



**COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT (CRD)  
TO NOTICE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT (NPA) 2011-20 (A)**

***'Authority, Organisation and Operations Requirements for  
Aerodromes'***

**CRD to NPA 2011-20 (A) — Explanatory Note**

*Explanatory Note***EXECUTIVE SUMMARY***Purpose*

The purpose of this executive summary is to give an overview of the changes undertaken by EASA (hereafter referred to as 'the Agency') following the public consultation on the new draft aerodrome rules. NPA 2011-20 was published on the Agency website (<http://www.easa.europa.eu>) on 13 December 2011. The consultation period ended, following a request for an extension, on 30 April 2012.

The IRs developed by the Agency were augmented by the development of Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMCs), Certification Specifications (CSs) and, where appropriate, Guidance Material (GM). This was done to present the total picture of how the rules should be implemented and managed.

*General Overview of Reactions*

Reactions focussed mainly on definitions, certification, changes and personnel requirements. Significant comments received focussed on the boundaries of responsibility and how the new aerodrome rules may be applied within existing national legal frameworks. Many comments received highlighted a lack of clarity on the correct application and use of the rules, in particular the application of AMC and GM. Other comments centred on the lack of clarity of how to use the flexibility tools contained in the rules. The Equivalent Level of Safety (ELOS), Certificate Specification (SC) and Deviation Acceptance and Action Document (DAAD) led to some confusion on the conditions of their application. The Agency has addressed these concerns and proposed solutions to them in the explanatory note attached to this CRD.

*Discussion*

To respond to the volume of comments received, the Agency organised an overview conference on 21 and 22 May 2012 to inform the industry of the views expressed by commentators and to inform them that a number of thematic review meetings would be established to identify solutions. Membership of the thematic review groups consisted of selected representatives of Competent Authorities, Aerodromes and ATM/Aerodrome Associations.

The consultation process resulted in a general request for the Agency to provide solutions to the identified inconsistencies, to provide more clarity around the intent and application of the rules and to reduce the level of detail contained within some of them. Furthermore, the approach to base the aerodrome IRs on legal text stemming from recently adopted rules in similar areas was implemented to help harmonising the processes across all domains. The thematic review meetings have been very instrumental in helping the Agency reach a common objective that meets the expectations of most of the commentators. What resulted has led to changes predominantly in the areas of Authority Requirements (AR) and Organisation Requirements (OR), all in an effort to bring final clarity to the scope of responsibilities of Member States and designated aviation authorities and operators.

Existing methods of allocated responsibilities within the Member States are respected by the proposed rules; Similarly, the scope of responsibility of the operators must not be moved beyond adequate limits and has been defined for legal clarity.

Particular focus for many commentators, and one that justifies inclusion in this summary, concerned the request for clarification on how the Certification Basis (CB) is constructed and recorded. The Agency's advice to Competent Authorities (CAs) is to review their existing processes on how they undertake certification of aerodromes under their

*Explanatory Note*

national schemes and see how they can be adopted, with minor modification, to record compliance with regard to the new regulation. The Agency is aware that in most cases CAs already certify aerodromes under their national legislation and therefore know and acknowledge the existing infrastructure. The Agency is not asking those CAs to start again from a 'blank page', but rather to assess the differences between their existing requirements for the aerodrome physical characteristics against the CSs and to ensure that those differences are taken into account during the construction of the new CB.

*Impact*

As mentioned in NPA 2011-20, the level of impact of these changes will vary depending on how Member States have chosen to adopt the ICAO SARPs (Standard and Recommended Practices) so far, and how they will make future use of their discretion in the application of the individual aerodrome certification process. This perception has not changed. However, the Agency has taken into account the concerns voiced by the Member States and Industry during the consultation and has reviewed the material with a view to providing solutions to identified inconsistencies, providing more clarity around the intent and application of the rules and reducing the level of detail contained within some of the rules.

Furthermore, the approach to base the aerodrome IRs on legal text stemming from recently adopted rules in similar areas was implemented to help harmonise the processes across all domains. However, some further adjustments have been made to better respect aerodrome specific issues and to avoid undue administrative burden in the AR and OR area. Overall, this led to a considerable move of text 'downwards' from IR into AMC, and from AMC to GM level.

*Conclusion*

The Agency has been mindful throughout the review period to include the expertise available in the Member States and Industry. In addition, it has attended many stakeholder meetings and has accepted requests for further explanatory meetings within Member States to promote better understanding of the rules and their impact on the industry after coming into force. The Aerodromes NPA gave the Industry a better understanding of how the rules will impact on their existing processes and procedures. On the whole, we believe the NPA was well received. It gave the Industry the chance to voice their concerns on some subjects which, following the review period, the Agency believes it has dealt with sympathetically. This CRD will add further clarification of the rules and give the Industry the confidence that the Agency has listened to their concerns and allowed for further flexibility in how they will implement the required changes.

## Explanatory Note

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>A. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
SCOPE .....	5
GENERAL OVERVIEW OF REACTIONS .....	7
EXPLANATIONS .....	7
<b>B. DRAFT REGULATION ON AERODROMES .....</b>	<b>12</b>
SCOPE .....	12
OVERVIEW OF REACTIONS .....	12
EXPLANATIONS .....	12
OVERVIEW OF MOST SIGNIFICANT CHANGES .....	14
<b>C. ANNEX I – PART - AUTHORITY REQUIREMENTS (PART-ADR.AR) .....</b>	<b>16</b>
SCOPE .....	16
OVERVIEW OF REACTIONS .....	16
EXPLANATIONS .....	16
OVERVIEW OF MOST SIGNIFICANT CHANGES .....	17
<b>D. ANNEX II – PART - ORGANISATION REQUIREMENTS (PART-ADR.OR) .....</b>	<b>20</b>
SCOPE .....	20
OVERVIEW OF REACTIONS .....	20
EXPLANATIONS .....	20
OVERVIEW OF MOST SIGNIFICANT CHANGES .....	21
<b>E. ANNEX III – PART - OPERATIONS REQUIREMENTS (PART-ADR.OPS) .....</b>	<b>23</b>
SCOPE .....	23
OVERVIEW OF REACTIONS .....	23
EXPLANATIONS .....	23
OVERVIEW OF MOST SIGNIFICANT CHANGES .....	24
<b>F. CERTIFICATION SPECIFICATIONS (PART-ADR.DSN) .....</b>	<b>26</b>
SCOPE .....	26
OVERVIEW OF REACTIONS .....	26
EXPLANATIONS .....	26
OVERVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT CHANGES .....	27

*Explanatory Note***A. Introduction****Scope**

1. Amended Regulation (EC) No 216/2008<sup>(1)</sup> (hereafter referred to as the 'Basic Regulation') extended the responsibilities of the European Aviation Safety Agency (hereafter referred to as the 'Agency') to the areas of ATM/ANS and aerodromes. This new responsibility mandated the Agency to prepare draft safety rules for aerodromes as well as common rules for certification and oversight by the National Aviation Authorities (NAAs) in support of the European Commission (EC). Proposed Implementing Rules (IRs) contain the conditions for the issuance of certificates and the obligations and privileges of certificate holders. Furthermore, the Agency would provide draft rules regarding aerodrome Safety Management Systems (SMSs). Such rules will be complimented by Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMCs), Guidance Material (GM) and Certification Specifications (CSs).
2. There were no pre-existing European Union (EU) rules for the safety of aerodromes. Therefore, as per Article 8a 6(a) of the Basic Regulation, the proposed future common aerodrome design and operations rules were developed primarily based on Annex 14, Volume 1, Aerodromes, to the Chicago Convention.
3. The purpose of this Comment Response Document (CRD) is to present the conclusions coming from the revision of comments made to the NPA during the public consultation and to assist the EC in laying down IRs for aerodromes. Those are supposed to be adopted by the EC, whereas the underpinning material is envisaged to be adopted by the Agency following a different process. Nonetheless, the Agency presents all those parts together in order to allow for a complete picture for the reader at any given time.
4. This CRD is based on NPA 2011-20 containing draft proposals for IR and related AMC, CS and GM for aerodromes. It consists of the following amended documents:

**B.I. DRAFT IMPLEMENTING RULE**

- a. Draft Commission Regulation
- b. Annex I — Part-AR
- c. Annex II — Part-OR
- d. Annex III — Part-OPS

**B.II. DRAFT ACCEPTABLE MEANS OF COMPLIANCE AND GUIDANCE MATERIAL**

- a. AMC/GM to Annex I — Part-AR
- b. AMC/GM to Annex II — Part-OR
- c. AMC/GM to Annex III — Part-OPS

**B.III. DRAFT CERTIFICATION SPECIFICATIONS**

- a. CS-ADR-DSN Book 1 (Certification Specifications (CSs))
- b. CS-ADR-DSN Book 2 (Guidance Material(GM))

***NPA consultation phase***

---

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

*Explanatory Note*

5. NPA 2011-20 was published on the Agency website (<http://www.easa.europa.eu>) on 13 December 2011. The consultation period ended, following a request for an extension, on 30 April 2012. The Agency had received around 9 000 comments.

**CRD consultation phase**

6. Comment summaries, related responses to summarised comments and the proposed revised rule text were discussed at the following events:

Overview conference — 21 and 22 May 2012

Thematic Review Meetings:

- a. Draft Regulation & Part AR — 12 June 2012
  - b. Part OR — 13 June 2012
  - c. Part OPS — 19 June 2012
  - d. Book I CS — 20 June 2012
8. Membership of thematic review meetings consisted of selected representatives of Competent Authorities, aerodromes and ATM/Aerodrome associations. Selection of the participants was done with a view to selecting members who were not part of the original rulemaking working groups earlier. This was done to achieve an independent and balanced view of the subject under review. The Agency chose the top issues to be reviewed at each meeting based on the comments received and presented those to the participants. The membership spent one day discussing the topics to gain understanding of the issues and developed a framework within which the text could be amended. The proposed text was then developed in cooperation with the review group members, after the meetings.
  9. The thematic review meetings have been very instrumental in helping the Agency reach a proposal that meets the expectations of most of the commentators. The result of this has led to changes predominantly in the areas of Authority Requirements (AR) and Organisation Requirements (OR), all in an effort to bring final clarity to the scope of responsibilities of Member States, the yet to be designated aviation authorities and operators. Existing allocated responsibilities within the Member States will be respected and not touched by the future rules. Similarly, the scope of responsibility of the operators must not be moved beyond adequate limits and needs to be defined for legal clarity. It is apparent that a substantial number of changes to the text proposed in the NPA were made to provide clarity rather than an actual substantial change, since as explained above, the objective to sustain existing methods and responsibilities is commonly shared.
  10. The Agency firmly believes that the consultation process has led to a significant improvement of the draft aerodrome rules. The present CRD including the revised legal draft accommodates the valid concerns and proposals voiced and should allow for a further adoption process as foreseen.

**Next Steps**

11. The Agency has issued this CRD to inform the community of its response to the comments received during the consultation period. Normally, a two month reaction period follows the publication of this CRD to allow for further clarifications in case certain comments may have been misunderstood by the Agency. The Agency is aware that this period covers the Christmas holidays and has therefore extended the period by one week to take this into account. **Reactions to this CRD should be received by the Agency by 3 February 2013.** Following this reaction period, the Agency will issue its Opinion on the draft Regulation and IRs. This is expected to be around February 2013. It is then anticipated that the comitology process will be completed within the calendar year to enable the new rules to come into force as planned on 1 January 2014. Adoption, and

*Explanatory Note*

publication, of the Agency's Decision on AMCs, CSs and GM will follow the adoption of those IRs by the EC.

**General Overview of reactions to the NPA**

12. Reactions focused mainly on definitions, certification, changes and personnel requirements. Significant comments received focussed on the boundaries of responsibility and how the new aerodrome rules may be applied within existing national legal frameworks. Many comments received highlighted a lack of clarity on the correct application and use of the rules, in particular the application of AMC and GM. Other comments centred on the lack of understanding of how to use the flexibility tools contained in the rules. The ELOS, SC and DAAD led to some confusion on the conditions of their application. These focal concerns will be particularly addressed in this Explanatory Note.

**Explanations**

13. Once the rules are adopted, the Agency's stakeholders will have to deal with the new requirements as IRs, AMCs and CSs. All the requirements can have additional information to help the user apply the requirement. This is published in the form of GM. Below, the difference in character of these rules is explained:
- IRs are binding in their entirety and are used to specify high level safety objectives. They meet the Essential Requirements (ERs) of Annex Va to the Basic Regulation. This means:
    - In general, ERs are deliberately not very detailed in terms of how to achieve the safety objective contained in the IRs in order to allow entities the flexibility to meet the requirements. The means to meet the requirements are typically detailed in an AMC. However, in certain circumstances, to enable uniform conformity and compliance without variation, the IRs are more detailed. These particular IRs have been introduced from existing legislation and allow, particularly the competent authorities, to harmonise their procedures.
  - AMCs are non-binding. This means:
    - AMCs developed by the Agency serve as a means by which the requirements contained in IRs can be met, hereby offering the benefit of the presumption of compliance. In other words, if AMCs published by the Agency are followed, there is a presumption that the intent of the IRs has been met. However, both the aerodrome operator and the competent authorities are free to decide how to show compliance with the requirements by using other means. This offers both the aerodrome operator and the competent authority the flexibility to review their existing procedures to see whether they can be used to meet the safety objective of IRs. If so, there is nothing to stop them using those existing procedures as an Alternative Method of Compliance (AMOC) provided the competent authority agrees.
  - CSs are non-binding technical standards to support the certification of aerodrome infrastructures. They also meet the relevant Essential Requirements (ERs) of Annex Va to the Basic Regulation. This means:
    - CSs are used to establish the Certification Basis (CB) for individual aerodromes as described below. CSs are the technical specifications used to define the infrastructure of an aerodrome. They are based on the SARPs contained within ICAO Annex 14, Volume 1, that have been used for a number of years by Member States to design and construct aerodrome facilities (as and when required) to build a new airport or accommodate a change in operation. Many MS have different requirements to the SARPs, and

*Explanatory Note*

some do not employ the recommended practices that are now included as CSs. However, all this has been taken into account by the use of the flexibility tools provided by the Agency.

What if a CS does not meet my existing specifications?

- An aerodrome operator may propose an ELOS for a given CS that demonstrates how it complies with the ER.

What if I cannot propose an ELOS?

- Additionally, the aerodrome operator may propose an individual technical solution when they feel the CS is inadequate or inappropriate for use at their aerodrome. This may result in the competent authority converting that proposal into a Special Condition (SC). SCs are conditions determined by the NAA for an aerodrome if the CSs established by the Agency are not adequate or are inappropriate to ensure conformity of the aerodrome with the ERs of Annex Va to the Basic Regulation. Such inadequacy or inappropriateness may especially be due to:
  - the design features of the aerodrome being driven by the geography or geology of the area; or
  - where experience in the operation of that or other aerodromes, having similar design features, has shown that safety may be compromised.

Comments were received requesting that CSs should be relegated to GM to give the Aerodrome Operators and CA the necessary flexibility on their application. However, as can be seen from the above description, the CSs do come with a level of flexibility that allows for agreement between the two parties before the CB becomes binding. However, in response to the comments received, the Agency has reviewed the application of the CSs and has moved 10 % of them to GM as it felt those did not meet the nature of specification but merely provided additional information.

What if the CS is not suitable?

If neither ELOS nor SC appear to be an option, you have the option of the DAAD, explained in detail below.

- However the requirement is presented (IR, AMC, CS), there can be additional information provided in Guidance Material.
  - Guidance Material is non-binding information provided to help with the understanding of the subject and possible application of the related rule. It must be fully understood that GM comes with no obligation to utilize, but is provided merely to assist the user.

*Harmonised Rules and level of detail*

14. The completion of the consultation process has resulted in a general request for the Agency to review the material with a view to providing solutions to identified inconsistencies, providing more clarity around the intent and application of the rules and to reduce the level of detail contained within some of the rules.
15. Furthermore, the approach to base aerodrome IRs on legal text stemming from recently adopted rules in similar areas was implemented to help harmonise the processes across all domains. However, some further adjustments have been made to better respect aerodrome specific issues and to avoid undue administrative burden in the AR and OR area. Overall, this led to a considerable move of text 'downwards' from IR into AMC, and from AMC to GM level.

*Present Tense*



*Explanatory Note*

16. Some have requested the use of present tense instead of 'should' in the AMCs. The Agency has followed its agreed rulemaking style guidelines that recommend the use of 'should' when AMCs are written. This aligns with the ICAO rulemaking style that uses the verb in recommended practices. The intention being that uniform application of which is recognized as desirable in the interest of safety, regularity or efficiency of international air navigation, and to which States will endeavour to conform.

'Should' is a modal verb indicating that something is the right thing for somebody to do. It does not carry an obligation for the person to do it.

*ICAO State Letter 41*

17. The consultation process has shown that the inclusion of some items from State Letter 41 has proved to be unpopular. Therefore, in response to this sentiment, the Agency has returned to the general line that only mature ICAO material should be used to develop the new aerodrome regulation. The sole exception from this approach regards the inclusion of Arresting Systems as it was agreed that new technologies should be reviewed and, where appropriate, included in the rules. However, the definition of an arresting system is yet to be developed. The Agency's rulemaking process does allow the adjustment of new rules following their publication by ICAO. Future State Letters will be reviewed and considered by the Agency in due course.

*Human Factors*

18. Human Factors (HF) principles are mentioned in the rules. 'What does this mean?' and 'How has this been applied in the new rules?' are questions often asked. Human Factors is about people in their living and working situations; about their relationships with machines, procedures and the environment around them; and also about their relationships with other people. So how has this been applied in the new rules? The development of the rules has included the application of HF in the form of facility requirements, qualification requirements, training, and the application of Safety Management Systems. The aim of all this is to provide individuals with the needed tools, competence and environment to undertake their work safely. The rules are designed to encourage the safety culture that allows individuals to report safety related issues without the fear of reprisals and helps provide an environment of trust and partnership.

*Obligation to 'Notify' and 'Inform'*

19. The Agency has reviewed all notification requirements in the articles and the AR rules in order to relieve the authorities from unnecessary administrative burden. The proposal for the Competent Authority to notify/inform aerodrome specific flexibility decisions during the certification process (e.g. ELOS, SC, DAAD), to other Member States and the Agency has not found support. Therefore, in the absence of a dedicated assessment mechanism for such information, this proposal will no longer be sustained and the associated IRs will be removed.

However, this requirement was retained where notifications were still necessary because they constitute an official notification on the part of the authority towards the regulated entity.

*ICAO/EASA relationship*

20. The development of the new rules has given the EU a unique opportunity to present a unified working relationship with ICAO over and above that which existed prior to the second extension. Responses to State Letters from future European Member States will be coordinated by the Agency. Changes to the SARPs made by ICAO will be addressed in future Rulemaking Programmes to ensure a unified application of their obligations. The Agency will support Member States to identify differences between ICAO requirements and those of the Agency.

The Agency has taken a number of significant steps to strengthen its involvement in ICAO matters. As of July 2011, an Agency Representative has been based in the Montreal

*Explanatory Note*

Office of the EU Representation at ICAO. This now enables the Agency to become more aware of the work of the Air Navigation Commission (ANC) and to strengthen the relations with the ICAO Secretariat. The Agency has also seconded an expert to support the Secretariat in developing the new Safety Management Annex 19. Finally, the Agency started working with the European Commission, EU Member States and ICAO to develop a simpler method for filing differences for those areas where EU has gained competence.

*Role of EASA Standardisation*

21. Concerns have been raised against the role that standardisation will have on the Competent Authorities' application of the flexibility tools and on the decisions taken. Standardisation inspections are conducted by the Agency to ensure that the competent authorities are applying the requirements. Their role is not to investigate the reasoning behind any decision taken by them regarding the application of the flexibility tools, but to merely ensure that the flexibility processes are being applied. Their role is not to question the content of the decisions being made by the competent authorities, but to assess the application of the procedures that led to how they made their decision. The role of the Agency standardisation team will be to assess the harmonised application of rules and not to 'police' competent authorities, hereby respecting the unshared room of discretion given to authorities by the legislator in the Basic Regulation.

*Qualified Personnel*

22. Many comments received indicated the confusion with regard to the interpretation of the terms qualified, qualification and competence. The proposed implementing rules do use the words 'qualified', 'qualification' and 'competence' in relation to both authorities' and aerodrome operators' personnel. The easiest one to start with is 'qualification' which does mean that a person should be in possession of a formal certificate, diploma or degree. The term 'qualified' denotes fitness for the purpose. This may be achieved through fulfilment of the necessary conditions such as completion of required training, or acquisition of a qualification, or through the gaining of suitable experience. It also indicates that the person is eligible for a duty, office, position, privilege, or status. It does not convey whether or not the person is effective in the role. The term 'competence' is a combination of related abilities, commitments, knowledge and skills that enable a person to act effectively in their role.

The Agency has developed further guidance material (GM) on this matter, for example under rule ADR.AR.B.005(a)(2).

*Surrounding or Vicinity*

23. Many commentators questioned the use of 'surroundings' instead of 'vicinity' in the new rules, particularly when the Agency had mentioned that the rules would be based on ICAO SARPs. The Agency took the decision to maintain the word 'surroundings' in the rules to ensure compatibility with the Basic Regulation. The meaning is intended to be the same as the ICAO 'vicinity'. However, for each type of surrounding, further guidance material is provided to describe the intent and scope, hereby ensuring analogy to ICAO.

*Certification Basis*

24. Many comments received questioned the construction of the Certification Basis (CB). It appears as though many commentators were expecting the Agency to describe in detail how the CB should be constructed and recorded. The Agency presented one view of how this could be achieved in the 'Kolndorf' example, produced to supplement the NPA. However, it appears as though many commentators compared that example with how they record their certification process today and discovered that it involved a major change to their processes, along with causing some confusion on the allocation of responsibilities. This is inconsistent with the Agency's objective of minimal impact on the industry following the introduction of this regulation. Therefore, in an attempt to clarify how the CB is constructed, the advice given by the Agency is that CAs should review their existing processes on how they undertake certification of aerodromes under their

*Explanatory Note*

national schemes and see if they can be used, with minor modification, to record compliance with regard to the new regulation. The Agency is aware that in most cases CAs already certify aerodromes under their national legislation and therefore know and acknowledge the existing infrastructure. Therefore, CAs are left with the responsibility to assess the differences between their existing requirements for the aerodrome physical characteristics against the CSs and to ensure that those differences are taken into account during the construction of the new CB.

*Numbering Style*

25. Some may notice a reference style change between the numbering system as included in the NPA and that now included in the CRD. The main changes affect the AMCs and GM. Each AMC or GM regardless of whether it is a single AMC to an IR will contain an index number. This allows for additional AMCs or GM to be introduced in the future without affecting changes to the first AMC, an example being;

**Before:** AMC1-ADR.AR.B.005(a) - Management System

**Now:** AMC1 ADR.AR.B.005(a) Management System

**Before:** CS-ADR-DSN.B.060 — Longitudinal slopes of runway

**Now:** CS ADR-DSN.B.060 Longitudinal slopes of runway

As you can see, AMC-ADR-DSN becomes AMC1 ADR-DSN even though it is the only AMC published at this present time so when a new AMC is installed, it automatically becomes AMC2 without affecting the original one. This note is to inform you that this change is deliberate and should not be included in any reaction to the CRD.

*Explanatory Note***B. Draft Regulation on Aerodromes****Scope**

The draft Regulation on 'Aerodromes' defines the general applicability of the Parts it covers and proposes transition measures in the form of conversion mechanisms for existing certificates and of the application of the DAAD.

**Overview of reactions**

Reactions on the draft Regulation focused mainly on the rules concerning exemptions in accordance with Art. 4.3b of the Basic Regulation and en-route obstacles. Others pertained to the areas of transition mechanisms and voiced strong support for the DAAD. Foremost, comments sought to ensure that undue burden emerging from the application of the new rules would be avoided, especially with regard to the transition procedures.

**Explanations***Article 2: Definitions*

1. A significant amount of comments concerned the definitions contained in Article 2 of the Cover Regulation. A number of these comments asked for a definition of equivalent level of safety. However, the Agency considered it more appropriate to provide guidance on the issue rather than a definition. In other cases, proposed definitions could not be accommodated because the Basic Regulation already contains a different definition (e.g. aerodrome equipment, apron management).

In addition, cross-reference to other definitions contained in other texts (e.g. Book 1 of certification specifications) was considered not feasible because of the different legal status of the texts, the terms that are actually used in each document, and the negative impact on the readability of the texts.

In general, the definitions that have been included in Article 2 are based on Annex 14 and the Basic Regulation. While in some cases, when felt necessary, an effort was made to harmonise the definitions with other aviation domains (e.g. low visibility procedures). Moreover, based on the comments made, as well as the review of the terms used, new definitions which are based on Annex 14 or other existing legislation have been introduced.

*Article 3: Competent Authority (CA) concept*

2. Article 3 of the draft regulation has been changed such that the Member States have to designate one or more entities as the Competent Authority(ies) within that Member State with the necessary powers and responsibilities for the certification and oversight of aerodromes, aerodrome operations, as well as personnel and organisations involved therein, within the scope and applicability of Regulation (EC) No 216/2008. When there is more than one such Competent Authorities, their different responsibilities (geographic or scope) have to be defined. EASA has developed the rules such that Annex I (Part AR) applies to designated Competent Authorities only (note the capital letters). It may therefore be up to the Member States to assess if there are other entities that have important oversight functions and that must be designated as a Competent Authority in order to ensure that the Member States' obligations under the BR, the essential requirements and its implementing rules (i.e. the coming aerodrome regulation), as well as its future obligations under Annex 19 of ICAO, are fully met.

As regards the AR rules as per NPA Articles ADR.AR.C.060 Wildlife management, ADR.AR.C.065 Obstacles – Objects, ADR.AR.C.070 Confusing, misleading and Hazardous lights, ADR.AR.C.075 Protection of communication, navigation and surveillance systems and ADR.AR.C.080 Other activities, it should be noted that these have been abolished as the tasks could not be clearly attributed to the Competent Authority in all countries.

*Explanatory Note**Article 5: Exemptions for smaller aerodromes*

3. The comments that were made with respect to the article on the exemptions were mainly aiming at making this process one that the Member States manage, so that the article now addresses itself to them instead of to the Competent Authority. Furthermore, detail has been removed from the article, to give it more flexibility. It is now silent as to the certification scheme that such aerodromes should be under.

*Article 6: Demonstration of Compliance*

4. Article 6 has been amended to include more flexibility to alleviate the burden of demonstration of compliance when constructing the Certification Basis.

It has been recognised that in most cases of conversion of existing certificates, particularly when the competent authority has based their existing regulation on ICAO Annex 14, Volume 1, the aerodrome operator should not have to prove compliance with the CSs provided that they have an existing certificate indicating that they comply with the specifications.

Demonstration of compliance with the requirements of the Basic Regulation and the IRs remains necessary in the cases where requirements differ from those in accordance to which the national certificate was issued. Furthermore, the option to waive the demonstration of compliance has been added to allow the authority to avoid undue cost for the operator under certain circumstances.

In cases where the national certificates include compliance with different applicable requirements (e.g. aviation noise protection, spatial planning provisions or wildlife conservation measures), those elements of the certificate will remain valid in accordance with relevant existing national provisions. However, aerodrome operators in these situations must apply for an additional certificate in accordance with Article 8a of the Basic Regulation within a maximum period of 48 months following the coming into force of this Regulation. This additional certificate will cover the redundant element of the existing national certificate, now superseded by the requirements of the Basic Regulation.

*Art. 6: 4-year conversion period*

5. The number of comments received on the subject of the 48 months to convert existing certificates indicated that clarity is needed on the administration of the procedure. A period of 48 months is proposed to allow Member States to convert existing aerodrome certificates by issuing new certificates under the Basic Regulation. The draft rules have been adjusted to explicitly also include the same period of 48 months for the authorities to fully align with the AR. Irrespective of this AR compliance, aerodrome certificates can be issued at any point in time within the given 48 months.

The Agency has deliberately not proposed rules on how this is managed so that competent authorities may agree on a suitable transition plan with aerodrome operators.

*Art. 7: Deviation Acceptance and Action Document (DAAD)*

6. The DAAD received overwhelming support during the consultation phase. However, some misunderstandings regarding its use and time period still remain. It should be kept in mind that the DAAD is available as one of three tools to deal with existing deviations from the new certification specifications and was introduced to deal with the unique environment within which aerodromes have evolved. The ELOS and the SCs are the other two means, and in most cases, these are expected to be preferably used to record the deviation. Once the deviation has been agreed and recorded in either one of these tools, it need not be reviewed again unless a change impacts on the area.

Should the deviation not qualify for either of the tools mentioned above, but nonetheless be supported by the authority, it should be recorded in the DAAD. The difference between this tool and the other two is that this document is not part of the Certification Basis and therefore should be reviewed regularly to ensure that it is kept up to date.

*Explanatory Note*

Regarding the time periods and validity: The DAAD is available for use from when this regulation comes into force and is available to record applicable deviations that were in existence prior to the entry into force of Regulation (EC) No 1108/2009. It cannot be used to add new deviations that arise after this regulation came into force or post certification. Hereby, its use is limited to initial certification. Following completion of any DAAD during the certification process, however, the life of the document is unlimited and will only disappear following the potential removal of the respective deviations. This means that it is up to authority to decide on the time period detailing how long any given deviation would be accepted.

The term DAAD is now formally enshrined in the draft rules.

Regarding the deadline: A deadline should be applied to subjecting any new applicant to the certification process with the availability of the DAAD. It shall be clear that this deadline comes without any effect for existing aerodromes which fall into the scope of the Basic Regulation.

The draft rules propose that this deadline be 31 December 2024.

*Articles 8, 9 and 10*

7. The structure of these articles was reviewed to emphasize their applicability to aerodrome surroundings only. Requirements are intended to remind the Member States of their obligations under the Basic Regulation and its essential requirements to ensure aerodrome safeguarding.

Article 10 was merged with Article 9, and a new article was installed to make logical concurrence of wildlife strike assessment and reporting in Part ADR.OPS. This requirement was addressed to CAs in the NPA, but, for reasons described below, these AR articles were deleted. The move to the draft regulation provides great flexibility to Member States on how to handle this requirement.

Also under the draft regulation is now found an article on the establishment of local community emergency plans which have to be coordinated with the aerodrome emergency plans and which closely mirror the essential requirement on this matter (C.3). This had previously been omitted.

**Overview of most significant changes**

<b>NPA</b>	<b>CRD</b>
Art. 1 – Subject matter	Three annexes were introduced, and the entities who should comply with them were named.
Art. 2 – Definitions	Numerous changes were made in response to comments. Notably a definition of the 'terms of the certificate' was introduced.
Art. 3 – Oversight capabilities	The notion of the Competent Authority (with capitals C and A) was made more precise under (1). The Member State is to designate the Competent Authority(ies), which are those entities that then need to comply with the authority requirements in Annex I. It was introduced that Member States shall ensure that the Competent Authorities of aerodromes located near borders coordinate to ensure the effective oversight and safeguarding of these aerodromes.
Art. 4 – Information to the Agency	The article is now addressed to the Member States, not the competent authorities.
Art. 5 – Exemptions	The title was made more clear. The article is now addressed to

## Explanatory Note

Now Art. 5 – Exemptions in accordance with Article 4(3b) of Regulation (EC) No 216/2008	Member States. The declaration and assessment under 1(b) that the exempted aerodrome is otherwise certified was removed.
Art. 6 – Conversion of certificates	The compliance demonstration requirement can be derogated from it if the demonstration results in an disproportionate effort.
Art 7 – Deviations from the Certification Specifications	The deadline for applications for DAADs has been extended to the year 2024.
Art. 8 – Obstacles – Objects  Now <b>Art. 8 – Aerodrome surroundings</b>	The title was changed and the requirement was reduced to Member States' obligation to ensure consultation with regard to proposed constructions within and beyond the limits of the obstacle limitation and protection surfaces and other surfaces associated with the aerodrome.
Art. 9 – Sources of lights  Now <b>Art. 9 – Safeguarding of aerodrome surroundings</b>	The title was changed and the requirement reduced to Member States' obligation to ensure appropriate consultations with regard to human activities and land use and in particular with respect to a list of items found in the Basic Regulation under ERs C2.
Art. 10 – Land use planning  Now <b>Art. 10 – Wildlife hazard management</b>	The subject was changed. Land use planning is newly covered by new Article 9. The new Article 10 installed the requirement that Member States must ensure that wildlife strike hazard are assessed and that wildlife strike reports are collected and forwarded to ICAO for inclusion in the ICAO Bird Strike Information System (IBIS) database.
Art. 11 – Entry into force  Now <b>Art. 11 – Local Community emergency plan</b>	The subject was changed and there is now the new requirement on Member States' obligation to ensure that a local community plan for aviation emergency situations in aerodrome local areas is established in line with Basic Regulation under ERs C3.
New <b>Art. 12 – Entry into force</b>	No substance change to old Article 11 – Entry into force.

*Explanatory Note***C. Annex I – Part – Authority Requirements (Part-ADR.AR)****Scope**

This Annex established requirements for the Competent Authorities involved in the certification and oversight of aerodromes, aerodrome operators and apron management service providers

**Overview of reactions**

The AR reaction focused mainly on the subjects of the management system, oversight programme, Issuance of the Certificate and Changes. Based on the comments received, the text has been reviewed with the aim of reducing the burden on the competent authority and clarifying their obligations.

**Explanations***Management System*

1. The comments received during the consultation period and the subsequent thematic review meetings highlighted the need to review the Management System requirements. The requirements for compliance monitoring 'function' were turned into a 'process'. The feedback system of audit findings was put into an AMC, while the requirement that there should be a person or group of persons was removed from the IR and placed in the same AMC as mentioned above, to provide more flexibility. Overall, those changes are meant to lessen the administrative burden on the authorities. This was also achieved by removing the requirement to send copies of the procedures to the Agency.

*Issuance of certificate*

2. The comments on ADR.AR.C.035 have resulted in a much lighter requirement for the competent authority with regard to the approvals process and issuance of a certificate. It has also been made more clear what the certificate is supposed to include, namely aerodrome's certification basis, the aerodrome manual, and, if relevant, any other operating conditions or limitations prescribed by the competent authority and any Deviation Acceptance and Action Documents (DAAD). The EASA forms for the certificates have been moved to GM (see next section).

*Template certificate and Terms of approval sheet*

3. The certificate form in the appendices to the draft regulation and the related 'terms of approval' sheet have been significantly reworked. The certificate has become a template in GM for information and is no longer an Agency form. Meanwhile the 'terms of approval' have become 'terms of the certificate' and the concept has been defined under the definitions. The elements of the 'terms of the certificate' which the Agency sees as the necessary minimum are given in the definition, while the 'terms of the certificate' template itself is also GM under Part AR, therefore allowing, as in the case of the certificate, for more flexibility than an Agency form.

*Approval of the Aerodrome Manual*

4. The Agency received a number of comments on the approval of the aerodrome manual. They focus mainly on the question of the practicalities of such approvals of the manual. In reaction to these concerns the requirements have been changed to say that the manual has to be produced in compliance with the respective OR on the manual and that it has to satisfy the competent authority. This means that it is not the case that the aerodrome manual would be approved.

*Changes*

5. The Agency has reviewed the changes regime on both sides of the rules, AR and OR (see the relevant section of the rules). The concept is based on two classes of changes: (1) changes that need prior approval by the competent authority and (2) changes that



## Explanatory Note

only need notification via an agreed procedure. The procedure is to be agreed upon at the time of the first certification or conversion of the aerodrome to enable an aerodrome operator to implement changes without prior competent authority approval. In this respect, the competent authority shall approve the procedure defining the scope of such changes and describing how such changes will be managed and notified. It should be understood that changes without effect to safety would belong to a third, yet unmentioned category which does not necessitate any notification.

*Safety Directives*

6. It should be understood that the rule on safety directives was developed in analogy to the airworthiness related to Commission Regulation (EC) No 748/2012<sup>2</sup>, as the aerodrome operator may be compared to a type certificate holder, and if there is an unsafe condition related to an element included in the CB of the aerodrome, this unsafe condition is to be notified to the aerodrome operator by the competent authority and then taken care of by the aerodrome operator or provider of apron management services, as the case may be.

*Wildlife management, obstacles - objects, Confusing, misleading and hazardous lights, Protection of communication, navigation and surveillance systems, Other activities*

7. The review of the comments to the AR rules regarding wildlife management, obstacle and object control, and those for confusing, misleading and hazardous lights as well as land-use in the aerodromes surroundings has resulted in requirements being moved from ADR.AR to the draft Regulation and being greatly reduced, because in many Member States, the CA does not have the jurisdiction to control the environment in the aerodrome surroundings.

**Overview of most significant changes**

<b>NPA</b>	<b>CRD</b>
ADR.AR.A.001 — Scope	Logical and legal errors in the rule were taken care of.
ADR.AR.A.005 — Competent Authority	The 'Competent Authorities' were made capital in line with the new Article 3 of the draft regulation. This means that Competent Authorities are those that are designated.
ADR.AR.A.010 — Oversight documentation	The 'Competent Authority' was made capital in line with the new Article 3 of the draft regulation. This was done throughout all rules.  (a) and (b): The rule was made into a clear distinction into what needs to be provided to CA personnel and what needs to be made available to regulated entities.
ADR.AR.A.015 — Means of compliance	Under (d)(2), 'notify' became 'inform'. (d)(4) was added to inform the other aerodromes in the Member State as appropriate.
ADR.AR.A.020 — Notification of cases of equivalent level of safety and special conditions	Deleted.
ADR.AR.B.005 — Management system	(a)(4): The second sentence ('Compliance...') was deleted and placed into a new AMC.

<sup>2</sup> COMMISSION REGULATION (EU) No 748/2012 of 3 August 2012 laying down implementing rules for the airworthiness and environmental certification of aircraft and related products, parts and appliances, as well as for the certification of design and production organisations.

## Explanatory Note

	<p>(a)(5) was deleted and placed in the new AMC.</p> <p>(d) was deleted as this is covered by rule on the Standardisation process of the Agency.</p>
ADR.AR.B.010 — Allocation of tasks	<p>Title clarification.</p> <p>The term 'natural or legal person' was replaced by 'qualified entity' throughout. Also in the relevant AMCs. (a)(1) was made much closer to the analogous rule in the ARA and ARO regulations and refers to Annex V of the Basic Regulation on qualified entities under which the aerodrome area also falls according to Article 13.</p>
ADR.AR.B.020 — Record keeping	<p>(a)(3): Adjustment made to read 'qualified entities'.</p> <p>(a)(6) is now (a)(7) and new (a)(6) asks for cases of ELOS, special conditions and DAADs, to be kept.</p> <p>(c): Retention time for records was reworked.</p> <p>Old (c)(2) was turned into a AMC.</p> <p>(d) lists records to which the 5-year rule applies.</p>
ADR.AR.C.005 — Oversight	<p>New (d) added to align with ARA and ARO regulations.</p>
ADR.AR.C.010 — Oversight programme	<p>Rule was changed to make it safety performance and risk based. Also the AMC on the oversight audit cycle and oversight programme was changed to give the safety performance and risk based criteria that are to be used.</p>
ADR.AR.C.015 — Initiation of certification process	<p>(a): In line with the deletion of ADR.OR.B.010, the eligibility criteria notion was also deleted here.</p> <p>Old (b), new (a): Having to already notify the aerodrome operator of the alternative means of compliance at this stage was deleted. The alternative means of compliance process under ADR.AR.A.015(d) is enough.</p>
ADR.AR.C.035 — Issuance of certificate	<p>Order for individual points were changed to improve the flow. New (b): The certificate models in the appendices are no longer part of the IR, but are now GM.</p> <p>New (c) asks for demonstration of compliance with ADR.OR.E.005 and ADR.OR.B.025 to the satisfaction of the competent authority. This means that the competent authority does no longer actively approve the whole manual. However, its elements that require prior approval shall be approved. Old (f) became new (d), and it details what the certificate is supposed to include. This was made more precise and 'terms of approval' was replaced by 'terms of the certificate'. The DAAD was included.</p> <p>(g) was unchanged, and it is key to the changes management.</p>
ADR.AR.C.040 — Changes	<p>New (a)(4) to say that the CA needs to notify the new CB to the operator if affected by the proposed change.</p> <p>(b): Now it reads that the change shall be approved and there has to be demonstration of compliance with ADR.OR.E.005 and ADR.OR.B.025 to the satisfaction of the competent authority. This means that the competent authority no longer actively approves the manual after a change. However, if the change is one that requires</p>

## Explanatory Note

	<p>prior approval, it shall be approved.</p> <p>New (c) asks for changing the 'terms of the certificate' if need be.</p>
ADR.AR.C.045 — Change of aerodrome operator	Deleted. There is now no such rule on the OR or AR side anymore.
ADR.AR.C.055 — Findings, observations, corrective actions, and enforcement measures	<p>In general this was made closer to the ARA and ARO rule of the same name.</p> <p>(a): The scope of oversight has been made slightly more precise.</p> <p>(b): Deletion of ',but is not limited to'. Replacement of 'terms of the approval' with 'terms of the certificate'.</p> <p>(e): Made clear that an 'observation' can only be issued for cases where it is not required to issue a level 1 or level 2 finding.</p> <p>(f) deleted and brought under (d) as is the case in ARA and ARO</p>
ADR.AR.C.060 — Wildlife management	Deleted.
ADR.AR.C.065 — Obstacles - Objects	Deleted.
ADR.AR.C.070 — Confusing, misleading and hazardous lights	Deleted.
ADR.AR.C.075 — Protection of communication, navigation and surveillance systems	Deleted.
ADR.AR.C.080 — Other activities	Deleted.

*Explanatory Note***D. Annex II – Part – Organisation Requirements (Part-ADR.OR)****Scope**

This Annex established the requirements to be followed by an aerodrome operator with respect to its certification, management, manuals and other responsibilities. It also included the requirements for a provider of apron management services.

**Overview of reactions**

As with the reaction on the AR, the comments made on the OR also focussed on the rules on oversight of third parties, Changes (in particular the ones that require prior approval), but additionally covered record keeping and personnel requirements. Besides perceived overly burdensome requirements, the common theme was one of misunderstandings and greater clarity needed.

**Explanations***Coordination with other organisations*

1. A number of comments sought clarification on the responsibilities of the aerodrome operator with regard to third parties operating or providing services at the aerodrome, such as ground handling services, fuel providers, Air Navigation Service Providers and airlines that are classified as 'other operators' at an aerodrome. The Agency reviewed the comments and has simplified the relevant requirements, by removing the provisions requiring documented arrangements and responsibilities with such third parties and the establishment and implementation of a programme by the aerodrome operator for ensuring their compliance with the relevant regulatory requirements and the aerodrome manual. Moreover, the Agency has turned the relevant AMC into GM, in order to provide further flexibility to the interested parties.

However, aerodrome operators should ensure that such entities have in place procedures to manage safety in their aerodrome-related operations, and that the aerodrome operator usually oversees this safety assurance by ensuring that both entities have an active integrated safety management system.

*Changes*

2. With regard to Changes, the Agency has accepted most of the comments received on the subject. Particular focus has been put on improving the clarity of the requirement as well as addressing specific topics including adding changes to the physical characteristics within the requirements for prior approval as well as defining further items that should be included in the list. The list has been included in GM (GM1 — ADR.OR.B.040 (a)(b))

*Personnel Requirements*

3. The personnel requirements have been substantially reduced and a large amount of material moved to AMC or GM. This has given the aerodrome operator the flexibility to manage their personnel requirements in line with their management systems.

*Occurrence reporting*

4. The occurrence reporting requirement has received a significant amount of comments. The proposed requirements as defined in the NPA neither affect existing national provisions for the implementation of the relevant EU law, namely Directive 2003/42/EC<sup>(3)</sup> and Regulation (EU) No 996/2010<sup>(4)</sup>, nor the reporting

---

<sup>(3)</sup> Directive 2003/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2003 on occurrence reporting in civil aviation (OJ L 167, 4.7.2003, p. 23-36).

*Explanatory Note*

systems established by the Member State to meet those obligations described in the above EU Regulation. The proposed requirements on the aerodrome operator merely support the reporting of safety occurrences in line with established occurrence reporting systems. They do not impose any additional requirements on them beyond those described in existing EU Legislation.

*Facilities requirements*

5. Responding to the comments received, the facilities requirements have been reviewed and amended. To this end, the requirement for the storage and handling of dangerous goods has been replaced with a high level requirement for the designation of appropriate areas for the storage of dangerous goods. Moreover, the relevant requirement for fuel storage and handling was removed, as it was felt that the issue is sufficiently covered by the relevant OPS requirements. Finally, relevant AMC and GM have been provided to facilitate the industry's compliance with the requirements.

*Compliance*

6. The Agency has reacted favourably to the majority of the comments related to the compliance requirement. More specifically, in line with the relevant essential requirements, the Agency has provided an AMC with which it is clarified that third parties may also be used for the required demonstration of compliance. In addition, the Agency has amended the relevant requirements to clarify the case of the 'other surfaces' associated with the aerodrome and has also provided relevant GM.

*Management*

7. A significant number of comments focussed on the management requirement for aerodrome operators. In response to the comments, the Agency has amended some of the relevant provisions with a view to simplifying or clarifying the requirements. Moreover, the Agency has reviewed and updated the relevant AMC and GM in order to provide the necessary flexibility needed, especially for less complex aerodrome operators.

**Overview of most significant changes**

<b>NPA</b>	<b>CRD</b>
ADR.OR.B.010 – Eligibility	The requirement has been deleted.
	A new requirement titled 'ADR.OR.B.037 – Continued validity of a declaration' for providers of apron management services has been added.
ADR.OR.B.040 – Changes	Prior approval is now also required for changes affecting the certification basis and aerodrome equipment, as well as for changes significantly affecting elements of the aerodrome operator's management system. Requirement ADR.OR.B.045 – Assessment of changes has been incorporated into ADR.OR.B.040.
ADR.OR.B.055 – Change of aerodrome operator	The requirement has been deleted.
ADR.OR.D.005 –	Paragraph (b)(3) has been simplified. Paragraph (b)(8) has been clarified. Paragraph (d) has been simplified and is now

<sup>(4)</sup> Regulation (EU) No 996/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 October 2010 on the investigation and prevention of accidents and incidents in civil aviation and repealing Directive 94/56/EC Text with EEA relevance (OJ L 295, 12.11.2010, p. 35-50).

*Explanatory Note*

Management	part of paragraph (b).
ADR.OR.D.015 — Personnel requirements	Paragraph (b)(2) has been deleted, while the remaining text has been clarified.
ADR.OR.D.020 — Facilities requirements	Paragraph (a) has been simplified, and paragraph (b) now refers to the storage of dangerous goods.
ADR.OR.D.025 — Coordination with other relevant organisations	Subparagraph (a)(3) and paragraph (c) have been deleted.

*Explanatory Note***E. Annex III – Part – Operations Requirements (Part-ADR.OPS)****Scope**

This Annex established the requirements to be fulfilled by the aerodrome operator with regard to Aerodrome Data, Aerodrome Operational Services, Equipment and Installations and Aerodrome Maintenance.

**Overview of reactions**

The requirements for aerodrome operations generated a number of comments related to Aeronautical Data, Aerodrome Emergency Planning, Rescue and Fire Fighting Services (RFFS) and Safeguarding. Aeronautical Data comments mainly concentrated on the alignment of the new rules on data quality with those already published in Commission Regulation (EU) No 73/2010<sup>(5)</sup> and questioned the relationship with ICAO Annex 15. Aerodrome Emergency Planning and RFFS both received comments requesting clarification on the application of the rules when the aerodrome operator is not directly involved in the development or provision of the services.

**Explanations***Rescue and Fire Fighting Services (RFFS)*

1. The requirements regarding RFFS have been the subject of many comments during the consultation period and formed a major discussion topic during the review meeting. The subjects of remission, cover required for Cargo only operations, and medical requirements formed the core of the comments and discussion during the review meeting. RFFS is currently undergoing a worldwide review within the ICAO Rescue and Fire Fighting Working Group (RFFWG) with a view to align the requirements with the current trend towards risk based regulation. This will result in an effective RFF best suited for the level and type of operation at the aerodrome. During this period of uncertainty, the Agency has chosen to remain committed to the general methodology of using only mature ICAO material. However, in recognition of the diverse provision of RFFS throughout the EU, the Agency has included some guidance material on the application of remission and level of protection for cargo only operations that will allow Member States to continue with their existing policies. As a consequence of the issues raised during the consultation period and the review meeting, the Agency plans in the near future to assess the impact of this matter and to establish a dedicated rulemaking effort to develop RFFS requirements appropriate for European application.

*Third Party service provision*

2. Concerns were raised both during the consultation period and at the thematic review meetings regarding the allocation of responsibilities for certain services provided for at the aerodrome. This led to a request to include a statement within the operations rules to quantify the level of responsibility the aerodrome operator has with regard to the provision of the service. To mitigate the impact, the Agency has included a new rule in the annex describing the intent of the obligation placed on the aerodrome operator and the ability of the Member State to allocate a third party to be responsible to the provision of the service.

*Aeronautical Data Quality*

3. A number of comments concerned the application of the Aeronautical Data Quality requirements with reference to Commission Regulation (EU) No 73/2010. The quality

---

<sup>(5)</sup> Commission Regulation (EU) No 73/2010 of 26 January 2010 laying down requirements on the quality of aeronautical data and aeronautical information for the single European sky (OJ L 23, 27.1.2010, p. 6-27).

*Explanatory Note*

requirements contained in this regulation are transposed from Annex 14, Volume 1, as directed by the Basic Regulation. The requirements contained in Commission Regulation (EU) No 73/2010 are intended to supplement and strengthen those contained in Annex 15 to the Chicago Convention in order to achieve aeronautical information of sufficient quality for Europe. Commission Regulation (EU) No 73/2010 does not direct anybody to produce the data or describe in detail what should be included in the data, but mandates how it should be done if it is produced. The difference is that this regulation describes in detail who is responsible for ensuring the data is produced and describes in detail what should be included, its safety criteria and target level of safety.

The material contained in this regulation does not conflict with the requirements contained in Commission Regulation (EU) No 73/2010. However, it must be understood that both regulations are applicable and must be complied with by anybody involved in the production of aeronautical data.

*Boundary fence*

4. Concerning the access to the movement area, the Agency had initially proposed the installation of a fence to deter the inadvertent or premeditated access of unauthorised persons or wildlife into the movement area. That raised the concerns that additional fences, other than security fences may be required. There were also concerns that the rule implies that fences could be used for bird control purposes. The Agency had decided to delete this requirement as it could be covered during the certification of the aerodrome using the appropriate CSs.

**Overview of most significant changes**

<b>NPA</b>	<b>CRD</b>
ADR.OPS.A.010 — Data quality requirements	New point (a): requirement for formal arrangements with entities with which there is exchange of aeronautical data and/or aeronautical information
	ADR.OPS.B.001 — Provision of operational services (New). This allows for the provision of some services by other entities.
ADR.OPS.B.005 — Aerodrome emergency planning	'establish' has been replaced with 'have and implement'. In (1), 'vicinity' has been deleted.
ADR.OPS.B.020 — Wildlife strike hazard reduction	In (a)(2), 'at the aerodrome' has been added at the end. In (a)(3), 'competent authority' has been replaced by 'appropriate authority'.
ADR.OPS.B.050 — Operations in adverse weather conditions	'shall establish and implement' has been replaced by 'shall ensure that means and procedures are established and implemented'.
ADR.OPS.B.060 — Access to the movement area	Points (a)(2) and (a)(3) have been deleted.
ADR.OPS.B.070 — Aerodrome works safety	New point (b) has been added requiring prior approval for major construction works.
ADR.OPS.B.075 —	'other areas' have been added.



## Explanatory Note

Safeguarding of aerodromes	'within its competence' has been included in (a)(2) and (a)(3).
ADR.OPS.B.080 — Marking and lighting of vehicles and other mobile objects	The phrase 'if the vehicles and aerodrome are used at night or in conditions of low visibility' has been deleted. The phrase 'Aircraft servicing equipment and vehicles used only on aprons may be exempted' has been deleted.
ADR.OPS.B.085 — Handling of hazardous materials	Deleted.
	ADR.OPS.B.090 — Use of the aerodrome by higher code letter aircraft (moved from ADR.OR.C.010).
ADR.OPS.C.005 — General	New point (b) to require the approval of the competent authority for the maintenance program and major maintenance activities.

*Explanatory Note***F. Certification Specifications (Part-ADR.DSN)****Scope**

1. To support the introduction of the rules mentioned above, the Agency has included two additional books detailing the CSs required to construct the Certification Basis and a book of GM to describe the application of the CSs in more detail.
2. These specifications prescribe the physical characteristics and obstacle limitation surfaces to be provided for at aerodromes, and certain facilities normally provided at an aerodrome. It is not intended that these specifications will limit or regulate the operation of an aeroplane.
3. The CSs do not include specifications relating to the overall planning of aerodromes (such as separation between adjacent aerodromes or capacity of individual aerodromes), impact on the environment, or to economic and other non-technical factors that need to be considered in the development of an aerodrome.
4. Book 1 contains the CSs for Aerodrome Physical Characteristics. It includes:
  - a. the design of the infrastructure;
  - b. the location of the infrastructure;
  - c. the performance requirements of the infrastructure;
  - d. marking of the infrastructure; and
  - e. lighting associated with the infrastructure.
5. Book 2 contains the GM to support the application of the CS.

**Overview of reactions**

Many comments received on the CSs tended to focus on the detailed editorial issues encountered when transferring the many ICAO requirements. This was not unexpected due to the volume of material subjected to review and analysis on its pertinence as a CS. A number of the comments received indicated the wish to downgrade CSs to GM to provide more flexibility. However, meaning and principles of ICAO Annex 14, Standards and Recommended Practices, where the Contracting States are expected to conform with the Standards and endeavour to conform with Recommendations, are not the same as the principles of CSs and GM and were not possible to implement in the CS and GM structure. CSs are non-binding technical standards adopted by the Agency to meet the requirements, while GM are non-binding explanatory and interpretation material on how to achieve the requirements described CSs and contain information, including examples, to assist the user in the interpretation and application of CSs. Because of the meaning of CSs and GM, in some cases it has not been possible to accept proposals for 'downgrading' of CSs to GM. However, these comments revealed a certain lack of understanding regarding the flexibility measures available to both competent authorities and aerodrome operators when constructing the certification basis. The previous explanations on this subject should have helped clarify the flexibility tools available.

**Explanations***Applicability*

The paragraph 'applicability' has been reviewed to describe that design specifications in Books 1 and 2 are applicable to aerodromes falling within the scope of the Basic Regulation. This is in response to received comments explaining that CSs should be used, beside the establishing Certification Basis, also for temporary requirements, maintenance work and similar requirements.

## Explanatory Note

*Intentionally Blank Page*

'Intentionally blank' appears in the GM and CS — it is placed there for continuity of CS/GM numbering (e.g. if the CS contains all relevant details, there is no further explanation required in GM; if there are no hard specifications for the CS, the related guidance is in GM).

**Overview of significant changes**

NPA	CRD
Safety Objectives to CSs	Safety objectives have been added to a number of CS.
GM	Some GM, derived from Annex 14 recommended practices, where there are clear ICAO requirement or dimensions, is moved to CS. However, some CSs, where there no clear requirement or objective to be in the CS, are moved to GM.
Operational parts in Book 1 and 2	Operational parts included in the CSs have been moved to ADR.OPS requirements
CS-ADR-DSN.A.005 — Aerodrome reference code	Element 1 reverts to ICAO text — 'Aeroplane reference field length'.
CS-ADR-DSN.B.195 — Clearways	New text for the length of clearways reverts to ICAO text: The length of a clearway should not exceed half the length of the take-off run available.
CS-ADR-DSN.C.215 — Dimensions of runway end safety areas	New text returned to ICAO including the EMAS option edit according to the agreed text of the panel.
CS-ADR-DSN.D.260 — Taxiway minimum separation distance	Taxiway minimum separation distances, all proposals from SL041, are deleted and the proposed CS is fully in accordance to ICAO Annex 14.
Table J-1. Dimensions and slopes of Obstacle Limitation Surface	Approach runways is added into the text.
CS-ADR-DSN.M.625 — 635 Approach lighting systems	CS and GM text and figures are reviewed in order to follow the continuity and requirements for each systems.
CS-ADR-DSN.N.775 — 800	CS and GM text and figures have been reviewed in order to follow continuity and requirements.
CS-ADR-DSN.T.915 — Siting of equipment and installations on operational areas	CS text has been supplemented with the original text from the Annex 14 which was previously proposed in the ADR.OPS part.
CS-ADR-DSN.H.440 — Slew Take-off climb surface	CS for Slew take-off climb surface is moved to GM so that the OLS requirements are fully in accordance with Annex 14.