

You can save this page as HTML and then open it in Microsoft Word for further editing.

<b>Title</b>	Authority and Organisation Requirements - Authority Requirements
<b>NPA Number</b>	NPA 2008-22b

**British Gliding Association** (office@gliding.co.uk) has placed **1** unique comments on this NPA:

<b>Cmt#</b>	<b>Segment description</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Attachments</b>
52	B. Draft Rules - I. Draft Opinion Part-AR - Subpart ATO - Section 1 - AR.ATO.105 Monitoring of activities - ATOs	12	<p>Within gliding, the majority of training takes place within a club environment, on weekends and using volunteer instructors. The students frequently attend the club on an ad-hoc basis. Pre-planning and requiring competent authority sampling flights with students is unworkable. Course standards can be analysed through experience of flight test outcomes.</p> <p>Proposal. Remove the sentence part ',including the sampling of training flights with students'.</p>	

Page viewed on 2009-05-25 18:12:53 GMT

Copyright © 2005-2009 [EASA](#)

You can save this page as HTML and then open it in Microsoft Word for further editing.

<b>Title</b>	Authority and Organisation Requirements - Organisation Requirements
<b>NPA Number</b>	NPA 2008-22c

**British Gliding Association** (office@gliding.co.uk) has placed **13** unique comments on this NPA:

Cmt#	Segment description	Page	Comment	Attachments
140	B. Draft Rules - III. Draft Opinion Part-OR	4	<p>The British Gliding Association is currently the organisation that delivers gliding flight training in the UK. Through its training organisation, managed and staffed almost exclusively by volunteers, the BGA training organisation provides the training required to exceed the requirements of ICAO Annex 1 (glider pilot licencing) and satisfy existing Law.</p> <p>While the BGA understands the need for standardisation and the need for detailed rules for <i>commercial air transport and complex aircraft training</i>, there is no safety case in gliding that would require regulation beyond that which would standardise existing practices across the member states. This will of course require dialogue between EASA and the gliding federations through the European Gliding Union.</p> <p>The European gliding community, like other air sport communities, finds that safety is increased through the adoption by the air sport of self regulation and high levels of pilot 'currency'. Prescriptive regulation has an adverse affect on recreational attitudes to safety. The costs associated with regulatory burden reduce the amount of flying carried out by sporting pilots. The long term negative effect on piloting skill and therefore safety is well understood.</p> <p>The BGA is concerned that the views of the European gliding community and its collective experience, safety data and knowledge were not consulted during the development of the NPA 2008-22 and associated RIA. Indeed, the BGA is disappointed that regulatory proposals which have the potential to adversely affect gliding have been developed without the drafting group understanding the risk that EASA is attempting to mitigate.</p> <p>The BGA has provided comments in this NPA that it hopes will allow EASA to understand that the proposals with NPA 2008-22 are clearly not written with gliding training organisation in mind. <b>The following comments within this NPA assume that the points require comment despite the BGA view that NPA 2008-22 in its present form is disproportional and not fit for purpose in a gliding training organisation context.</b> The BGA would welcome the opportunity to work with EASA through the European Gliding Union and Europe Air Sports to develop a revised approach to this rulemaking task that takes into consideration the needs of the</p>	

Cmt#	Segment description	Page	Comment	Attachments
			European gliding community as well as those of EASA.	
55	B. Draft Rules - III. Draft Opinion Part-OR - Subpart GEN - Section 1 - OR.GEN.030 Changes to the organisation's approval	5	<p>The NAA's are becoming increasingly mindful of costs. For example, in the UK, the UK CAA charges a fee for ANY change to an approval. It would be helpful if this part identified that the notification is the important issue and that approval amendment or change can occur at a future date if necessary. This would permit, for example, a number of minor developments to be published as single change and associated single NAA fee.</p> <p>Proposal. OR.GEN.030 a. '...enable the competent authority to determine continued compliance with this Part and to amend in due course if necessary the organisational approval certificate.'</p>	
65	B. Draft Rules - III. Draft Opinion Part-OR - Subpart GEN - Section 2 - OR.GEN.200 Management system	7	<p>Gliding training in member states currently takes place under the oversight of gliding federations. Almost without exception, the training is non-commercial and not for profit in nature and delivered by volunteers. The gliding federations have in place management systems that provide adequate quality and safety management. All deliver the training 'product' through the clubs. Clearly EASA FCL requires a standardised approach. but standardisation should not be used as a tool to add bureaucratic and economic burden on gliding and its participants. The BGA welcomes the comment at OR.GEN.200 (b), but notes that in fact the detail within NPA 22 does <u>not</u> appear to consider the 'nature and complexity' of gliding.</p> <p>Most of the following comments reflect on this important point.</p>	
66	B. Draft Rules - III. Draft Opinion Part-OR - Subpart ATO - Section 1 - OR.ATO.010 Legal entity and financial resources	9	<p>To date, gliding training in the UK has been conducted within a integrated structure that comprises both the national gliding association (BGA) and all clubs.</p> <p>The BGA is responsible for the overall definition and development of the training system and the oversight of training operations; training operations are directly managed by clubs. Similar process takes place within most member state gliding federations.</p> <p>The system works extremely well, it ensures coherence in all aspects of the training system; allows for the rapid dissemination of new practices; and, reduces overhead and administration costs.</p> <p>The fundamental performance of the system is attested in the excellent quality of trained pilots and overall safety levels.</p> <p>We strongly suggest, therefore, that it should be possible to meet this requirement through a coherent gliding federation of clubs rather than requiring each club to become an individually approved training organisation.</p>	

Cmt#	Segment description	Page	Comment	Attachments
67	B. Draft Rules - IV. Draft Decision Part-OR - Subpart GEN - Section 2 - AMC 2 to OR.GEN.200(a) Management System	24 - 25	<p>This requirement is disproportional and entirely unsuitable to non-commercial, fundamentally volunteer resourced gliding flight training that has a history of high quality oversight by gliding federations.</p> <p>All gliding federations within the EU train pilots to a minimum of the ICAO Annex 1 requirement. The supporting structure, including flight instructor and examining resources have been developed to meet safety, management and pilot standards needs. There is no safety case that would require anything other than a standardised approach.</p> <p>The requirements within AMC 2 to OR.GEN.200 (a) (2) are disproportionate and should not apply to a gliding approved training organisation within an air sport federation recognised by the competent authority.</p>	
68	B. Draft Rules - IV. Draft Decision Part-OR - Subpart GEN - Section 2 - AMC 3 OR.GEN.200(a) Management System - OPS	32	<p>This part should not apply to the operation of sailplanes or other non-complex, non-commercial aircraft regardless of organisation size.</p>	
69	B. Draft Rules - IV. Draft Decision Part-OR - Subpart GEN - Section 2 - AMC 4 OR.GEN.200(a) Management System - OPS	32	<p>If compliance monitoring is required for approved training organisations within an air sport federation recognised by an NAA, then this part identifies the maximum requirement proportional to gliding, regardless of the size of the organisation.</p>	
71	B. Draft Rules - IV. Draft Decision Part-OR - Subpart GEN - Section 2 - AMC to OR.GEN.200(b) Management System - ATO	36	<p>The BGA disagrees with the assumptions made in this part items 2 - 4.</p> <p>It is clear from previous comments that the requirements for an 'other' organisation are disproportional (and in many cases economically impossible) for what is fundamentally volunteer managed gliding training within an air sport federation recognised by an NAA. Clearly any gliding training outside of that established format should be considered separately.</p> <p>Proposal. Item 1 should read 'Small training organisations and any Air Sport approved training organisations within an Air Sport Federation recognised by an NAA should have...'</p>	
70	B. Draft Rules - IV. Draft Decision Part-OR - Subpart GEN - Section 2 - AMC 1 OR.GEN.200(b) Management	36	<p>It is clear from previous comments that the requirements for an 'other' organisation are disproportional (and in many cases economically impossible) for what is fundamentally volunteer managed gliding training within an air sport federation recognised by an NAA. Clearly any gliding training outside of that established format should be considered separately.</p>	

Cmt#	Segment description	Page	Comment	Attachments
	System - OPS		Proposal. Item 1 should read 'An organisation employing 20 or less FTE or any Air Sport approved training organisations within an Air Sport Federation recognised by an NAA should be regarded as a small organisation.'	
72	B. Draft Rules - IV. Draft Decision Part-OR - Subpart GEN - Section 2 - AMC 2 to OR.GEN.215 Facilities - ATO	37 - 38	Item 3 in this part should be applicable to small organisations <u>and</u> any air sport approved training organisations within an Air Sport Federation recognised by the competent authority.	
73	B. Draft Rules - IV. Draft Decision Part-OR - Subpart ATO - Section 1 - AMC to OR.ATO.010(b) Legal entity and financial resources	39 - 40	This requirement will only be possible for an airsport such as gliding if the Approved Training Organisation is a centrally resourced Air Sport Federation with flight training delivered by clubs. Small clubs would find this disproportional requirement impossible to deliver.	
74	B. Draft Rules - IV. Draft Decision Part-OR - Subpart ATO - Section 1 - AMC to OR.ATO.015 Application	41	<p>Item 11 - aircraft registration.</p> <p>Sailplane ownership is constantly changing as the market evolves and needs change. There is no known reason why the approval would need to list the registration of aircraft used by the ATO.</p> <p>Proposal. Remove the requirement to list the registration of aircraft used in the ATO.</p>	
75	B. Draft Rules - IV. Draft Decision Part-OR - Subpart ATO - Section 1 - AMC to OR.ATO.135 Aerodromes	48	<p>Item 1 d in this part requires an air traffic control service.</p> <p>Other than occasionally (subject to local arrangements) where gliding flight training takes place within controlled airspace, there is no existing requirement to operate gliding flight training with air traffic control.</p> <p>The safety case for introducing such a requirement has not been explained. Neither the NPA nor gliding safety data identifies a safety need.</p> <p>The economic and organisational impact of requiring air traffic control oversight of gliding flight training would be very significant. The requirement is totally disproportional.</p> <p>Proposal; Remove requirement 1.d and if necessary add '4. Air traffic control requirements are to be considered'.</p>	