

LIGHT AVIATION AIRPORTS STUDY GROUP (LAASG)

Meeting at Aviation House, Gatwick

Thursday 3rd November 2005

Present:

- Graham Forbes (GF), CAA (PLD) Chair**
- David Beaven (DB), CAA (GAD)**
- David Corbett (DC), GASCo**
- Ray Elgy (RE), CAA (ASD)**
- Paul Fleming (PF), CAA (ASD)**
- John Haffenden (JHaf), AOA**
- Janet Hoare (JHo), BBGA/BHAB**
- Martin Marsh (MM), CAA (PLD)**
- Geoff Parker (GP), CAA (Flt Ops)**
- Dorothy Pooley (DP), GAPAN**
- Barry Tempest (BT), PFA**
- John Walker (JW), AOPA**
- Inez Bartolo (IB), CAA (ASD) Secretary**

1 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Messrs Beaton, Finnigan, Grierson, Phillips, Slater and Smailes.

2 NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The notes of the previous meeting were agreed without change.

3 ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Action Item 41: RE advised the Group that one of the recommendations coming out of previous meetings is the proposal that ASD hold internal meetings to discuss the proposal to look at the implications of removing public

transport from Article 126, and this will be conducted over a period of time. However, RE reminded the Group that whatever discussions held would reflect ICAO obligations and European developments.

Action Item 42: IB has distributed the list of aerodromes noted in the European ANP to LAASG members. Action complete.

4. DRAFT REPORT OF THE LAASG (Version 2) - COMMENTS

Executive Summary:

Opening discussion focussed on whether the Group should be using the term 'airport' instead of 'aerodrome'. It was agreed that 'aerodrome' would be the appropriate term, as defined in the Air Navigation Order. The report will reflect this change. It was further agreed that the report would define all terms used.

SLMG should be added, after gliders, throughout the report. The report will reflect this change. Also, gyroplanes operate under an exemption and this should be noted.

Page 3, 'accepting alternative arrangements' should be changed to more accurately reflect the intent. It was considered that 'reviews or considers alternative arrangements' would be more appropriate.

1.1: No comment

1.2 No comment

2.1 It was decided that a further paragraph could be added to enhance 2.1, perhaps quoting the EU Charter on SME's, which says... "*Small enterprises are the most sensitive of all to changes in the business environment. They are the first to suffer if weighed down with excessive bureaucracy*". And that '*Small enterprises must be considered as a main driver for innovation, employment as well as social and local integration in Europe. The best possible environment for small business and entrepreneurship needs therefore to be created*'.

2.2 No comment other than SLMG and gyroplanes should be considered for inclusion.

- 2.3 No comment
- 2.4 Public transport should be the preferred terminology.
- 2.5 No comment
- 3.1 No comment
- 4.1 No comment
- 4.2 No comment other than SLMG and gyroplanes should be considered for inclusion.
- 4.3 JHo felt this paragraph was confusing, as the latter part discussed the requirements to acquire a licence, but the opening sentence discussed a 'Code of Practice'. RE clarified that the reference to a licence was intended to apprise the reader that a Code of Practice would not constitute a 'licence'. JHo felt that the wording led the reader to believe that a Code of Practice airfield must comply with CAP 168; RE confirmed this was not the intent of the sentence and that it will be changed to more accurately reflect its intent.
- 4.4 No comment.

(Note: Section 5 of the report will be re-written by GP). However, the following points were noted at the meeting:

- 5.1 JHo believes that Article 42 can be changed and quoted Article 42(2) as follows:

Article 42(2) states “without prejudice to any conditions imposed under Article 6, the operator of an aircraft shall not be required for the purposes of this article to satisfy himself as to the adequacy of fire-fighting, search, rescue or other services which are required only after the occurrence of an accident”

GP explained that Article 42(2) addresses the issue of **additional** fire fighting services which would only be required in the event of an accident; for example, the requirement for local fire brigades to attend any aircraft accident to supplement the RFFS already promulgated. Article 42(2) states that the operator of an aircraft does not need to satisfy himself that local arrangements are in place for any

additional fire crew attendance. This should not be confused with the requirement for aircraft operators to satisfy themselves that the aerodrome is adequately manned and equipped in regard to the promulgated RFFS.

- 5.2 Although this paragraph adequately covers the requirement that aircraft operators satisfy themselves that aerodromes are adequately manned and equipped, it was decided that it could be worded in a slightly different manner. It was therefore agreed that GP would re-write the paragraph and, indeed, the whole of section 5.
- 5.3 GP to re-write.
- 5.4 GP to re-write.
- 5.5 GP to re-write. DC requested that the final sentence be changed slightly, replacing '...the required standard' to '...a required standard'.
- 5.6 JHo considers the statement in this paragraph to be incorrect, stating that Industry members were unanimous in seeing a benefit in removing public transport passenger flights but that the CAA that were opposed to it. RE believes the intent of the paragraph concerns itself with the requirement, under Article 42, for an aircraft operator to satisfy himself that the aerodrome is adequately manned and equipped. JHo raised concern that she has to present the Report to her members and it contains an inaccurate declaration that the Group concurred on this statement, when she considers they did not. GF also considered that this particular paragraph might send out the wrong message. After lengthy debate, it was agreed to record the fact that there would be strong industry support for the development of a detailed proposal to remove of the requirement for public transport operations by aircraft under 5700kg that take place from licensed aerodromes, and accept alternative arrangements, eg a code of practice and a limited level of RFFS to maintain safety levels.
- 5.7 JHo requested that the list of aircraft numbers, supplied to IB, be included in the appendix covering aircraft sizes. This was agreed.
- 6.1 Special category RFF had been excluded because it only applies to flying training and it was considered that if flying training were removed, it would not be relevant. However, GF suggested that Special should be included because there is no

guarantee that we will be able to remove flying training from licensed aerodromes, but the review should be conducted anyway. Special category will be added to this paragraph.

7 No comment.

8. No comment.

9.1 (a) Change 'Reviews and revises...' to 'Reviews and, if appropriate, revises...'

Remove 'public transport' but keep in flying training. (See 5.6.1 above).

Include reference under this recommendation to review public transport, as detailed under Section 5 of the report (numbering to be decided).

(b) No comment.

(c) Special category RFF should be added to this sub-paragraph. It was confirmed that Category 3 RFF would not be included in this review.

APPENDICES:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1: Terms of Reference: | No comment. |
| 2: Article 126: | No comment. |
| 3: Article 42: | Article 42 should be added to appendices. |
| 4: Annex 14 extracts: | The Group should assume a reader knows nothing of subject matter, so there should be an extract to guide the reader to be informed about what Annex 14 states. |
| 5: Survey of European States: | GF feels the surveyed information will be difficult to put together as there several different sources, but details will be incorporated. |

6	Safety Data Analysis:	The Group felt this information is important to support 'evidence' regarding safety statistics
7	JAR FCL Extract:	Extracts should include FTOs and registered facilities – landing areas
8	Survey of RFF costs:	The Group decided to remove RFF costs from appendices, as not really informative and only based on 'Special Category'.
9	Sample Code of Practice:	The part covering 'how it would be regulated' has not yet been completed. The section covering 'approval' could be removed.
10	Draft Outline RIA:	GF hopes to be able to attach draft RIA to Report.
11	List of aircraft 2730-5700kg:	As amended.
12	CAP 168 extract:	Appendix 8H to be included

5 FURTHER ACTIONS PRIOR TO FINAL REPORT

The Chairman will present the report to Ron Elder (Head of Aerodromes, Air Traffic Standards and Licensing Division) once the final draft has been agreed with group members. It was further decided that the report should be made available to the Strategic review, as this will ensure it receives early consideration. It was pointed out that consideration should be given to what the Group wishes the Executive Committee to do with the report, ie are they being asked to 'note' the report or take it forward.

DC requested that the Industry members are offered guidance by the CAA as to what they are able to say to their membership, in order that they can report back on when the report will be presented and what will happen to it afterwards.

6 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

It was further proposed that an additional item should be added, perhaps under 2.1, that if the Group are successful, through a regulatory impact assessment, in removing flying training from licensed aerodromes, the onus on flying training organisations (FTOs) would most likely increase and it is considered that this possibility should be relayed to members so they are aware of the potential increased burden on the FTO. JW also believes that difficulty may arise where there is more than one organisation operating from a site and the

question of who takes the lead on any code of practice. The CAP 755 'Recreational Aviation Activities manual' was also discussed – this provides a framework which may provide a suitable template for use by training organisations as distinct from the aerodrome operator.

PF advised that at a recent ICAO Aerodromes Panel (Working Group of the Whole) meeting, the workload of the RFF working group was examined, and their action list is to include a review of the categorisation of RFF. There is no time limit on this review, but it would possibly extend beyond 3 years.

Again, discussion turned to Article 126 and Industry's desire to remove public transport below 5700kg and flying training from Article 126 and replace with a Code of Practice. PF advised that there would be a recommendation to review Article 126 in the report. It could be that ASD might suggest which type of aerodrome needs to be licensed based on Annex 14. Once achieved, a clear category of aerodrome might appear and those types of aerodromes could provide ICAO compliant RFF. These types of aerodromes would provide Flight Operations Department and the aircraft operator with an assurance that they meet a standard level of safety. PF further advised that European aspects must be taken into account, although there may be some flexibility when it comes to the review; however, careful decisions need to be taken, which will take some time and effort. Article 126, and its predecessors, is a means of establishing safety levels at aerodromes in the UK that are open to public transport and flying training. If Article 126 were abolished, and possibly CAP 168, there would then need to be another means of meeting the expectations of ICAO, in addition to the other bodies, for example DfT and the general public. Through Article 126 we can show how the UK oversees safety at aerodromes.

PF raised some concern regarding the Group's choice of a code of practice, as opposed to the adoption of CAP 428 (Safety Standards at Unlicensed Aerodromes). PF added that the CAA already publishes guidance material under CAP 428; if the Group do not wish to accept that guidance material then justification should be offered. JW would prefer to see the Code of Practice issued as a CAP. PF confirmed that if CAP 428 does not satisfy the needs of 'unlicensed' aerodromes, then it should be changed. DB advised that CAP 428 was produced by GAD and he believes if there is concern over its usefulness, then one of the recommendations should be a review of the document.

It was decided that approved changes would be incorporated in the report and distributed to all members of the study group for agreement.

It was also agreed that there should be no need for another meeting, as any changes to the report can now be agreed electronically. It is proposed that a deadline for comment will most likely be 28 November, a week before presentation to Ron Elder

DP will be unable to comment on final report due to other commitments, but agreed to delegate this role to a member of GAPAN. GF reminded the Group that they have a responsibility to feed back information gathered from the meetings to their membership.

OUTSTANDING ITEMS:

- The Group agreed that UK interpretation of the terms 'public use' and 'international flight' need to be explained, via the DfT, with a comment included in the report that clarification should be sought.
- Still waiting for Martin Robinson's responses on European facilities; this will hopefully be included in Appendix 5.
- Report on European flying training (Appendix 5) needs to be drafted.
- Sample Code of Practice: Two sections need completing (addresses for Manchester regional office and extract from JAR-FCL). The part covering 'how it would be regulated' has not yet been completed.
- Report should identify whether CAP 428 is an acceptable document or whether this document could be improved
- Chairman to obtain a slot in the Executive Committee agenda
- Chairman to speak to Alex Plant and David Chapman
- IB to confirm no copyright issue with ICAO

