficiency checks should be able to be handled in the manner described in the former paragraph.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please see also the response provided to your similar comment assigned to another segment. The Agency agrees with the approach described and will add the following additional explanation in the first part of the AMC:

"The instructor is normally taking over the role of the student pilot. In the case of the course for the LAFI(B) an additional person holding a BPL or LPL(B) licence or a student pilot for these licences may be on board in order to function as a student pilot under the supervision of the instructor."

The additional comment on the proficiency check or skill test is not understood as this AMC contains only the content of the training course but has nothing to do with any test or check. Please see the responses already provided.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC to FCL.930.FI - FI training course**

p. 471

comment

5750

comment by: *Geschäftsführer Luftsportverband RP*

Es ist mir nach wie vor unerklärlich, warum man für den PPL A Fluglehrer eine so hohe Qualifikation vorschreibt. Der FI(A) ist doch lediglich eine Vorstufe für einen Nerufsfluglehrer , wie Nachtflug, Instrumentenflug, etc

Im Luftsport wurde zu 99 % im VFR-Tagflug geschult. Die hohen Anforderungen lassen nun diesen Lehrer im Luftsport aussterben. Man kann sich leicht ausrechnen, wie dann die Zukunft in den Luftsportvereinen Deutschland sich entwickeln wird: zunächst nur noch Lehrer über 60 Jahre, dann keine Lehrer mehr, dann keine Vereinsflugschüler mehr, später mangels Auslastung keine Vereinsflugzeuge mehr!!

Die Vorschläge für Flugschulen NPA 2008-22 ff sehen doch ebenfalls Vereinfachungen vor, wenn nur bis zum PPL ausgebildet wird.

Deshalb auch hier die dringende Bitte eines Überdenkens: Herabsetzung der Pflicht-Praxisstunden auf 10. Die Fluglehrer-Prüfung ist maßgebend für das Bestehen!! Anrechnung von Ausbildungszeiten eines LAF(A) für den FI(A) von 50 %.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for expressing your concerns for the future of General Aviation, and for your positive view on some of the proposals in NPA 22.

The issue of a reduction of the training hours required during the course was discussed with the licensing experts during the review phase but it was decided to stick to the JAR-FCL requirements. With regards to your last point, giving credit for a LAFI towards an FI, the Agency has already agreed on developing such a crediting system.

comment

6594

comment by: *UK CAA*

**Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL 930 FI (CONTENT)

**Page No:**

471

**Comment:**

The Teaching and Learning Syllabus is at AMC to FCL 930 LAFI

**Justification:**

Clarification

**Proposed Text:**

	Amend text - Part 1, teaching and learning instruction to comply with AMC to FCL.920 and FCL.930 LAFI
response	<i>Partially accepted</i>  Thank you for providing your opinion.  The Agency agrees and will add a reference in this AMC to FCL.930.FI in order to make clear that the text in "Content of the Instructional Techniques" in AMC to FCL.930.LAFI training course, Part 1 Teaching and learning, shall be taken into account.

comment	7027 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span>  <b>Paragraph:</b> AMC to FCL.930.FI <b>Page No*:</b> 471 of 647 <b>Comment:</b> It is stated that the aim of the FI course is to refresh the technical knowledge of the student instructor. In the absence of the requirement for CPL theoretical knowledge to teach PPL, SPL, BPL, and LPL, EASA should consider whether a dedicated FI theoretical knowledge syllabus should be developed which ensures a deeper understanding of the theoretical knowledge subjects than is required of a student in those aircraft categories. <b>Justification:</b> It is generally accepted that to teach a theoretical subject effectively, the instructor must have a deeper understanding of the subject than is required to be taught. The CAA recognises that much of the CPL theoretical knowledge is not relevant to an instructor teaching, for example the PPL, however it is important that the FI has an understanding of the theoretical knowledge syllabus in enough depth to be able to answer effectively and accurately questions from students.
response	<i>Noted</i>  Thank you for providing your feedback.  The Agency rediscussed the issue of the CPL theoretical knowledge for the FI and decided to include these JAR-FCL requirements again.  Based on this decision the main reason for your proposal is not any longer valid and the syllabus for the TK can be kept as proposed.

<b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC to FCL.930.FI - FI training course - A. Aeroplanes</b> <span style="float: right;">p. 472-491</span>
--

comment	1207 <span style="float: right;">comment by: Schäfer</span>
response	<i>Noted</i>  No text provided with this comment.

comment	5554	comment by: <i>Chris Gowers</i>
	<p>Para 5. Components of briefing: 1 Aim, 2 Airmanship 3 Air Exercise content (What, how, whom) 4. Check of understanding.</p> <p>The aim should come first and the principles of flight should have been covered in the long brief and that knowledge only needs to be checked by questioning at the pre-flight brief.</p>	
response	<i>Not accepted</i>	
	<p>Thank you for providing your opinion.</p> <p>The text in Para 5 is already well established as it is taken from JAR-FCL. The Agency has no records indicating that the wording represents a problem, and will consequently keep the text unchanged.</p>	
comment	5560	comment by: <i>Chris Gowers</i>
	<p>Para 5. Components of briefing: 1 Aim, 2 Airmanship 3 Air Exercise content (What, how, whom) 4. Check of understanding. The aim should come first and the principles of flight should have been covered in the long brief and that knowledge only needs to be checked by questioning at the pre-flight brief.</p>	
response	<i>Not accepted</i>	
	<p>See response to the identical comment #5554.</p>	
comment	5564	comment by: <i>Chris Gowers</i>
	<p>Long Briefing Exercise 6 delete "lateral level" insert "wings level"</p> <p>I think that is what is meant by lateral level. Lateral level is not a term usually used in aviation English.</p>	
response	<i>Not accepted</i>	
	<p>The text is taken over from JAR-FCL. The Agency can see no reason to change the text at this stage, in particular considering that this is the only comment.</p>	

<p><b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC to FCL.930.FI - FI training course - B. Helicopters</b></p>	<p>p. 491-506</p>
--	-------------------

comment	439	comment by: <i>Rod Wood</i>
	<p>Throughout the FI(H) Syllabus, the emphasis is on demonstration. Should there not be the aim of "Demonstrate the ability to teach"? or indeed instead of "to demonstrate", just "to teach". It is an instructor course not a basic course where the objective for the student is to demonstrate the ability to complete the various air exercises.</p>	
response	<i>Not accepted</i>	
	<p>The Agency considers this to be covered in the paragraph FI training course - General (b) "Train the student instructor to teach the ground subjects and air exercises".</p> <p>The text in the AMC is well established within the training industry, as it is</p>	

based on the existing text in Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.340 and the associated AMC.

comment

6600

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL.930 FI B Helicopters  
Ex 22 Nav Problems at low Heights and Poor Visibility

**Page No:**

502

**Comment:**

Safety working groups in the UK identified that helicopters should consider a precautionary landing as an option in poor weather or visibility and this should be included in the PPL(H) syllabus.

LLST(H) included this in NPA 25 to JAR FCL 2 and it is included in the EASA PPL(H). Therefore it should be included in the instructor syllabus.

**Justification:**

Standardisation – With the elements to be taught on the PPL(H) syllabus.

Safety

**Proposed Text:**

Add new line:

- appropriate recce procedures and choice of a precautionary landing area.

response

*Partially accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency has decided for clarification to amend the text in AMC to FCL.930.FI - FI Training course, B - Helicopters, Part 2, Exercise 22 - Navigation, under the title "*navigation problems at low heights and reduced visibility*". Add as new last item "Appropriate procedures and choice of landing area for precautionary landing".

In the same way this exercise item will be added for the LAFI(H) training course syllabus.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC to FCL.930.FI - FI training course - E. Balloons**

p. 514

comment

7904

comment by: Svenska Ballongfederationen

FI – E. Balloons

In the exercises where the instructor student is flying it should be allowed to have a student pilot as a live training subject for the instructor student. This makes for a more realistic training exercise. Good flying weather should also be put to good use; therefore it also makes sense to train both the student pilot and the instructor student at the same time. We are not as fortunate with a lot of good weather up here in the northern parts of Europe as might be the case further down south so all opportunities are needed for training both student pilots and student instructors.

Skill tests and proficiency checks should be able to be handled in the manner described in the former paragraph.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for providing this response.

The Agency agrees that the procedure explained makes sense and should be allowed in the case of the training flights for the LAFI or FI(B) certificate.

The Agency will add a sentence in the AMC material for the instructor courses in order to reflect this.

You will also find a similar approach already included in the "Assessment of Competence" for the instructors. Please see AMC No 1 to FCL.930.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC to FCL.940.FI(a)(2) - Flight Instructor (FI)/Instrument Rating Instructor (IRI) refresher seminar** p. 514-515

comment

2518

comment by: *Andrew Kaye*

Both LAFI and FI should be permitted to instruct for both PL and BPL licences as they involve the same skills, the only difference being that a FI can be paid and do it commercially and a LAFI cannot do it on a commercial basis.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for expressing your view.

The comment does not really belong to this segment dealing with the IRI refresher course. However, the Agency's response is anyway that there are substantial differences in the training courses for the LAFI and the FI for the categories aeroplanes and helicopters. Thus, the difference in privileges. For LAFIs and FIs on balloons and helicopters the course content will be the same.

Furthermore, it should be highlighted that as a general requirement (see FCL.915) the instructor has to hold at least the licence and rating for which instruction is to be given. As a consequence, the LAFI holding himself/herself only a LAPL cannot be allowed to provide instruction for the SPL.

comment

3896

comment by: *Luftfahrt-Bundesamt*

AMC to FCL.940.FI(a)(2):

This AMC is a copy of former JAR-FCL requirements and does not reflect new requirements regarding competency based training. (see also our comment on FCL.920).

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency is generally in favour of competency-based training also for instructor courses. It agrees that the entire regime of the instructor requirements is based on the existing regime in JAR-FCL. The Agency thus can see no reason to drastically change this AMC as it was decided and requested by the industry and the authorities to stay as close as possible with JAR FCL. The introduction of competency-based concepts might be a topic for a future rulemaking task.



comment	5472	comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i>
	This AMC is a copy of former JAR-FCL requirements and does not reflect new requirements regarding competency based training.	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	Please see response to Comment #3896.	
comment	6389	comment by: <i>Axel Schwarz</i>
	The seminar must also be applicable to TRIs and SFIs (see FCL.940.TRI and FCL.940.SFI), or the requirement for TRIs and SFIs to attend a refresher seminar should be removed.	
response	<i>Not accepted</i>	
	The text is based on the existing text in JAR-FCL. The Agency sees it highly likely that course contents and focus for FI/IRI-courses and TRI/SFI-courses will be different, as the former mostly instructs for SP Private pilot privileges and SP Instrument Ratings, while the latter group of instructors mainly instruct for professional MP Type Ratings.	
comment	7235	comment by: <i>UK CAA</i>
	<p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC to FCL.940.FI(a)(2) para 5</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 514 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> All instructors should be aware of the non-technical skills training and should have the subject covered as part of the refresher seminar.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Consistency</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Add to the list; "n. update on non-technical skills knowledge"</p>	
response	<i>Not accepted</i>	
	The course content list is taken from JAR-FCL. It covers both Human Factors and Airmanship. It also gives the Authority the option of including any additional topic. The Agency sees no need for an amendment to this list at this stage. The issue of "non-technical skills knowledge" will be part of a future rulemaking task.	
comment	7873	comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i>
	Refresher seminar have a lot in common for all instructors. Limitation for FI and IRI only shall be replaced by general "instructor refresher seminar" and numbering only AMC to FCL.940	
response	<i>Not accepted</i>	
	Please see response to Comment #6389.	

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - GM to FCL.940.FI (a) and FCL.940.LAFI - Flight instructor and Light Aircraft Flight Instructor certificate - Revalidation and renewal form - A. Aeroplanes** p. 515-516

comment	<p>5495 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ECA- European Cockpit Association</i></span></p> <p>Comment: change text in the "proficiency check" below box should be changed as follows:                  .....(Name of applicant) has given proof of flying instructional ability during a proficiency check flight. This was done to <del>my satisfaction</del> <u>required standard</u>.</p> <p>Justification:                  The checks are done to comply with minimum standards, not to satisfy any particular person. It is more accurate to reflect the requirement as to comply with a required standard.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment. The change will be taken into benevolent consideration when drafting the final text.</p>

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - GM to FCL.940.FI (a) and FCL.940.LAFI - Flight instructor and Light Aircraft Flight Instructor certificate - Revalidation and renewal form - B. Helicopters** p. 516-517

comment	<p>5496 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ECA- European Cockpit Association</i></span></p> <p>Comment: change text in the "proficiency check" below box should be changed as follows:                  .....(Name of applicant) has given proof of flying instructional ability during a proficiency check flight. This was done to <del>my satisfaction</del> <u>required standard</u>.</p> <p>Justification:                  The checks are done to comply with minimum standards, not to satisfy any particular person. It is more accurate to reflect the requirement as to comply with a required standard.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment. Your proposal will be taken into consideration when drafting the final text.</p>

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - GM to FCL.940.FI (a) and FCL.940.LAFI - Flight instructor and Light Aircraft Flight Instructor certificate - Revalidation and renewal form - C. Airships** p. 518-519

comment	<p>5497 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ECA- European Cockpit Association</i></span></p>
---------	---

Comment: change text in the "proficiency check" below box should be changed as follows:

.....(Name of applicant) has given proof of flying instructional ability during a proficiency check flight. This was done to ~~my satisfaction~~ required standard.

Justification:

The checks are done to comply with minimum standards, not to satisfy any particular person. It is more accurate to reflect the requirement as to comply with a required standard.

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing this comment. Your proposal will be taken into consideration when drafting the final text.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - GM to FCL.940.FI (a) and FCL.940.LAFI - Flight instructor and Light Aircraft Flight Instructor certificate - Revalidation and renewal form - D. Sailplanes**

p. 519-520

comment 5138

comment by: *Diether Memmert*

Der vorliegende Entwurf, NPA 2008-17a+b+c, verfehlt, was den nichtgewerblichen Teil auf dem Sektor Segelflug und TMG (recreational aviation) angeht, in einigen Punkten seine originäre Aufgabe, nämlich Sicherheit **gegenüber Dritten unter Beachtung der Verhältnismäßigkeit** zu gewährleisten.

Mehr Sicherheit wird nicht durch weitere Überprüfungen, Auflagen und bloße Behauptungen erreicht.

In den Flugvereinen des DAeC wurde eine vorbildliche Leistung mit gutem Sicherheitsstandard bei Ausbildung, In-Übunghaltung, sowie Weiterbildung von Piloten und Fluglehrern in weitgehend ehrenamtlicher Tätigkeit erbracht. Dies sollte sicherlich für die gesamte EU als Richtschnur dienen können.

Es ist eben nicht richtig, daß ein System, das sicherlich im gewerblichen Bereich seine Gültigkeit hat, auch einfach dem Freizeitsport übergestülpt werden kann.

Der vorgeschlagene verwaltungstechnische Überbau (FIE, ATO, Beschränkung der Gültigkeit mit periodischer fliegerischer Überprüfung, etc.) ist unnötig und kostet die Piloten (aus ihrer Tasche!) nur zusätzliche Gebühren. Diese Mittel fehlen dann für Erlangung von mehr Flugpraxis. Diese war aber schon immer das wirkungsvollste Mittel zum Erhalt ausreichender Flugsicherheit!

Das vorliegende Formular ist ueberzogen und gehoert entsprechend meiner Einwendungen in den vorherigen Kapiteln ueberarbeitet.

Dipl.-Ing. TU Diether Memmert, Segelflugpilot seit 1953 mit >8500 Flugstunden

**Aenderungen:**

Formular entsprechend ueberarbeiten

response *Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion. Please refer to the responses given to the relevant comments in Subpart J.

As no explanation is provided regarding the kind of change you would like to have included, the Agency is not able to verify your input or to change something.

comment 5498 comment by: ECA- European Cockpit Association

Comment: change text in the "proficiency check" below box should be changed as follows:

.....(Name of applicant) has given proof of flying instructional ability during a proficiency check flight. This was done to ~~my satisfaction~~ required standard.

Justification:

The checks are done to comply with minimum standards, not to satisfy any particular person. It is more accurate to reflect the requirement as to comply with a required standard.

response Accepted

Thank you for providing this comment. Your proposal will be taken into consideration when drafting the final text.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - GM to FCL.940.FI(a) and FCL.940.LAFI - Flight instructor and Light Aircraft** p. 520-521  
**Flight Instructor certificate - Revalidation and renewal form - E. Balloons**

comment 1265 comment by: Günter End

Stundenanforderungen sind in Ordnung. Eine Mindestforderung für die letzten 12 Monate sollte unterbleiben.

response Noted

Thank you for providing your opinion.

However, it seems that your comment should have been addressed another segment. This GM contains the revalidation and renewal form for the LAFI.

As no specific requirements like the ones mentioned by you are contained, the Agency is not able to provide a substantiated response.

comment 5499 comment by: ECA- European Cockpit Association

Comment: change text in the "proficiency check" below box should be changed as follows:

.....(Name of applicant) has given proof of flying instructional ability during a proficiency check flight. This was done to ~~my satisfaction~~ required standard.

Justification:

The checks are done to comply with minimum standards, not to satisfy any particular person. It is more accurate to reflect the requirement as to comply with a required standard.

response Accepted

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency agrees with your proposal. The change will be taken into consideration when drafting the final text. A reference to the required standard will be introduced.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC  
No 1 to FCL.930.TRI - TRI training course - aeroplanes**

p. 521-523

comment

266

comment by: *Michel Lacombe AF TRTO*

Synthetic device training :

TRI only checked on a simulator will be allowed to perform all the normal operations (line training of ZFTT type rating and simulator sessions), so in this training we need to make a difference between these TRI(a) (restraint) and the TRI(a) checked to perform the base training.

For safety reason we have in companies to restraint these type of population as in A320 to B 747 as these kind of exercises are certainly the most dangerous in term of image in an accident case.

So we have to think the TRI training with these two populations.

**New text :**

**SYNTHETIC DEVICE TRAINING**

4 The applicant for a TRI(A) certificate should be taught and made familiar with the device, its limitations, capabilities and safety features, and the instructor station.

5 An applicant for a TRI(A) certificate, should be taught and made familiar with giving instruction from the instructor station.

6 In addition, an applicant for a TRI(A) certificate before being checked for the delivery of base training, should be taught and made familiar with giving instruction from the seat normally occupied by the copilot, including demonstrations of appropriate handling exercises.

7 Courses should be developed in order to give the applicant experience in training a variety of exercises, covering both normal and abnormal operations. The syllabus should be tailored appropriate to the aircraft type, using exercises considered more demanding for the student. This should include engine out handling and engine out operations in addition to representative exercises from the type transition course.

8 The applicant should be required to plan, brief, train and debrief sessions using all relevant training techniques.

9 At the completion of the training on the synthetic device the applicant should be required to pass a formal test demonstrating all of the competencies listed in FCL.920.

response

*Partially accepted*

Thank you for your comment.

The text has been amended partially as proposed.

comment

2294

comment by: *Ryanair***Comment**

The function of a TRI (A) Un-restricted in an airline is to conduct required aircraft training with type rating students. Therefore such TRIs never conduct aircraft training other than in the circuit for the required minimum take-offs and landings.

The synthetic device training required in the Aircraft Training section of the TRI course is very similar to the simulator training that a Line Training Captain should receive prior to aircraft training as LTC. The qualified LTC then conducts line training with pilots who have had, perhaps, only six touch and gos and 170hrs flying. This line training activity is the perfect preparation for an un-restricted TRI in an airline.

It would be efficient if the synthetic device training for both qualifications could be combined. Thus an LTC could be trained as per the STD requirements in the TRI course and this training would be credited at a later date if the LTC was put forward for TRI(A) un-restricted.

**Proposal**

At the end of paragraph 9 (a) state: -

No course running order is stipulated. This synthetic device training may be completed as part of, or combined with another course.

response

*Noted*

There is nothing that prevents the course from being combined, as long as all the content is covered. The Agency considers that the addition you propose is not necessary.

comment

2295

comment by: *Ryanair***Comment**

In the CONTENT section the course is broken into two parts. Part 2 comprises both simulator and aircraft training. This implies that Part 2 must be completed in full. In the context of ATO and Airline training procedures and requirements, very few restricted privilege TRIs go forward to be un-restricted TRIs. It would be preferable to create a break between the simulator qualification and progress to the aircraft training phase.

**Proposal 1**

Add to paragraph 8 the following: -

No further training required as Restricted Privilage TRI.

OR

**Proposal 2**

Content

	<p>The course consists of 3 parts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Part 1, that should comply with AMC to FCL.920</li> <li>- Part 2, that consists of Synthetic Device Training</li> <li>- Part 3, that consists of Aircraft Training</li> </ul> <p>Training for Restricted Privilege TRIs ceases on completion of Parts 1 and 2.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment. The text has been amended to better reflect the structure proposed in the rule.</p> <p>As for your proposal to separate the simulator training from the aircraft training, the Agency does not agree. In the view of the Agency, the whole content of the course needs to be completed by the TRI, either in simulators, or in the aircraft. The rule will furthermore specify that the TRI who has conducted the assessment of competence in a simulator will receive the TRI certificate restricted to instruction in simulators.</p>
comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>2389</p> <p>Comment: This is another difference with JARFCL, which requires these instructors to be specially approved by the authority for this purpose. However, taking into account the new system that will be created by the implementing rules on management systems, it is considered preferable to have the nomination of these instructors made by the training organisation, and controlled by their management system.</p> <p>Proposal: Amend AMC as follows:</p> <p>replace "designated for this purpose by the Authority" with, "nominated for this purpose by the ATO"</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text has been amended as proposed.</p>
comment	<p>3300</p> <p>comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></p> <p>Part FCL AMC N°1 to FCL. 930. TRI : TRI training course - aeroplanes This AMC is a specific one for aeroplane category only.</p> <p>The paragraph 8 is in contradiction with FCL 920(b), which states that the assessment of applicant's competencies is included in the skill test.</p> <p>In view of the objectives of the training and the exercises to be performed, it seems important to provide this part of training in a FFS.</p> <p>Change in this AMC the word « aircraft » with the word « aeroplane »</p> <p>Delete paragraph 8:</p> <p><del>8 At the completion of the training the applicant should be required to pass a formal test demonstrating all of the competencies listed in FCL .920.</del></p>

	In the new paragraph 8 <del>9-8</del> (a) The applicant for a TRI(A) certificate should receive instruction in a <del>synthetic device</del> <b>FFS</b> to a satisfactory level in :
response	<i>Accepted</i> Text has been amended as proposed.
comment	<b>3895</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Luftfahrt-Bundesamt</i></span> AMC No 1 to FCL.930.TRI:  One of the headlines is: 'Flight and/or synthetic device training instructor competency course'. Is that intentionally and correct?  It is not understood what the formal test mentioned in No 8 (under 'synthetic device training') is all about? Please indicate precisely what is meant and who will be the examiner (what examiner certificate/category will be required?).  See our comment on FCL.935.TRI (applies here, too).
response	<i>Noted</i> 1. Title has been amended. 2. Sentence has been deleted. See reply to comment 3895 above.
comment	<b>4492</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>AEA</i></span> <b>Relevant Text:</b> <b>AMC No 1 to FCL.930.TRI TRI training course aeroplanes</b> 10 Upon successful completion of the training above, the applicant should receive training in an aircraft in flight under the supervision of a TRI instructor. At the completion of training the applicant instructor should be required to conduct a training flight under the supervision and to the satisfaction of a TRI (A) designated for this purpose by the Authority. <b>Comment:</b> Any TRI can instruct a TRI if he complies with FCL 905 3) requirements. There is no TRI instructor in the regulation. This TRI doesn't need to be designated by the Authority. <b>Proposal:</b> In paragraph 10, delete " instructor" and "by the Authority"
response	<i>Partially accepted</i> Text has been amended. Please see also reply to comment 2389 above.
comment	<b>4543</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Irish Aviation Authority</i></span> <b>[Proposal: To amend the following AMC to bring it in line with the above amendments to Subpart J, Appendix 12 to allow what currently happens for Transport Category Aircraft and with other wording already existing in the NPA.]</b>  <b>AMC No 1 to FCL.930.TRI TRI training course aeroplanes</b>



## GENERAL

*[Final sentence, delete "only".]*

The content of the training program should cover training exercises applicable to the aircraft type as set out in the applicable type rating courses.

CONTENT *[Should be amended as follows:]*

The course consists of 3 parts: [to bring it in line with FCL.930.TRI and TRI(H)]

Part 1 Teaching and Learning that should comply with AMC to FCL.920

Part 2 Technical Training

Part 3 Flight Training that should have the following content:

## PART 2 TECHNICAL TRAINING

The technical theoretical knowledge instruction should comprise of not less than 10 hours training to include the revision of technical knowledge, the preparation of lesson plans and the development of classroom instructional skills to enable the TRI(H) to instruct the technical theoretical knowledge syllabus.

If a TRI certificate for multi-pilot aircraft is sought, particular attention should be given to multi-crew cooperation.

The type rating theoretical syllabus should be used to develop the TRI's teaching skills in relation to the type technical course syllabus. The course instructor should deliver example lectures from the applicable type technical syllabus and the candidate instructor should prepare and deliver at least five lectures, on topics selected by the course instructor from the type rating course.

## PART 3 FLIGHT TRAINING

## FLIGHT AND/OR SYNTHETIC DEVICE TRAINING INSTRUCTOR COMPETENCY COURSE

1 The course should be related to the type of aircraft on which the applicant wishes to instruct.

2 TEM, CRM and the appropriate use of behavioural markers should be integrated throughout

3 The content of the training programme should cover all the significant exercises applicable to the aircraft type. *[change "identified and" to "all the"]*

## SYNTHETIC DEVICE TRAINING

4 The applicant for a TRI(A) certificate should be taught and made familiar with the device, its limitations, capabilities and safety features, and the instructor station.

5 The applicant for a TRI(A) certificate should be taught and made familiar with

giving instruction from the seat normally occupied by the co-pilot, captain and IOS including demonstrations of appropriate handling exercises. *[add "captain and IOS"]*

6 Courses should be developed in order to give the applicant experience in training a variety of exercises, covering both normal and abnormal operations. The syllabus should be tailored appropriate to the aircraft type, using exercises considered more demanding for the student. This should include engine-out handling and engine out operations in addition to representative exercises from the type transition course.

7 The applicant should be required to plan, brief, train and debrief sessions using all relevant training techniques.

8 At the completion of training the applicant should be required to pass a formal test demonstrating all of the competencies listed in FCL.920.

#### AIRCRAFT TRAINING

9 (a) The applicant for a TRI(A) certificate should receive instruction in a synthetic device to a satisfactory level in:

i) Right Hand Seat familiarisation, which should include at least the following as pilot flying:

- (a) Pre-flight preparation and use of checklists
- (b) taxiing;
- (c) takeoff;
- (d) rejected takeoff
- (e) engine failure during takeoff, after V1
- (f) engine inoperative approach and go-around; and
- (g) one engine (critical) simulated inoperative landing
- (h) other emergency and abnormal operating procedures (as necessary)

ii) Aircraft training techniques *[add: (b) Transit to the training area and circuit*

*(c) Maintaining good situational awareness (e) Assessing trainee performance]*

- (a) Methods for giving appropriate commentary
- (b) Transit to the training area and circuit
- (c) Maintaining good situational awareness
- (d) Particularities of handling the aircraft in touch and go manoeuvres
- (e) Assessing trainee performance
- (f) Intervention strategies developed from situations role-played by a TRI course instructor, taken from but not limited to:

- (i) Takeoff configuration warning
- (ii) Over controlling
- (iii) High flare long float
- (iv) Long flare
- (v) Baulked landing
- (vi) Immediate go around from touch
- (vii) Too high on approach no flare
- (viii) Incorrect configuration

- (ix) GPWS warning
- (x) Misuse of rudder
- (xi) Over control in roll axis during flare
- (xii) Incapacitation
- (xiii) Actual abnormal or emergencies

9 (b) Additionally, if the applicant is required to train emergency/abnormal procedures in an aircraft, synthetic device training as follows:

Appropriate methods and minimum altitudes for simulating failures

Incorrect rudder inputs

Failure of a critical engine

Approach and full-stop landing with simulated engineout

In this case, the abnormal manoeuvres refer to engineout handling as necessary for completion of type rating training. If the applicant is required to train other abnormal items in the transition course, additional training will be required.

10 Upon successful completion of the training above, the applicant should receive training in an aircraft in flight under the supervision of a TRI instructor. At the completion of training the applicant instructor should be required to conduct a training flight under the supervision and to the satisfaction of a TRE (A) designated for this purpose by the Authority. *[change TRI (A) to TRE (A)]*

#### TRAINING WHERE NO FSTD EXISTS

Where no synthetic device exists for the type for which the certificate is sought, a similar course of training should be conducted in the applicable aircraft type. This includes all elements listed under this sub paragraph, the synthetic device elements being replaced with appropriate exercises in an aircraft of the applicable type.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for your comment.

The text has been amended to better reflect the structure proposed in the rule.

comment

5255 comment by: *CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority*

Current Text;

The TRI course should give particular emphasis to the role of the individual in relation to the importance of human factors in the manmachine environment and the role of CRM. Special attention should be given to the applicant's maturity and judgment including an understanding of adults, their behavioral attitudes and variable levels of learning ability.

Comment : For consistency with previous comments text should be ammended to use the term Non-technical Skills.

Ammend to read:

	<p>The TRI course should give particular emphasis to the role of the individual in relation to the importance of human factors in the manmachine environment <i>and the development of the required Non-technical Skills</i> .</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task. We suggest that you submit to the Agency a rulemaking proposal on this issue.</p>
comment	<p>5263 comment by: <i>CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority</i></p> <p>Attachment <a href="#">#72</a></p> <p>Current Text:</p> <p>FLIGHT AND/OR SYNTHETIC DEVICE TRAINING INSTRUCTOR COMPETENCY COURSE</p> <p>1 The course should be related to the type of aircraft on which the applicant wishes to instruct.</p> <p>2 TEM, CRM and the appropriate use of behavioural markers should be integrated throughout</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The term Behavioural marker system is not defined:</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> Add the following definition:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">4. Behavioural Marker System – a taxonomy or listing of the key non-technical skills associated with effective, safe, and efficient task performance decomposed into the major skill areas (e.g. Decision Making) with exemplar behaviours illustrating both good and poor performance</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work in a separate rulemaking task. We suggest that you submit to the Agency a rulemaking proposal on this issue.</p>
comment	<p>5273 comment by: <i>CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority</i></p> <p>Current Text:</p> <p>FLIGHT AND/OR SYNTHETIC DEVICE TRAINING INSTRUCTOR COMPETENCY COURSE</p> <p>1 The course should be related to the type of aircraft on which the applicant wishes to instruct.</p> <p>2 TEM, CRM and the appropriate use of behavioural markers should be integrated throughout</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> TEM and CRM are part of the required Non-technical Skills. For</p>

consistency with previous comments the term Non-technical Skills should be added to the text.

**Proposal: ammend to read**

FLIGHT AND/OR SYNTHETIC DEVICE TRAINING INSTRUCTOR COMPETENCY COURSE

1 The course should be related to the type of aircraft on which the applicant wishes to instruct.

2 *Non-technical Skills such as TEM, CRM and the appropriate use of a behavioural markers system should be integrated throughout*

response *Not accepted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work in a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you submit to the Agency a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment

5293

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

Part FCL AMC N°1 to FCL. 930. TRI : TRI training course - aeroplanes

This AMC is a specific one for aeroplane category only.

The paragraph 8 is in contradiction with FCL 920(b), which states that the assessment of applicant's competencies is included in the skill test.

In view of the objectives of the training and the exercises to be performed, it seems important to provide this part of training in a FFS.

Change in this AMC the word « aircraft » with the word « aeroplane »

Delete paragraph 8:

~~8 At the completion of the training the applicant should be required to pass a formal test demonstrating all of the competencies listed in FCL .920.~~

In the new paragraph 8

~~9-8~~ (a) The applicant for a TRI(A) certificate should receive instruction in a ~~synthetic device~~ **FFS** to a satisfactory level in :

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 3300 above.

comment

5474

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

One of the headlines is: 'Flight and/or synthetic device training instructor competency course'. Is that intentionally and correct?

It is not understood what the formal test mentioned in No 8 (under 'synthetic device training') is all about? Please indicate precisely what is meant and who will be the examiner (what examiner certificate/category will be required ?).

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 3895 above.

comment

5505

comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

Comment: change text on "Synthetic Device Training", point 5 as follows:

5 The applicant for a TRI(A) certificate should be taught and made familiar with giving instruction from the seat from all operating positions ~~normally occupied by the copilot~~, including demonstrations of appropriate handling exercises.

Justification:

The instructor may be instructing a pilot in command or a co-pilot, so he/she should be entitled to act from any position in the cockpit.

response

*Accepted*

Text has been amended as proposed.

comment

5962

comment by: *ENAC TLP*

The draft does not prescribe any training requirements or the competency standards that an Examiner or an Instructor should demonstrate in the area of non-technical/CRM skills and TEM assessment. This will lead to the possibility of poor practical training in this area and misapplication of the assessment process due to subjectivity, bias, and poor inter-rater reliability that will undermine confidence in licensing rules and diminish the training value of assessment.

**Needs** training or competence requirements for Instructors and Examinersf in the area of Non-technical/CRM Skills and TEM assessment .

**Proposal:**

Under the label of Human Performance contained in syllabiFlightcrew must be trained in the concepts, use and application of NTS in support to TEM, CRM and Airmanship. Examiners and Instructors shall undergo specific training in the use of a behavioral marker system for the purpose of non-technical skills assessment. Examiners shall demonstrate competence in the assessment of non-technical skills to the relevant competent authority as part of the Instructor rating and Examiner authorisation process.

**AMC N 1 to FCL. 930.TRI TRI training course – aeroplanes**

**General**

**FLIGHT AND/OR SYNTETIC DEVICE TRAINING INSTRUCTOR COMPETENCY COURSE**

**Page 522**

to be modified as follows (*italics*)

2 TEM, CRM and the appropriate use of *NTS* behavioural markers should be integrated throughout

response

*Not accepted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work in a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you submit to the Agency a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment

6609

comment by: *UK CAA*

**Paragraph:**

AMC No 1 to FCL.930.TRI

**Page No:**

521 of 647

**Comment:**

Nowhere within the AMC or the IRs for the requirements of a TRI(A) course does it lay down who is capable of tutoring this course. Ideally the TRI tutor should have some experience of teaching type rating courses, e.g. a minimum of, say, 4 complete conversion courses prior to being selected to instruct TRI tutors.

**Justification:**

A newly qualified TRI probably hasn't learnt the intricacies of instructing that particular type of aircraft sufficiently to be able to then instruct a new TRI.

**Proposed Text:  
(if applicable)**

Add a new paragraph in the GENERAL part as follows:

*"A tutor for the TRI(A) course shall have conducted a minimum of 4 complete type rating conversion courses prior to being permitted to conduct TRI training for new TRI(A)."*

response *Noted*

Text has been amended as proposed.

comment

7896

comment by: CAA Finland

The structure is not clear ref FCL.930.TRI

(b) The course shall include, at least:

- (1) 25 hours of theoretical knowledge;
- (2) 10 hours of instructional techniques, including revision of technical knowledge, the preparation of lesson plans and the development of classroom / simulator instructional skills;
- (3) 5 hours of flight instruction in the appropriate aircraft or a simulator representing that aircraft for single-pilot aircraft and 10 hours for multi-pilot multi-engine aircraft or a simulator representing that aircraft.

Amended text proposal:

The course consists of **3** parts:

Part 1, that should comply with AMC to FCL.920

Part 2, ~~that should have the following content~~ **instructional technics:**

**FLIGHT AND/OR SYNTHETIC DEVICE TRAINING INSTRUCTOR COMPETENCY COURSE**

1 The course should be related to the type of aircraft on which the applicant wishes to instruct.

2 TEM, CRM and the appropriate use of behavioural markers should be integrated throughout

3 The content of the training programme should cover identified and significant exercises applicable to the aircraft type.

**SYNTHETIC DEVICE TRAINING**

**4** The applicant for a TRI(A) certificate should be taught and made familiar with the device, its limitations, capabilities and safety features, and the instructor station **including emergency evacuation.**

**5** The applicant should be required to plan, brief, train and debrief sessions using all relevant training techniques.

**Part 3, flight instruction:**

## AIRCRAFT TRAINING

**6** The applicant for a TRI(A) certificate should be taught and made familiar with giving instruction from the seat normally occupied by the copilot, including demonstrations of appropriate handling exercises.

**7** Courses should be developed in order to give the applicant experience in training a variety of exercises, covering both normal and abnormal operations. The syllabus should be tailored appropriate to the aircraft type, using exercises considered more demanding for the student. This should include engineout handling and engine out operations in addition to representative exercises from the type transition course.

**8** ~~(a)~~ The applicant for a TRI(A) certificate should receive instruction in a synthetic device to a satisfactory level in:....

**9** At the completion of training the applicant should be required to pass a formal test demonstrating all of the competencies listed in FCL.920.

~~9(b)~~ **10**

~~10-11~~

response *Noted*

Thank you for your comment.

The text has been amended to better reflect the structure proposed in the rule.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC  
No 2 to FCL.915.TRI - TRI training course - helicopters**

p. 523-527

comment

2364

comment by: *AECA(SPAIN)*

- Part 1 Teaching and Learning that should comply with AMC to FCL.920

No information on Teaching and learning found at FCL.920

response

*Noted*

The AMC to FCL.920 contains instructor competencies that should be integrated in the Teaching and Learning phase of the course. This was established in the Draft NPA FCL 36, which was transferred from the JAA LST to the Agency, and agreed to be included in this NPA.

comment

2365

comment by: *AECA(SPAIN)*

- Part 2 Technical Training

...candidate instructor should prepare and deliver at least five lectures, each of 45 minutes duration....

To be removed

Justification:

Currently not required under Appendix 1 JAR-FCL 2.330C so what is the reasoning?

response

*Partially accepted*

The mention of 5 lectures of 45 minutes each has been deleted.



comment	2598	comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i>
	Should read: " AMC 2 to FCL 930.TRI" Reason: 930.TRI describes TRI training course.	
response	<i>Accepted</i> Text has been amended.	
comment	3897	comment by: <i>Luftfahrt-Bundesamt</i>
	AMC No 2 to FCL.915.TRI:  The title / headline of this AMC needs correction (it is titled AMC No 2 to FCL.915.TRI instead of AMC No 2 to FCL.930.TRI)  Regarding Part 3 Flight training, a single pilot helicopter may be a single or a multi engine helicopter. A multi pilot helicopter will be a multiengine helicopter where under certain requirements a co-pilot is required. A second flight crew member is not a justification for an increase of 100% in requirements (up from 5 h to at least 10h only for the reason of a second flight crew member).	
response	<i>Partially accepted</i>  1. Text has been amended.  2. This difference in the amount of hours was already included in JAR-FCL 2. The Agency does not intend to change it at this time, without a dedicated assessment.	
comment	4444	comment by: <i>Bond Offshore Helicopters</i>
	- Part 1 Teaching and Learning that should comply with AMC to FCL.920  No information on Teaching and learning found at FCL.920	
response	<i>Noted</i>  Please see reply to comment 2364 above.	
comment	4445	comment by: <i>Bond Offshore Helicopters</i>
	- Part 2 Technical Training ...candidate instructor should prepare and deliver at least five lectures, each of 45 minutes duration....  To be removed  Justification: Currently not required under Appendix 1 JAR-FCL 2.330C so what is the reasoning?	
response	<i>Noted</i>  Please see reply to comment 2365 above.	

comment	<p>4686 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Héli-Union</i></span></p> <p>- Part 1 Teaching and Learning that should comply with AMC to FCL.920</p> <p>No information on Teaching and learning found at FCL.920</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 2364 above.</p>
comment	<p>4687 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Héli-Union</i></span></p> <p>- Part 2 Technical Training ...candidate instructor should prepare and deliver at least five lectures, each of 45 minutes duration....</p> <p>To be removed</p> <p>Justification: Currently not required under Appendix 1 JAR-FCL 2.330C so what is the reasoning?</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 2365 above.</p>
comment	<p>4907 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>HUTC</i></span></p> <p>- Part 1 Teaching and Learning that should comply with AMC to FCL.920</p> <p>No information on Teaching and learning found at FCL.920</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 2364 above.</p>
comment	<p>4908 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>HUTC</i></span></p> <p>- Part 2 Technical Training ...candidate instructor should prepare and deliver at least five lectures, each of 45 minutes duration....</p> <p>To be removed</p> <p>Justification: Currently not required under Appendix 1 JAR-FCL 2.330C so what is the reasoning?</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 2365 above.</p>
comment	<p>5255 ❖ <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority</i></span></p> <p>Current Text;</p>

The TRI course should give particular emphasis to the role of the individual in relation to the importance of human factors in the manmachine environment and the role of CRM. Special attention should be given to the applicant's maturity and judgment including an understanding of adults, their behavioral attitudes and variable levels of learning ability.

Comment : For consistency with previous comments text should be ammended to use the term Non-technical Skills.

Ammend to read:

The TRI course should give particular emphasis to the role of the individual in relation to the importance of human factors in the manmachine environment *and the development of the required Non-technical Skills* .

response *Not accepted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you submit to the Agency a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment

5273 ❖

comment by: *CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority*

Current Text:

FLIGHT AND/OR SYNTHETIC DEVICE TRAINING INSTRUCTOR COMPETENCY COURSE

1 The course should be related to the type of aircraft on which the applicant wishes to instruct.

2 TEM, CRM and the appropriate use of behavioural markers should be integrated throughout

**Comment:** TEM and CRM are part of the required Non-technical Skills. For consistency with previous comments the term Non-technical Skills should be added to the text.

**Proposal: ammend to read**

FLIGHT AND/OR SYNTHETIC DEVICE TRAINING INSTRUCTOR COMPETENCY COURSE

1 The course should be related to the type of aircraft on which the applicant wishes to instruct.

2 *Non-technical Skills such as TEM, CRM and the appropriate use of a behavioural markers system should be integrated throughout*

response *Not accepted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you submit to the Agency a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment	<p>5475 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAA Belgium</span></p> <p>The title / headline of this AMC needs correction (it is titled AMC No 2 to FCL.915.TRI instead of AMC No 2 to FCL.930.TRI)</p> <p>Regarding Part 3 Flight training, a single pilot helicopter may be a single or a multi engine helicopter.  A multi pilot helicopter will be a multiengine helicopter where under certain requirements a co-pilot is required.  A second flight crew member is not a justification for an increase of 100% in requirements (up from 5 h to at least 10h only for the reason of a second flight crew member).</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 3897 above.</p>
comment	<p>6613 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b>  AMC No 2 to FCL.915.TRI  <b>Page No:</b>  523 of 647  <b>Comment:</b>  The title of this AMC is incorrect. It refers to FCL.930.TRI and not FCL.915.TRI  <b>Justification:</b>  Editorial  <b>Proposed Text:</b>  <b>(if applicable)</b>  Change FCL number in title to read AMC No 2 to FCL.930.TRI.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text has been amended.</p>
comment	<p>6617 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b>  AMC No 2 to FCL.915.TRI  <b>Page No:</b>  524 of 647  <b>Comment:</b>  The TRI(H) Course Content differs from the aeroplane one at AMC No 1 to FCL.915.TRI at the top of page 522. There should be no difference between these course content requirements.  <b>Justification:</b>  Consistency of course material &amp; requirements.  <b>Proposed Text:</b>  <b>(if applicable)</b>  Change either the aeroplane course content to read the same as the helicopter one or vice versa.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Text has been amended to improve consistency.</p>

comment	6624	comment by: UK CAA
	<p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC to FCL 915 TRI TRI(H) COURSE CONTENT</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 524</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The Teaching and Learning Syllabus is at AMC to FCL 930 LAFI</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Clarification</p> <p><b>Proposed Text:</b> Amend text - Part 1, teaching and learning instruction to comply with AMC to FCL.920 and FCL.930 LAFI</p>	
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 2364 above.</p>	
comment	6840	comment by: CAA CZ
	<p>Title should be corrected to AMC No. 2 to FCL.930.TRI.</p>	
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text has been amended.</p>	
comment	7188	comment by: CHC Europe EASA Ops Team - representing 550 pilots across Europe
	<p>- Part 1 Teaching and Learning that should comply with AMC to FCL.920</p> <p>No information on Teaching and learning found at FCL.920</p>	
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 2364 above.</p>	
comment	7189	comment by: CHC Europe EASA Ops Team - representing 550 pilots across Europe
	<p>- Part 2 Technical Training ...candidate instructor should prepare and deliver at least five lectures, each of 45 minutes duration....</p> <p>To be removed</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Currently not required under Appendix 1 JAR-FCL 2.330C so what is the reasoning?</p>	
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 2365 above.</p>	

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC to FCL.930.CRI - CRI training course - General**

p. 527

comment

6628

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL.930.CRI

**Page No:**

527 of 647

**Comment:**

The content of the CRI course is different again to the helicopter one but is the same as the aeroplane one. All instructor courses should have the same general content requirements.

**Justification:**

Consistency

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Change the CRI course content in line with either the aeroplane or the helicopter one but all three course contents should have the same structure.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your comment, but there is no CRI for helicopters, since there are no helicopter classes, only types.

comment

6630

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL 930.CRI

**Page No:**

527

**Comment:**

The training course specified is for training CRI for MEP class training only. This is totally inadequate and inappropriate for training CRIs on HPA types and especially Jet types such Citation series and Very Light Jets. A full rewrite of the CRI training course to take into account CRI on complex types and HPA is required.

**Justification:**

There is an increasing demand for CRI trained on Jet types for which propeller theory and practice is inappropriate and high performance training and system training is more appropriate.

response

*Noted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment, and agrees that further work needs to be done for the training courses for instructors for VLJs. However, at this stage it is not possible to develop that work. The objective of the Agency was to transfer the content of JAR-FCL and adapt it in order to achieve a coherent system. Further work needs to be developed in future rulemaking tasks.

In addition, please note that this is an AMC, which means that alternative means of compliance may be developed, better tailored to the needs of the courses.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC to FCL.930.CRI - CRI training course - Part 3 - Long briefings**

p. 538-547

comment	5566	comment by: <i>Chris Gowers</i>
	Page 539 MINIMUMCONTROL SPEEDS last paragraph. Delete "Ø" , insert "o"	
	Typo error	
response	<i>Accepted</i>	
	Text amended as proposed.	

<b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC to FCL.930.IRI - IRI Training course</b>	p. 548-549
--	------------

comment	5567	comment by: <i>Chris Gowers</i>
	Para 4 Part 1 is in a smaller font than the rest	
	Tpo error	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	Thank you for your comment. The Agency has done an editorial review to ensure that the font size is consistent.	

comment	6633	comment by: <i>UK CAA</i>
	<p><b>Paragraph:</b>  AMC to FCL 930 IRI  IRI Training course GENERAL  The course shall consist of 3 parts  Part 1</p> <p><b>Page No:</b>  548</p> <p><b>Comment:</b>  The Teaching and Learning Syllabus is at AMC to FCL 930 LAFI</p> <p><b>Justification:</b>  Clarification  Standardisation with other instructor ratings</p> <p><b>Proposed Text:</b>  Amend text  - Part 1, teaching and learning instruction to comply with AMC to FCL.920 and FCL.930 LAFI</p>	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	The teaching and learning syllabus should contain the material included in AMC to FCL.920. This was what was foreseen in NPA FCL 36. The AMC for the LAFI course could be used as guidance when developing the content of the IRI course.	

comment	6636	comment by: <i>UK CAA</i>
	<p><b>Paragraph:</b>  AMC to FCL 930 IRI</p>	

IRI Training course GENERAL  
The course shall consist of 3 parts  
Part 3

**Page No:**  
548

**Comment:**

This paragraph does not specify the minimum of flight training hours to be conducted in the aircraft/FSTD

**Justification:**

The IRI certificate qualification is to teach in an aircraft and the skill test should be conducted in an aircraft therefore an element of training should be conducted in an aircraft.

**Proposed Text:**

Amend para:

- Part 3 Flight Training. An approved IRI course should comprise of at least 10 hours of flight instruction of which a maximum of 8 hours may be conducted in FSTD...

response *Accepted*

Thank you for sending your proposal.  
The Agency carefully reviewed the issue and agrees with your proposal. The text has been amended as proposed.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC to FCL.930.IRI - IRI Training course - Part 3 - Flight Training Syllabus - B. p. 559-567 Helicopters**

comment 2560

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

A new long briefing 12 "use of GPS" should be foreseen. Reason:  
1) was future work at JAA ( was mentioned in JAR-FCL as "to be developed").  
2) has been mentioned for aeroplanes (p.559) and As (p.574)

response *Partially accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment, and agrees that further material on the exercise/"Long Briefing 12" should be developed. However, at this moment that is not possible. This will have to be included in a future rulemaking task.

However, the Agency agrees that the "Long Briefing" has to be added at the end of the training syllabus for the IRI training course helicopter as it was already the case for the IRI on aeroplanes or airships.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC to FCL.930.IRI - IRI Training course - Part 3 - Flight Training Syllabus - C. p. 567-574 Airhips**

comment 2488

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

AMC to FCL 930 IRI §B Helicopter

response *Noted*

Thank you for your comment, but the Agency cannot really understand what



you are requesting/proposing.

comment 2490 comment by: CAA Belgium

A new long briefing

response *Noted*

Thank you for your comment, but the Agency cannot really understand what you are requesting/proposing.

comment 6995 comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL1015

**Page No:**

567

**Comment:**

1 day is inadequate for all examiner training but not all examiners need 5 days. Stating competencies and training item should be enough. A better way would be to have a table of training requirements for each examiner authority so that as the importance or complication of the tests increase, then the training requirement increases. For example the first requirement would be applicable to all examiners e.g. 1. Examiner Core course. 2. Briefing techniques 3. Assessment techniques. One would then add on theoretical and practical training appropriate to the examiner privileges sought.

**Justification:**

It is inappropriate to state a minimum of 1 day or a maximum of 5 days

**Proposed Text:**

**(if applicable)**

Delete paragraph 1.1 Rewrite this whole section UK CAA is prepared to assist with drafting using CAA Standards Document 21, available on the CAA website at [www.caa.co.uk](http://www.caa.co.uk)

response *Noted*

Thank you for your input.

Your comment seems to refer to the AMC to FCL.1015.

At this time the Agency intends to keep the text basically unchanged - but please see the comments on the dedicated segment, as well as the amended text.

The Agency appreciates your offer to help develop further material - this could be used in a future rulemaking task. In addition, please note that this is an AMC, which allows the development of alternative means of compliance, more tailored to the concrete needs.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart J: Instructors - AMC to FCL.930.MCCI - MCCI Training course - aeroplanes** p. 574-575

comment 1958 comment by: Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch

**Important area of skill and knowledge missing**

**Poof:**

1) Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations call for the knowledge of " non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors."

This is NOT ""threat and error management"!

2) §(16) of the Basic Regulations principles claim for a "promotion of a "culture of safety"

3) "threat and error management" is a special approach and methodology not accepted by all. More modern and general accepted techniques exist (see my comments on TEM, definitions error and error management and the Basic Regulations of the EC.

**Proposal:**

Replace in **PART 2 TECHNICAL TRAINING**

"The FSTD training consists of the application of core instructor competencies to MCC training in a commercial air transport environment, including principles of threat and error management and CRM"

with

"The FSTD training consists of the application of core instructor competencies to MCC training in a commercial air transport environment, including principles of non-technical skills with regard to flight safety including the recognition and management of threats and errors and CRM "

response

*Noted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you submit to the Agency a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment

4935

comment by: *Irish Aviation Authority*

This AMC says that the course consists of 2 parts, whereas FCL.930.MCCI on page 61 shows three parts. See other comments on Subpart J above.

Also PART 2 refers to an authorisation instead of a certificate.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for your comment.

The structure of the training course has been improved to better reflect the rule.

The editorial you mention has been corrected.

comment

7217

comment by: *CHC Europe EASA Ops Team - representing 550 pilots across Europe*

MCCI (H) does not appear to feature as a qualification – is this correct?

Justification:

response	<p>There is a requirement for the same qualification as the fixed-wing.</p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>There is an MCCI(H) qualification. See for example FCL.915.MCCI. However, at the moment, no AMC material has been developed yet. This will need to be the subject of a future rulemaking task.</p>
comment	<p><b>7901</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span></p> <p>The structure is not clear ref FCL.930.MCCI</p> <p>(b) The course shall include, at least:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) 25 hours of theoretical knowledge instruction, including instructional techniques;</li> <li>(2) Technical training related to the type of FSTD where the applicant wishes to instruct;</li> <li>(3) 3 hours of practical instruction,</li> </ol> <p>Amended text proposal: The course consists of 3 parts:</p> <p>Part 1, that should comply with AMC to FCL.920</p> <p>Part 2, technical training:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The FSTD training consists of the application of core instructor competencies to MCC training in a commercial air transport environment, including principles of threat and error management and CRM.</li> <li>2 The content of the training programme should cover identified and significant exercises applicable to MCC course exercises in sufficient depth to meet the standard required for issue of the MCCI (A) authorization.</li> <li>3 The course should be related to the type of STD on which the applicant wishes to instruct. A training programme should give details of all theoretical knowledge instruction.</li> <li>4 TEM, CRM and the appropriate use of behavioural markers should be integrated throughout</li> <li>5 The applicant for a MCCI(A) certificate should be taught and made familiar with the device, its limitations, capabilities and safety features, and the instructor station including emergency evacuation.</li> <li>6 The applicant should be required to plan, brief, train and debrief sessions using all relevant training techniques.</li> </ol> <p>Part 3, practical training:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7 The content of the instruction programme should cover training exercises as applicable to the MCC requirements of an applicant for a multi-pilot type rating.</li> </ol> <p>Training Exercises The exercises ....</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment. The structure of the training course has been improved to better reflect the rule.</p>
comment	<p><b>7903</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span></p> <p>Ref my comment that skill test is required:</p>

~~2 Confirmation of competency of the applicant to be authorised as an MCCI(A) will be determined by the applicant conducting at least 3 hours MCC instruction to a satisfactory standard on the relevant FNPT or flight simulator under the supervision of a TRI(A), SFI(A) or MCCI(A) notified by the Authority for this purpose.~~

response *Not accepted*

Please see reply to your comment. The Agency considers that a skill test is not adequate.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart K: Examiner Certificates** p. 576

comment 2995 comment by: *Julia WILKINSON*

This new requirement seems totally unnecessary and will impose yet more difficulties on training pilots who may have to travel far afield to find another Examiner. Why can't an Examiner do at least some of a student's training (especially in some areas there may be very few Instructors available), as long as an Instructor has done their recommendation check flight?

response *Noted*

This is indeed possible. Please see replies to comments on FCL. 1005.

comment 3964 comment by: *Professional Air Training Ltd*

see comment 3938

response *Noted*

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart K: Examiner Certificates - GM to FCL.1000 - Examiner certificates – special conditions** p. 576

comment 3965 comment by: *Professional Air Training Ltd*

see comment 3938

response *Noted*

comment 6689 comment by: *Kevin Ison*

I would prefer an examiner be allowed to carry out some training as well as being allowed to examine the student, providing another instructor has done the recommendation flight.

response *Noted*

This is possible. Please see replies to comments on FCL.1005.

comment	6844	comment by: CAA CZ
	<p>General comment</p> <p>In all forms, which states the number of examiner license should be added, additionally to his license number, also <b>number of his authorisation</b>, because almost all NAA publish lists of examiners, which they approved, only with the number of authorisation.</p>	
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Your comment will be taken into account when reviewing Part-FCL and Part-AR forms.</p>	

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart K: Examiner Certificates - AMC to FCL.1015 - Examiner standardisation course**

p. 576-577

comment	267	comment by: Michel Lacombe AF TRTO
	<p>The lasting of the examiner standardization course of this general chapter (page 576) doesn't correspond with the contents in page 577</p> <p>So the text should be modified:</p> <p><b>New Text:</b>  <b>AMC to FCL.1015</b>  <b>Examiner initial training standardisation course</b></p> <p>GENERAL</p> <p>1. The competent authority may provide the course itself or through an arrangement with a training organization. This arrangement should clearly state that the training organization is acting under the management system of the competent authority.</p> <p>1.1 The initial training course should last:</p> <p>1.1.1 For the LAFE, FE and FIE, at least one day, divided into theoretical training and practical training;</p> <p>1.1.2 for other examiners, at least 3 days, divided into theoretical training (<b>one</b> day) and practical training in a simulator conducting proficiency checks and skill tests under supervision (at least <b>two</b> days).</p> <p>1.2 At the end of the training standardization, if no further training is required, the approved training organization shall present the candidate to the Authority for the examiner assessment of competence.</p>	
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text will be changed accordingly.</p>	

comment	1542	comment by: Danish Balloon Organisation
	<p><b>AMC to FCL.1015 CONTENT 2.2 c. :</b></p> <p>We suggest deletion of the sentence "consisting of the conduct of at least two test/check profiles in the role of examiner" in 2.2 c so the new wording reads:</p>	

c. For an initial examiner certificate, practical training should include the examination of the test profile sought, including briefing, conduct of the skill test/proficiency check, assessment of the applicant to whom the test/check is given, debriefing and recording/documentation under the supervision of an examiner of the appropriate category on the applicable type. This training is conducted in the aircraft if approval for testing/checking in the aircraft is required. If examiner privileges in FSTD's are required, practical instruction in the use of FSTD(s) for testing/checking should also be completed.

Justification: For the LAFE, FE and FIE a one day course divided into theoretical and practical training is envisaged. For LAFE and FE balloons it makes no sense to require the conduct of at least two test/check profiles.

response *Not accepted*

The Agency considers the conduct of two checks / test for the initial practical training for examiners of all aircraft categories as necessary and does not agree to exclude the examiners for tests and checks on balloons. As no justification is provided, the Agency will keep this requirement for all categories.

If the weather situation will not allow to conduct these 2 checks / tests under supervision the same day as the theoretical part this can be done at a separate day.

comment

1905

comment by: *French Army AVN. FTO*

1.1.2 :

the French Army Aviation FTO requests that the course dedicated to other examiners than FE and FIE, **should last only 3 days** (1 day for ground training, 2 days for practical training).

response

*Accepted*

Text will be changed accordingly.

comment

2391

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

Comment: Some simulator sessions are conducted with two applicants for a skill test or a check. In this case the practical training for the initial examiner should be validated with one simulator session provided there are two applicants in this session.

Proposal: Amend text CONTENT 2.2 Practical training (c) to read:(see bold sentence)

2.2 Practical training consisting of at least:

c) For an initial examiner certificate, practical training should include the examination of the test profile sought, consisting of the conduct of at least two test/check profiles in the role of examiner, **(these two test/check profiles can be performed in the same simulator session)** including briefing,

conduct of the skill test/proficiency check, assessment of the applicant to whom the test/check is given, debriefing and recording/documentation under the supervision of an examiner of the appropriate category on the applicable type. This training is conducted in the aircraft if approval for testing / checking in the aircraft is required. If examiner privileges in FSTD's are required, practical instruction in the use of FSTD(s) for testing/checking should also be completed.

response *Accepted*

Text will be changed accordingly.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 2397 IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

Question: § 2.2 refers to a Flight Examiner Manual. Where is this manual published?

response *Noted*

Reference to the FEM will be deleted.

The intention of the Agency is to introduce the current JAA FEM as an AMC to Part-FCL as part of the rulemaking task FCL.002.

The introduction of the FEM will need some careful revision of its contents, which could not be performed in task FCL.001.

comment

comment by: *Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, 2425 ❖ IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)*

Comment: Last sentence of (c) implies that a standardisation course must be followed for each country where an examiner intends to exercise his privileges. As Part FCL is common to all member states, only one session is sufficient.

There is an urgent need to move towards a competency basis for training and evaluating examiners. The industry FCL group is prepared to make a proposal for amendment to AMC. This will enable time based and inventory prescriptions to be removed.

Proposal:

Move (b) (c ) and new (d) to AMC delete wording from (c ) "and their documentation and reporting"

New para (d) Examiners shall be briefed on documentation and reporting, protection requirements for personal data... (existing wording)

**Amend AMC to FCL 1015**

1.1.1 For all examiners... (existing text)

Delete para 1.1.2

Under 2. delete para d.

response *Noted*

Please see replies to comments to FCL.1015.  
The Agency considers that the examiner standardisation course needs to be performed for each Member State.

As for the minimum duration of the course, it was taken from the text of the rule, and is now only in the AMC. In this regard, see also reply to comment 267 above.

comment 2599 comment by: CAA Belgium

Should read "AMC1 to FCL 1.015"  
Reason: on page 577 there is AMC 2 to FCL 1.015.

response *Accepted*

Text will be changed accordingly.

comment 3298 comment by: DGAC FRANCE

Part FCL : AMC to FCL.1015

The requirement of this paragraph doesn't fit with the content of the Part FCL.1015 (b) and the content of paragraph 2.2 c. in page 577.  
Paragraph 2.2.1 is at a better place in "GENERAL" and the competent Authority may also provide the course itself.

GENERAL

1. The competent authority may provide the course itself or through an arrangement with a training organization. This arrangement should clearly state that the training organization is acting under the management system of the competent authority.

~~1.1 The initial training course should last:~~

~~-~~

~~1.1.1 For the LAFE, FE and FIE, at least one2 day, divided into theoretical training (one day) and practical training;~~

~~1.1.2 For other examiners, at least 5 days, divided into ground training and practical training or a simulator conducting proficiency checks and skill tests under supervision (at least 3 days).~~

***1.1 The competent authority or the approved training organization should determine any further training if necessary before presenting the candidate for the examiner assessment of competence.***

Delete paragraph 2.2.1

~~The approved training organisation should determine any further training required before the candidate is presented to the Authority for the examiner assessment of competence.~~

response *Partially accepted*

Please see reply to comment 267 above.



comment	<p>3505</p> <p>Subpart K AMC to FCL.1015</p> <p><b>Inconsistence with regard to FCL.1015 (b)(1); 1 day course</b></p>	comment by: <i>FOCA Switzerland</i>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see replies to comments to FCL.1015. The minimum duration of the course was taken from the text of the rule, and is now only in the AMC. In this regard, see also reply to comment 267 above.</p>	
comment	<p>3616</p> <p>Paragraph 1.1.1 Inconsistency with regard FCL 1015 (b) (1)</p>	comment by: <i>Susana Nogueira</i>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see replies to comments to FCL.1015. The minimum duration of the course was taken from the text of the rule, and is now only in the AMC. In this regard, see also reply to comment 267 above.</p>	
comment	<p>3898</p> <p>AMC to FCL.1015:</p> <p>This AMC should titled 'AMC 1 to FCL.1015.</p> <p>The FEM can hardly be used as reference material under EASA requirements and Standards. It is partially incomplete and partially outdated due to JAR-FCL developments since 2005. The terminology is partially inconsistent with FCL requirements (sometimes more like prose than facts/requirements necessary for standardisation and required test standards). Paragraphs 2.2.(c), 2.2.1, 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 are not consistent with Part FCL.</p> <p>The present FEM needs to be updated with regard to MPL(A) skill test and examiners, with regard to any material on the totally missing powered lift, ballon, airship etc..</p> <p>The FEM is missing essential parts relating to helicopter and apparently there is no relation to complex/non complex aircraft in regard to the Basis Regulation in this AMC..</p> <p>If EASA still intends to introduce the LAPL, there should be a reference here.</p> <p>Regarding AMC to FCL.1015 2.1 (d)) and 2.1.1: National requirements for examination duties as well as briefing on the protection requirements for personal data, liability, accident insurance and fees, as applicable in the Member State concerned seem to be not in line with the examiner privileges received from the EU-Community and not bound to EU member States. There is no standardisation or safety benefit to be expected for the applicant for an examiner certificate issued by one member state, when the examiner exercises most of his privileges in one or several other EU-member states with different national examiner duty requirements and very different requirements on protection requirements for personal data, liability, accident insurance and fees.</p>	comment by: <i>Luftfahrt-Bundesamt</i>

	<p>This is specifically true in the lot of cases, where examiners exercise their 'Community privileges' outside of the EU, e.g. Middle East and Far East.</p> <p>See our comment on FCL.1015.</p>	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	<p>Editorial accepted. AMC will be renumbered.</p> <p>As for the FEM, please see reply to comment 2397.</p> <p>The Agency considers that the examiner standardisation course needs to be performed for each Member State. Please see replies to comments to FCL.1005.</p>	
comment	3966	comment by: <i>Professional Air Training Ltd</i>
	see comment 3938	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
comment	4585	comment by: <i>AEA</i>
	<p><b>Relevant Text:</b> GENERAL 1. The competent authority may provide the course itself or through an arrangement with a training organisation. The course should last <b>at least 5 days</b>, divided into ground training and practical training in a simulator conducting role played proficiency checks and skill tests (at least 3 days). <b>Comment:</b> This AMC is in contradiction with FCL 1015 (b) where only one day course is required. <b>Proposal:</b> Change the AMC</p>	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	<p>Please see replies to comments to FCL.1015. The minimum duration of the course was taken from the text of the rule, and is now only in the AMC. In this regard, see also reply to comment 267 above.</p>	
comment	4822	comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i>
	Para 1.1.1 Inconsistency with regard to FCL.1015 (b) (1); 1 day course	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	<p>Please see replies to comments to FCL.1015. The minimum duration of the course was taken from the text of the rule, and is now only in the AMC. In this regard, see also reply to comment 267 above.</p>	
comment	5140	comment by: <i>Diether Memmert</i>
	Der vorliegende Entwurf, NPA 2008-17a+b+c, verfehlt, was den nichtgewerblichen Teil auf dem Sektor Segelflug und TMG (recreational	

aviation) angeht, in einigen Punkten seine originäre Aufgabe, nämlich Sicherheit **gegenüber Dritten unter Beachtung der Verhältnismäßigkeit** zu gewährleisten.

Mehr Sicherheit wird nicht durch weitere Überprüfungen, Auflagen und bloße Behauptungen erreicht.

In den Flugvereinen des DAeC wurde eine vorbildliche Leistung mit gutem Sicherheitsstandard bei Ausbildung, In-Übunghaltung, sowie Weiterbildung von Piloten und Fluglehrern in weitgehend ehrenamtlicher Tätigkeit erbracht. Dies sollte sicherlich für die gesamte EU als Richtschnur dienen können.

Es ist eben nicht richtig, daß ein System, das sicherlich im gewerblichen Bereich seine Gültigkeit hat, auch einfach dem Freizeitsport übergestülpt werden kann.

Der vorgeschlagene verwaltungstechnische Überbau (FIE, ATO, Beschränkung der Gültigkeit mit periodischer fliegerischer Überprüfung, etc.) ist unnötig und kostet die Piloten (aus ihrer Tasche!) nur zusätzliche Gebühren. Diese Mittel fehlen dann für Erlangung von mehr Flugpraxis. Diese war aber schon immer das wirkungsvollste Mittel zum Erhalt ausreichender Flugsicherheit!

Der FIE ist auf dem Sektor 'recreational aviation' ueberfluessig.

Dipl.-Ing. TU Diether Memmert, Segelflugpilot seit 1953 mit >8500 Flugstunden

**Aenderungen:**

1.1.1 Streiche FIE.

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment.

As to your standard comment already addressed to several other segments, see the responses already provided.

Regarding your proposal to delete the FIE, the Agency has to point out that the FIE is needed for the skill tests and proficiency checks of all the different instructors.

The Agency believes that this examiner category should stay and will not follow your proposal. No justification is provided why this category of examiner should not be needed.

comment

5294

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

Part FCL : AMC to FCL.1015

The requirement of this paragraph doesn't fit with the content of the Part FCL.1015 (b) and the content of paragraph 2.2 c. in page 577.

Paragraph 2.2.1 is at a better place in "GENERAL" and the competent Authority may also provide the course itself.

response

*Noted*

Please see reply to comment 267 above.

The minimum duration of the course was taken from the text of the rule, and is now only in the AMC.

comment

5295

comment by: *AEA*

**Relevant Text:****CONTENT**

2. The training should comprise:
  - 2.1 Theoretical training covering at least
  - 2.2 Practical training consisting of at least:

For an initial examiner certificate, practical training should include the examination of the test profile sought, consisting of **the conduct of at least two test/check profiles in the role of examiner**, including briefing, conduct of the skill test/proficiency check, assessment of the applicant to whom the test/check is given, debriefing and recording/documentation under the supervision of an examiner of the appropriate category on the applicable type. This training is conducted in the aircraft if approval for testing / checking in the aircraft is required. If examiner privileges in FSTD's are required, practical instruction in the use of FSTD(s) for testing/checking should also be completed.

**Comment:**

Some simulator sessions are conducted with two applicants for a skill test or a check. In this case the practical training for the initial examiner should be validate with one simulator session provided there are two applicants in this session.

**Proposal:****CONTENT**

2. The training should comprise:
  - 2.1 Theoretical training covering at least:
  - 2.2 Practical training consisting of at least:

For an initial examiner certificate, practical training should include the examination of the test profile sought, consisting of **the conduct of at least two test/check profiles in the role of examiner, (these two test/check profiles can be performed in the same simulator session)** including briefing, conduct of the skill test/proficiency check, assessment of the applicant to whom the test/check is given, debriefing and recording/documentation under the supervision of an examiner of the appropriate category on the applicable type. This training is conducted in the aircraft if approval for testing / checking in the aircraft is required. If examiner privileges in FSTD's are required, practical instruction in the use of FSTD(s) for testing/checking should also be completed.

response

*Accepted*

Text will be changed accordingly.

comment

5476

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

This AMC should titled 'AMC 1 to FCL.1015.

The FEM can hardly be used as reference material under EASA requirements and Standards. It is partially incomplete and partially outdated due to JAR-FCL developments since 2005. The terminology is partially inconsistent with FCL requirements (sometimes more like prose than facts/requirements necessary for standardisation and required test standards). Paragraphs 2.2.(c), 2.2.1, 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 are not consistent with Part FCL.

The present FEM needs to be updated with regard to MPL(A) skill test and examiners, with regard to any material on the totally missing powered lift,

ballon, airship etc..

The FEM is missing essential parts relating to helicopter and apparently there is no relation to complex/non complex aircraft in regard to the Basis Regulation in this AMC..

If EASA still intends to introduce the LAPL, there should be a reference here.

Regarding AMC to FCL.1015 2.1 (d) and 2.1.1:

National requirements for examination duties as well as briefing on the protection requirements for personal

data, liability, accident insurance and fees, as applicable in the Member State concerned seem to be not in line with the examiner privileges received from the EU-Community and not bound to EU member States.

There is no standardisation or safety benefit to be expected for the applicant for an examiner certificate issued by one member state, when the examiner exercises most of his privileges in one or several other EU-member states with different national examiner duty requirements and very different requirements on protection requirements for personal data, liability, accident insurance and fees.

This is specifically true in the lot of cases, where examiners exercise their 'Community privileges' outside of the EU, e.g. Middle East and Far East.

See our comment on FCL.1015

response *Noted*

Please see reply to coment 3898 above.

comment

5614

comment by: *CRM Advisory Panel to the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority*

Attachment [#74](#)

The draft does not prescribe any training requirements or the competency standards that an Examiner should demonstrate in the area of non-technical skills assessment. This will lead to the possibility of miss-application of the assessment process due to subjectivity, bias, and poor inter-rater reliability. This will undermine confidence in the application of the licensing rules and the assessment of non-technical skills in particular.

**Proposal:**

Examiners shall undergo specific training in the use of a behavioral marker system for the purpose of non-technical skills assessment. Examiners shall demonstrate competence in the assessment of non-technical skills to the relevant competent authority as part of the Examiner authorisation process.

*(Suggested ammendedl text is underlined in italics):*

**SUBPART K  
EXAMINER CERTIFICATES**

**AMC to FCL.1015 - Examiner standardisation**

CONTENT

2. The training should comprise:

2.1 Theoretical training covering at least:

a.....

e. Fundamentals of human performance and limitations relevant to flight examination.

f. Fundamentals of evaluation and the use for assessment of a non-technical skills behavioural marker system that is approved by the competent authority and relevant to applicant's performance.

g. Quality System of the Approved Training Organisation;

h. Multicrew Cooperation (MCC), Human Performance and Limitations, and the use and application of behavioural marker systems, if applicable.

2.2 Practical training consisting of at least:

a.....

b. ....

c. For an initial examiner certificate, practical training should include the examination of:

the test profile sought, consisting of the conduct of at least two test/check profiles in

the role of examiner, including briefing, conduct of the skill test/proficiency check,

technical and non-technical skills assessment of the applicant to whom the test/check is given, debriefing of technical and non-technical skills, and recording/documentation under the supervision of an examiner of the appropriate category on the applicable type.

2.3 For extension of an examiner certificate to further types (as required for TRE), further practical training on the new type may be required, consisting of the conduct of at least one test/check profile in the role of examiner on the new type, including briefing, conduct of the skill test/proficiency check, technical and non-technical skills assessment of the applicant to whom the test/check is given, debriefing of technical and non-technical skills, and recording/documentation under the supervision of an examiner of the appropriate category on the applicable type.

## **AMC 2 to FCL.1015**

### **Standardisation arrangements for examiners**

#### PURPOSE OF A TEST/CHECK

5 Determine through practical demonstration during a test/check that an applicant has acquired or maintained the required level of knowledge and, technical and non-technical skills/proficiency;

#### ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

17 Although test/checks may specify flight test tolerances, an applicant should not be expected to achieve these at the expense of smoothness or stable flight. An examiner should make due allowance for unavoidable deviations due to turbulence, ATC instructions, etc.. An examiner should terminate a test/check only for the purpose of assessing the applicant, or for safety reasons. An examiner will use one of the following terms for assessment:

a. A 'pass', provided the applicant demonstrates the required level of knowledge, technical and non-technical skills/proficiency and, where applicable, remains within the flight test tolerances for the licence or rating; or

b. A 'fail' provided that any of the following apply:

i. the flight test tolerances have been exceeded after the examiner has made

	<p>due allowance for turbulence or ATC instructions;</p> <p>ii. the aim of the test/check is not completed;</p> <p>iii. the aim of exercise is completed but at the expense of safe flight, violation of a rule or regulation, <u>a non-technical skill(s) deficiency that directly resulted in an unacceptable technical consequence, or rough handling;</u></p> <p><u>iv. an acceptable level of knowledge is not demonstrated;</u></p> <p><u>v. the intervention of the examiner or safety pilot is required in the interest of safety.</u></p>
response	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.</p> <p>We suggest that you submit to the Agency a rulemaking proposal on this issue.</p>

comment	<p><b>5964</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ENAC TLP</i></span></p> <p>The draft does not prescribe any training requirements or the competency standards that an Examiner or an Instructor should demonstrate in the area of non-technical/CRM skills and TEM assessment. This will lead to the possibility of poor practical training in this area and misapplication of the assessment process due to subjectivity, bias, and poor inter-rater reliability that will undermine confidence in licensing rules and diminish the training value of assessment.</p> <p><b>Needs</b> for assessment training or competence requirements for Instructors and Examiners in the area of Non-technical/CRM Skills and TEM</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> Under the label of Human Performance contained in syllabiFlightcrew must be trained in the concepts, use and application of NTS in support to TEM, CRM and Airmanship. Examiners and Instructors shall undergo specific training in the use of a behavioral marker system for the purpose of non-technical skills assessment. Examiners shall demonstrate competence in the assessment of non-technical skills to the relevant competent authority as part of the Instructor rating and Examiner authorisation process.</p> <p><b>AMC to FCL.1015 - Examiner standardisation course</b></p> <p><b>CONTENT</b></p> <p><b>Page 576/577</b></p> <p>to be modified as follows (<i>italics</i>)</p> <p>2. The training should comprise:</p> <p>2.1 Theoretical training covering at least:</p> <p>a.) to e.) as it is</p> <p>f. Fundamentals of evaluation <i>and the use for assessment of a validated NTS behavioural marker system acceptable to the competent authority and relevant to flight examination.</i></p> <p>g. Quality System of the Approved Training Organisation;</p> <p>h. Multi-Crew Cooperation (MCC) <i>if applicable</i>, Human Performance and Limitations <i>and the use and application of behavioural marker systems.</i></p> <p>2.2 Practical training consisting of at least:</p> <p>a. as it is</p> <p>b. as it is</p> <p>c. For an initial examiner certificate, practical training should include the</p>
---------	--

examination of the test profile sought, consisting of the conduct of at least two test/check profiles in the role of examiner, including briefing, conduct of the skill test/proficiency check, *technical and non-technical skills* assessment of the applicant to whom the test/check is given, debriefing of *technical and non-technical skills*, and recording/documentation under the supervision of an examiner of the appropriate category on the applicable type.

1.2.1 as it is

1.2.2 as it is

2.3 For extension of an examiner certificate to further types (as required for TRE), further practical training on the new type may be required, consisting of the conduct of at least one test/check profile in the role of examiner on the new type, including briefing, conduct of the skill test/proficiency check, *technical and non-technical skills* assessment of the applicant to whom the test/check is given, debriefing of *technical and non-technical skills*, and recording documentation under the supervision of an examiner of the appropriate category on the applicable type. A further examiner check on the new type...omissis.....as it is.

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 5614 above.

comment

6236

comment by: *Cary Crawley*

FCL1015 1.1.2 Would suggest a five day course for Examiners. I think that in the case of hot air balloon Examiners, this is excessive. Perhaps a maximum of two days, one theory and one observed actual or mock check-flight. The two days need not be concurrent but the theory should come first.

response

*Noted*

Please see reply to comment 267 above.

comment

6392

comment by: *Axel Schwarz*

Why should a course for examiners (CRE, IRE, TRE) last 5 days if even the course for the FE only lasts one day. After all, it is the FE who has the widest range of privileges and performs skill tests for the issue of such basic licences as the PPL or the CPL. Therefore the requirements for obtaining a FE should be amongst the highest.

response

*Noted*

The AMC only offers minimum durations. This does not mean that the course should/could not last longer, depending on the concrete privileges and background of the examiners.

comment

6394

comment by: *Axel Schwarz*

2. Training content, item g.: It will be very difficult - if not impossible - to train the "Quality System of the Approved Training Organisation" if the examiner training is provided by the Authority or by another ATO. The requirement should therefore read "Quality Systems of ATOs" and give a general understanding of the Quality System requirements instead of focusing on one specific quality system.



response *Partially accepted*

Text amended to refer to management system of approved training organisations, for consistency with Part-OR.

comment 6654 comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**  
AMC to FCL1015 paragraph 2.1 a)

**Page No:**  
576

**Comment:**  
Refers to Flight Examiners Manual. Where does this fit into EASA FCL?

**Justification:**  
FEM is needed but must be incorporated as a AMC.

**Proposed Text:  
(if applicable)**  
Refer to AMC reference. Review this whole section. The FEM is the ideal place to detail the conduct of examiners training and how to conduct tests. However this needs to be incorporated as an AMC then delete examiner AMCs.

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 2397 above.

comment 6658 comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**  
AMC to FCL1015 paragraph 2.22

**Page No:**  
577

**Comment:**  
This applies to all examiners conducting IR revalidation not just helicopters.

**Justification:**  
The requirement for CRI to conduct IR revalidations/renewals must be backed up by suitable training

**Proposed Text:  
(if applicable)**  
Delete: "*For helicopters,.....*" then write " If examiner privileges are required to include.....etc

response *Accepted*

Text changed accordingly.

comment 6843 comment by: CAA CZ

There is AMC 2 to FCL.1015 on page 577so this AMC should be numbered as AMC No. 1 to FCL.1015.

response *Accepted*

Text will be changed accordingly.

comment 7237 comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL.1015 para 2.1

**Page No:**

576 of 647

**Comment:**

The examiner will need to be able to assess non-technical skills as part of any test or check. Therefore the training for examiners should include non-technical skills.

**Justification:**

Consistency

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Amend as follows;

"f. Fundamentals of evaluation *and the use for assessment of a non-technical skills behavioural marker system that is approved by the competent authority, and relevant to applicant's performance*"

g. Quality....

h. Multi-Crew Cooperation (MCC), Human performance and Limitations *and the use and application of behavioural marker systems, if applicable.*"

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 5614 above.

comment

7240

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL.1015 para 2.2

**Page No:**

577 of 647

**Comment:**

The examiner will need to be able to assess non-technical skills as part of any test or check. Therefore the training for examiners should include non-technical skills.

**Justification:**

Consistency

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Amend to read;

1. ....

2. ....

3. For an initial examiner....conduct of the skill test/proficiency check, *technical and non-technical skills* assessment of the applicant to whom the test/check is given, *debriefing of technical and non-technical skills, and recording.....*"

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 5614 above.

comment

7251

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL.1015 para 2.3

**Page No:**

577 of 647

**Comment:**

The examiner will need to be able to assess non-technical skills as part of any test or check. Therefore the training for examiners should include non-technical skills.

**Justification:**

Consistency

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Amend to read;

For extension of an examiner..... conduct of the skill test/proficiency check, *technical and non-technical skills* assessment of the applicant to whom the test/check is given, debriefing of *technical and non-technical skills*, and recording....."

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 5614 above.

comment

7921

comment by: *CAA Finland*

Ref my comment to FCL.1015, FEM alone is 112 pages without helicopters. Amended text proposal:

1.1 The course should last:

1.1.1 For the LAFE, FE and FIE, at least **4 days**, divided into theoretical and practical training;

1.1.2 for other examiners, at least **6** days, divided into ground training and practical training in a simulator conducting role played proficiency checks and skill tests (at least 3 days).

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 267 above.

Your proposal for minimum durations seems excessive.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart K: Examiner Certificates - AMC 2 to FCL.1015 - Standardisation arrangements for examiners**

p. 577-580

comment

2276

comment by: *Bundespolizei-Fliegergruppe und Polizeihubschrauberstaffeln/ -fliegerstaffeln der Länder*

According to LIMITATIONS 1, four checks/tests are to be planned per day relating to type rating, but in paragraph 2 four hours are to be planned for a type rating test/check.

LIMITATIONS 2 should read as follows:

An examiner should plan at least two hours for LPL, SPL, BPL or type rating test/checks

LIMITATIONS 4 does not give a time frame for MPH type rating

response *Noted*

These are just indicative values. The examiner can always plan for less tests or checks, or for more time. In order to make this clear, the Agency will pass paragraphs 1 and 2 to guidance material, and review them for consistency.

Please see reply to comment no 7926 below.

comment	<p>comment by: <i>Industry Group (Airbus, Alteon Training, Bell Helicopters, Boeing, CAE, CTC Aviation Group, ECOGAS, Flight Safety International, IAAPS (International Association of Aviation Personnel Schools), IACA, IATA, KLM Luchtvaartschool, Lufthansa Flight Training, TUI Group Airlines)</i></p> <p>2398</p> <p>Page 578 under Conduct of Test/Check § 9: Comment: text ambiguous.</p> <p>Proposal: remove sentence " a failed item is a failed section", as later in the sentence it is said: "a failed item is not always a failed section".</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text amended accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>2954</p> <p>comment by: <i>Robert WORSMAN</i></p> <p>Given the rule change that a examiner for balloons can also instruct then it would be sensible to add in here that he should not instruct the same pilot on the day of that pilot's flight test</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Please see replies to comments to FCL.1005, where the restrictions in the case of vested interests are explained.</p>
comment	<p>2955</p> <p>comment by: <i>Robert WORSMAN</i></p> <p>AMC 2 to FCL 1015 section 16. For Balloonists</p> <p>The best way to establish a friendly and relaxed atmosphere is by previous contact and established relationship. This is why it is important for the examiner to have the opportunity to carry out instructor flights.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see replies to comments to FCL.1005.</p>
comment	<p>3563</p> <p>comment by: <i>Rory Worsman</i></p> <p>Given the change that allows examiners to instruct (the only sensible option) then it would also make sense to prevent them to instruct a PUT on the day of his flight test.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 2954 above.</p>
comment	<p>3564</p> <p>comment by: <i>Rory Worsman</i></p>

	<p>Given the requirement to make the trainee at ease during his flight test then it is most important that the examiner is allowed to instruct.</p> <p>This creates a friendly and relaxed atmosphere by previous contact.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see replies to comments to FCL.1005</p>
comment	<p><b>3801</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Klaus HARTMANN</i></span></p> <p>Unter Punkt 2 'An examiner should plan at least 2 hours for a LPL, BPL.....' ist auch im besten Falle nicht möglich. Besprechung, Fahrtvorbereitung, Aufrüsten, Fahrt, Verpacken, Nachbesprechung, Dokumentation ist realistisch nicht unter 3 Stunden möglich, eher mehr, wenn ein guter Qualitätsstandard für die Prüfung gewährleistet werden soll. Die Angabe könnte Qualitätseinbußen zur Folge haben, auch wenn 'at least' geschrieben steht. Ebenso gibt es keinen zeitlichen Unterschied für einen LAFI oder FI im Ballonbereich, bei denen identische tests durchgeführt werden. Der LAFI ist mit 3 h der FI mit eher realistischen 4 h angeben.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency is aware that a BPL or LPL(B) examination will normally last at least 2-4 hours as the minimum flight time is mentioned under subparagraph 4 with 45 minutes.</p> <p>These are just indicative values. The examiner can always plan for more time (the term "at least" is used). In order to make this clear, the Agency will pass paragraphs 1 and 2 to guidance material, and review them for consistency.</p>
comment	<p><b>3899</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Luftfahrt-Bundesamt</i></span></p> <p>AMC 2 to FCL.1015:</p> <p>This AMC seems to be a mix of copies from JAR-FCL 1 and JAR-FCL 2 AMC material (amendment 2 from 2002!), except for three letters: MPL. A careful review in relation to the requirements is strongly recommended.</p> <p>This AMC needs amendment in the area of competency based assessment and documentation for the new licence MPL and for the new skill tests or proof of competence for instructor certificates CRI,TRI,SFI etc. This AMC is partially outdated and needs also editorial amendments (instructor certificates etc.).</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency notes the statement that this AMC needs to be revised. This should be done with task FCL.002.</p>
comment	<p><b>3967</b> <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Professional Air Training Ltd</i></span></p> <p>see comment 3938</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p>

comment	<p>5107</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>George Knight</i></p> <p>P 579 Method &amp; Content of the Test/Check</p> <p><i>"18 Before undertaking a test/check, an examiner will verify that the aircraft or flight simulation synthetic training device intended to be used, is suitable and appropriately equipped for the test/check. <b>Only aircraft or synthetic flight simulation training devices approved by the Authority for skill testing/proficiency checking may be used.</b>"</i></p> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p>For light aircraft and sailplanes recreational licences this restriction that each aircraft to be used for a test must have been approved by the authority is a nonsense.</p> <p><b>Propose:</b></p> <p><i>"18 Before undertaking a test/check, an examiner will verify that the aircraft or flight simulation synthetic training device intended to be used, is suitable and appropriately equipped for the test/check. <b>For tests/checks in connection with professional licenses and ratings</b> only aircraft or synthetic flight simulation training devices approved by the Authority for skill testing/proficiency checking may be used."</i></p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency will delete the reference to the need for aircraft /FSTD to be specifically approved.</p>
comment	<p>5109</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>George Knight</i></p> <p>P 579 Method and Content of the test / check</p> <p><i>"20 A test/check flight will be conducted within the limitations contained in the operations manual of a Approved Training Organisation and, where applicable, the operations manual of a registered facility."</i></p> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p><i>Small ATOs (e.g gliding clubs) may not have (may not be required to have) an Operations Manual - this is the subject of a separate consultation.</i></p> <p><b>Propose:</b></p> <p><i>"20 A test/check flight will be conducted within the limitations contained in the operations manual of a Approved Training Organisation and, <del>where applicable,</del> the operations manual of a registered facility where applicable."</i></p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Reference to registered facilities will be deleted. It was a mistake when transposing the text from JAR-FCL. Registered facilities no longer exist in the EASA system.</p>
comment	<p>5477</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i></p> <p>This AMC seems to be a mix of copies from JAR-FCL 1 and JAR-FCL 2 AMC material (amendment 2 from 2002!), except for three letters: MPL. A careful review in relation to the requirements is strongly recommended.</p>

This AMC needs amendment in the area of competency based assessment and documentation for the new licence MPL and for the new skill tests or proof of competence for instructor certificates CRI, TRI, SFI etc.  
This AMC is partially outdated and needs also editorial amendments (instructor certificates etc.).

response *Noted*

Please see reply to comment 3899 above.

comment

5967

comment by: ENAC TLP

The draft does not prescribe any training requirements or the competency standards that an Examiner or an Instructor should demonstrate in the area of non-technical/CRM skills and TEM assessment. This will lead to the possibility of poor practical training in this area and misapplication of the assessment process due to subjectivity, bias, and poor inter-rater reliability that will undermine confidence in licensing rules and diminish the training value of assessment.

**Needs** for assessment training or competence requirements for Instructors and Examiners in the area of Non-technical/CRM Skills and TEM

**Proposal:** Under the label of Human Performance contained in syllabi Flightcrew must be trained in the concepts, use and application of NTS in support to TEM, CRM and Airmanship. Examiners and Instructors shall undergo specific training in the use of a behavioral marker system for the purpose of non-technical skills assessment. Examiners shall demonstrate competence in the assessment of non-technical skills to the relevant competent authority as part of the Instructor rating and Examiner authorisation process.

## **AMC 2 to FCL.1015**

### **Standardisation arrangements for examiners**

#### **PURPOSE OF A TEST/CHECK**

##### **Page 578**

to be modified as follows (*italics*)

5 Determine through practical demonstration during a test/check that an applicant has acquired or maintained the required level of knowledge *and*, *technical* skills/proficiency;

#### **ASSESSMENT SYSTEM**

##### **Page 579**

to be modified as follows (*italics*)

17 (a) A 'pass', provided the applicant demonstrates the required level of knowledge, *\_technical* skills/proficiency and, where applicable, remains within the flight test tolerances for the licence or rating; or

17 (b) A "fail" provided that any the following apply:

i. to vi, as it is:

*Non-technical skills assessment alone shall not be used as a reason for a failure of a test/check.*

#### **METHOD AND CONTENTS OF THE TEST/CHECK**

##### **Page 580**

to be modified as follows (*italics*)

21 (e.) Post –flight debriefing shall include:

- *evaluation of technical performance and assessment of relevant NTS/TEM/CRM.*

	- <i>documentation of the test/check.</i>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task. We suggest that you submit to the Agency a rulemaking proposal on this issue.</p>
comment	<p>6237 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Cary Crawley</i></span></p> <p>These time requirements should be left very flexible in the case of hot air ballooning.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 6400 below. The values will only be there as guidance.</p>
comment	<p>6321 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Jonathan Coote</i></span></p> <p>Point 9: Inconsistent wording: "A failed item is a failed section" followed by "A failed item is not always a failed section".</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text amended accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>6400 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Axel Schwarz</i></span></p> <p>Paragraph 4: Stipulating a minimum duration for various types of test/check flights is not necessary since there exists a taxative list of exercises to be performed during any such flight. Requiring a certain duration will only lead to examiners paying more attention to flying the correct amount of time than executing the required flying exercises. Also, students will tend to complain over extensive costs should the actual test/check flights take longer than mentioned here.</p> <p>Since the approach to any training becomes more and more competency-based, this should also be reflected in the testing requirements. Any examiner will acknowledge that performing the required checkflight programme will take a certain amount of time which, nevertheless, may vary with student performance, weather situation, ATC requirements, local procedures etc. I therefore strongly suggest omitting this paragraph and put in something in the line of "An examiner should plan a test/check flight so that all required exercises can be performed while allowing sufficient time for each of the exercises and with due regard to the weather conditions, traffic situation, ATC requirements and local procedures."</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency agrees with the reasoning behind your proposal. The sentence you suggest will be included in the AMC, and the values will be included as</p>



guidance material for the examiner.  
See also reply to comment 2276 above.

comment 6457 comment by: DCAA

AMC 2 to FCL.1015 item 1 Change text to "or more than two tests/checks relating to type rating

response *Not accepted*

The proposal complies with JAR-FCL. Furthermore, it only gives an indication of how much time should be planned. The Agency sees no evidence that it needs to be changed at this time.

comment 6458 comment by: DCAA

AMC 2 to FCL.101 AMC 2 to FCL.1015 item 4 dMPL 180 minutes (contains both licence skill test, instrument skill test and type rating skill test).

response *Not accepted*

The proposal complies with JAR-FCL. Furthermore, it only gives an indication of how much time should be planned. The Agency sees no evidence that it needs to be changed at this time.

comment 6459 comment by: DCAA

AMC 2 to FCL.1015 item 6  
Delete registered faciliDelete registered facilit  
Delete registered facil

response *Accepted*

Text amended accordingly.

comment 6663 comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**  
AMC2 to FCL1015 paragraph 4a  
**Page No\*:**  
578  
**Comment:**  
**Justification:**  
A VFR SEP Class rating could take only 30 minutes.  
**Proposed Text:**  
**(if applicable)**  
Add : single pilot class rating VFR only.

response *Accepted*

Text amended accordingly.

comment 6665 comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

	<p>AMC No 2 to FCL 1015 paragraph 4d  <b>Page No*:</b>  578  <b>Comment:</b>  There is no test specified that combines CPL and IR.  <b>Justification:</b>  <b>Proposed Text:</b>  <b>(if applicable)</b>  Delete: <i>"CPL/IR"</i></p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Text has been amended to refer only to CPL.</p>

comment	<p>6668 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b>  AMC No 2 to FCL.1015 Paragraph 9  <b>Page No:</b>  578  <b>Comment:</b>  Line 1 states 'A failed item is a failed section'. Line 3 states 'A failed item is not always a failed section'.  <b>Justification:</b>  Contradiction.  <b>Proposed Text:</b>  <b>(if applicable)</b>  Amend for consistency.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text amended accordingly.</p>

comment	<p>6670 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b>  AMC No 2 to FCL.1015 Paragraph 20  <b>Page No:</b>  579  <b>Comment:</b>  Paragraph mentions Registered Facilities which is no longer appropriate.  <b>Justification:</b>  <b>Proposed Text:</b>  <b>(if applicable)</b>  Delete 'and, where applicable, the operations manual of a registered facility'.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text amended accordingly.</p>

comment	<p>6675 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b>  AMC No 2 to FCL.1015 Paragraph 20  <b>Page No:</b>  580</p>
---------	---

response	<p><b>Comment:</b> This paragraph gives the examiner discretion over which items may be repeated. This is not stated in the Appendices to Part FCL describing the various tests.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b></p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Examiner discretion should be added to appropriate Appendices (4, 7, 9, 12).</p> <p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The right for the applicant to repeat an item should not be left at the discretion of the examiner. The first sentence of paragraph 27 of the AMC deleted.</p>
comment	<p>6678 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC 2 to FCL1015</p> <p><b>Page No*:</b> 580</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Simulating IMC is an important examiner skill where appropriate to sole reference to instruments.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b></p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> New paragraph 23 and renumber paragraphs: When manoeuvres are to be flown by sole reference to instruments the examiner shall ensure that a suitable method of screening is used to simulate IMC.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency agrees with your proposal and will amend the text accordingly.</p>
comment	<p>7261 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC 2 to FCL.1015 para 5 &amp; 17</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 578 &amp; 579 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> There are no prescribed training standards for the training of non-technical skills for examiners. This will lead to the possibility of misapplication of the assessment process due to subjectivity, bias and possibly poor inter-rater reliability. Ultimately this will undermine the confidence in the application of NT S to the relevant competent authority as part of the Examiner authorisation process.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Consistency</p> <p><b>Proposed Text: (if applicable)</b> Add text as follows; "5. ...the required level of knowledge <i>and technical and non-technical skill/proficiency</i>" 6. ...</p>

17. Although...
- a. A 'pass', .....knowledge, *technical and non-technical* skills/proficiency...
  - b. A 'fail'...
    - i. ...
    - ii...
    - iii. the aim...rule or regulation, *a non-technical skill(s) deficiency that directly resulted in an unacceptable technical consequence, or rough handling;*
    - iv. *an unacceptable level of knowledge is demonstrated,*
    - v. the intervention...

response *Noted*

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.  
We suggest that you submit to the Agency a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment

7926

comment by: *CAA Finland*

Para 4:

ATPL includes same items as MP skillt est / proficiency check. Clarification required. Amended text proposal:

d. 120 minutes for CPL/IR, MPL, ~~and~~ ATPL **and multi-pilot type rating per pilot.**

response

*Accepted*

Text will be ameded accordingly.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart K: Examiner Certificates - AMC to FCL.1020 - Assessment of competence**

p. 580-582

comment

344

comment by: *Michel Lacombe AF TRTO*

NUMBERING forgotten

AMC to FCL.1020  
Assessment of competence

GENERAL

**1** The competent authority may nominate either one of its inspectors or a senior examiner to assess the competence of applicants for an examiner certificate.

DEFINITIONS

**2** 'Inspector' - The inspector of the Authority conducting the examiner competence assessment.

'Examiner Applicant' - The person seeking certification as an Examiner

'Candidate' - The person being tested/checked by the Examiner Applicant. This

person may be a pilot for whom the test/check would be required, or the Inspector of the Authority who is conducting the Examiner Certification Acceptance Test.

#### CONDUCT OF THE ASSESSMENT

**3** An inspector of the Authority, or a senior examiner, will observe all examiner applicants conducting a test on a 'candidate' in an aircraft for which examiner certificate is sought.....

response *Accepted*

Text amended.

comment

1445

comment by: *Bristow Helicopters*

#### CONDUCT OF THE ASSESSMENT

..... Items from the related ~~"Syllabi for training course and skill test/proficiency checks content for the call/type rating"~~ **training course and test/check schedule** will be selected by the inspector .....

#### Justification:

This whole section is general to all examiner certificates, but the paragraph above is specific to the TRE. To make it applicable to all examiners amend as indicated above.

5. The examiner ~~TRE~~ applicant should maintain the necessary level of communication with the "candidate". The following check details should be followed by the examiner ~~TRE~~ applicant.

#### Justification:

Delete TRE to make it applicable to all examiners.

response

*Accepted*

Text amended.

comment

1447

comment by: *Bristow Helicopters*

#### RECORDING DOCUMENTATION

A. the relevant ~~skill~~ test **or check** form

#### Justification:

This section is generic to all types of examiner and duties may include the conduct of both tests and checks.

response

*Accepted*

Text amended.

comment

2143

comment by: *British International Helicopters*

#### CONDUCT OF THE ASSESSMENT

..... Items from the related ~~"Syllabi for training course and skill test/proficiency checks content for the call/type rating"~~ **training course and test/check schedule** will be selected by the inspector .....

	<p>Justification: This whole section is general to all examiner certificates, but the paragraph above is specific to the TRE. To make it applicable to all examiners amend as indicated above.</p> <p>5. The examiner <del>TRE</del> applicant should maintain the necessary level of communication with the "candidate". The following check details should be followed by the examiner <del>TRE</del> applicant.</p> <p>Justification: Delete TRE to make it applicable to all examiners.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text amended.</p>
comment	<p>2144 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>British International Helicopters</i></span></p> <p>RECORDING DOCUMENTATION</p> <p>A. the relevant <del>skill</del> test <b>or check</b> form</p> <p>Justification: This section is generic to all types of examiner and duties may include the conduct of both tests and checks.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text amended.</p>
comment	<p>2366 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>AECA(SPAIN)</i></span></p> <p>CONDUCT OF THE ASSESSMENT</p> <p>..... Items from the related "<del>Syllabi for training course and skill test/proficiency checks content for the call/type rating</del>" <b>training course and test/check schedule</b> will be selected by the inspector .....</p> <p>Justification: This whole section is general to all examiner certificates, but the paragraph above is specific to the TRE. To make it applicable to all examiners amend as indicated above.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Text amended.</p>
comment	<p>2367 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>AECA(SPAIN)</i></span></p> <p>5. The examiner <del>TRE</del> applicant should maintain the necessary level of communication with the "candidate". The following check details should be followed by the examiner <del>TRE</del> applicant.</p> <p>Justification: Delete TRE to make it applicable to all examiners.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p>

Text amended.

comment

3019

comment by: *Deutscher Aero Club (DAeC)*

Quote from draft rule: "An inspector of the Authority, or a senior examiner, will observe all examiner applicants conducting a test on a 'candidate' in an aircraft for which examiner certificate is sought."

This means three persons on board. Is the Agency aware of the fact that no sailplane exits with a capacity of more than two persons? That's even not covered by CS-22. It seems that the requirements above was copy and paste from current JAR-FCL regulations without considering the specifics of other aircraft categories.

A high number of aeroplane used by flight training organisations are also two-seater (Aquila A210, Katana, Cessna 152).

Discussions with existing inspectors discovered that they are not willing to enter an aircraft for the purpose of conducting such an assessment without having access to the controls. The reason for the prof/skill-check is the fact, that an Examiner is my not yet or not anymore competent to fulfil is duties. This means if the Examiner's reactions are inappropriate the Inspector must have access to the controls to recover the situation, especially as the Inspector has overall responsibility. Hint: In e.g. an Airbus it is possible to change seats during flight, but in a small aircraft that's impossible.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

The Agency is fully aware that an assessment of competence when conducting a test on a "candidate" in an aircraft for which the examiner certificate is sought might have to be taken on a two-seater aircraft (e.g. a sailplane). The Agency is also aware that there are quite a lot of two-seater aircraft certified according to different certification codes. The two-seaters mentioned (Aquila, Katana, Cessna 152 and several other two-seaters, helicopters and sailplanes - there might be even hot-air balloons and hot-air airships where under certain circumstances only 2 persons can be carried) are well known.

But the Agency still does not agree with your statement and the conclusion to draw out of it.

Your reasoning did not take into account the explanation provided in the same AMC for the term "candidate". Please check the text again (under definitions) and you will find the following definition:

"Candidate" - the person being tested/checked by the Examiner Applicant. This person may be a pilot for whom the test/check would be required (in this case you would be right with your assumption) or the Inspector of the Authority who is conducting the Examiner Certification Acceptance Test". In the latter case clearly the inspector and the examiner applicant could be the only persons on board the aircraft because the inspector is taking over the role of the pilot to be checked. This means also that the inspector certainly will have access to the controls because due to the fact that only two seats are available he/she must sit on the left side (or in the case of a sailplane in the front seat).

The Agency has also understood the "hint" provided (large complex aircraft

versus small non-complex sailplane) and will take it into consideration for future amendments of this AMC.

The Agency cannot see any problem with the wording proposed.

comment **3900** comment by: *Luftfahrt-Bundesamt*

AMC to FCL.1020:

It is assumed that this is copied from the FEM. The AMC appears to be intended for all examiner roles, but in this case it is editorially incomplete because beginning with No 5 all material seems to refer to the TRE role only. It does not include the TRE(A) for MPL.

response *Noted*

Text will be revised and amended for consistency.

comment **4446** comment by: *Bond Offshore Helicopters*

#### CONDUCT OF THE ASSESSMENT

..... Items from the related "~~Syllabi for training course and skill test/proficiency checks content for the call/type rating~~" **training course and test/check schedule** will be selected by the inspector .....

#### Justification:

This whole section is general to all examiner certificates, but the paragraph above is specific to the TRE. To make it applicable to all examiners amend as indicated above.

5. The examiner ~~TRE~~ applicant should maintain the necessary level of communication with the "candidate". The following check details should be followed by the examiner ~~TRE~~ applicant.

#### Justification:

Delete TRE to make it applicable to all examiners.

response *Accepted*

Text amended.

comment **4447** comment by: *Bond Offshore Helicopters*

#### RECORDING DOCUMENTATION

A. the relevant ~~skill~~ test **or check** form

#### Justification:

This section is generic to all types of examiner and duties may include the conduct of both tests and checks.

response *Accepted*

Text amended.



comment

4688

comment by: *Héli-Union*

## CONDUCT OF THE ASSESSMENT

..... Items from the related "~~Syllabi for training course and skill test/proficiency checks content for the call/type rating~~" **training course and test/check schedule** will be selected by the inspector .....

## Justification:

This whole section is general to all examiner certificates, but the paragraph above is specific to the TRE. To make it applicable to all examiners amend as indicated above.

5. The examiner ~~TRE~~ applicant should maintain the necessary level of communication with the "candidate". The following check details should be followed by the examiner ~~TRE~~ applicant.

## Justification:

Delete TRE to make it applicable to all examiners.

response

*Accepted*

Text amended.

comment

4689

comment by: *Héli-Union*

## RECORDING DOCUMENTATION

A. the relevant ~~skill~~ test **or check** form

## Justification:

This section is generic to all types of examiner and duties may include the conduct of both tests and checks.

response

*Accepted*

Text amended.

comment

4909

comment by: *HUTC*

## CONDUCT OF THE ASSESSMENT

..... Items from the related "~~Syllabi for training course and skill test/proficiency checks content for the call/type rating~~" **training course and test/check schedule** will be selected by the inspector .....

## Justification:

This whole section is general to all examiner certificates, but the paragraph above is specific to the TRE. To make it applicable to all examiners amend as indicated above.

5. The examiner ~~TRE~~ applicant should maintain the necessary level of communication with the "candidate". The following check details should be followed by the examiner ~~TRE~~ applicant.

## Justification:

Delete TRE to make it applicable to all examiners.

response

*Accepted*

Text amended.

comment 4910 comment by: HUTC

RECORDING DOCUMENTATION

A. the relevant ~~skill~~ test **or check** form

Justification:

This section is generic to all types of examiner and duties may include the conduct of both tests and checks.

response *Accepted*

Text amended.

comment 5478 comment by: CAA Belgium

It is assumed that this is copied from the FEM. The AMC appears to be intended for all examiner roles, but in this case it is editorially incomplete because beginning with No 5 all material seems to refer to the TRE role only. It does not include the TRE(A) for MPL.

response *Noted*

Text will be revised and amended for consistency.

comment 5968 comment by: ENAC TLP

The draft does not prescribe any training requirements or the competency standards that an Examiner or an Instructor should demonstrate in the area of non-technical/CRM skills and TEM assessment. This will lead to the possibility of poor practical training in this area and misapplication of the assessment process due to subjectivity, bias, and poor inter-rater reliability that will undermine confidence in licensing rules and diminish the training value of assessment.

**Needs** for assessment training or competence requirements for Instructors and Examiners in the area of Non-technical/CRM Skills and TEM

**Proposal:** Under the label of Human Performance contained in syllabiFlightcrew must be trained in the concepts, use and application of NTS in support to TEM, CRM and Airmanship. Examiners and Instructors shall undergo specific training in the use of a behavioral marker system for the purpose of non-technical skills assessment. Examiners shall demonstrate competence in the assessment of non-technical skills to the relevant competent authority as part of the Instructor rating and Examiner authorisation process.

**AMC to FCL.1020 Assessment of competence**

**ASSESSMENT**

**Page 581/582**

(6.) The examiner applicant should refer to the flight test tolerances given in the relevant *test/check* Appendix.

Attention should be paid to the following points:

- a.) questions *to and from* the candidate/s
- b.) and c.) as it is

(7) The examiner applicant should demonstrate to the inspector the ability to conduct a fair, unbiased debriefing of the "candidate/s" based on

identifiable factual items *and using appropriate training aids*. A balanced between friendliness and firmness should be evident. The following points should be discussed with the "candidate/s", at the applicant's discretion *and using appropriate models for NTS/CRM/TEM assessment, directly linked to the observed elements of technical performance*:

- a.) as it is
- b.) as it is
- c.) as it is.

response **Noted**

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task.

We suggest that you submit to the Agency a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

comment

6402

comment by: DSvU

AMC to FCL.1020  
Assessment of competence

Comment:  
GENERAL

The competent authority may nominate either one of its inspectors or a senior examiner to assess the competence of applicants for an examiner certificate.

Proposal:  
GENERAL

The competent authority *or an approved training organisation, approved by the competent authority*, may nominate either one of its inspectors or a senior examiner to assess the competence of applicants for an examiner certificate.

Justification:

self-explanatory, if the competent authority has transferred jurisdiction to an approved training organisation.

response **Noted**

If the authority does so, it will have to be in compliance with the Basic Regulation and national administrative law as all provisions on delegations of competence within the system of the Member States. There is no need to refer to such provisions in the Implementing Rules or the AMC/GM.

comment

6673

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**  
AMC to FCL.1020  
**Page No:**  
580 of 647  
**Comment:**

In this AMC in the GENERAL part, a "senior examiner" may be nominated by the competent authority to conduct an initial assessment of competence on a newly trained examiner. This is an expansion of the IR at FCL.1020 where it restricts the initial assessment of competence to the competent authority and therefore the AMC has greater strength. This is contrary to the way this should

	work. <b>Justification:</b> The AMC cannot be more wide ranging than the IR. <b>Proposed Text:</b> <b>(if applicable)</b> Delete the words " <i>or a senior examiner</i> " from the first sentence. Also delete these words from the CONDUCT OF ASSESSMENT paragraph (first line).
response	<i>Noted</i>  Text of FCL.1020 amended to refer to an inspector of the authority or a senior examiner.
comment	6681 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span>  <b>Paragraph:</b> AMC to FCL 1020 paragraph 4 h <b>Page No*:</b> 581 <b>Comment:</b> Screens are needed for PPL CPL and Class/type and IR tests. <b>Justification:</b> <b>Proposed Text:</b> <b>(if applicable)</b> Use of screens and simulated weather assumptions.
response	<i>Partially accepted</i>  Thank you for providing your opinion.  The Agency agrees in general and will add "use of screens" as a separate sub-paragraph.
comment	6683 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span>  <b>Paragraph:</b> AMC to FCL.1020 Paragraph 6 <b>Page No:</b> 581 <b>Comment:</b> Delete 'Appendix.' <b>Justification:</b> Typographical error <b>Proposed Text:</b> <b>(if applicable)</b> Delete 'Appendix.'
response	<i>Noted</i>  Text amended.
comment	8117 <span style="float: right;">comment by: European Sailplane Manufacturers</span>  The manufacturer hope that no three-seaters will be needed as they are not permitted in the CS-22 requirements.....

	<p>In earnest: the authority inspector or the candidate have to remain on the ground as sailplanes have only 1 or 2 seats.</p> <p>This is also true for VLA / LSA / small CS-23 airplanes.....</p> <p>The AMC has to be amended here.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency acknowledges your comment.</p> <p>It can be confirmed from the Agency's side that no three-seater sailplane will be needed in order to comply with the given framework for the Examiner Certification Acceptance Test.</p> <p>But it also has to be pointed out that the Agency does not agree with your proposal and will not amend the AMC. Please see the response already provided to comment No. 3019 (Deutscher Aero Club) in the same segment above to understand the Agency's reasoning.</p>

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Subpart K: Examiner Certificates - AMC to FCL.1025 - Validity, revalidation and renewal**

p. 582

comment	<p>1449 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Bristow Helicopters</i></span></p> <p>This validity period should be stated in the Rule for clarity (refer to my previous comments on validity periods).</p> <p>Justification: Clarity of the rule.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The validity period is stated in the rule. This AMC will be deleted.</p> <p>Please see also reply to comments on FCL.1025.</p>
comment	<p>2145 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>British International Helicopters</i></span></p> <p>This validity period should be stated in the Rule for clarity</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The validity period is stated in the rule. This AMC will be deleted.</p> <p>Please see also reply to comments on FCL.1025.</p>
comment	<p>2369 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>AECA(SPAIN)</i></span></p> <p>This validity period should be stated in the Rule.</p> <p>Justification: Clarity of the rule.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p>

The validity period is stated in the rule. This AMC will be deleted.

Please see also reply to comments on FCL.1025.

comment

3816

comment by: DGAC FRANCE

AMC to FCL.1025

This wording is consistent with FCL.940 and FCL.1025 (a).

Strokes elements are not consistent with AR.FCL.215 which says :

*"When issuing, revalidating or renewing a rating or instructor certificate, the competent authority shall extend the validity period of the rating or instructor certificate until the end of the month in which the validity would otherwise expire. That date shall remain the expiry date of the rating or instructor certificate."*

Future work ! AMC to FCL.1025 should be withdraw and AR.FCL.215 amended as follow : *"When issuing, revalidating or renewing a rating ~~or~~ instructor **or examiner** certificate, the competent authority shall ....*

**Delete this AMC :**

**~~AMC to FCL.1025~~**

**~~Validity, revalidation and renewal~~**

~~The period of 3 years should be counted in addition to the remainder of the month of issue. If issued~~

~~within the final 12 calendar months of validity of a previous examiner check, the period of validity should be extended from the date of issue until 3 years from the expiry date of that previous examiner check. When the examiner authorization is revalidated at the same time as his instructor certificate, the validity period of the instructor certificate may be aligned with the examiner certificate.~~

response

*Accepted*

AMC will be deleted.

Please see also replies to comments on FCL.1025

comment

3901

comment by: Luftfahrt-Bundesamt

AMC to FCL.1025:

This AMC seems to be a copy from JAR-FCL 2, subpart I and is not consistent with JAR-FCL 1, amendment 7.

The procedure for revalidation of an instructor rating or instructor authorisation is a licensing requirement (entry into a licence or issue of authorisation) and thus required in a different subpart for instructors.

It should not be part of the procedures for examiner certification, which will not be entered into a licence.

response

*Noted*

This AMC will be deleted.

comment	4448	comment by: <i>Bond Offshore Helicopters</i>
	<p>This validity period should be stated in the Rule for clarity (refer to our previous comments on validity periods).</p> <p>Justification: Clarity of the rule.</p>	
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The validity period is stated in the rule. This AMC will be deleted.</p> <p>Please see also reply to comments on FCL.1025.</p>	
comment	4690	comment by: <i>Héli-Union</i>
	<p>This validity period should be stated in the Rule for clarity (refer to our previous comments on validity periods).</p> <p>Justification: Clarity of the rule.</p>	
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The validity period is stated in the rule. This AMC will be deleted.</p> <p>Please see also reply to comments on FCL.1025.</p>	
comment	4911	comment by: <i>HUTC</i>
	<p>This validity period should be stated in the Rule for clarity (refer to our previous comments on validity periods).</p> <p>Justification: Clarity of the rule.</p>	
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The validity period is stated in the rule. This AMC will be deleted.</p> <p>Please see also reply to comments on FCL.1025.</p>	
comment	5141	comment by: <i>Diether Memmert</i>
	<p>Der vorliegende Entwurf, NPA 2008-17a+b+c, verfehlt, was den nichtgewerblichen Teil auf dem Sektor Segelflug und TMG (recreational aviation) angeht, in einigen Punkten seine originäre Aufgabe, nämlich Sicherheit <b>gegenüber Dritten unter Beachtung der Verhältnismäßigkeit</b> zu gewährleisten.</p> <p>Mehr Sicherheit wird nicht durch weitere Überprüfungen, Auflagen und bloße Behauptungen erreicht.</p> <p>In den Flugvereinen des DAeC wurde eine vorbildliche Leistung mit gutem Sicherheitsstandard bei Ausbildung, In-Übunghaltung, sowie Weiterbildung von Piloten und Fluglehrern in weitgehend ehrenamtlicher Tätigkeit erbracht. Dies sollte sicherlich für die gesamte EU als Richtschnur dienen können.</p> <p>Es ist eben nicht richtig, daß ein System, das sicherlich im gewerblichen Bereich seine Gültigkeit hat, auch einfach dem Freizeitsport übergestülpt</p>	

werden kann.

Der vorgeschlagene verwaltungstechnische Überbau (FIE, ATO, Beschränkung der Gültigkeit mit periodischer fliegerischer Überprüfung, etc.) ist unnötig und kostet die Piloten (aus ihrer Tasche!) nur zusätzliche Gebühren. Diese Mittel fehlen dann für Erlangung von mehr Flugpraxis. Diese war aber schon immer das wirkungsvollste Mittel zum Erhalt ausreichender Flugsicherheit!

Die Festlegungen des vorliegenden Kapitels sind ueberzogen und gehoeren entsprechend meiner Einwendungen in den frueheren Kapiteln ueberarbeitet.

Dipl.-Ing. TU Diether Memmert, Segelflugpilot seit 1953 mit >8500 Flugstunden

**Aenderungen:**

Ueberarbeiten

response *Noted*

The comment with exactly the same wording has been assigned to several other segments. Please see the responses already provided. As no specific comment or proposal has been made (the comment "revise" is clearly not enough to provide a substantiated response), the Agency is not able to deal with it.

This AMC will be deleted.

Please see also reply to comments on FCL.1025.

comment 5479

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

This AMC seems to be a copy from JAR-FCL 2, subpart I and is not consistent with JAR-FCL 1, amendment 7.

The procedure for revalidation of an instructor rating or instructor authorisation is a licensing requirement (entry into a licence or issue of authorisation) and thus required in a different subpart for instructors.

It should not be part of the procedures for examiner certification, which will not be entered into a licence.

response *Noted*

This AMC will be deleted.

comment 6999

comment by: *UK CAA*

**Paragraph:**

AMC to FCL.1025

**Page No:**

582

**Comment:**

FCL.940 provides for the revalidation and validity of instructor ratings. This AMC conflicts with those provisions if the validity of the instructor rating can be changed whereas the intent to be able to align instructor validity with that of an examiner authorisation is common practice and desirable for administrative convenience. The paragraph possibly needs rewording to enable this.

**Justification:**

The last sentence implies that an FI rating (for example) can be revalidated during the test for an examiner authorisation renewal. The skills for these two activities are very different and the ability to examine in no way demonstrates ability to fly and teach. The possibility to align the two qualification validities



	should be retained even if they are revalidated on separate occasions, or as in the case of FI and CRI, are revalidated on experience.
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The validity period is stated in the rule. This AMC will be deleted.</p> <p>Please see also reply to comments on FCL.1025.</p>
comment	<p>7932 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span></p> <p>New AMC to FCL.1025(c) ref my proposal to FCL.1025(c):</p> <p>The amount of time lapsed since the expiry of the validity period of the certificate.</p> <p>The amount of training needed to reach the desired level of proficiency should increase with the time lapsed. In some cases, after evaluating the pilot, and when the time lapsed is very limited (less than 3 months), the training organisation may even determine that no further refresher training is necessary. The following may be taken as guidance when determining the needs of the applicant:</p> <p>(a) Expiry for a period shorter than 1 year: a more detailed written or verbal theoretical knowledge examination relevant to the examiner certificate during the assessment of competency.</p> <p>(b) Expiry for longer than 1 year but shorter than 3 year: a more detailed written or verbal theoretical knowledge examination relevant to the type or class of aircraft and a minimum of 1 training session before the assessment of competency.</p> <p>(c) Expiry for longer than 3 year but shorter than 7 years: a more detailed written or verbal theoretical knowledge examination relevant to the type or class of aircraft and a minimum of 2 training sessions before the assessment of competency.</p> <p>(d) Expiry for longer than 7 years: the applicant should undergo the full training course for the issue of the relevant examiner certificate.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see replies to comments on FCL.1025.</p>

<b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices</b>
--

p. 583
--------

comment	<p>896 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ERA</i></span></p> <p>Appendices to Part-FCL</p> <p>ERA members general comment: The technical structure of most of these Appendices make it more appropriate to transfer them into AMCs. As Appendices will be part of the law, ERA members suggest that submitting future amendments to the Appendices covering typos, advancements in technology, new aircraft types, developments in training techniques and student qualifications via the European Parliament protracted comitology process is not justified. Therefore ERA members strongly request the transfer of all Appendices into AMCs.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p>

Please see replies to dedicated comments on each of the Appendices.  
As for Appendix 3, it contains general rules on how the training courses for commercial licences should be organised. It is the Agency's opinion that at this time it should remain included in the rule; however, certain elements that are identified as non-essential based on the comments received have been transferred to AMC. Please see amended text.

comment 7968

comment by: CAA Finland

General comment:

Some of the forms include training certificate and skill test / proficiency check. We support that training certificates are published in common form. They shall include detailed information so that they can be compared to the requirements for the issue of a licence, rating or certificate. One page forms can not include the required information.

response *Noted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed the comments requesting editorial/formatting and changes to the Appendices and forms. These requests were assessed with a view to decide whether these changes could be done at this stage of the process. The Agency has concluded that at this time it will be very difficult to make all the changes requested in a consistent manner, while ensuring the necessary quality.

Therefore, the Agency has decided the following:

2. To leave the content/format of the forms unchanged from what was included in JAR-FCL.
3. In the meantime, to develop report forms to be used by examiners when complying with FCL.1030 (reporting obligations), to be included as AMC to this paragraph. These report forms will be based on the content of the AMCs to Appendices 7, 9 and 12, as published in this NPA.
4. To include this point in the work of rulemaking task FCL.002, which is already included in the Agency's rulemaking programme, to start shortly after the FCL opinion is published. The main purpose of this task is to deal with editorial aspects and to include in Part-FCL and the related AMC/GM some material coming from the JAA that could not be included directly in FCL.001 (e.g. the Learning objectives). During the development of this task the Agency will look into the several Appendices to Part-FCL and try to change them so that they can be used directly as forms, to achieve further harmonisation. The comments received on this NPA will be taken into account for that work.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC to Appendix 3**

p. 583

comment 477

comment by: London Metropolitan University

There are references to an ATP MODULAR course. This needs to be addressed as previously commentd on in FCL.515

response *Noted*

Please see reply to your comment in Appendix 3 on this issue. The ATP modular course was included in paragraphs FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H in Subpart D.

As a result of the comments received, and for reasons of consistency, it was transferred to Appendix 3, and the related AMCs to AMC to Appendix 3.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC to Appendix 3 - A. ATP integrated course - aeroplanes**

p. 583-585

comment 822 comment by: OAA Oxford

Clarification required: A. Crediting - suggests hours may be, not shall be, credited. This contradicts Appendix 3, A, 4

response *Noted*

The first sentence of the paragraph will be deleted, since it is a repetition of what is in the rule. Please see also amended text for the rule, and reply to your comment in Appendix 3, on the same issue.

comment 824 comment by: OAA Oxford

Phase 3 states 25 hours PIC prior to VFR navigation test. AMC FCL 1.160 & 1.165 (a) (1) states 40 hours PIC for the same period. Has the minimum been reduced or is this an error?

Appendix 3 A, 10 (e) (1) states 20 hours SPIC

AMC to Appendix 3 Phase 4 (b) states 35 hours instrument time flown as SPIC.

JAR FCL 1.160 & 1.165 (a) (1) 13 (e) (ii) states 20 hours.

We believe SPIC should be 20 hours.

response *Accepted*

Thank you for your comment.

Phase 3:

Flight time as PIC changed to 40 hours, as established in JAR-FCL

Phase 4:

Flight time as SPIC is amended to 20 hours, to be in accordance with Appendix 3.A.

comment 1570 comment by: IAAPS

There are references to an ATPL MODULAR course. This needs to be addressed as previously commented on in FCL.515

response *Noted*

Please see reply to your comment on FCL.515 and the amended text for Appendix 3. The ATPL modular course used to be included in FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H. Based on the comments received, and for reasons of consistency it has been added to Appendix 3, and the respective AMCs to AMC to Appendix 3.

comment	<p>2600</p> <p>Phase 4. Replace "35 hours instrument time flown as SPIC" by "20 hours instrument time flown ans SPIC". Reason: to be in accordance with Appendix 3,A, §10 (e)(1).</p>	comment by: <i>CAA Belgium</i>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 824 above.</p>	
comment	<p>4859</p> <p><u>Page 584, AMC to Appendix 3</u> 3. <u>ATP Integrated course – aeroplanes – Phase 3</u></p> <p>3. Exercises up to the VFR navigation progress test should comprise <b>5</b> hours dual instruction and at least <b>25</b> hours as pilot-in-command.</p> <p>The 25 hours is less than those required for licence issue and those stated in JAR-FCL AMC FCL 1.160&amp; 1.165(a)(1). Change Phase 3, para 3 to read:</p> <p><b>3. Exercises up to the VFR navigation progress test should comprise 5 hours dual instruction and at least 40 hours as pilot-in-command.</b></p>	comment by: <i>Flight Training Europe</i>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 824 above.</p>	
comment	<p>4863</p> <p><u>Page 584, AMC to Appendix 3, A. ATP Integrated Course</u></p> <p>AMC to Appendix 3 A. ATP integrated course – aeroplanes, Phase 4 (b) incorrectly states "35 hours instrument time flown as SPIC". This does not agree with Appendix 3, which in turn is incorrect and states 2 different SPIC hour's requirements. To align with current JAR-FCL rules the SPIC hours should read "at least 20 hours SPIC" Change Phase 4 b to read:</p> <p><b>b. at least 20 hours instrument time flown as SPIC</b></p>	comment by: <i>Flight Training Europe</i>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 824 above.</p>	
comment	<p>5679</p> <p><b>AMC to Appendix 3</b></p> <p>THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE</p> <p>Present text: "The xxx hours of instruction can include classroom work, interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels, computer based training, and other media as approved by the Authority, in suitable proportions."</p> <p><b>REQUEST:</b></p>	comment by: <i>Civil Aviation Training Europe</i>

As in **AMC to FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H**, theoretical knowledge instruction should allow the use of distance learning courses

**BACKGROUND:**

While Universities other educational branches worldwide increase their offer of distance learning degrees exponentially, the EASA FCL still does not reflect this modern technique of learning

New dimensions of learning methodology have arisen since the 90's.

Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning, allowing new dimensions of methodology. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."

Blended learning (mixture of classroom and distance learning) is without doubt the best learning method and should be favoured even before sole classroom teaching.

From middle school graduation to academical bachelor and master degrees...Distance Learning with modern e-learning technology is the key to present and future learning.

For aviation theory training **state/government certified** distance learning institutes / courses should be allowed that offer student coaching and support via a mix of modern technology (online chats, forums, email, telephone)

Neglecting modern distance learning courses is an anachronism in today's world.

**PROPOSAL:**

Change wording **in all relevant sections of AMC to Appendix 3 and GM to Appendix 5** to:

"An approved course should include formal classroom work and may include the use of such facilities as interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels and computer based training and other media distance learning (correspondence) courses as approved by the Authority.

**State/government certified distance learning courses with learner support system and blended learning concept may also be offered as part of the course."**

LITERATURE / REFERENCES

1. University of London

[http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about\\_us/facts.shtml](http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about_us/facts.shtml)

2. Harvard University

<http://www.extension.harvard.edu/>

**3. Advanced Distributed Learning Network (ADLNet)**

<http://www.adlnet.gov/>

The Advanced Distributed Learning (ADL) Initiative is a collaborative effort between government, industry and academia to establish a new distributed

learning environment that permits the interoperability of learning tools and course content on a global scale.

4. The European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning (EURODL)  
<http://www.eurodl.org/>

5. " Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."

<http://ezinearticles.com/?Common-Myths-About-Distance-Learning-Courses&id=1986125>

<http://ezinearticles.com...author> unknown

"Maybe some people still think the term "distance learning" means waiting for the postman to deliver boxes of books and exams. But: Since the 1980s, thousands of colleges and universities have switched to distance learning methods; and millions of students are now choosing online schools as their top choice in higher education. In fact, online education has overtaken the industry, giving distance learning a whole new meaning. With nearly thirty years to develop learning technology for the Internet, the online colleges and universities of today have refined the distance learning process to provide accredited degree programs for adult learners.

The soaring popularity of Distance Learning can neither be neglected nor turned down.

H.J. Seibert, 25.Feb2009

response

*Noted*

The text of the proposed AMC to FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H was added to all modular courses in AMC to Appendix 3. As for the text addition proposed by you, the Agency does not consider it necessary, since this possibility is already included in the reference to distance learning courses. Those distance learning courses are already mentioned in OR.ATO.400 and the related AMC for modular courses of theoretical knowledge instruction. ATOs have to be approved to conduct distance learning courses.

Distance learning courses are not possible for integrated courses due to the structure of the course itself.

comment

6357 ❖

comment by: *Axel Schwarz*

A. The requirement 10 (b) and (c) with 50 hours X-country PIC-time and 20 hours SPIC time for the required 70 hours total PIC time leaves no space for the initial solo flights (usually non X-country) in Phase 2 and the required 5 solo night flights (usually only traffic patterns).

The requirement for PIC X-country flying should therefore be reduced to 35 hours (see also AMC to Appendix 3 A).

B. The same applies to the CPL/IR integrated course paragraph 9 (b) and (c) (compare with AMC to Appendix 3 B).

C. In contrast to the above, there would be plenty of room in the CPL (VFR) integrated course for X-country flights. The requirement of paragraph 9 (c) could easily be lifted to 50 hours since there is no SPIC-time in this course.

	AMC to Appendix 3 A: Phase 4 b. should be revised to only 20 hours SPIC in accordance with Appendix 3 A
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing your comment.</p> <p>The proposed text was taken over from Appendix 1 JAR-FCL 1.160 &amp; 1.165(a)(1). Your proposal does not represent a surplus in safety and will therefore not be taken into consideration when drafting the final text.</p>
comment	<p>6460 <span style="float: right;">comment by: DCAA</span></p> <p>AMC to App. 3 A Phase 4 c To be moved to phase 3 as a new item d. The same for CPL/IR integrated course.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for providing this comment, the text will be amended as requested.</p>
comment	<p>6685 <span style="float: right;">comment by: UK CAA</span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC to Appendix 3</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 584 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Phase 4 paragraph 4b states 35 hours instrument time flown as SPIC, JAR-FCL states 50 hours</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Clarification</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 824 above.</p>
comment	<p>7340 <span style="float: right;">comment by: ECOGAS</span></p> <p>Current wording: "A. ATP integrated course - aeroplanes CREDITING In the case of a PPL(A) or PPL(H) entrant, 50% of the aircraft hours flown by the entrant prior to the course may be credited...."</p> <p>Issue: Conflicts with Appendix 3(A)(4), which should be changed</p> <p>Suggestion: Deconflict wording by amending Appendix 3(A)(4)</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Text of AMC has been amended and only the second sentence is now included. Please see amended text.</p>
comment	<p>7342 <span style="float: right;">comment by: ECOGAS</span></p>

	<p>Current wording: "Phase 3 3. Exercises up to the VFR navigation progress test comprise a total of at least 5 hours of dual instruction and at least 25 hours as pilot-in-command."</p> <p>Issue: AMC FCL 1.160 and 1.165 (A) (1) states 40 hours PIC for the same period.</p> <p>Suggestion: Identify whether change to JAR requirement is deliberate or accidental</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 824 above</p>

comment	<p>7343 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ECOGAS</i></span></p> <p>Current wording: "Phase 4 4 Exercises up to the instrument rating skill test comprise (b) 35 hours instrument time flown as SPIC;"</p> <p>Issue: Appendix 3(A), 10(e)(1) states 20 hours SPIC AMC to Appendix 3 Phase 4(b) states 35 hours instrument time flown as SPIC JAR FCL 1.160 and 1.165 (a)(1)13(e)(ii) state 20 hours</p> <p>Suggestion: SPIC requirement should be 20 hours</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 824 above.</p>

comment	<p>7944 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>Atlantic Training Support</i></span></p> <p>A deconflict wording by amending appendix 3(A)(4)</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Please see reply to comment 824 above.</p>

<p><b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC to Appendix 3 - B. CPL/IR integrated course - aeroplanes</b></p>	<p>p. 585-587</p>
--	-------------------

comment	<p>825 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>OAA Oxford</i></span></p> <p>Clarification required: B Crediting - suggests hours <u>may</u> be, not <u>shall</u> be, credited. This contradicts Appendix 3, B, 4</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The first sentence of the paragraph will be deleted since it is a repetition of what is in the rule. Please see also amended text for the rule.</p>



comment 4866 comment by: *Flight Training Europe*

Page 587 AMC to Appendix 3, B. CPL/IR Integrated Course

AMC to Appendix 3 B. CPL/IR integrated course – aeroplanes, Phase 4 (b) incorrectly states “50 hours instrument time flown as SPIC”. This does not agree with Appendix 3, which in turn is incorrect and states 2 different SPIC hour’s requirements. To align with current JAR-FCL rules the SPIC hours should read “at least 20 hours SPIC” Change Phase 4 b to read:

**b. at least 20 hours instrument time flown as SPIC**

response *Accepted*

Flight time as SPIC is amended to 20 hours, to be in accordance with Appendix 3.A.

comment 5679 ❖ comment by: *Civil Aviation Training Europe*

**AMC to Appendix 3**

THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE

Present text:

"The xxx hours of instruction can include classroom work, interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels, computer based training, and other media as approved by the Authority, in suitable proportions."

**REQUEST:**

As in **AMC to FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H**, theoretical knowledge instruction should allow the use of distance learning courses

**BACKGROUND:**

While Universities other educational branches worldwide increase their offer of distance learning degrees exponentially, the EASA FCL still does not reflect this modern technique of learning

New dimensions of learning methodology have arisen since the 90's.

Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning, allowing new dimensions of methodology. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."

Blended learning (mixture of classroom and distance learning) is without doubt the best learning method and should be favourized even before sole classroom teaching.

From middle school graduation to academical bachelor and master degrees...Distance Learning with modern e-learning technology is the key to present and future learning.

For aviation theory training **state/government certified** distance learning institutes / courses should be allowed that offer student coaching and support via a mix of modern technology (online chats, forums, email, telephone)

Neglecting modern distance learning courses is an anachronism in todays

world.

**PROPOSAL:**

Change wording **in all relevant sections of AMC to Appendix 3 and GM to Appendix 5** to:

"An approved course should include formal classroom work and may include the use of such facilities as interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels and computer based training and other media distance learning (correspondence) courses as approved by the Authority.

**State/government certified distance learning courses with learner support system and blended learning concept may also be offered as part of the course."**

LITERATURE / REFERENCES

1. University of London

[http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about\\_us/facts.shtml](http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about_us/facts.shtml)

2. Harvard University

<http://www.extension.harvard.edu/>

**3. Advanced Distributed Learning Network (ADLNet)**

<http://www.adlnet.gov/>

The Advanced Distributed Learning (ADL) Initiative is a collaborative effort between government, industry and academia to establish a new distributed learning environment that permits the interoperability of learning tools and course content on a global scale.

4. The European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning (EURODL)

<http://www.eurodl.org/>

5. " Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."

<http://ezinearticles.com/?Common-Myths-About-Distance-Learning-Courses&id=1986125>

<http://ezinearticles.com...author> unknown

"Maybe some people still think the term "distance learning" means waiting for the postman to deliver boxes of books and exams. But: Since the 1980s, thousands of colleges and universities have switched to distance learning methods; and millions of students are now choosing online schools as their top choice in higher education. In fact, online education has overtaken the industry, giving distance learning a whole new meaning. With nearly thirty years to develop learning technology for the Internet, the online colleges and universities of today have refined the distance learning process to provide accredited degree programs for adult learners.

The soaring popularity of Distance Learning can neither be neglected nor turned down.

H.J. Seibert, 25.Feb2009

response

*Noted*

The text of the proposed AMC to FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H was added to all modular courses in AMC to Appendix 3. As for the text addition proposed by you, the Agency does not consider it necessary, since this possibility is already included in the reference to distance learning courses. Those distance learning courses are already mentioned in OR.ATO.400 and the related AMC for modular courses of theoretical knowledge instruction. ATOs have to be approved to conduct distance learning courses. Distance learning courses are not possible for integrated courses due to the structure of the course itself.

comment

6357 ❖

comment by: *Axel Schwarz*

A. The requirement 10 (b) and (c) with 50 hours X-country PIC-time and 20 hours SPIC time for the required 70 hours total PIC time leaves no space for the initial solo flights (usually non X-country) in Phase 2 and the required 5 solo night flights (usually only traffic patterns).

The requirement for PIC X-country flying should therefore be reduced to 35 hours (see also AMC to Appendix 3 A).

B. The same applies to the CPL/IR integrated course paragraph 9 (b) and (c) (compare with AMC to Appendix 3 B).

C. In contrast to the above, there would be plenty of room in the CPL (VFR) integrated course for X-country flights. The requirement of paragraph 9 (c) could easily be lifted to 50 hours since there is no SPIC-time in this course.

AMC to Appendix 3 A: Phase 4 b. should be revised to only 20 hours SPIC in accordance with Appendix 3 A

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment. The proposed text was taken over from Appendix 1 JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165(a)(1). Your proposal does not represent a surplus in safety and will therefore not be taken into consideration when drafting the final text.

comment

7344

comment by: *ECOGAS*

Current wording:

"B. CPL/IR integrated course - aeroplanes

CREDITING

In the case of a PPL(A) or PPL(H) entrant, 50% of the aircraft hours flown by the entrant prior to the course may be credited...."

Issue:

Conflicts with Appendix 3(B)(4), which should be changed

Suggestion:

Deconflict wording by amending Appendix 3(B)(4)

response

*Noted*

Please see reply to comment 825 above.

<b>Appendix 3 - C. CPL integrated course - aeroplanes</b>
---

comment	826	comment by: <i>OAA Oxford</i>
	Clarification required: C. Crediting - suggests hours <u>may</u> be, not <u>shall</u> be, credited. This contradicts Appendix 3, C, 4	
response	<i>Partially accepted</i>	
	Thank you for providing this comment. First sentence of the paragraph will be deleted since it is a repetition of what is in the rule in Appendix 3 D. CPL integrated course - Aeroplanes, GENERAL, paragraph (4).	
comment	5679 ❖	comment by: <i>Civil Aviation Training Europe</i>
	<p><b>AMC to Appendix 3</b></p> <p>THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE</p> <p>Present text:          "The xxx hours of instruction can include classroom work, interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels, computer based training, and other media as approved by the Authority, in suitable proportions."</p> <p><b>REQUEST:</b>          As in <b>AMC to FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H</b>, theoretical knowledge instruction should allow the use of distance learning courses</p> <p><b>BACKGROUND:</b>          While Universities other educational branches worldwide increase their offer of distance learning degrees exponentially, the EASA FCL still does not reflect this modern technique of learning</p> <p>New dimensions of learning methodology have arisen since the 90's.</p> <p>Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning, allowing new dimensions of methodology. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."</p> <p>Blended learning (mixture of classroom and distance learning) is without doubt the best learning method and should be favourized even before sole classroom teaching.</p> <p>From middle school graduation to academical bachelor and master degrees...Distance Learning with modern e-learning technology is the key to present and future learning.</p> <p>For aviation theory training <b>state/government certified</b> distance learning institutes / courses should be allowed that offer student coaching and support via a mix of modern technology (online chats, forums, email, telephone)</p> <p>Neglecting modern distance learning courses is an anachronism in todays world.</p>	

**PROPOSAL:**

Change wording **in all relevant sections of AMC to Appendix 3 and GM to Appendix 5** to:

"An approved course should include formal classroom work and may include the use of such facilities as interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels and computer based training and other media distance learning (correspondence) courses as approved by the Authority.

**State/government certified distance learning courses with learner support system and blended learning concept may also be offered as part of the course."**

## LITERATURE / REFERENCES

1. University of London

[http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about\\_us/facts.shtml](http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about_us/facts.shtml)

2. Harvard University

<http://www.extension.harvard.edu/>

**3. Advanced Distributed Learning Network (ADLNet)**

<http://www.adlnet.gov/>

The Advanced Distributed Learning (ADL) Initiative is a collaborative effort between government, industry and academia to establish a new distributed learning environment that permits the interoperability of learning tools and course content on a global scale.

4. The European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning (EURODL)

<http://www.eurodl.org/>

5. " Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."

<http://ezinearticles.com/?Common-Myths-About-Distance-Learning-Courses&id=1986125>

<http://ezinearticles.com...author> unknown

"Maybe some people still think the term "distance learning" means waiting for the postman to deliver boxes of books and exams. But: Since the 1980s, thousands of colleges and universities have switched to distance learning methods; and millions of students are now choosing online schools as their top choice in higher education. In fact, online education has overtaken the industry, giving distance learning a whole new meaning. With nearly thirty years to develop learning technology for the Internet, the online colleges and universities of today have refined the distance learning process to provide accredited degree programs for adult learners.

The soaring popularity of Distance Learning can neither be neglected nor turned down.

H.J. Seibert, 25.Feb2009

response *Partially accepted*

The text of the proposed AMC to FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H was added to all

modular courses in AMC to Appendix 3.

As for the text addition you proposed, the Agency does not consider it necessary, since this possibility is already included in the reference to distance learning courses. Those distance learning courses are already mentioned in OR.ATO.400 and the related AMC for modular courses of theoretical knowledge instruction. ATOs have to be approved to conduct distance learning courses. Distance learning courses are not possible for integrated courses due to the structure of the course itself.

comment

6357 ❖

comment by: *Axel Schwarz*

A. The requirement 10 (b) and (c) with 50 hours X-country PIC-time and 20 hours SPIC time for the required 70 hours total PIC time leaves no space for the initial solo flights (usually non X-country) in Phase 2 and the required 5 solo night flights (usually only traffic patterns).

The requirement for PIC X-country flying should therefore be reduced to 35 hours (see also AMC to Appendix 3 A).

B. The same applies to the CPL/IR integrated course paragraph 9 (b) and (c) (compare with AMC to Appendix 3 B).

C. In contrast to the above, there would be plenty of room in the CPL (VFR) integrated course for X-country flights. The requirement of paragraph 9 (c) could easily be lifted to 50 hours since there is no SPIC-time in this course.

AMC to Appendix 3 A: Phase 4 b. should be revised to only 20 hours SPIC in accordance with Appendix 3 A

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your comment.

The proposed text was taken over from Appendix 1 JAR-FCL 1.160 & 1.165(a)(1). Your proposal does not represent a surplus in safety and will therefore not be taken into consideration when drafting the final text.

comment

7345

comment by: *ECOGAS*

Current wording:

"C. CPL integrated course - aeroplanes

CREDITING

In the case of a PPL(A) or PPL(H) entrant, 50% of the aircraft hours flown by the entrant prior to the course may be credited...."

Issue:

Conflicts with Appendix 3(C)(4), which should be changed

Suggestion:

Deconflict wording by amending Appendix 3(C)(4)

response

*Noted*

Please see reply to comment 826 above.

comment

5679 ❖

comment by: *Civil Aviation Training Europe***AMC to Appendix 3**

## THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE

Present text:

"The xxx hours of instruction can include classroom work, interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels, computer based training, and other media as approved by the Authority, in suitable proportions."

**REQUEST:**

As in **AMC to FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H**, theoretical knowledge instruction should allow the use of distance learning courses

**BACKGROUND:**

While Universities other educational branches worldwide increase their offer of distance learning degrees exponentially, the EASA FCL still does not reflect this modern technique of learning

New dimensions of learning methodology have arisen since the 90's.

Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning, allowing new dimensions of methodology. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."

Blended learning (mixture of classroom and distance learning) is without doubt the best learning method and should be favourized even before sole classroom teaching.

From middle school graduation to academical bachelor and master degrees...Distance Learning with modern e-learning technology is the key to present and future learning.

For aviation theory training **state/government certified** distance learning institutes / courses should be allowed that offer student coaching and support via a mix of modern technology (online chats, forums, email, telephone)

Neglecting modern distance learning courses is an anachronism in todays world.

**PROPOSAL:**

Change wording **in all relevant sections of AMC to Appendix 3 and GM to Appendix 5** to:

"An approved course should include formal classroom work and may include the use of such facilities as interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels and computer based training and other media distance learning (correspondence) courses as approved by the Authority."

**State/government certified distance learning courses with learner support system and blended learning concept may also be offered as part of the course."**

LITERATURE / REFERENCES

1. University of London

[http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about\\_us/facts.shtml](http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about_us/facts.shtml)

2. Harvard University

<http://www.extension.harvard.edu/>

**3. Advanced Distributed Learning Network (ADLNet)**

<http://www.adlnet.gov/>

The Advanced Distributed Learning (ADL) Initiative is a collaborative effort between government, industry and academia to establish a new distributed learning environment that permits the interoperability of learning tools and course content on a global scale.

4. The European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning (EURODL)

<http://www.eurodl.org/>

5. " Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."

<http://ezinearticles.com/?Common-Myths-About-Distance-Learning-Courses&id=1986125>

<http://ezinearticles.com...author> unknown

"Maybe some people still think the term "distance learning" means waiting for the postman to deliver boxes of books and exams. But: Since the 1980s, thousands of colleges and universities have switched to distance learning methods; and millions of students are now choosing online schools as their top choice in higher education. In fact, online education has overtaken the industry, giving distance learning a whole new meaning. With nearly thirty years to develop learning technology for the Internet, the online colleges and universities of today have refined the distance learning process to provide accredited degree programs for adult learners.

The soaring popularity of Distance Learning can neither be neglected nor turned down.

H.J. Seibert, 25.Feb2009

response

*Partially accepted*

The text of the proposed AMC to FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H was added to all modular courses in AMC to Appendix 3.

As for the text addition proposed by you, the Agency does not consider it necessary, since this possibility is already included in the reference to distance learning courses. Those distance learning courses are already mentioned in OR.ATO.400 and the related AMC for modular courses of theoretical knowledge instruction. ATOs have to be approved to conduct distance learning courses. Distance learning courses are not possible for integrated courses due to the structure of the course itself.



**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC to Appendix 3 - E. ATP/IR integrated course - Helicopters**

p. 592-595

comment	1454	comment by: <i>Bristow Helicopters</i>
	<p>The information contained in the AMC material for the various integrated and modular courses is in many cases a repetition in a different format of the equivalent information contained in the relevant Appendix, which can lead to inconsistencies, errors and difficulty in interpreting and complying with the rule.</p> <p>I have already commented earlier that, in my opinion, the associated Appendix 3 material should become AMC. If this is to be the case, the information in Appendix 3 and this existing AMC will require editing and rationalisation to avoid repetition and confusion.</p>	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	<p>Thank you for providing your opinion. It is correct that there are still repetitions which could be avoided. This was a consequence of the transfer of the material of JAR-FCL.</p> <p>The Agency will review those items when drafting the final text.</p>	
comment	2370	comment by: <i>AECA(SPAIN)</i>
	<p>The information contained in the AMC material for the various integrated and modular courses is in many cases a repetition in a different format of the equivalent information contained in the relevant Appendix, which can lead to inconsistencies, errors and difficulty in interpreting and complying with the rule.</p>	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	Please see the reply above to comment 1454.	
comment	4449	comment by: <i>Bond Offshore Helicopters</i>
	<p>The information contained in the AMC material for the various integrated and modular courses is in many cases a repetition in a different format of the equivalent information contained in the relevant Appendix, which can lead to inconsistencies, errors and difficulty in interpreting and complying with the rule.</p> <p>We have already commented earlier that, in our opinion, the associated Appendix 3 material should become AMC. If this is to be the case, the information in Appendix 3 and this existing AMC will require editing and rationalisation to avoid repetition and confusion.</p>	
response	<i>Noted</i>	
	Please see the reply above to comment 1454.	
comment	4691	comment by: <i>Héli-Union</i>
	<p>The information contained in the AMC material for the various integrated and modular courses is in many cases a repetition in a different format of the</p>	

equivalent information contained in the relevant Appendix, which can lead to inconsistencies, errors and difficulty in interpreting and complying with the rule.

We have already commented earlier that, in our opinion, the associated Appendix 3 material should become AMC. If this is to be the case, the information in Appendix 3 and this existing AMC will require editing and rationalisation to avoid repetition and confusion.

response *Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1454.

comment 4912

comment by: *HUTC*

The information contained in the AMC material for the various integrated and modular courses is in many cases a repetition in a different format of the equivalent information contained in the relevant Appendix, which can lead to inconsistencies, errors and difficulty in interpreting and complying with the rule.

We have already commented earlier that, in our opinion, the associated Appendix 3 material should become AMC. If this is to be the case, the information in Appendix 3 and this existing AMC will require editing and rationalisation to avoid repetition and confusion.

response *Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1454.

comment 5679 ❖

comment by: *Civil Aviation Training Europe*

### **AMC to Appendix 3**

#### **THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE**

Present text:

"The xxx hours of instruction can include classroom work, interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels, computer based training, and other media as approved by the Authority, in suitable proportions."

#### **REQUEST:**

As in **AMC to FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H**, theoretical knowledge instruction should allow the use of distance learning courses

#### **BACKGROUND:**

While Universities other educational branches worldwide increase their offer of distance learning degrees exponentially, the EASA FCL still does not reflect this modern technique of learning

New dimensions of learning methodology have arisen since the 90's.

Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning, allowing new dimensions of methodology. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."

Blended learning (mixture of classroom and distance learning) is without doubt the best learning method and should be favoured even before sole classroom teaching.

From middle school graduation to academical bachelor and master degrees...Distance Learning with modern e-learning technology is the key to present and future learning.

For aviation theory training **state/government certified** distance learning institutes / courses should be allowed that offer student coaching and support via a mix of modern technology (online chats, forums, email, telephone)

Neglecting modern distance learning courses is an anachronism in today's world.

**PROPOSAL:**

Change wording **in all relevant sections of AMC to Appendix 3 and GM to Appendix 5** to:

"An approved course should include formal classroom work and may include the use of such facilities as interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels and computer based training and other media distance learning (correspondence) courses as approved by the Authority.

**State/government certified distance learning courses with learner support system and blended learning concept may also be offered as part of the course."**

LITERATURE / REFERENCES

1. University of London

[http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about\\_us/facts.shtml](http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about_us/facts.shtml)

2. Harvard University

<http://www.extension.harvard.edu/>

**3. Advanced Distributed Learning Network (ADLNet)**

<http://www.adlnet.gov/>

The Advanced Distributed Learning (ADL) Initiative is a collaborative effort between government, industry and academia to establish a new distributed learning environment that permits the interoperability of learning tools and course content on a global scale.

4. The European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning (EURODL)

<http://www.eurodl.org/>

5. " Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."

<http://ezinearticles.com/?Common-Myths-About-Distance-Learning-Courses&id=1986125>

<http://ezinearticles.com...author> unknown

"Maybe some people still think the term "distance learning" means waiting for the postman to deliver boxes of books and exams. But: Since the 1980s, thousands of colleges and universities have switched to distance learning methods; and millions of students are now choosing online schools as their top choice in higher education. In fact, online education has overtaken the industry, giving distance learning a whole new meaning. With nearly thirty years to develop learning technology for the Internet, the online colleges and universities of today have refined the distance learning process to provide accredited degree programs for adult learners. The soaring popularity of Distance Learning can neither be neglected nor turned down.

H.J. Seibert, 25.Feb2009

response

*Partially accepted*

The text of a proposed AMC to FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H has been added to all modular courses in AMC to Appendix 3.

As for the text addition proposed by you, the Agency does not consider it necessary, since this possibility is already included in the reference to distance learning courses.

Distance learning courses are already mentioned in OR.ATO.400 and the related AMC for modular courses of theoretical knowledge instruction. ATOs have to be approved to conduct distance learning courses.

Distance learning courses are not possible for integrated courses due to the structure of the course itself.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC to Appendix 3 - F. ATP integrated course - Helicopters**

p. 595-596

comment

5679 ❖

comment by: *Civil Aviation Training Europe*

**AMC to Appendix 3**

**THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE**

Present text:

"The xxx hours of instruction can include classroom work, interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels, computer based training, and other media as approved by the Authority, in suitable proportions."

**REQUEST:**

As in **AMC to FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H**, theoretical knowledge instruction should allow the use of distance learning courses

**BACKGROUND:**

While Universities other educational branches worldwide increase their offer of distance learning degrees exponentially, the EASA FCL still does not reflect this modern technique of learning

New dimensions of learning methodology have arisen since the 90's.

Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of

high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning, allowing new dimensions of methodology. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."

Blended learning (mixture of classroom and distance learning) is without doubt the best learning method and should be favourized even before sole classroom teaching.

From middle school graduation to academical bachelor and master degrees...Distance Learning with modern e-learning technology is the key to present and future learning.

For aviation theory training **state/government certified** distance learning institutes / courses should be allowed that offer student coaching and support via a mix of modern technology (online chats, forums, email, telephone)

Neglecting modern distance learning courses is an anachronism in todays world.

**PROPOSAL:**

Change wording **in all relevant sections of AMC to Appendix 3 and GM to Appendix 5** to:

"An approved course should include formal classroom work and may include the use of such facilities as interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels and computer based training and other media distance learning (correspondence) courses as approved by the Authority.

**State/government certified distance learning courses with learner support system and blended learning concept may also be offered as part of the course."**

LITERATURE / REFERENCES

1. University of London

[http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about\\_us/facts.shtml](http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about_us/facts.shtml)

2. Harvard University

<http://www.extension.harvard.edu/>

**3. Advanced Distributed Learning Network (ADLNet)**

<http://www.adlnet.gov/>

The Advanced Distributed Learning (ADL) Initiative is a collaborative effort between government, industry and academia to establish a new distributed learning environment that permits the interoperability of learning tools and course content on a global scale.

4. The European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning (EURODL)

<http://www.eurodl.org/>

5. " Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."

<http://ezinearticles.com/?Common-Myths-About-Distance-Learning->

[Courses&id=1986125](#)

<http://ezinearticles.com...author> unknown

"Maybe some people still think the term "distance learning" means waiting for the postman to deliver boxes of books and exams. But: Since the 1980s, thousands of colleges and universities have switched to distance learning methods; and millions of students are now choosing online schools as their top choice in higher education. In fact, online education has overtaken the industry, giving distance learning a whole new meaning. With nearly thirty years to develop learning technology for the Internet, the online colleges and universities of today have refined the distance learning process to provide accredited degree programs for adult learners.

The soaring popularity of Distance Learning can neither be neglected nor turned down.

H.J. Seibert, 25.Feb2009

response *Partially accepted*

The text of a proposed AMC to FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H has been added to all modular courses in AMC to Appendix 3.

As for the text addition proposed by you, the Agency does not consider it necessary, since this possibility is already included in the reference to distance learning courses.

Distance learning courses are already mentioned in OR.ATO.400 and the related AMC for modular courses of theoretical knowledge instruction. ATOs have to be approved to conduct distance learning courses.

Distance learning courses are not possible for integrated courses due to the structure of the course itself.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC to Appendix 3 - G. CPL/IR integrated course - helicopters**

p. 596-598

comment 1453

comment by: *Bristow Helicopters*

CPL(H) Integrated course and CPLH/IR Integrated course Phase 2 item I (in both courses) is a partial repetition of item n. Propose deletion of item I in each course and renumbering of existing paragraphs m and n:

~~I. general handling progress test conducted by a delegated instructor not connected with the applicant's training;~~

Justification:

Phase 1 and Phase 2 syllabi are common throughout all the helicopter integrated courses, only the hours breakdown differs for the CPL(H) integrated course. Phase 2 syllabi in the ATP/IR and ATP VFR are correct and should be mirrored in the CPL(H) and CPLH/IR courses

response *Partially accepted*

The Agency follows your proposal and will delete item I. in "CPL integrated course - helicopters" and "CPL/IR integrated course - helicopters" and renumber the existing paragraphs. To be compliant with "ATP/IR and ATP

integrated courses - helicopters", the paragraph m. of these courses will be taken for CPL/IR and CPL as well (including the reference to Appendix 4 to Part-FCL).

comment 2371 comment by: *AECA(SPAIN)*

CPL(H) Integrated course and CPLH/IR Integrated course Phase 2 item l (in both courses) is a partial repetition of item n. Propose deletion of item l in each course and renumbering of existing paragraphs m and n:

Justification:

Phase 1 and Phase 2 syllabi are common throughout all the helicopter integrated courses, only the hours breakdown differs for the CPL(H) integrated course. Phase 2 syllabi in the ATP/IR and ATP VFR are correct and should be mirrored in the CPL(H) and CPLH/IR courses

response *Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1453.

comment 4450 comment by: *Bond Offshore Helicopters*

CPL(H) Integrated course and CPLH/IR Integrated course Phase 2 item l (in both courses) is a partial repetition of item n. Propose deletion of item l in each course and renumbering of existing paragraphs m and n:

~~l. general handling progress test conducted by a delegated instructor not connected with the applicant's training;~~

Justification:

Phase 1 and Phase 2 syllabi are common throughout all the helicopter integrated courses, only the hours breakdown differs for the CPL(H) integrated course. Phase 2 syllabi in the ATP/IR and ATP VFR are correct and should be mirrored in the CPL(H) and CPLH/IR courses

response *Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1453.

comment 4692 comment by: *Héli-Union*

CPL(H) Integrated course and CPLH/IR Integrated course Phase 2 item l (in both courses) is a partial repetition of item n. Propose deletion of item l in each course and renumbering of existing paragraphs m and n:

~~l. general handling progress test conducted by a delegated instructor not connected with the applicant's training;~~

Justification:

Phase 1 and Phase 2 syllabi are common throughout all the helicopter integrated courses, only the hours breakdown differs for the CPL(H) integrated course. Phase 2 syllabi in the ATP/IR and ATP VFR are correct and should be mirrored in the CPL(H) and CPLH/IR courses

response *Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1453.

comment

4913

comment by: HUTC

CPL(H) Integrated course and CPLH/IR Integrated course Phase 2 item I (in both courses) is a partial repetition of item n. Propose deletion of item I in each course and renumbering of existing paragraphs m and n:

~~I. general handling progress test conducted by a delegated instructor not connected with the applicant's training.~~

Justification:

Phase 1 and Phase 2 syllabi are common throughout all the helicopter integrated courses, only the hours breakdown differs for the CPL(H) integrated course. Phase 2 syllabi in the ATP/IR and ATP VFR are correct and should be mirrored in the CPL(H) and CPLH/IR courses

response

Noted

Please see the reply above to comment 1453.

comment

5679 ❖

comment by: Civil Aviation Training Europe

### AMC to Appendix 3

#### THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE

Present text:

"The xxx hours of instruction can include classroom work, interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels, computer based training, and other media as approved by the Authority, in suitable proportions."

#### REQUEST:

As in **AMC to FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H**, theoretical knowledge instruction should allow the use of distance learning courses

#### BACKGROUND:

While Universities other educational branches worldwide increase their offer of distance learning degrees exponentially, the EASA FCL still does not reflect this modern technique of learning

New dimensions of learning methodology have arisen since the 90's.

Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning, allowing new dimensions of methodology. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."

Blended learning (mixture of classroom and distance learning) is without doubt the best learning method and should be favourized even before sole classroom teaching.

From middle school graduation to academical bachelor and master degrees...Distance Learning with modern e-learning technology is the key to present and future learning.



For aviation theory training **state/government certified** distance learning institutes / courses should be allowed that offer student coaching and support via a mix of modern technology (online chats, forums, email, telephone)

Neglecting modern distance learning courses is an anachronism in today's world.

**PROPOSAL:**

Change wording **in all relevant sections of AMC to Appendix 3 and GM to Appendix 5** to:

"An approved course should include formal classroom work and may include the use of such facilities as interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels and computer based training and other media distance learning (correspondence) courses as approved by the Authority.

**State/government certified distance learning courses with learner support system and blended learning concept may also be offered as part of the course."**

LITERATURE / REFERENCES

1. University of London

[http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about\\_us/facts.shtml](http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about_us/facts.shtml)

2. Harvard University

<http://www.extension.harvard.edu/>

**3. Advanced Distributed Learning Network (ADLNet)**

<http://www.adlnet.gov/>

The Advanced Distributed Learning (ADL) Initiative is a collaborative effort between government, industry and academia to establish a new distributed learning environment that permits the interoperability of learning tools and course content on a global scale.

4. The European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning (EURODL)

<http://www.eurodl.org/>

5. "Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."

<http://ezinearticles.com/?Common-Myths-About-Distance-Learning-Courses&id=1986125>

<http://ezinearticles.com...author> unknown

"Maybe some people still think the term "distance learning" means waiting for the postman to deliver boxes of books and exams. But: Since the 1980s, thousands of colleges and universities have switched to distance learning methods; and millions of students are now choosing online schools as their top choice in higher education. In fact, online education has overtaken the industry, giving distance learning a whole new meaning. With nearly thirty years to develop learning technology for the Internet, the online colleges and universities of today have refined the distance learning process to provide accredited degree programs for adult learners.

The soaring popularity of Distance Learning can neither be neglected nor turned down.

H.J. Seibert, 25.Feb2009

response

*Partially accepted*

The text of a proposed AMC to FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H has been added to all modular courses in AMC to Appendix 3.

As for the text addition proposed by you, the Agency does not consider it necessary, since this possibility is already included in the reference to distance learning courses.

Distance learning courses are already mentioned in OR.ATO.400 and the related AMC for modular courses of theoretical knowledge instruction. ATOs have to be approved to conduct distance learning courses.

Distance learning courses are not possible for integrated courses due to the structure of the course itself.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC to Appendix 3 - H. CPL integrated course - Helicopters**

p. 598-600

comment

5679 ❖

comment by: *Civil Aviation Training Europe*

**AMC to Appendix 3**

**THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE**

Present text:

"The xxx hours of instruction can include classroom work, interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels, computer based training, and other media as approved by the Authority, in suitable proportions."

**REQUEST:**

As in **AMC to FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H**, theoretical knowledge instruction should allow the use of distance learning courses

**BACKGROUND:**

While Universities other educational branches worldwide increase their offer of distance learning degrees exponentially, the EASA FCL still does not reflect this modern technique of learning

New dimensions of learning methodology have arisen since the 90's.

Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning, allowing new dimensions of methodology. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."

Blended learning (mixture of classroom and distance learning) is without doubt the best learning method and should be favoured even before sole classroom teaching.

From middle school graduation to academical bachelor and master

degrees...Distance Learning with modern e-learning technology is the key to present and future learning.

For aviation theory training **state/government certified** distance learning institutes / courses should be allowed that offer student coaching and support via a mix of modern technology (online chats, forums, email, telephone)

Neglecting modern distance learning courses is an anachronism in today's world.

**PROPOSAL:**

Change wording **in all relevant sections of AMC to Appendix 3 and GM to Appendix 5** to:

"An approved course should include formal classroom work and may include the use of such facilities as interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels and computer based training and other media distance learning (correspondence) courses as approved by the Authority.

**State/government certified distance learning courses with learner support system and blended learning concept may also be offered as part of the course."**

LITERATURE / REFERENCES

1. University of London

[http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about\\_us/facts.shtml](http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about_us/facts.shtml)

2. Harvard University

<http://www.extension.harvard.edu/>

**3. Advanced Distributed Learning Network (ADLNet)**

<http://www.adlnet.gov/>

The Advanced Distributed Learning (ADL) Initiative is a collaborative effort between government, industry and academia to establish a new distributed learning environment that permits the interoperability of learning tools and course content on a global scale.

4. The European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning (EURODL)

<http://www.eurodl.org/>

5. " Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."

<http://ezinearticles.com/?Common-Myths-About-Distance-Learning-Courses&id=1986125>

<http://ezinearticles.com...author> unknown

"Maybe some people still think the term "distance learning" means waiting for the postman to deliver boxes of books and exams. But: Since the 1980s, thousands of colleges and universities have switched to distance learning methods; and millions of students are now choosing online schools as their top choice in higher education. In fact, online education has overtaken the industry, giving distance learning a whole new meaning. With nearly thirty

years to develop learning technology for the Internet, the online colleges and universities of today have refined the distance learning process to provide accredited degree programs for adult learners.

The soaring popularity of Distance Learning can neither be neglected nor turned down.

H.J. Seibert, 25.Feb2009

response *Noted*

Distance learning courses are already mentioned in OR.ATO.400 and the related AMC for modular courses of theoretical knowledge instruction. ATOs have to be approved to conduct distance learning courses.

Distance learning courses are not possible for integrated courses due to the structure of the course itself.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC to Appendix 3 - I. CPL modular course - Helicopters**

p. 600-601

comment

5679 ❖

comment by: *Civil Aviation Training Europe*

**AMC to Appendix 3**

THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE

Present text:

"The xxx hours of instruction can include classroom work, interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels, computer based training, and other media as approved by the Authority, in suitable proportions."

**REQUEST:**

As in **AMC to FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H**, theoretical knowledge instruction should allow the use of distance learning courses

**BACKGROUND:**

While Universities other educational branches worldwide increase their offer of distance learning degrees exponentially, the EASA FCL still does not reflect this modern technique of learning

New dimensions of learning methodology have arisen since the 90's.

Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning, allowing new dimensions of methodology. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."

Blended learning (mixture of classroom and distance learning) is without doubt the best learning method and should be favoured even before sole classroom teaching.

From middle school graduation to academical bachelor and master degrees...Distance Learning with modern e-learning technology is the key to present and future learning.

For aviation theory training **state/government certified** distance learning

institutes / courses should be allowed that offer student coaching and support via a mix of modern technology (online chats, forums, email, telephone)

Neglecting modern distance learning courses is an anachronism in today's world.

**PROPOSAL:**

Change wording **in all relevant sections of AMC to Appendix 3 and GM to Appendix 5** to:

"An approved course should include formal classroom work and may include the use of such facilities as interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels and computer based training and other media distance learning (correspondence) courses as approved by the Authority.

**State/government certified distance learning courses with learner support system and blended learning concept may also be offered as part of the course."**

LITERATURE / REFERENCES

1. University of London

[http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about\\_us/facts.shtml](http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about_us/facts.shtml)

2. Harvard University

<http://www.extension.harvard.edu/>

**3. Advanced Distributed Learning Network (ADLNet)**

<http://www.adlnet.gov/>

The Advanced Distributed Learning (ADL) Initiative is a collaborative effort between government, industry and academia to establish a new distributed learning environment that permits the interoperability of learning tools and course content on a global scale.

4. The European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning (EURODL)

<http://www.eurodl.org/>

5. "Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."

<http://ezinearticles.com/?Common-Myths-About-Distance-Learning-Courses&id=1986125>

<http://ezinearticles.com...author> unknown

"Maybe some people still think the term "distance learning" means waiting for the postman to deliver boxes of books and exams. But: Since the 1980s, thousands of colleges and universities have switched to distance learning methods; and millions of students are now choosing online schools as their top choice in higher education. In fact, online education has overtaken the industry, giving distance learning a whole new meaning. With nearly thirty years to develop learning technology for the Internet, the online colleges and universities of today have refined the distance learning process to provide accredited degree programs for adult learners.

The soaring popularity of Distance Learning can neither be neglected nor

	turned down.
	H.J. Seibert, 25.Feb2009
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>The text of a proposed AMC to FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H has been added to all modular courses in AMC to Appendix 3.</p> <p>As for the text addition proposed by you, the Agency does not consider it necessary, since this possibility is already included in the reference to distance learning courses.</p> <p>Distance learning courses are already mentioned in OR.ATO.400 and the related AMC for <u>modular courses</u> of theoretical knowledge instruction. ATOs have to be approved to conduct distance learning courses.</p> <p>Distance learning courses are <u>not possible for integrated courses</u> due to the structure of the course itself.</p>

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - GM to Appendix 5 MPL – Integrated Multi-Crew Pilot Licence training course**

p. 602

comment	<p>5510 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>ECA- European Cockpit Association</i></span></p> <p>Comment: This part should be upgraded to IR, as the requirements come from ICAO Annex 1, 2.5.</p> <p>Justification: Almost all parts of ICAO Annex I 2.5 regulation material were downgraded to GM to Appendix 5 (e.g. ETOPS approach). This is unacceptable. It must be upgraded to IRs. For this EASA has to file non compliance with ICAO Regulation. This is not acceptable. See also comment of requirement related to Appendix 5.2 on page 106, and general comment on subpart E.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>The Agency follows in the GM to Appendix 5 MPL - Integrated Multi-Crew Pilot Licence training course closely the AMC/IEM material in JAR-FCL concerning this subject.</p> <p>The MPL Training scheme can be found in the AMC/IEM K – Multi-Crew Pilot Licence (Aeroplane) – MPL(A). The Competency units, competency elements and performance criteria can be found in IEM FCL No. 1 to Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 &amp; 1.525 MPL(A) - Competency Units, Competency Elements and Performance Criteria.</p> <p>The Agency does not see the need to change this.</p>
comment	<p>6984 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA CZ</i></span></p> <p><b>(AMC to Appendix 4)</b> Note: Number of the paragraph is in brackets because it does not exist. The number is just proposed place where the text should be added.</p>

„Application and Report Form for the CPL(A)/(H) Skill Test“ according to paragraph IEM FCL 1.170/2.170 is not included in the proposal. It should be completed

response *Partially accepted*

The Agency has included the 'Application and Report Form for the CPL(A)/(H) Skill Test' in the AMC to Appendix 7. Please see the amended text of this AMC to Appendix 7.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - GM to Appendix 5 MPL – Integrated Multi-Crew Pilot Licence training course - General**

p. 602

comment

6461

comment by: *DCAA*

GM to APP. 5 GM to Appendix 5 For the MPL training scheme the printing quality should be improved so that it is readable. It is suggested that the training scheme is put on one whole page and turned 90 degrees.

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for your comment.

The MPL Training Scheme is indeed difficult to read when printed. We will take your suggestion in account and the scheme quality will be improved so that it is readable.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - GM to Appendix 5 MPL – Integrated Multi-Crew Pilot Licence training course - Theoretical Knowledge Instruction**

p. 603

comment

5679 ❖

comment by: *Civil Aviation Training Europe*

**AMC to Appendix 3**

**THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE**

Present text:

"The xxx hours of instruction can include classroom work, interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels, computer based training, and other media as approved by the Authority, in suitable proportions."

**REQUEST:**

As in **AMC to FCL.515.A and FCL.515.H**, theoretical knowledge instruction should allow the use of distance learning courses

**BACKGROUND:**

While Universities other educational branches worldwide increase their offer of distance learning degrees exponentially, the EASA FCL still does not reflect this modern technique of learning

New dimensions of learning methodology have arisen since the 90's.

Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning, allowing new dimensions of methodology. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."

Blended learning (mixture of classroom and distance learning) is without doubt the best learning method and should be favourized even before sole classroom teaching.

From middle school graduation to academical bachelor and master degrees...Distance Learning with modern e-learning technology is the key to present and future learning.

For aviation theory training **state/government certified** distance learning institutes / courses should be allowed that offer student coaching and support via a mix of modern technology (online chats, forums, email, telephone)

Neglecting modern distance learning courses is an anachronism in todays world.

**PROPOSAL:**

Change wording **in all relevant sections of AMC to Appendix 3 and GM to Appendix 5** to:

"An approved course should include formal classroom work and may include the use of such facilities as interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels and computer based training and other media distance learning (correspondence) courses as approved by the Authority.  
**State/government certified distance learning courses with learner support system and blended learning concept may also be offered as part of the course."**

LITERATURE / REFERENCES

1.University of London

[http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about\\_us/facts.shtml](http://www.londonexternal.ac.uk/about_us/facts.shtml)

2. Harvard University

<http://www.extension.harvard.edu/>

**3. Advanced Distributed Learning Network (ADLNet)**

<http://www.adlnet.gov/>

The Advanced Distributed Learning (ADL) Initiative is a collaborative effort between government, industry and academia to establish a new distributed learning environment that permits the interoperability of learning tools and course content on a global scale.

4. The European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning (EURODL)

<http://www.eurodl.org/>

5. " Distance education has undergone a thorough facelift recently. Inventions of high end telecommunication devices, software and hardware have redefined the entire process of distance learning. Online colleges are no way different than traditional schools."



<http://ezinearticles.com/?Common-Myths-About-Distance-Learning-Courses&id=1986125>

<http://ezinearticles.com...author> unknown

"Maybe some people still think the term "distance learning" means waiting for the postman to deliver boxes of books and exams. But: Since the 1980s, thousands of colleges and universities have switched to distance learning methods; and millions of students are now choosing online schools as their top choice in higher education. In fact, online education has overtaken the industry, giving distance learning a whole new meaning. With nearly thirty years to develop learning technology for the Internet, the online colleges and universities of today have refined the distance learning process to provide accredited degree programs for adult learners.

The soaring popularity of Distance Learning can neither be neglected nor turned down.

H.J. Seibert, 25.Feb2009

response *Noted*

Your comment seems to refer to Appendix 3, where it is repeated. Please see the reply to your comment in the dedicated segment.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - GM to Appendix 5 MPL – Integrated Multi-Crew Pilot Licence training course - Competency Units, Competency Elements and Performance Criteria - 1.**

p. 603

comment

1959

comment by: *Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch*

**NOT in concordance with Basic Regulations of the EC**

**Poof:**

1) Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations call for the knowledge of " non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors."

This is NOT ""threat and error management"!

2) §(16) of the Basic Regulations principles claim for a "promotion of a "culture of safety"

3) "threat and error management" is a special approach and methodology not accepted by all. More modern and general accepted techniques exist (see my comments on TEM, definitions error and error management and the Basic Regulations of the EC.

**Proposal:**

Replace in COMPETENCY UNITS, COMPETENCY ELEMENTS AND PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

"1. Apply human performance principles, including principles of threat and error management"

"1. Apply principles of human performance and limitations and non-technical skills with regard to flight safety including the recognition and management of threats and errors and CRM

response *Noted*

The Agency follows in Appendix 5 Integrated MPL training course closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.515 and Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 & 1.525.

The competency requirements concerning the competency units in paragraph 13 (b) of Appendix 5 are exactly the same requirements as in paragraph 16, Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 & 1.525.

The Competency units, competency elements and performance criteria can be found in IEM FCL No. 1 to Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 & 1.525 MPL(A) - Competency Units, Competency Elements and Performance Criteria.

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task. We suggest that you submit to the Agency a rulemaking proposal on this issue.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - GM to Appendix 5 MPL – Integrated Multi-Crew Pilot Licence training course - Principles of threat and error management**

p. 614

comment

1960

comment by: *Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch*

**The basic Regulations of the EC prescribe a much broader view on flight safety using non-technical skills. The proposed NPA contradicts this.**

TEM (THREAT AND ERROR MANAGEMEN) is just **ONE** approach to air safety. Origin is the Human Factors Group of the University of Texas. Most of the NPA text is identical with their published material (see [http://www.flightsafety.org/tem\\_home.html](http://www.flightsafety.org/tem_home.html) and in particular Maurino: <http://www.flightsafety.org/doc/tem/maurino.doc>)

Not all experts agree on this material. Recent publications in the EC propose a much more modern and efficient view on flight safety for civil aviation and measures for flight safety. (see, for example, Badke-Schaub et al 2008: Human Factors, Springer, Ultsch 2008, Eisenreich 2008)

**Proof:**

1) Annex II 1.b1. (xi) of the Basic Regulations call for the knowledge of " non-technical skills, including the recognition and management of threats and errors."

This is NOT only ""threat and error management"!

2) §(16) of the Basic Regulations principles claim for a "promotion of a "culture of safety"

Proposal:

**Install a working group of European experts on flight safety for civil aviation with the clear appointment to develop a model which is consistent with the EC's Basic Regulations and integrates modern views on Human Factors.**

response

*Noted*

The Agency follows in Appendix 5 Integrated MPL training course closely

paragraph JAR-FCL 1.515 and Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 & 1.525 and their AMC.

The Description of the principles of threat and error management can be found in IEM FCL No. 2 to Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 & 1.525 MPL(A) – The Description of the principles of threat and error management.

The issue of non-technical skills, and specifically their assessment, was never solved at JAR-FCL level. Before more detailed provisions are included in Part-FCL, the issue needs to be carefully assessed, and should be subject to further work, in a separate rulemaking task. We suggest that you submit a rulemaking proposal on this issue to the Agency.

comment

5514

comment by: *ECA- European Cockpit Association*

Comment: delete the whole point on "Principles of Threat and Error Management", i.e., pages 614 to 620 included.

Justification:

Some sections should be only referred to, not covered as a subject, i.e. Threat and Error Management (TEM) (p.614 onwards). This should be left for the classroom, simulator or aircraft. TEM should be taught in the classroom/aircraft. It is not the job of a regulatory document to expound the relative merits of TEM. It should only be referred to as subject to be taught.

response

*Noted*

Please see the reply above to comment 1960.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - GM to Appendix 5 MPL – Integrated Multi-Crew Pilot Licence training course - Principles of threat and error management - 3. Errors**

p. 615-617

comment

1961

comment by: *Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch*

The definition of "Error" is insatisfactory.

Proof

- i) Errors that jeopardize a flight might also be conducted by other persons important to the aims of a flight e.g. ramp agents, ATC, manufacturers etc
- ii) "organizational or flight intentions or expectations" is too broad, this includes, for example, commercial aims of an airline
- iii) This is taken directly from TEM, a special technique not accepted by all.
- iv) Errors are not separated from violations, therefore non punitive environments can not be established (§(16) of the Basic Regulations principles)

Proposal: replace above definition by:

**Error**

Intentional human actions or inactions aiming at a safe and accident free flight, which have, however, a negative impact on these aims. A prerequisite for an error is the knowledge and skill for the right action instead of the erroneous action. Violations are not subsumed under errors.

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency follows in Appendix 5 Integrated MPL training course closely paragraph JAR-FCL 1.515 and Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 & 1.525 and their AMC.

The Description of the principles of threat and error management can be found in IEM FCL No. 2 to Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.520 & 1.525 MPL(A) – The Description of the principles of threat and error management.

The definition of 'Errors' is exactly the same and the Agency does not see the need to change this.

comment

1962

comment by: *Prof. Dr. Alfred Ultsch*

**The proposed categories are not helpful in the prevention management or teaching on how to deal with errors.**

Proof:

- no distinction between violations and errors are made.

Communications

- Communicat among pilots have special deficiencies which have to be regarded, see for example the Schulz von Thrun model on communication adopted in Wiedemann, R. et al: Human Factors Konzept der Vereinigung Cockpit, erhältlich auf Anfrage unter <http://www.vcockpit.de/kontakt.php>

response

*Noted*

Please see the first part of the reply above to your other comment.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC No 1 to Appendix 6 - Modular training course for IR**

p. 621

comment

1271

comment by: *PPL/IR Europe*

JAR-FCL currently requires only 10% of theoretical knowledge instruction to be classroom based. Prior to JAR-FCL, courses could be entirely based on Distance Learning. The current AMC appears to be less flexible than JAR-FCL, in that it only acknowledges that distance learning "may also be offered".

We believe the determination of "suitable proportions" should be competency-based, and the AMC should permit candidates to take courses which are 100% Distance Learning based.

We believe the JAR-FCL approach to theoretical knowledge training is inefficient and at odds with modern training methods. Many FTOs produce their own primitively bound black and white training books, with a corresponding reduction in quality and increase in costs compared to standard published texts. Candidates for the IR range from school leavers with modest qualifications to University professors. It is inconceivable that so wide a range of applicants must all undergo the same training course with the same prescribed number of hours.

Our proposed wording is

*2. The 150 hours of theoretical knowledge instruction can include classroom work, interactive video, slide/tape presentation, learning carrels, computer*

*based training, and other media as approved by the Authority, in suitable proportions. Approved courses may also be entirely based on distance learning (correspondence and internet).*

response

*Noted*

The Agency follows in Appendix 6 closely the text of Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 1.205 and JAR-FCL 2.205 and their appendices.

The AMC to Appendix 6 is a copy of the AMC FCL 1.205 IR(A) - Modular flying training course.

The use of distance learning is clearly possible (see paragraph 2).

However, in JAR-FCL the possibility to have complete distance learning courses was never agreed; The Agency does not intend to change this at this time, without a dedicated assessment.

comment

3394 ❖

comment by: *Richard DUMAS, PPL(A)*

Simplifier les exigences pour l'IR Théorique :

- a. en restreignant le cursus théorique au strict nécessaire
- b. en autorisant le self-training

Raisons du commentaire :

a) Les JAR.FCL ont fermé l'IR aux pilotes privés. Le NPA ne corrige pas cette abération, au contraire :

- l'utilisation d'un IR FAA est même rendu plus difficile
- en l'état du NPA, l'IMC rating UK est interdit

b) L'aviation générale certifiée Française va donc continuer à avoir un taux d'accident mortel par hdv double de celui du UK (IMC rating) ou des US (IR accessible au privé), un écart qui, sur les 5 ans d'existence de l'ESEA, a représenté plus de 100 morts. Plus grave : la sécurité au UK va désormais se dégrader.

Quand l'EASA – où le S signifie safety, consciente de son devoir vis-à-vis de cette hécatombe, adressera-t-elle cette question de sécurité et favorisera-t-elle l'accès des pilotes privés au vol en IMC - donc en IFR ?

Enfin, il est très regretté que, dans ce NPA qui crée une licence "dirigeable" qui ne concerne qu'une poignée de pilotes en Europe - l'EASA ne traite ni de la reconduction ni de la généralisation Européenne de l'IMC rating du UK souhaitées par des milliers de pratiquants ?

response

*Noted*

It was already indicated in the Explanatory memorandum to Part-FCL, under Subpart I, number 48 (page 29), of NPA 2008-17a, that the issue of qualifications for flying in Instrument Meteorological Conditions (IMC) is currently being reviewed in a separate Rulemaking task, FCL.008. As part of the work, this task is reviewing the requirements for the IR, specifically in what relates to private pilots.

The comments received on A-NPA 14-2006 and on this NPA dealing with the issue of the qualifications to fly in IMC will be taken into account by this working group. The task FCL.008 will result in an NPA which will be submitted

to public consultation, and on which you will be able to make your comments.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC No 2 to Appendix 6 - Modular training course for IR - aeroplanes** p. 621-623

comment

6688

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC No 2 to Appendix 6

**Page No:**

621 of 647

**Comment:**

This AMC deals with the Modular training course for IR but only includes aeroplanes and airships. The helicopter AMC has been forgotten.

**Justification:**

The helicopter course needs to be included

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Add complete new AMC for helicopters. To maintain consistency, it should be numbered AMC No 3 to Appendix 6 and the existing AMC No 3 should be renumbered AMC No 4.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for your comment.

The reason why there is no dedicated AMC for the IR(H) modular course is because there was no AMC to Appendix 1 to JAR-FCL 2.205. The text of this Appendix was almost totally included in Appendix 6, with the exception of the two paragraphs that are included in AMC No 1 to Appendix 6, which is general and applies to all categories of aircraft.

At this moment, and in what refers to aeroplanes and helicopters, the Agency is basically only transferring the AMC/GM material that existed already in the JARs, and it is not possible to develop a new AMC for the IR(H) modular course. This may, however, be a subject to a future rulemaking task.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC No 3 to Appendix 6 - Modular training course for IR - airships** p. 624-626

comment

6792

comment by: CAA CZ

Abbreviation for an airship should be corrected (~~As~~s) - in this NPA the symbol composed of the capital letter "A" and the small letter "s" is used .

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for your comment.

This editorial will be changed accordingly in 'Certificate of completion of Basic Instrument Flight Module (As)'.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC No 1** p. 627

<b>to Appendix 7 - IR skill test and proficiency check form</b>
---

comment	6985	comment by: CAA CZ
	<p>AMCs to Appendices 7, 9, 12, <b>(4 and AMC No 1/2 to FCL.220)</b></p> <p>Almost all the Authorities publish the list of examiners with the number of examiner's authorisation, so the following should be completed to appropriate boxes in all „<i>Application and Report Forms</i>“:</p> <p>„Type and number of licence <b>and examiner's authorisation</b>“  or „Licence number <b>and number of FIE's authorisation</b>“.</p>	
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The Agency has conducted an editorial review of all the forms, and your comments have been taken into account.</p>	

<b>B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC No 1 to Appendix 7 - IR skill test and proficiency check form - A. Aeroplanes</b>
--

p. 627

comment	6692	comment by: UK CAA
	<p><b>Paragraph:</b> AMC No 1 to Appendix 7</p> <p><b>Page No:</b> 627 of 647</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> For the Application and report form, why is there a separate form for helicopters, which doesn't have as much information as the form for the other two categories? There should only be one form for all three categories of aircraft. This will ease the administrative burden on the NAAs.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Unnecessary administration.</p> <p><b>Proposed Text:</b> <b>(if applicable)</b> Delete forms B &amp; C then in box 1 change the word aeroplane to aircraft and remove the (A) from the title of the form. Perhaps the applicant should have a signature box (similar to the helicopter requirement) under his licence number?</p>	
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The Agency has developed a new harmonised form, and your proposals have been integrated. Please see amended text.</p>	
comment	6694	comment by: UK CAA
	<p><b>Paragraph:</b> <b>AMC No 1 to Appendix 7</b></p> <p><b>Page No:</b></p>	

627

**Comment:**

There is nothing on the form to confirm that the examiner has seen a valid medical certificate.

**Justification:**

Efficiency of process and better regulatory oversight to ensure validity of medical certification. This would also prevent applicants from applying for licences and ratings for which they were ineligible on medical grounds.

**Proposed Text:  
(if applicable)**

Add to all application forms for skill tests, proficiency checks and ratings a box for the examiner to countersign that he/she has seen a current, valid medical certificate.

In the case of a night rating, the examiner could tick a box to confirm that the applicant does not have a VCL limitation on his/her medical certificate.

In the case of an IR, the examiner could tick a box to confirm that the applicant has undertaken an audiogram (date should be stated on the medical certificate).

response

*Not accepted*

Thank you for providing your opinion.

Please refer to FCL.1030 (a)(2) which states that when conducting skill tests and proficiency checks, examiners shall verify whether the applicant complies with all the qualification, training and experience requirements established by this Part. Any qualification other than the SFI has to be put in a valid licence. A licence is only valid if the associated medical certificate is valid too. This implies that verifying the qualifications of the candidate includes the medical; therefore it is not necessary to mention it specifically or to create an additional box for this.

comment

7950

comment by: *CAA Finland*

Details of flight:

Place for landing time + total airborne time are missing

Applicants signature ("approval") is not absolutely necessary, but reasonable ref AMC to App 9

response

*Accepted*

Thank you for your comment.

The Agency has developed a new harmonised form, and your proposals have been integrated. Please see the amended text.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC No 1 to Appendix 7 - IR skill test and proficiency check form - B. Helicopters**

p. 628

comment

7954

comment by: *CAA Finland*



	<p>Details of flight: Place for landing time + total airborne time are missing</p> <p>Applicants signature ("approval") is not absolutely necessary, but reasonable, ref AMC to App 9</p> <p>Quite often IR-equipped helicopters are MPH under IFR. Need for crosses: As SP-OPS or MP-OPS</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The Agency has developed a new harmonised form, and your first 2 proposals have been integrated. Please see amended text. As for your last proposal, the Agency considers that it is not necessary.</p>

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC to Appendix 9 - ATPL/type rating/training/skill test and proficiency check form**

p. 630

comment	<p>1141 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAA Belgium</span></p> <p>PROPOSAL for all report forms for the benefit of the Competent Authorities:</p> <p>Add a box underneath the form where the examiner, after having taken a successful test, can write until which date he revalidated the rating on the licence of the applicant. This information is necessary for the CA.</p>
response	<p><i>Not accepted</i></p> <p>In accordance with AR.FCL.215 this period can never exceed 4 weeks, and is determined by the competent authority. The Agency, therefore, does not see the need for such information to appear in the form.</p>
comment	<p>4755 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAA Belgium</span></p> <p>In general, proof reading is needed. Some examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Skill test/Proficiency check report form for MPA and MPH are identical. Why use 2 forms then? Contradicts the expressed principle of EASA not duplicating unnecessary.</li> <li>- ST/PC report form for SPH has box for simulator data. Why no such box in the SPA ST/PC report form? There are less SPH simulators available than for SPA.</li> <li>- In general, many further editorial details needs attention.</li> </ul>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency has merged the forms and conducted an editorial review. Please see amended text.</p>
comment	<p>7079 <span style="float: right;">comment by: CAA Norway</span></p> <p>AMC to Appendix 9</p> <p>In general, proof reading is needed. Some examples:</p>

- Skill test/Proficiency check report form for MPA and MPH are identical. Why use 2 forms then? Contradicts the expressed principle of EASA not duplicating unnecessary.
- ST/PC report form for SPH has box for simulator data. Why no such box in the SPA ST/PC report form? There are less SPH simulators available than for SPA.
- In general, many further editorial details needs attention.

response *Partially accepted*

Please see reply to comment 4755 above.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC to Appendix 9 - ATPL/type rating/training/skill test and proficiency check form - A. Multi-engine multi-pilot aeroplanes**

p. 630

comment 299

comment by: *Michel Lacombe AF TRTO*

AMC to Appendix 9 :  
A Multi-engine multi-pilot aeroplane :

In the fourth line of the table it is asked to indicate what kind of type rating (pilot-in command or co-pilot).

What for ???

Today the type rating is established indifferently for both and on the licence the function (pilot-in command or co-pilot) is not mentioned.

Are we going to keep this or change it ???

As in Appendix 9 the applicant may choose the left or right seat for the skill test, what will be the criteria?? Furthermore the notion of pilot-in command or co-pilot is more dependent of the operator than of the licence.

So, I suggest withdrawing this mention.

response *Accepted*

Thank you for providing your input.

The Agency carefully reviewed all the comments received on these forms which were actually based on the existing JAR-FCL forms.

The issues mentioned with your comment were further discussed with the experts and the forms reviewed and amended based on the input received. The Agency agrees to delete the reference to "PIC or Co-pilot".

comment 1136

comment by: *CAA Belgium*

A. Some details on the application and report form.

Delete "examiner\*" in box 2

Delete "examiner\*" in box 3

Reason: as these are training items there is no examiner role.

Add in box 4: "\*" after "skill test/proficiency check"

Delete in box 4: "\*" after examiner.

response *Accepted*

The Agency has reviewed the form. Please see amended text.

comment

6696

comment by: UK CAA

**Paragraph:**

AMC to Appendix 9 A, C & D Box 2 on each form

**Page No:**

630, 632 & 633

**Comment:**

If the Simulator number is inserted in the first paragraph, why is it necessary to include the other information relating to the manufacturer, number of axes, motion system & visual system? If the simulator has a national (or EASA) reference number, all this has been checked already either by the JOEB subgroup JSET or by the EASA catch up programme and this is unnecessary administration. Why are there three different category of aircraft forms anyway, all the information is the same and therefore they could be made into one form.

**Justification:**

Overly bureaucratic.

**Proposed Text:****(if applicable)**

Delete references to simulator manufacturer, number of axes, motion system & visual system. Reduce to one form.

response

*Accepted*

The Agency has carefully reviewed all the comments received on these forms which were based on the forms already established under JAR-FCL.

The Agency agrees with your proposal and will delete some of the proposed boxes for the FSTD related information as you are right with your statement that the simulator number should be sufficient for this purpose.

You Agency also took into account your proposal to merge the different forms and developed one common form. Please see the amended text.

comment

7956

comment by: CAA Finland

Applicant-section:

Multi-engine / Training record... quite unclear. Need for clarification.

response

*Noted*

The Agency has reviewed the form. Please see amended text.

comment

7959

comment by: CAA Finland

Attachment [#75](#)

A common training certificate in all levels would be helpful. As an attached form there is an example for MP type rating course.

response

*Noted*

Thank you for your input.

The Agency has reviewed the form and tried to create as much harmonisation as possible.

Any further harmonisation of this type of form will need to be subject to a future rulemaking task.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC to Appendix 9 - ATPL/type rating/training/skill test and proficiency check form - B. Single-engine and multi-engine single-pilot aeroplanes**

p. 631

comment 6848 comment by: CAA CZ

In the form for Single-pilot ME, the box for confirmation of theoretical knowledge examination (in percentage) according to FCL.725(b)(2) and FCL.025(b)(1), which is in part 1 of form in AMC to Appendix 9 A for Multi-pilot ME, is missing . The box should be added.

response *Accepted*

Thank you for your comment.

The Agency has reviewed the form. Please see amended text.

comment 7553 comment by: *FlightSafety International*

Make single-pilot same as multi-pilot to support previous arguments

Add Type Rating as Pilot-In Command/Co-Pilot\* delete as necessary

response *Noted*

The Agency has reviewed the form. Please see amended text.

comment 7964 comment by: *CAA Finland*

Details of flight:  
Place for block-times are missing

Applicants signature ("approval") is not absolutely necessary, but reasonable, ref AMC to App 9

Sometimes ME-SP aircraft are operated MP-OPS. Need for crosses: As SP-OPS or MP-OPS

response *Partially accepted*

Thank you for your comment.

The Agency has reviewed the form. Please see amended text.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC to Appendix 9 - ATPL/type rating/training/skill test and proficiency check form - C. Multi-pilot helicopters**

p. 632

comment 6697 comment by: *UK CAA*

**Paragraph:**

AMC to Appendix 9 A, C & D Box 2 on each form

**Page No:**

630, 632 & 633

**Comment:**

If the Simulator number is inserted in the first paragraph, why is it necessary to include the other information relating to the manufacturer, number of axes, motion system & visual system? If the simulator has a national (or EASA) reference number, all this has been checked already either by the JOEB subgroup JSET or by the EASA catch up programme and this is unnecessary administration. Why are there three different category of aircraft forms anyway, all the information is the same and therefore they could be made into one form.

**Justification:**

Overly bureaucratic.

**Proposed Text:**

**(if applicable)**

Delete references to simulator manufacturer, number of axes, motion system & visual system. Reduce to one form.

response

*Accepted*

The Agency has reviewed the forms and merged them.

Based on the input received some changes were introduced. Please see the responses provided already in the other segments regarding your proposals. The Agency agrees with your proposal and the additional boxes on specific simulator issues will be deleted. Please see amended text.

comment

7966

comment by: *CAA Finland*

Applicant-section:

Multi-engine / Training record... quite unclear. Need for clarification.

response

*Noted*

The Agency has reviewed the form. Please see amended text.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC to Appendix 9 - ATPL/type rating/training/skill test and proficiency check form - D. Single-engine and multi-engine single-pilot helicopters**

p. 633

comment

6698

comment by: *UK CAA*

**Paragraph:**

AMC to Appendix 9 A, C & D Box 2 on each form

**Page No:**

630, 632 & **633**

**Comment:**

If the Simulator number is inserted in the first paragraph, why is it necessary to include the other information relating to the manufacturer, number of axes, motion system & visual system? If the simulator has a national (or EASA) reference number, all this has been checked already either by the JOEB subgroup JSET or by the EASA catch up programme and this is unnecessary administration. Why are there three different category of aircraft forms anyway, all the information is the same and therefore they could be made into

	<p>one form.  <b>Justification:</b>  Overly bureaucratic.  <b>Proposed Text:</b>  <b>(if applicable)</b>  Delete references to simulator manufacturer, number of axes, motion system &amp; visual system. Reduce to one form.</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency has reviewed the form. Please see the responses provided to your similar comments addressed to the other segments. The Agency will delete some of the FSTD references and will merge the forms. Please see amended text.</p>

comment	<p>7971 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span></p> <p>Details of flight:  Place for block and airborne times are missing.</p> <p>Applicants signature ("approval") is not absolutely necessary, but reasonable, ref AMC to App 9</p> <p>Sometimes ME-SP aircraft are operated MP-OPS. Need for crosses: As SP-OPS or MP-OPS</p>
response	<p><i>Partially accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency has reviewed the form. Please see amended text.</p>

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC No 1 to Appendix 12 Skill test and proficiency check form for the flight instructor certificate - A. Aeroplanes** p. 634-635

comment	<p>6701 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>UK CAA</i></span></p> <p><b>Paragraph:</b>  AMC No 1 to Appendix 12  <b>Page No:</b>  635  <b>Comment:</b>  FI Skill test form omits applicant for SE CRI.  <b>Justification:</b>  CRI (SE) exist  <b>Proposed Text:</b>  <b>(if applicable)</b>  Add necessary boxes for CRI(A) SE SPA</p>
response	<p><i>Accepted</i></p> <p>The Agency has conducted an editorial review of the form. The box for the CRI will not mention any longer the CRI ME only.</p>

comment	<p>7991 <span style="float: right;">comment by: <i>CAA Finland</i></span></p>
---------	---

Report form part 6:  
This form could with small changes be used also for SFI/TRI/MCCI/STI.

response *Noted*

The Agency has conducted an editorial review of the forms and will put it in AMC to subpart J. For some of the instructor categories there might be no specific form developed at this stage. As it is AMC material the competent authorities could develop a specific one for other instructor categories and approve it as alternative AMC.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC No 1 to Appendix 12 Skill test and proficiency check form for the flight instructor certificate - B. Helicopters** p. 636-638

comment 7992

comment by: *CAA Finland*

Report form part 6:  
This form could with small changes be used also for SFI/TRI/MCCI/STI.

response *Noted*

The Agency has conducted an editorial review of the forms and will put these forms in an AMC to subpart J. For some of the instructor categories there might be no specific form developed at this stage. As it is AMC material the competent authorities could develop a specific one for other instructor categories and approve it as alternative AMC.

**B. Draft Decision Part-FCL - AMC and GM - Part-FCL Appendices - AMC No 2 to Appendix 12 - Skill test and proficiency check form for the Light Aircraft Flight Instructor certificate - C. Sailplanes** p. 644-645

comment 5144

comment by: *Diether Memmert*

Der vorliegende Entwurf, NPA 2008-17a+b+c, verfehlt, was den nichtgewerblichen Teil auf dem Sektor Segelflug und TMG (recreational aviation) angeht, in einigen Punkten seine originäre Aufgabe, nämlich Sicherheit **gegenüber Dritten unter Beachtung der Verhältnismäßigkeit** zu gewährleisten.

Mehr Sicherheit wird nicht durch weitere Überprüfungen, Auflagen und bloße Behauptungen erreicht.

In den Flugvereinen des DAeC wurde eine vorbildliche Leistung mit gutem Sicherheitsstandard bei Ausbildung, In-Übunghaltung, sowie Weiterbildung von Piloten und Fluglehrern in weitgehend ehrenamtlicher Tätigkeit erbracht. Dies sollte sicherlich für die gesamte EU als Richtschnur dienen können.

Es ist eben nicht richtig, daß ein System, das sicherlich im gewerblichen Bereich seine Gültigkeit hat, auch einfach dem Freizeitsport übergestülpt werden kann.

Der vorgeschlagene verwaltungstechnische Überbau (FIE, ATO, Beschränkung der Gültigkeit mit periodischer fliegerischer Überprüfung, etc.) ist unnötig und kostet die Piloten (aus ihrer Tasche!) nur zusätzliche Gebühren. Diese Mittel fehlen dann für Erlangung von mehr Flugpraxis. Diese war aber schon immer das wirkungsvollste Mittel zum Erhalt ausreichender Flugsicherheit!

Das vorliegende Formular ist ueberzogen und gehoert entsprechend meiner

Einwendungen in den frueheren Kapiteln ueberarbeitet.

Dipl.-Ing. TU Diether Memmert, Segelflugpilot seit 1953 mit >8500 Flugstunden

**Aenderungen:**

Formular entsprechend ueberarbeiten

response

*Not accepted*

The Agency acknowledges your comment.

However, as the proposal for a change states only: "revise the form" but without providing any substantiated additional information to which item or section you are referring to the Agency is not able to provide a response on this subject.

The first part of your comment is a standard comment assigned to several other subparts but only containing very general statements. Please see the responses already provided to your other comments.

This application and report form for the instructor skill test has to be filled out by the applicant, the instructor doing the pre-entry flight test, the ATO providing the course and the examiner doing the skill test. The Agency does not understand why it should be changed as it contains all the necessary data for the authority to be checked before putting the endorsement on the licence.

As this form can be filled out within some minutes the Agency does not agree and will keep it basically unchanged (editorial review will be done). Please keep in mind that the future system will allow the ATO to develop an alternative form and ask the competent authority to accept it as an alternative AMC. Nothing will prevent you from developing a different and better application form which has to be approved by your competent authority as alternative AMC.



**Appendix A - Attachments**

 [LPC-OPC-MPA.pdf](#)

Attachment #1 to comment [#1223](#)

 [LST-OPC-MPA.pdf](#)

Attachment #2 to comment [#1223](#)

 [LST-OPC-MPA.pdf](#)

Attachment #3 to comment [#1224](#)

 [LST-OPC-MPA.pdf](#)

Attachment #4 to comment [#1225](#)

 [LST-OPC-MPA.pdf](#)

Attachment #5 to comment [#1226](#)

 [APPENDIX 12 Ryanair Proposal 13-01-09.pdf](#)

Attachment #6 to comment [#1272](#)

 [NPA-FCL-36 Sub Part F v4.pdf](#)

Attachment #1 to comment [#2396](#)

 [Comments on EASA proposals.pdf](#)

Attachment #2 to comment [#435](#)

 [AerobaticRatingUKcomments.pdf](#)

Attachment #3 to comment [#427](#)

 [Using Behavioural marker systêms.pdf](#)

Attachment #1 to comment [#5263](#)

 [Using Behavioural marker systêms.pdf f](#)

Attachment #2 to comment [#5614](#)

 [Using Behavioural marker systêms.pdf](#)

Attachment #1 to comment [#5263](#)

 [Using Behavioural marker systêms.pdf f](#)

Attachment #2 to comment [#5614](#)