

Extrait de l'analyse du document « **2014 aviation safety summary** » effectuée par le CNFAS (Aéro Club de France) et distribué par l' EMF

We carefully read the 21-pages analysis of the European Commission survey (attached document), on which we all worked a lot last summer (simultaneously with the EASA survey).

First of all : We didn't find any cause of worry for our microlight activities.

There are even glimmers of hope if the EC and EASA take into account our recommendations as users. However let's not be naive and take things for granted.

The layout of the report is quite clear, with tables that account the detailed positions by categories of respondents.

We were surprised by the exceptional rate of answers by the Germans: 47% out of 225 contributions. But maybe the pilots have been directly solicited, as their organization allows it.

Organizations, individuals and NAAs agree to say that rules are too fastidious and over-detailed(p4). Also, today's levels of security, which are good, could be maintained with lighter standard operating procedures and reduced costs. These are good news for our general aviation fellows.

There is a trend (ex : p11) towards encouraging the devolution of new responsibilities to 'competent user's organizations'.

Also, there is an unanimous assertion that the regulation system should be more proportionate (in relation to risks), less finicky and less costly (p12).

The survey underlines a general consensus regarding light flying : Public authorities should intervene less, and some missions (organization, control) could be carried out by private organizations such as aeronautical federations. (p18)

I do not expect the EC and EASA to radically simplify procedures on the basis of this survey.

However, in our debates we may be able to lean on the main conclusions of the survey, thanks to its official character. It would be awkward for the EC and EASA to go against their own recommendations...

But the world can be a strange place...

EXTRACTS FROM THE C.E. DOCUMENT

iv. Ability to carry out oversight by NAAs and EA

➤ Some of the organisations, especially from the General Aviation sector, suggested that the scope of Annex II to Regulation 216/2008 should be extended, and that leisure and sport aviation would be better regulated at the national level;

c. Subsidiarity of EU action

➤ A number of organisations suggested that sport and recreational aviation, especially with balloons and gliders, could be better regulated at the national than EU level. There were however submissions, suggesting that instead of reverting back to national approaches, the EU regulatory system for light aviation should be improved, and/or a choice given to the operators / manufacturers whether they would like to be under the EU or national system;

➤ Many of the General Aviation organisations were of the opinion that more responsibility should be devolved from the authorities to competent users' organisations and individuals;

ii. The need for public authority involvement in protecting the citizens

➤ Finally there is a large degree of consensus that the lowest need for public authority involvement is justified in case of persons flying for recreational purposes such as parachutists, and private pilots;

iii. Governance

There is a very strong agreement between also the categories of respondents that more responsibility for safety should be given to the operators themselves, and that in the case of general aviation, certain regulatory tasks could be entrusted to specialised authorised private organisations, such as sport aviation associations.

Where proposals were made by the respondents that certain activities be regulated at the national level instead of EU level, that primarily concerned light and recreational aviation.