



Department
for Transport

Government Response to the General Aviation Red Tape Challenge Panel Report

October 2014



Government Response to the General Aviation Red Tape Challenge Panel Report

October 2014

Department for Transport
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London SW1P 4DR
Telephone 0300 330 3000

Website www.gov.uk/dft

General enquiries <https://forms.dft.gov.uk>

© Crown copyright 2014

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

You may re-use this information (not including logos or third-party material) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> **OGL** or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Contents

Ministerial Foreword	4
Government Response to GA Challenge Panel final report	6
Introduction	6
Background	8
Key themes and Panel recommendations	9
GA Border issues	21
Annex A – CAA work for UK General Aviation	26
1. National	26
2. EU and International	27
3. Airspace	28
4. Governance and Finance	28
Annex B – Objectives of the General and Business Aviation Strategic Forum (GBASF)	29
Annex C – Response to Challenge Panel recommendation	32

Ministerial Foreword

General Aviation (GA) plays a unique yet fundamental role within the UK's aviation industry. 95% of all registered aircraft in this country are engaged in GA activity. The sector trains future generations of pilots and engineers. And it is worth approximately £1.4bn to our economy, supporting thousands of skilled jobs.

Yet this huge contribution has often gone unrecognised. Instead of protecting and supporting the industry, successive governments have allowed it to become overburdened with regulation. As a result, the future of a job-creating sector has been put at risk, potentially compromising the growth of UK aviation and engineering skills and training.

The UK has long enjoyed an enviable reputation as a global centre of aviation excellence, but by continuing to undermine General Aviation, we were in danger of risking that status. So last year, the government launched the General Aviation Red Tape Challenge, asking the industry how best to reduce unnecessary regulation and stimulate growth across the GA sector. The unprecedented number of responses we received highlighted the urgent need to tackle issues long considered too difficult to address.

We appointed an independent panel of GA experts to challenge and critique the Government and the CAA's programme of reform. The panel reported back in May, presenting us with a long list of ideas to cut red tape and wider recommendations. Implementing these is a big job, but it's one we are determined to complete.

We have begun by setting out a timetable for action.

Next spring, we will join forces with the GA community, the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and colleagues across government to produce a comprehensive GA strategy. Recently commissioned research into the value of GA to the UK economy will be used to drive this work forward and remove obstacles to growth.

We have also made commitments to:

- Support the delivery of the European Aviation Safety Agency's (EASA) General Aviation Road Map, including consideration of amendments to the EASA Basic Regulation where appropriate.
- Work with EASA and the US FAA to gain support for the principle of mutual recognition of manufacturing standards.
- Consider how to simplify legislation for GA users crossing borders.
- Launch a comprehensive review of the all sections of the Air Navigation Order affecting General Aviation.

A Minister-led Star Chamber will be convened to ensure delivery of this programme. As well as reviewing Government progress against the Panel's recommendations, this group will also monitor the CAA's regulatory programme for GA.

Government has also endorsed the CAA's red tape reform programme, and we welcome the recent launch of a GA Unit dedicated to effective, transparent, risk-based regulation. This has already resulted in projects to de-regulate single seat microlights; to allow hand held radios in permit-to-fly aircraft; to reduce the amount of classroom training required for student pilots; to allow the use of pilot controlled lighting at licensed aerodromes; and to let gyroplanes be used for self-hire.

Other proposed changes include:

- Reducing requirements for flight testing prototype or modified aircraft
- Allowing pilots over 65 to continue as the single pilot of commercial balloon flights
- Submitting to EASA a new training syllabus for private pilots that meets modern needs
- Reducing the number of questions in initial pilot exams to the minimum required.

We have already made a great deal of progress, but we are under no illusions about the amount of work ahead. The Red Tape Challenge and the Challenge Panel have provided a strong framework for the future. This report demonstrates our determination to deliver this framework, to secure the UK's position as a global GA leader and to unlock the sector's potential for jobs and growth.

Robert Goodwill MP
Parliamentary Under Secretary
of State for Transport
October 2014

Rt Hon Grant Shapps MP
Minister without Portfolio
October 2014

Government Response to GA Challenge Panel final report

Introduction

This document sets out the Government's response to the issues raised by the General Aviation (GA) Challenge Panel and the recommendations made in its final report which was published on 29 May. This position will be developed further over the coming months, including in light of the economic research we have commissioned, and will lead to the development of a wider Government Strategy for GA early next year.

General Aviation is a crucial part of the UK's aviation sector: it trains the next generation of pilots and engineers; supports highly-skilled jobs; provides essential connectivity services; and forms a key part of our cultural heritage.

The Government welcomes the Panel's report and the rigour with which both the Panel, the General and Business Aviation Strategic Forum and individual General Aviation stakeholders have challenged our approach to regulation of the sector. The Panel has worked extremely hard to complete their report in six months and it provides a strong foundation for change in the sector. The Government proposes to work in tandem with CAA and the sector to carefully consider, enable and facilitate change.

A vast amount of work has taken place since the GA Challenge Panel was established last November. The independent industry regulator, the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), has put in place a comprehensive programme to reform the way in which it regulates GA, including the creation of a new GA Unit, dedicated to leading on issues which impact upon the sector.

The CAA's programme of work is an ambitious one, which will bring about tangible benefits for the sector. They have consulted on a GA Policy Framework in order to ensure that the changes it is delivering in its better and more proportionate approach to the regulation of GA are permanently embedded within the culture of the CAA.

Work already completed by the CAA to reduce the regulatory burden includes:

- Deregulated all single seat microlight aeroplanes up to 300kg Maximum Take off Mass (MTOM);
- Relaxed the certification rules for handheld radios to be used in 'non-EASA' aircraft, providing safety benefits to the GA Sector;

- Changing the requirement to reduce the amount of classroom training required for student pilots and reducing the number of private pilot exam questions to the minimum required by EASA;
- Allowing gyroplanes to be used for self-hire.

Other proposed changes are:

- Reducing the requirements for flight testing prototype or modified aircraft to encourage innovation;
- Allowing balloon pilots over 65 to continue as the single pilot of commercial balloon flights;
- Submitting to EASA a new alternate training syllabus for private pilots that is more in keeping with current needs;
- A list of the achievements so far can be found at **Annex A**. More detail on this and about the future programme of GA work can be found at www.caa.co.uk/ga

In this response to the GA Panel's final report the Government endorses the CAA's establishment of a GA Unit and their development of an ambitious reform programme and proposes further specific commitments from Government to ensure the development and delivery of a comprehensive reform programme for GA, specifically;

- (i) The establishment of a new cross-Department Star Chamber chaired by the Minister Without Portfolio and including senior representation from all Government Departments with influence on GA matters. This will review progress on all aspects of GA reform;
- (ii) A commitment to pursue economic research in order to inform views where Government policy could go further to support a vibrant GA sector – for example in the areas of planning and training;
- (iii) Changes to the main external stakeholder forum with amended Terms of Reference – reporting annually to Ministers, with a remit to challenge, prioritise and oversee both delivery of CAA reforms and fees and charges for the GA sector;
- (iv) A commitment to challenge and support the delivery of the European Aviation Safety Agency's (EASA) General Aviation Road Map, including consideration of amendments to the EASA Basic Regulation where appropriate;
- (v) A commitment to work with EASA and the US FAA to gain support for the principle of mutual recognition of manufacturing standards;
- (vi) Tasking the CAA to work with the Future Airspace Strategy Visual Flight Rules Industry Group (FASVIG) to consider how best to take forward Panel recommendations relating to access, charging and classification of airspace; and
- (vii) Considering how to make the legislative requirements for GA users crossing the border easier to understand;

- (viii) Consultation on pre-notification periods for GA flights to change the timescale for advance notification for designated customs ports to one hour before departure and to consider any views on the notification timescales for Certificate of Agreement airports with a view to reducing the regulatory burden on GA.
- (ix) Agreement from the Ministry of Defence (MOD) to work with the Department for Transport (DfT) to explore opportunities for GA access to military airfields.

At **Annex C** we respond to each of the full list of recommendations made by the Panel in both the interim and final reports. This also includes, where relevant, views from the CAA on areas where it has direct responsibility and is able to take action without Government intervention either at the national or international level.

In order to ensure continuing momentum we will work with the GA community and key GA representative bodies, the CAA, and across relevant Government Departments, as necessary, to produce a comprehensive strategy by spring 2015 which reviews progress against Government commitments and the delivery of CAA's programme and takes account of the findings of the proposed economic research.

Background

The GA Red Tape Challenge held in early 2013 received nearly 500 responses, including 298 via e-mail, three times as many emails as any other theme to date. As part of the Government's response to this, Ministers established an independent GA Challenge Panel, primarily to operate as a "critical friend" to the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) as the organisation changes its approach to the regulation of GA, to provide advice to Government and to encourage effective engagement between the CAA and the GA sector. The Challenge Panel was invited to suggest innovative approaches with the potential to improve the regulation of GA, with the aim of achieving deregulatory outcomes, in order to help drive growth and innovation in the sector.

The Panel published an interim report to Ministers on 30th January which included 53 initial recommendations based on the first phase of its investigations. It followed up with a final report at the end of May, which included 11 overarching recommendations for Government and the CAA to consider further.

During the course of its work, the Panel worked closely with and met colleagues at all levels of the CAA. It also held meetings with Ministers and officials within several Government departments about policies for which they are responsible and which impact on GA.

This report summarises the Government's response to the Panel's work and final report, taking each area thematically, quoting key recommendations as appropriate. It focuses on what the Government considers to be some of the most significant changes proposed by the Panel and where the Government can provide direction now.

As noted above, a comprehensive response to each of the Panel's recommendations is included in **Annex C**. We have not attempted to provide a

detailed response to all recommendations in the main body of the report. In practice the reform programme splits into five broad work programmes:

1. The proposed General Aviation review of the Air Navigation Order;
2. As part of ongoing development of safety regulation in European or International fora;
3. Airspace recommendations – to be taken forward in discussion with the Future Airspace Strategy Visual Flight Rules Industry Group (FASVIG);
4. The continuing culture change and efficiency drive within the CAA, and
5. Recommendations for Government – for example regarding the promotion of GA, planning and borders issues, both listed as one point (4)

Key themes and Panel recommendations

Safety regulation

On safety regulation the Panel recommended (final report no.1) that **“the CAA should adopt a risk-based total-system approach to safety.”**

The Government welcomes the recommendations linked to safety in the Panel's report. The Government is committed to continuing to support the move towards a risk based regulatory approach for General Aviation safety. We recognise that the current regulatory framework is too prescriptive, and that a proactive risk based approach will remove unnecessary burdens on GA. The Government is committed to supporting the CAA's approach to performance based regulation and the plans they already have in place to deliver these reforms.

We welcome the CAA's development of a GA Policy Framework, the work of the new GA Unit, its commitment to improving the way that safety for GA is regulated, and the work done to date in deregulating some areas, and delegating responsibilities in others.

Air Navigation Order – General Aviation Review

A large number of the areas for reform identified as a result of the Red Tape Challenge process and the Panel report require amendments to the Air Navigation Order (ANO) before full implementation of changes would be possible. The ANO is the overarching legislation which includes the majority of safety regulation affecting aviation including General Aviation. If the Government addressed all of these areas on a case-by-case basis then it is likely that it would take a significant amount of time before the cumulative effect achieved the level of change demanded. We have therefore agreed with the CAA that we will conduct a full review of ANO measures which impact upon GA with the objective of consulting on initial concepts in March 2015 and a second consultation on specific recommendations in September 2015. This will be an ambitious programme of reform accompanied by impact assessments where appropriate and will aim to deliver tangible reductions in regulatory burdens to a wide range of GA stakeholders.

In the meantime we will encourage and support the CAA to make full use of the ANO exemptions power, where appropriate, so that the GA community can benefit from the proposed deregulatory changes as soon as possible.

ANO amendments already agreed as part of the wider aviation Red Tape Challenge (largely reflecting the removal of redundant provisions) will be incorporated into the ANO reform programme. This new commitment will also supersede the aviation Red Tape Challenge commitment to conduct a cost benefit analysis on the need to review the ANO. We will move with immediate effect to the review and consultation stage.

Airspace

Airspace is a finite national UK asset with a range of diverse airspace users vying for access to it. This creates a significant challenge for the CAA, as it is difficult for the organisation to ensure that there is always an equitable balance for all airspace users across the breadth of the UK. This has meant that in some parts of the UK the General Aviation community is not always able to access certain volumes of airspace as easily as it would like.

We agree with the Panel that the CAA's Future Airspace Strategy (FAS) should improve the overall efficiency of our airspace, and we are actively supporting the delivery of this strategy. The need for greater airspace efficiency is fundamental, as it will benefit not just commercial airlines but also General Aviation. For example, by optimising the use of controlled airspace, airports will find it less necessary to seek additional controlled airspace in their environs and the CAA will find it easier to challenge those proposals which aim to reclassify airspace unnecessarily.

The Panel has commented on the CAA's airspace change process. This is indeed a mature system as the Panel points out and it is also very robust and fit for purpose. Nevertheless, all systems can be improved and we are pleased to note the CAA intends to make some short-term amendments to the current version of CAP 725 relating to airspace changes during 2014, prior to a more fundamental review in 2015. Both iterations will include public consultation on CAP 725 thereby offering the General Aviation community an opportunity to influence reform. We urge the GA community to engage fully with this process. We would also look to the CAA to take on board, where it can, the need to make it easier to re-classify airspace and to monitor the use of controlled airspace.

The Government also welcomes the formation of the FAS Visual Flight Rules Industry Group (FASVIG) which is modelled on the successful FAS Industry Implementation Group. FASVIG provides a genuine opportunity for the General Aviation community to work collaboratively to address key areas of concern and to come forward with detailed, worked up proposals which can then be taken forward. For example, on greater access to controlled airspace. We look forward to seeing the outcome of its work in due course.

The Panel made a number of specific recommendations on airspace the responses to which are covered in Annex D. In this document, we highlight two of the interim findings in particular:

The Panel recommended in the interim report (no.30) that **“the Government should require, as a matter of public policy, that reasonable access under Visual Flight Rules to controlled airspace is provided by Air Navigation Service Providers offering Air Traffic Control within that airspace, to users who are not the intended beneficiary of the airspace, at the cost of the intended beneficiaries of the airspace classification and at no cost to other users.”**

We agree that there should be reasonable access to controlled airspace, which is a shared national asset, for Visual Flight Rules traffic. Instrument Flight Rules users of controlled airspace pay for access to that airspace under the en-route and terminal charges under the Single European Sky charging regulation (Commission Regulation No. 1191/2010, amending EC 1794/2006).

In some areas of uncontrolled airspace, often surrounding controlled airspace, the General Aviation community already benefits from the free provision of the Lower Airspace Radar Service which many of its members find useful and which is funded by the State and commercial airlines.

In the case of controlled airspace, the charging regime for air traffic services is covered in the Single European Sky charging regulation, under a user pays principle. Within these rules, it is an accepted principle that the beneficiaries of using controlled airspace should pay unless the flights are specifically exempted by the State from doing so, in which case the State pays the associated costs. Because of the way the UK decided to implement the charging regulation the costs to non-IFR users have already been minimised. We could, however, foresee circumstances where it would be fair and practical for VFR users to pay an appropriate contribution for services that provide benefit to them. We could not, therefore, enshrine the principle that as a general matter of public policy, VFR users should pay nothing.

However, we do appreciate that there might be some realistic and pragmatic options also available which could enable greater access to controlled airspace at lower altitudes without compromising our international obligations. We are willing to consider further ideas/proposals from the General Aviation community on this issue and would therefore encourage the FASVIG to consider this matter in detail and to formulate a credible proposal which both we and the CAA could examine.

The Panel also recommended (no.32) that **“the Government should implement, as a matter of public policy, an ongoing charge per unit volume to Air Navigation Service Providers who service controlled airspace, to incentivise efficient use of airspace as a shared resource.”**

We agree there is a need to ensure that controlled airspace used by an air navigation service provider is monitored to ensure that it is still required and that the rationale for the airspace classification remains justified. The Panel’s recommendation is an interesting one, but is likely to be at odds with the Charging Regulation and may lead to a much broader debate on who pays for what. For example there may be an argument that restricting controlled airspace imposes a cost on users which it might be reasonable to reflect in a charge on GA. We think therefore that the better approach is for the CAA to monitor the use of controlled airspace, perhaps more systematically than it has done in the past and to put in place measures to make the re-classification of controlled airspace

easier. In addition, airspace change sponsors wishing to benefit from more controlled airspace should be made aware that there will be regular reviews of how the new controlled airspace is being used and that, once in place, controlled airspace is not to be considered as a fixed permanent structure for all time and can be reclassified as and when the CAA thinks this is justified and appropriate.

EU Engagement and Regulation

Regarding EU regulation the Panel recommended (final report no.3) that **“the CAA should ensure that the single market, harmonisation and simplification benefits of EU regulation are realised in full.”**

The Government, in partnership with the CAA, will seek to support and influence EASA to achieve their stated aim of ‘simpler, lighter, better’ rules for GA. We will continue to develop our strong strategic partnership with EASA, and stress our support for the continuation of EASA’s work to review rulemaking for GA and ensure that all rules are proportionate to the activities concerned. In particular, we fully support the EASA Roadmap for the Regulation of General Aviation. We also support the initiatives proposed by the General Aviation Sub Committee of the Safety Standards Consultative Committee in their General Aviation Projects and proposals paper. We look forward to working with EASA and the Commission to make progress on the roadmap and associated initiatives, supporting objectives that deliver a proportionate approach to safety risk management. This includes supporting the Commission’s review of the Basic Regulation and seeking appropriate amendment through our response to the associated Advance Notice of Proposed Amendment issued by EASA on 23 May 2014.

CAA Finances

The Panel reviewed the way CAA raises finance and considered that the Government should commit to reduce the annual rate of return paid by the CAA.

Following the Panel’s recommendation it has been agreed that the rate of return paid by the CAA will be reduced from the current level of 6% to 3.5%.

Regulation and Governance

On general regulatory principles the Panel made the point that **“The Government should ensure that there is no further increase in the burden of regulation and a commitment to investigate ways to reduce it in relevant areas.”**

The Government agrees with the Panel’s recommendation that there should be no further increase in the regulatory burden on the GA sector and is committed to looking for ways in which this can be reduced in the future. Under the Government’s one-in, two-out rule, any measure which regulates or deregulates business and is expected to result in a direct net cost to business must be offset by measures that provide savings to business of at least double that amount.

The Government is committed to the production of impact assessments for all new proposed policy measures. These are an important tool in assessing the likely benefits and impacts of new policy interventions. The CAA is also committed to the principles of better regulation and to producing impact assessments for policy proposals. They should continue to complete these for all future proposals for policy changes which could impact upon the GA sector.

GA organisations are often classified as small businesses and it is therefore important that all policy changes which could have an impact on these entities are considered fully, in order to reduce the burdens on such organisations. Impact Assessments for measures that have an impact on small businesses must contain robust Small & Micro Business Assessments. The General Aviation ANO review will be accompanied by comprehensive impact assessments.

Cross Departmental Star Chamber

The Panel reviewed the way GA is managed by the CAA and the level of Government intervention and decision-making, together with the way both engage with external stakeholders.

In the final report (at 7.2) it suggested that **“The Government should appoint a GA champion and establish a permanent GA governance structure, with representation from relevant Government Departments, to review policies that affect GA and maintain the momentum of reform.”**

Following the recommendations made by the Challenge Panel it has been agreed that improvements should be made to the oversight of the programme of work in this area.

A new cross departmental Star Chamber will be established in order to oversee development of the GA strategy. This will be chaired by the Minister without Portfolio and will aim to meet three times before spring 2015, with the first meeting taking place in the autumn. Meetings will be attended by Government departments with a direct interest in this work, including DfT, BIS, Home Office/HMRC, and CLG, as appropriate. The CAA will also report back on delivery of their GA work programme. The Star Chamber will provide ongoing challenge to Government departments and the CAA to ensure that they are sticking to commitments made in relation to the programme of GA related work.

The Star Chamber will also have the scope to develop new ideas for tackling issues which affect the GA sector, for example following the completion of the proposed economic research into GA, and for working with Government departments and the CAA to agree how these can be delivered.

The Star Chamber will lead on work to bring all developments and commitments into a Government Strategy for GA in spring 2015.

Stakeholder Engagement

We will also revise the Terms of Reference of the General Aviation Strategic Forum and rename it as the General and Business Aviation Strategic Forum (GBASF). This group will be chaired by Roger Hopkinson as (Facilitator of the General Aviation Alliance, and Chairman of the Light Aircraft Association). Membership will include the Chief Executive Officer of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association and the Chief Operating Officer of British Business and General Aviation, the CAA Chief Executive and the Director of CAA's Safety Airspace and Regulation Group. Government will be represented by the Department for Transport.

This Group will have the remit to challenge, prioritise and oversee delivery of reforms and will report as necessary to the new Star Chamber. They will also fulfil some of the functions which the Panel had recommended in its report that a potential GA Champion might lead on, particularly overseeing delivery of the CAA's

programme of reform for GA. The Group will also report to the CAA Financial Advisory Committee in order to ensure GA views on fees and charges are taken into account. They will also report directly to the Chief Executive of CAA and the Department for Transport's Director General of Civil Aviation, who will also attend an annual meeting. The Group will produce an annual progress report for the Aviation Minister.

New, draft Terms of Reference for the group can be found at **Annex B**.

Planning

Across the UK there is a network of aerodromes of varying sizes, from airports in Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales and regional airports in England to small business and general aviation airfields into which GA aircraft can readily gain access. The Government has acknowledged, in the Aviation Policy Framework, that maintaining access to such a national network is vital to the continuing success of the sector.¹ The Government will consider whether the evidence produced as a result of the economic research on the value of GA, commissioned as part of this Government response, provides further insights in to the characteristics of a key airport on the national network.

The planning system can have an impact on the operation of small and medium-sized aerodromes. The Government's approach to planning in England is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Government believes that planning matters should be considered by local communities working within the broad framework of national planning policy which includes relevant national policy statements such as the Aviation Policy Framework published in March 2013.

The Panel suggested that (at 8.1): **“Safeguarding or retention (in planning terms) after consultation and in conjunction with the operators of sites should be provided by specific policy or statutory means including where appropriate by CAA safeguarding.”**

The NPPF urges local planning authorities to ‘identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen choice’ which could apply to airport infrastructure. Local development frameworks and other strategic planning documents should include aeronautical safeguarding, both for officially safeguarded aerodromes² and for aerodromes where unofficial safeguarding procedures have been agreed between the operator and Local Planning Authorities. However the responsibility for aerodrome safeguarding rests with the aerodrome licence holder or operator.

With regard to protecting airfields more generally from development on the site itself (for example, for housing) local authorities have the responsibility to consider the case for safeguarding land to protect aerodromes, and indeed any other sites they consider important. While the Government has no plans to change policy to make this a requirement, we do expect that, when planning for ports, airports and airfields that are not subject to a national policy statement (likely to cover most, if not all, general aviation airfields), plans should take account of their growth

1 Aviation Policy Framework, March 2012 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/aviation-policy-framework>

2 Safeguarding in this context refers to the official safeguarding process by which necessary measures are taken to ensure the safety of aircraft, and thereby the passengers and crews aboard them, while taking-off or landing, or while flying in the vicinity or an aerodrome. Airport operators to whom DfT Circular 01/2003 apply should maintain safeguarding maps to reflect potential proposals for future development of airports and ensure they are certified by the CAA.

and role in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs.³ The forthcoming economic research into GA could provide a useful insight into the importance of GA airfields and the Government will look again at planning issues in relation to airfields once the economic research has been undertaken.

At 8.2 the Panel recommended that **“Clarification of the designation and test and or re-classification or exemption should be sought in relation to classification of aerodromes as brownfield sites.”**

One of the core planning principles in the NPPF is to encourage the effective reuse of land that has been previously developed (brownfield land). This is designed to protect greenfield areas and contributes to community wellbeing by bringing underused or derelict land bank into use.⁴

While brownfield land is defined as land that has been previously developed, it is down to local authorities to interpret that definition. Aerodrome owners or operators should engage with the local planning process to try and influence how the aerodrome site is defined in local planning policies.

Furthermore at 8.3 the Panel suggested that **“Information should be provided directly to strategic airfields informing them of the benefits of their assets to the community and potential access to funding to assist with neighbourhood planning or designation of this kind of asset. “**

The Community Right to Bid gives communities a chance to nominate buildings and land as an asset of community value. If the local authority decides that the nominated asset meets the definition set out in the legislation it will add it to a register of assets of community value. If the asset is put up for sale the community can trigger a moratorium on the sale for up to 6 months. This will give local groups the opportunity to get together and raise finance to bid to buy the asset. It takes just 21 people who are already on the electoral register to nominate an asset. The government has put in place a free advice service (<http://mycommunityrights.org.uk>) and made available £17.5 million of grants to support communities that want to take over buildings and land.

Innovation and development

The Panel made two specific suggestions (9.2 and 9.3) regarding how innovation could be encouraged within GA:

The Government should facilitate partnerships with key manufacturers to encourage development of levels of GA expertise and the Government should evaluate potential technological developments for GA and the economic and employment benefits of this.

The Government engages with aerospace manufacturers and general aviation trade bodies through dialogue with ADS (the national aerospace trade associations for aerospace, defence and security) the Aerospace Growth Partnership and the British Business and General Aviation Association. There will also be benefits from building on these relationships with other key general aviation representative bodies via the proposed General and Business Aviation

³ National Planning Policy Framework, Department of Communities and Local Government, March 2012, <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/2116950.pdf>

⁴ NPPF, pg. 26

Strategic Forum. All of this work can benefit UK manufacturers who supply into the GA market – for example, on engine, airframe, advanced systems projects.

The GA community can also participate in the Knowledge Transfer Networks (KTNs), which facilitate innovation communities in the UK to connect, collaborate and find out about new opportunities in key research and technology sectors. Innovate UK also offers support and funding to help business develop new products and services – and bring them closer to market. Their assessment criteria for selection projects includes economic and employment benefits.

Aviation skills development

The Panel was keen to see a coordinated approach to the way skills in GA services are captured and developed and suggested (at 10.1) that **“The Government should engage with major industry groups, to develop a coordinated skills strategy for GA.”**

Government is planning to evaluate the GA by market segment as part of its economic research. It will consider the size, value and potential for growth of the training sector in the light of this evidence. If companies wish to compete for public funding for research & technology, supported by their own evidence around economic and employment benefits, they can do so – for example through the calls for bids published by the Technology Strategy Board (<https://www.gov.uk/technology-strategy-board>).

The Government has a range of schemes to support businesses of all sizes and these can be accessed by the GA community, as with other areas of business. It is for industry to identify its skills needs and how these may be supported through available public support schemes – for example, in respect of apprenticeship training funding. Consistent with this approach, BIS works closely with the aerospace manufacturing industry’s efforts on skills where industry, through the Aerospace Growth Partnership, has identified strategic skills requirements for which it is looking to commit increased private investment against which the Government is considering support under the Employer Ownership of Skills programme (<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/uk-commission-for-employment-and-skills>).

The Panel also recommended (10.3) that **“The Government should ensure new courses for GA engineering apprenticeships are available and adequately funded and consider launching a test programme.”**

Government is reforming Apprenticeships to make them more rigorous and responsive to the needs of small and large employers. The reforms will:

- Put employers in the driving seat of designing Apprenticeships so that they respond to the needs of industry.
- Simplify Apprenticeship standards replacing long, complex frameworks with short, simple, accessible standards written by employers in a language they understand.
- Increase the Quality of Apprenticeships through more rigorous testing at the end of the Apprenticeship and grading.
- Give employers greater control over funding in the future.

We are planning to route funding for Apprenticeship training via employers to give them greater control and purchasing power over Apprenticeship training. Introducing enforced co-investment will ensure employers have a greater stake in guaranteeing that the training provision their apprentices receive is high quality. We believe this approach has the potential to lead to a transformational change in the way employers engage with the Apprenticeship system. Considerable efforts are being made to ensure that any new funding model will work for small businesses. We also want employers to have a choice whether to delegate functions to a third party. A technical consultation asking for detailed feedback on the preferred funding mechanism closed on 1 May. We received over 1,200 responses which are now being considered.

The Apprenticeship Grant for Employers (AGE) (<http://www.apprenticeships.org.uk/Employers/Steps-to-make-it-happen/Incentive.aspx>) provides payments of £1,500 per apprentice to support smaller employers (with up to 1,000 employees) taking on a new apprentice aged 16-23. To be eligible the employer must not have taken on an apprentice in the previous 12 months. Employers can claim support for up to 10 apprentices. The 2014 Budget made available £170m additional funding over 2014-16. This will enable us to meet higher than originally anticipated demand for the grant in FY14-15, and extend starts on the scheme to December 2015. The new budget will fund over 100,000 additional incentive payments for employers to take on young apprentices (aged 16-24), providing a major boost to their job prospects. From January 2015, the scheme will be focused on companies with fewer than 50 employees as opposed to those with fewer than 1,000 employees as is currently the case.

Implementation of the reforms to Apprenticeships will be facilitated by Trailblazers led by employers and professional bodies. The leading employers involved in these Trailblazers are collaborating to design Apprenticeships to make them world-class. They are developing the new Apprenticeship Standards and a high level assessment approach and these will become the standards for Apprenticeships in these occupations. This will build on what already exists to ensure that professionalism and quality in training are the primary focus. The standards produced by the first Trailblazers were published on 4 March 2014 (www.apprenticeships.org.uk/standards) and publication of the Phase 2 standards is due in July. A full list of sectors and employers involved can be viewed in our [Trailblazer Guidance](#). Trailblazer activity will continue throughout 2014/15; we expect the first new Apprenticeships will begin to be delivered during 2014/15 and our aim is that from 2017/18 all Apprenticeships starts will be on the new standards.

There are currently both Phase 1 and Phase 2 Trailblazers in the aviation sector:

1. Aerospace – Led by organisations including Airbus, BAE Systems, GKN Aerospace, the Institution of Engineering and Technology, Magellan Aerospace UK Ltd, Marshall Aerospace and Defence Group, MSM Aerospace Fabricators, Rolls-Royce, the Institute of Mechanical Engineers, GTA England, the National Federation of Engineering Centres and the Royal Aeronautical Society. This has developed the standard for an Aerospace Manufacturing Fitter.

2. Airworthiness – Led by organisations including British Business & General Aviation Association, LRTT Ltd, BAE Systems, Aircraft Maintenance & Support, Virgin Atlantic Airways Ltd, Avalonaero, Harrods Aviation Limited, Civil Aviation Authority, NAL Asset Management Ltd, Aviation Quality Management Services Ltd, Rizon Jet UK Ltd, Airbus, Rolls Royce, Marshalls Aerospace, Inflight MRO Services (Stansted & Southend), and Ministry of Defence. This will develop the standard for an Aircraft Maintenance Fitter/Mechanic.
3. Aviation – Led by organisations including British Airways, Birmingham Airport, Bristol Airport, Coventry Airport Ltd, Exeter International Airport, Gatwick Airport, Heathrow Airport Ltd, Leeds Bradford International Airport, London City Airport, London Gatwick Airport, London Southend Airport, Newcastle International Airport, Norwich International Airport, OmniServe, Southampton International Airport, Stobart Air, Swissport Ltd and the Royal Air Force. This will develop the standard for an Airside Operations Operative.

With regards to Higher Education loans we have to prioritise the public funding we give to higher education, in terms of both the funds we give universities for teaching and learning and the money we make available to students for their support. The Higher Education student support system in this country is generally designed to fund broadly-based undergraduate level study and is not intended to support specific professional or vocational training. Training to become a pilot is training for a commercially-based profession, like accountancy or law. We do not fund the professional training involved in becoming a solicitor or a barrister, on the basis that sponsorship from future employers or commercial loans are available to students who can look forward to high earnings when qualified. There are some publicly funded institutions in the UK such as Brunel University and Buckinghamshire New University which offer degrees linked to the aviation industry. Some include opportunities to undertake pilot training. In these cases the Student Support Regulations allow us to fund the academic elements of the course, while the student has to meet the cost of the commercial pilot's licence and the required flying experience. It is important that all those involved in the aviation sector work together to develop and support a variety of pathways and routes for individuals to enter the profession. It is particularly important that employers are involved in this work as we need to ensure that the supply of pilots meets their needs.

International students

Regarding the visa requirements for GA training the Panel suggested that (10.2) **“The Government should ensure that visa requirements and training courses focused on attracting overseas students are fully coordinated and communicated.”**

The UK has a great offer to attract the best international students. Those with the right qualifications, sufficient funds to cover their fees and maintenance costs, and a good level of English can study here with no annual limit on numbers. It is a fundamental Government rule that visitors to the UK must intend to return to their home country after their visit. For that reason, student visitors are not permitted to switch into longer term migration routes like Tier 4. However, we will consider further whether there is a particular problem regarding students who come to the

UK to study English language training with the intention of immediately moving on to aviation training (where a high level of English language ability is a pre-requisite).

PSO funds

The Government has recently developed an initiative to consider possible funding for air service routes under Public Service Obligations. As such the Panel considered (at 10.4) **“The Government should encourage the use of PSO funds for new route development between regional airfields and a London airport.”**

As part of the 2013 Spending Round announcement the Chief Secretary to the Treasury announced that £20million would be made available over 2014-16 period to maintain regional air access to London through the establishment of a Public Service Obligation (PSO), where there was the probability that an existing air service would be lost.

The Chancellor announced in the Budget 2014 that this fund would double in value to £20 million per year to ensure that the UK is able to maintain its existing regional air links to London. Significantly the Chancellor also announced that applications will now also be allowed for start-up aid for new routes from UK regional airports which handle fewer than five million passengers per annum that meet the new EU aviation State aid guidelines which will provide the opportunity for airports outside the south east to improve connectivity and stimulate further economic growth in their regions.

The Department for Transport is working with the Treasury to develop guidance which will clarify how the Government will ordinarily expect to interpret the EUs aviation State aid guidelines, and explain how the funding process will work. This will determine how the funding process will operate in practice. The guidance is expected to be published over the summer and this will provide information for those organisations seeking to make applications for supporting air routes.

Once this guidance has been published, the Government would encourage eligible airfields to consider applying for this funding.

Economic Research into GA

Data on the value of GA is outdated and that panel therefore recommended that (10.5) the **“Government research on GA should focus on the economic value it could bring to the UK.”**

The most recent research into the economic benefit of the UK GA sector was undertaken in 2005, when it was estimated that the sector contributed around £1.4 billion annually to the UK economy. During its discussions the Panel noted that this research was now out of date and that its work had been made more challenging because of gaps in the existing data which is available in relation to the GA sector. It recommended that the Government should fund a short piece of research to establish the current economic contribution of GA as well as addressing these gaps in the evidence base.

Ministers in the Department for Transport and the Cabinet Office agreed that a short project, funded by the Government’s Ministerial Contestability fund should be undertaken to improve knowledge of these issues.

The project will consist of research into the economic contribution of the GA sector, where we would look to identify current evidence on the value of the sector as well as any data gaps which exist, and seek potential areas for the Government to target when exploring future policy interventions for protecting the growth of the GA sector. For example the research might inform thinking on the potential for growth of the UK aviation training sector or influence views on the characteristics of a key airport on the national network. Work on this project has now begun and this will report to Ministers at the end of the year.

GA Border issues

The Government is grateful to have the opportunity to respond to the General Aviation Report in respect of customs matters.

The Government recognises the problems facing UK GA and is committed to ensuring that customs requirements do not impede opportunities for growth and improving the contribution of General Aviation (GA). GA provides particular challenges for the customs authorities because of the unscheduled and unpredictable nature of the associated air traffic. The Government is committed to delivering the smoothest passage possible for legitimate pilots, passengers and goods. However, in developing our policies we seek to balance a customs service that reflects modern international trade practices, whilst delivering a safe, secure and effective Border with safeguards and sanctions that help reduce the tax gap and protect UK Borders.

HMRC works closely with the sector on the development of GA policy and have fully engaged with the sector to understand fully the issues around advance notification.

Background to HMRC & Border Force

It may be helpful to set out the way that HMRC and Border Force interact. This may then explain why there will be difficulties in implementing all of the Panel's recommendations.

The Secretary of State exercises general customs functions concurrently with the HMRC Commissioners. The Secretary of State also designates an official in her Department as the Director of Border Revenue which reflects the dual accountability of Border Force to the Home Secretary and, in respect of its revenue functions at the border, to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The revenue functions of Border Force are vested in the statutory office of the Director of Border Revenue who, like HMRC, acts subject to the general direction of the Treasury.

The Borders, Citizenship and Immigration Act 2009 (BCIA 2009) was framed to ensure that, in exercising revenue functions, the Secretary of State is required to act in accordance with the policies and guidance of the Commissioners. The BCIA 2009 did not transfer any of the powers of the Commissioners for HMRC. In practice accountability is exercised through the Financial Secretary to the Treasury who has oversight in the Treasury over customs and excise matters. The legislation for customs and immigration matters is separate and distinct, which was why the BCIA was drafted in this manner because, by convention, decisions on tax liability, including customs duties and tax administration generally, are kept at arm's length from Ministers.

Specific concerns

It may be helpful to clarify some of the assumptions made by the Panel. First, there are significant differing requirements between Immigration and Customs reporting requirements albeit that Border Force delivers both activities operationally.

There is also a need for clarity around places that can handle GA aircraft. For Customs purposes places where GA aircraft may arrive/depart have to be approved under UK legislation. These places fall into 2 categories:

1. Airports designated by DfT which are open generally to all types of aircraft and may include GA terminals. Customs legislation requires these airports to operate under an Examination Station Approval; and
2. Non-designated locations where HMRC, as a customs facilitation measure, permit the arrival and departure of limited types of air traffic including GA aircraft. Such places operate under a Certificate of Approval.

'General Aviation Agreement Aerodrome' is not a term recognised for customs purposes.

It should also be understood that the requirement to submit a 'General Aviation Report' (GAR) is, primarily, a customs requirement. UK customs legislation requires all modes of transport to report inwards. In the case of General Aviation aircraft the means of doing this is by completing the GAR. Therefore the proposal to make its use at Ports of Entry as only 'best practice' would be contrary to a legal requirement. Further to this, 'Ports of Entry' is not a term used by Customs as it has no legal bearing.

The Panel recommended (no.11) that **“The Government should ensure that border regulations and security and airport administrative procedures do not impinge of GA activity.”**

The Government is committed to delivering a safe, secure and effective border and to preventing terrorism. General Aviation (GA) provides particular challenges for Border Force (BF) and the police because of the unscheduled and unpredictable nature of the traffic. Whilst security is our priority, we want to ensure the smoothest passage possible for pilots, passengers and goods who pose no security, immigration or customs issues. In developing our policies we therefore seek to balance our security requirements with the need to keep the regulatory burden on the sector to a necessary minimum.

The Home Office seeks to work closely with the sector on the development of GA policy. We have recently launched a consultation on proposals for BF to charge for GA premium services, and have engaged with the GA representative bodies to fully understand their concerns around advance notification. The National Crime Agency has also recently re-launched Operation Pegasus, the multi-agency approach to securing community intelligence on suspicious GA flight movements (<http://www.nationalcrimeagency.gov.uk/campaigns/project-pegasus-aviation-vigilance>).

Notification periods

The Panel also suggested at 11.1 that **“The notification period for GA flights should be reduced to a maximum of one hour and should not be required at ports of entry.”**

The Home Office has been working with HMRC to strengthen the advance notification framework for customs purposes. HMRC acknowledge the difficulties the GA sector currently have in respect of reporting for customs purposes and this will shortly form part of a joint HMRC and Border Force consultation on the Commissioners Directions (CDs). It should be noted that the CDs are only in respect of Passenger Information as the main legal requirement for GA reporting is a general requirement for customs purposes.

The timescales referred to in the report in respect of submitting the GAR are not being enforced at the moment for customs purposes pending consultation on our proposals. HMRC and Border Force will consult on proposals to make the timescale for advance notification for designated customs ports to one hour before departure. They will also consider any views on the notification timescales for Certificate of Agreement airports with a view to reducing the burden on GA but taking into account the level of threat and risk concerned. However, references to ‘Ports of Entry’ are not applicable.

We are also considering whether we need to strengthen the advance notification framework for immigration purposes. We will consult with the sector on any such proposals.

Terrorism Act 2000

At 11.2 the Panel recommended that **“The provision under the Terrorism Act 2000 which requires that pilots give Special Branch notification should be taken out and should adopt measures similar to those for other forms of transport.”**

We will review the current notification provisions and their operation to establish if a different approach can provide an appropriate level of security assurance without placing unnecessary burdens on the sector.

Border force and notification periods

The Panel also encouraged (11.3) **“Border Force (BF) should work with the GA sector to improve notification procedures which secure them high quality information yet streamline notification procedures for GA pilots.”**

We have regular contact with the GA sector and are keen to work together for mutual benefit, including on notification procedures. A good example of this is the Collaborative Business Portal (CBP) for submission of General Aviation Reports (GARs) which was developed in conjunction with one of the representative bodies, and the development of the electronic GAR. We are also developing an automated system for cross-checking GARs and flight plans and a 24 hour helpline for contingency situations.

Customs and immigration

At 11.4 the Panel considered that **“The Government should develop a clear strategy on customs and immigration.”**

The Home Office and HMRC are aligned in our ambitions for the border. The Government have noted the recommendation at 11.4 but have no plans to change their policy on how customs requirements are administered at the Border. HMRC and the Home Office work closely on the development of policy and BF’s strategic priorities are set by the Ministers of the two Departments. The transfer of, or trying to transfer, the policy accountability to one agency would be fraught with legal and practical difficulties. It would confuse customs and immigration controls and require considerable legislative changes. We are not immediately persuaded that the benefits of restructuring the way that customs requirements are administered at the Border, or the system of designations for customs/immigration/police purposes would justify the challenge of doing so. Our intention is for BF to be the best in the world.

We recognise that the legislative framework for GA users crossing the border is complex and confusing. We will do what we can to ensure that we communicate the requirements clearly to the sector and ensure that all processes and requirements are effective, clear and easy to understand.

Finally the Panel also believed (11.5) that **“The Government should negotiate improved co-operation with European authorities to enable flights originating in the UK to land at airfields that do not have customs facilities.”**

HMRC has a key role in influencing the negotiations on the adoption and delivery of the Union Customs Code, and the longer term development of the EU Future Customs Initiative (FCI). However, this is a matter for individual Member States to decide upon and not something the Government could attempt to influence.

Ministry of Defence (MOD) Issues

There is scope for GA to use some military airfields around the UK subject to meeting specific requirements at applicable sites. Whilst the Panel did not offer views on this, the Ministry of Defence (MOD) has agreed to engage and work with the Department for Transport (DfT) to examine whether access can be enhanced for GA flights to military airfields where possible and to identify any specific issues which might be constraining GA users from making the most of the opportunities offered by this arrangement.

Next Steps

The Government and the CAA will continue to work towards bringing about improvements for the GA sector over the coming months. The GA Challenge Panel’s report has provided Government with a starting point to put in place policies which will bring about beneficial changes to the way in which GA is regulated in the UK.

Once the proposed Economic Research has reported at the end of 2014 and has been fully analysed, the Government will be in a better position to assess whether it is appropriate to put in place additional new policies which could support the GA sector.

The Government is aiming to publish the GA Strategy and full delivery plan next spring, which will be timely as this will be a year on from the establishment of the CAA's GA Unit. Government will work with the General and Business Aviation Strategic Forum and the GA community to develop this GA Strategy so that the GA sector can ensure that it reflects a shared understanding of priorities for reform.

Annex A

CAA work for UK General Aviation

Building on the formation of the dedicated GA Unit in the CAA and our response to the GA Red Tape Challenge we continue to be committed to supporting and encouraging a dynamic recreational GA sector. With a safety regulation system that imposes the minimum necessary burden and empowers individuals to make responsible decisions to secure acceptable safety outcomes, to make the UK the best country in the world for general aviation.

Our work for GA has included:

1. National

All GA

- We have consulted on and developed the GA Policy Framework which will allow us to deliver a better, transparent and more proportionate approach to the regulation of GA. The ongoing use of the framework as a basis for our decision making will ensure we embed a more proportionate and risk based culture within the CAA. The final policy will be published in November 2014 but we have already used its basic principles to allow the first paid passenger flights in a Spitfire aircraft without the operator needing a full Air Operators Certificate approval.
- We have started a review of the Air Navigation Order (ANO) where it affects GA. One aim of the project is to consult on further deregulation. The work will be overseen by a GA community challenge panel. A public consultation on initial concepts will begin in late March 2015, with a second consultation on specific opportunities for deregulation in September 2015.
- We now allow the use of pilot controlled lighting at licensed aerodromes.
- We now allow aircraft owners to make the choice of whether or not to use EN 228 Mogas fuel in their aircraft if it is allowed in the aircraft flight manual or relevant approval.
- We have removed the need for aircraft owners to renew an existing exemption for their aircraft to carry military markings.

- We have allowed the Light Aircraft Association to start flight tests with the aim of permitting permit aircraft to fly at night and in instrument conditions. We will work with the LAA to grant this permission in 2015.
- We have provided the framework to enable other organisations to provide airworthiness oversight of small aircraft.
- We deregulated all single seat microlight aeroplanes up to 300kg Maximum Take-off Mass for airworthiness and noise purposes.
- We relaxed the certification rules for handheld radios to be used in 'non-EASA' aircraft.

Training and licensing

- We have reduced the number of Private Pilot Licence (PPL) theoretical knowledge examination questions to the 120 specified by EASA.
- Together with GA training experts we have completed a review of the PPL and LAPL training syllabi to remove legacy requirements and ensure it is relevant for today's world. The new syllabi will be notified to EASA as an Alternative Means of Compliance with full implementation in the latter half of 2015. This will be completed in conjunction with the introduction of on-line PPL exams.
- We issued revised procedures and requirements for pre-notification and procedures for examiners holding Part-FCL certificates outside the UK.
- We made national licenses valid for life.
- We asked a recently qualified pilot to undertake a review of the process an individual goes through to obtain a PPL in the UK. It included looking at the costs, regulatory requirements and other associated hurdles. We will use its findings to help introduce improvements to the process.
- We removed the requirement for full IFR screens on instrument training flights.

Gyroplanes

- We have worked closely with the gyroplane community (since 2012) and have introduced a new instructor training course and syllabus and a panel of gyroplane examiners which meets twice a year to review training standards, accident reports and future developments.
- We now allow the hiring of type approved gyroplanes via clubs.

2. EU and International

- By adopting some parts of EASA's non commercial operation rules early we allowed a relaxation to the rules on private flight cost sharing and increased from four to six the number of people who may share costs. It also allows PPL and LAPL holders to act as pilot in command on introductory flights undertaken within an organisation and clarified that sailplane towing and parachute dropping are non commercial operations.

- We worked with EASA to agree a faster rule making process to:
 - increase the upper age limit for single pilots of commercial balloon flights;
 - rationalise the revalidation requirements for balloon group ratings;
 - continue the use of revalidation examiner privileges;
 - make seaplane and amphibious rating revalidations more proportionate.
- We engaged with EASA and member states to propose deferring the requirement for Part-FCL flight crew training to be conducted at Approved Training Organisations until April 2018. We also strongly supported proposed alternative options for private pilot training to continue outside of ATOs beyond April 2018. These will be voted on at the October 2014 EASA committee.
- We worked with EASA and other Member States to develop proposals to simplify the requirements to become a non-complex Approved Training Organisation.

3. Airspace

- We published a new more proportionate policy for instrument approaches at aerodromes (www.caa.co.uk/cap1122)
- We helped facilitate the work of the Future Airspace Strategy VFR Implementation Group (FASVIG) to enable GA to be more involved in the UK's Future Airspace Strategy (FAS). A cross-sector implementation plan, which will set out the approach to deployment of specific VFR initiatives, will be launched at a FASVIG conference in Spring 2015.
- Working closely with NATS and consulting with GA we amended pilot charts to reduce the amount of clutter and make other improvements in the way they show information.

4. Governance and Finance

- In addition to setting up the GA Unit, a General Aviation Partnership group has been established to encourage collaborative working.
- We allowed maintenance and continuing airworthiness organisations to list categories of non-complex aircraft rather than individual types reducing the number of approvals required and providing a financial saving.
- We have started an in-depth review of our fees and charges to GA to ensure that these are coherent and proportionate with the amount of work we undertake for each task. The first stage of this project will be completed during spring 2015 and feed into our 2016/17 FY fees and charges consultation process.

Annex B

Objectives of the General and Business Aviation Strategic Forum (GBASF)

- To foster the development of a sustainable and safe General Aviation sector in the UK.
- To challenge, oversee & prioritise the delivery of the Government's reform programme for General Aviation to deliver on the commitment to provide a proportionate regulatory regime for General Aviation that cuts unnecessary bureaucracy and red tape.
- To support the effective implementation and execution of the CAA GA Unit's Programme of work and ongoing output.
- Advise the CAA Financial Advisory Committee (FAC) ensuring strategic requirements for GA are fully taken into account in the fees and charges applied by the CAA.
- Ensure that wider views of other GA stakeholder bodies which are relevant to specific programme delivery areas are properly considered.
- To facilitate alignment of UK Stakeholders on EU regulatory proposals affecting General Aviation.
- Advise the Aviation Minister on strategic Government issues affecting GA. (Produce for the Aviation Minister an annual position report on the delivery of the Government's reform programme)
- The Agenda and Approved Minutes of the GBASF will be published on the CAA Website.

The Membership of the GBASF is comprised of:

CAA	CEO, DARSG, and Head GA Unit
DfT	Head of Aviation Policy (DfT Aviation Director annual attendance)
AOPA	CEO
BBGA	CEO
GAA	GAA Facilitator (Chairman)

By agreement with the Chairman others may attend in an advisory role for whole meetings or for specific topics.

Secretariat support will be provided by the CAA to attend meetings and provide administrative support to aid the functioning of the GBASF.

The tasks of the Chairman are to:

- Chair the meetings of GBASF.
- Prepare, together with the Secretary, the agenda and documentation for the meetings.
- Serve as a contact point for the Secretariat on subjects dealt with by the GBASF Members between meetings.
- Represent GBASF, when necessary, in its contacts with any third party.

The tasks of the secretariat are to:

- Distribute preparatory documents, agenda, working papers and minutes for meetings.
- Update of the membership and contact list.
- Provide general meeting administration.
- Distribution of papers, communications etc to outside recipients.
- Draft the agenda and preparatory documents.
- Attend meetings and draft the minutes.
- Assist the Chairman with the conduct of the meeting.

Meeting arrangements

The GBASF will meet quarterly. The Chairman may propose to hold further meetings at their discretion or by the proposal of a Member, with the agreement of the majority of GBASF members.

GBASF members are appointed by position held in their respective organisations. However, members unable to attend a notified meeting may nominate an alternative for that meeting. Such alternate should be notified to the Chairman and Secretary prior to the meeting.

If a particular meeting or agenda item requires specialist knowledge not available within the GBASF then appropriate specialists can be invited by the Chairman to attend as required. Such attendance will be notified in advance of the meeting.

The GBASF may establish ad hoc working groups as necessary in order to deal with specific subjects.

The DfT will also prepare and distribute appropriate papers as required.

The GBASF Chairman or the Head of the GA Unit will give a synopsis of its activities and issues to the General Aviation Partnership Group.

GBASF – Finance Advisory Committee (FAC) engagement

1. GBASF will form a subgroup comprising selected members of GBASF and appropriate GA representative experts to review and advise FAC on the CAA Scheme of Charges proposals in the context of the Government's GA Programme. Recommendations made by the GBASF Finance Subgroup, not agreed by the FAC, will be submitted to the CAA Board for further consideration.
2. The scope of General Aviation in this context has been specifically designed to align with EU regulatory classification and CAA industry oversight accountability. It is accountable for regulatory oversight of airworthiness, operations and associated personnel training and licensing for non-commercial operation of 'other-than complex' aircraft. This encompasses aircraft ranging from microlights, historic, and amateur-built aircraft, through to balloons, airships and gliders, piston twins and single-engine turbine aeroplanes to 5700kg Max Take-Off Mass (MTOM), and single-pilot helicopters to 3175kg MTOM. The GA Unit will also have oversight of GA-aligned non-EASA aerodromes.
3. To achieve the above the GBASF will:
 - a. Support the work of the FAC by examining the financial costs associated with GA activities and the impact on CAA Schemes of Charges.
 - b. Report and agree all findings and recommendations with the FAC for before implementation of any recommendations by industry and/or the CAA GA Unit.
 - c. Make its recommendations to the FAC, as far as possible, based upon consensus. If consensus cannot be achieved then the opposing views are to be recorded and all views passed to the FAC for consideration in their deliberations.
 - d. Invite a CAA Finance Department representative to meetings where finance issues are to be discussed to ensure that proposals and issues can be fully and effectively debated.

Annex C

Response to Challenge Panel recommendation

RTC recommendation	Comments
Interim recommendation 1: regular economic research should be conducted into the value of GA to the UK economy.	The Government will commission Economic research over the summer which will update the evidence base on the current value of the GA sector to the UK economy. This will report in early in 2015.
Interim recommendation 2: the CAA should collect data on GA in a way that balances proportionality in the cost and burden of collection with the need to have a sound evidence-base when making regulatory decisions.	The CAA agrees that reliable quantitative data is important and is working with the GA community to identify efficient methods to capture data (e.g. on airspace utilisation) which will aid sound decision making and risk assessment. In terms of safety data reporting CAA will work with GA organisations to ensure that the new European occurrence reporting regulation is interpreted in a pragmatic way whilst promoting the benefits of reporting to facilitate effective 'cost-benefit based' decision making.
Interim recommendation 3: the CAA should, where possible and proportionate, analyse and make available the data on GA it collects.	CAA recognises the need to make the most of the data it collects in order to promote efficient use of oversight and inform areas of potential de-regulation. As an example, the CAA is producing a detailed 10-year analysis of GA safety data, which will be published in 2015 and promoted within GA circles, to help inform areas of safety improvement through non-regulatory means.
Interim recommendation 4: GA programme success should be measured by outcome focussed, robust data that can be proportionately collected or is already collected but not analysed, and can be used as a metric without creating unintended consequence.	As noted in the responses to recommendations 2 and 3 the CAA, together with the General and Business Aviation Strategic Forum (GBASF), will have a key role in agreeing performance metrics, the data upon which these are based and a robust approach to the use of a post-implementation review process.

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Interim recommendation 5: the CAA GA Unit should consider a range of measures for success (including hours flown, aerodrome numbers, safety levels, charges to the GA sector, the proportion of craft operated from the UK not on the UK register, impact assessments, and pilot medicals), and regularly publish data on several different measures of success.</p>	<p>The CAA agrees that appropriate measures of success will have to be developed. The General and Business Aviation Strategic Forum will have a key role to play in doing this.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 6: the CAA publish an annual report of activities undertaken that will change the cost or burden of compliance for GA.</p>	<p>The CAA agrees that the GA Unit should report publicly on its work and achievements, including reducing the burden of regulation. This will be done throughout the year as well as through an Annual Report.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 7: the CAA be given a duty to have regard to the desirability of promoting economic growth, and for the CAA to consider opportunities for GA to contribute to economic growth when carrying out that duty.</p>	<p>The Government has proposed a new Growth Duty for non-economic regulators, including the CAA, as part of the Deregulation Bill. This legislation is currently going through the Parliamentary process and it is hoped that this will enter into force from April 2015.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 8: the UK should support the European Commission's proposal to change EU legislation to give EASA objectives that balance safety, growth and a proportionate approach to risk.</p>	<p>The Government will carefully consider any formal proposal for legislative change that the Commission may issue. However, we have always made it clear that we support a regulatory regime which that balances safety and growth, and take a proportionate approach to risk.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 9: the Government should review the requirement that the CAA provide a 6% return on capital.</p>	<p>Ministers have agreed to this recommendation and the Government will undertake the review as soon as possible.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Interim recommendation 10: the CAA should work to ensure that positive changes in its culture of GA regulation permeate throughout the organisation.</p>	<p>The CAA recognises that delivering on its commitments to significantly reduce red tape burden on GA will require a fundamental and sustained shift in mindset at all levels within the organisation, including our front line staff, and approach. The essential elements of this approach will be;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * clear leadership from the Board of the CAA as demonstrated in its November 2013 response to the RTC, * A dedicated team which includes both policy makers and inspectors, established as the GA Unit knowledgeable about general aviation and whose individual performance will be judged against the CAA Board’s statement. * A clear programme of activity, delivery against which will be transparently reported. * Transparent policy principles against which it will take decisions on regulation (the Policy Framework that the CAA is consulting on). * Effective engagement with the GA community , as evidenced in the reshaping of the GBASF and creation of the GA Partnership to set priorities, gather feedback and stimulate sector appetite for delegation and deregulation. * Proactive engagement in the European arena as demonstrated by the Head of the GA Unit taking on the role of chair of the EASA National Aviation Authorities GA Roadmap Group and is a member of the six-strong EASA GA Task Force. * A programme of legislative changes in the UK and within EASA that will be necessary to facilitate the freedoms to which the CAA is committed. * The CAA have consulted on the GA Policy Framework (to be released to the public in November 2014) and has already been used to deliver a better and more proportionate approach to the regulation of GA. Continued use of the framework will help permanently embed a more proportionate and risk based culture within the CAA.
<p>Interim recommendation 11: the CAA should work to communicate clearly with the GA sector in developing and communicating regulatory decisions.</p>	<p>The CAA, and specifically the GA Unit, has an active strategy for engaging with the GA community. Key elements of this are the refreshed General and Business Aviation Strategic Forum (GBASF) and the new GA Partnership. These groups ensure that stakeholder input to regulatory reforms are sought in advance of final decision making. Our engagement with the GA community will be further enhanced by a dedicated GA section on the CAA website once the new web platform is introduced post-Nov 2014.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Interim recommendation 12: the CAA should establish regular meetings between the CAA CEO and senior staff and frontline GA practitioners to improve communication between the CAA and those it regulates in discussions of the impact of CAA regulation and oversight.</p>	<p>The CAA's Chief Executive and senior staff already often meet many GA stakeholders through a combination of scheduled meetings with association representatives, site visits to GA locations, speaking engagements, meetings with individuals at their request and other events. In addition the Chief Executive is now a member of the General and Business Aviation Strategic Forum and the CAA Board now receives updates on the progress of the GA Unit. The GA Programme of work is undergoing a review and will be re-published in November 2014.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 13: the CAA should focus efforts on explaining the EASA regulatory framework and the rationale behind it, using links to the original regulations where feasible.</p>	<p>CAA is part of the regulatory process, as are all parts of the aviation sector, including GA. CAA will continue to communicate the background to regulatory decisions and in doing so clarify areas of alleged 'gold-plating'. We are also working with EASA with there new initiative to take a New Approach to General Aviation and part of this work includes the production of handbook or web-tool listing all current GA rules with the aim to make them easier to find and to understand.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Interim recommendation 14: the CAA should set out the cultural and organisational measures it will take to protect and reward good management of total system safety in accordance with the risk-based proportionate approach.</p>	<p>The CAA recognises that delivering on its commitments to significantly reduce red tape burden on GA will require a fundamental and sustained shift in mindset at all levels within the organisation, including our front line staff, and approach. The essential elements of this approach will be;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Clear leadership from the Board of the CAA as demonstrated in its November 2013 response to the RTC, * A dedicated team which includes both policy makers and inspectors, established as the GA Unit knowledgeable about general aviation and whose individual performance will be judged against the CAA Board's statement. * A clear programme of activity, delivery against which will be transparently reported. * Transparent policy principles against which it will take decisions on regulation (the Policy Framework that the CAA is consulting on). * Effective engagement with the GA community , as evidenced in the establishment of the GBASF and creation of the GA Partnership to set priorities, gather feedback and stimulate sector appetite for delegation and deregulation. * Proactive engagement in the European arena as demonstrated by the Head of the GA Unit taking on the role of chair of the EASA National Aviation Authorities GA Roadmap Group and is a member of the six-strong EASA GA Task Force. * A programme of legislative changes in the UK and within EASA that will be necessary to facilitate the freedoms to which the CAA is committed. * The CAA have consulted on the GA Policy Framework (to be released to the public in November 2014) and this has already been used to deliver a better and more proportionate approach to the regulation of GA. Continued use of the framework will help permanently embed a more proportionate and risk based culture within the CAA. * The CAA have started a review of all areas of the Air Navigation Order (the main UK law covering aviation) that affect GA with a commitment to consult on further areas which can be deregulated. A public consultation on initial concepts will begin in late March 2015, with a second consultation on specific deregulatory proposals in September 2015 and changes to the ANO planned to come into force in 2016. This review will undertaken by thematic Working Groups consisting of staff from across the CAA following a process which cover the Better Regulation principles and those outlined in the GA Policy Framework thus helping change the culture within the CAA.

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Interim recommendation 15: the Government should ensure that the legal framework supports good management of total system safety in accordance with the risk-based proportionate approach, and protects individuals from civil liability where they make decisions in accordance with that approach.</p>	<p>The Government believes that the existing legal framework already facilitates good management of total system safety in accordance with the risk-based proportionate approach, and protects individuals from civil liability where they make decisions in accordance with this. The Department for Transport supports this position in all of its dealings with both the European Commission/EASA and in the development of domestic regulations.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 16: the CAA should work with the European Commission and EASA to ensure that the UK framework for the regulation of promotional flights is consistent with the European framework, and to develop a common understanding of 'informed consent'.</p>	<p>The CAA has already implemented this recommendation by providing ANO exemptions in advance of UK's derogation introduction of EU Part NCO regulations in August 2016. This permitted PPL and LAPL holders to act as Pilot in Command on introductory flights undertaken within an organisation. Additionally, the CAA have consulted on the GA Policy Framework (to be released to the public in November 2014) and this has already been used to deliver a better and more proportionate approach to the regulation of GA.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 17: the CAA should develop clear, quantitative target level of safety (allowable risk levels) for each different class of stakeholder exposed to risk, against which potential regulatory interventions can be assessed. It may be necessary to specify a marginal expenditure of resource to be compared with the risk (e.g. the Value of Preventing a Fatality) for stakeholders with little or no control over their risk exposure.</p>	<p>The CAA have consulted on the GA Policy Framework (to be released to the public at the end of November 2014) and this has enabled us to better understand appropriate risk levels for GA activity. EASA are also considering work on allowable levels of risk under their new approach to GA work. The CAA will contribute to and consider the outcomes of this work.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 18: the CAA should carefully consider the cost-benefit of all certification and approval processes over which it has discretion, and apply criteria of cost (including compliance costs and time, as well as fees) vs. benefit (including confidence and complexity factors) to decide if certification/ approval is warranted.</p>	<p>This will form part of the project prioritisation criteria. Considering the cost versus benefit of any significant regulatory change is now a specific step in the CAA's policy development process.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Interim recommendation 19: where EU regulation requires certification or approval that is not supported by a favourable cost benefit, the CAA should apply the lightest possible touch to such processes to minimise compliance burden, and where appropriate, lobby for changes to the EU regulation.</p>	<p>The CAA participates in all layers of scrutiny in the regulatory development process and consistently lobbies to ensure a positive cost benefit outcome. The GA Unit has now been established to apply such regulation in the lightest possible manner in accordance with the CAA's commitment not to 'gold plate'.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 20: the Government should, with immediate effect, issue a general exemption from the requirement to obtain permission for paid flight instruction to the owner (or joint owners) of a foreign-registered aircraft.</p>	<p>The Government only requires owner/operators of non EEA registered aircraft to obtain permission for any paid flight instruction/examination in the UK. The vast majority of the aircraft that this relates to are USA registered for which there is no regular safety oversight in the UK by the US FAA. If the Government were to issue a general exemption for such a requirement this would encourage a further influx of USA registered aircraft to be based in the UK. There would be no restriction for the use for these aircraft on a commercial basis for flight training purposes, causing great concern due to the lack of a safety oversight.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 21: the Government should review the value added by the current regulatory framework for aerial work in foreign-registered aircraft and consider entirely removing the requirement to obtain permission.</p>	<p>If the Government were to remove the regulatory requirement for non EEA registered aircraft to carry out any type of aerial work, such as aerial photography/survey, parachute dropping etc. in the UK, this could have both serious security and safety implications.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 22: the CAA should cease its practice of requiring certified version of documents submitted in support of licence applications.</p>	<p>The CAA will consider reviewing its policy versus EU regulation and make suitable changes where appropriate and where the risk of fraudulent applications is low.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 23: the CAA should use impact assessments to conduct a genuine exploration of options, not to justify simplistic make-rule vs. do-nothing options.</p>	<p>The CAA agrees in respect of UK regulations. Impact assessments for EU regulations are the responsibility of EASA and the Commission. The CAA will do this in accordance with Better Regulation principles, enhancing its internal Mandate process to specifically include 'assessment of potential alternatives'. The policy development process used by the CAA specifically seeks to identify, explore and assess all credible options.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Interim recommendation 24: the CAA should consider in all impact assessments strategies to mitigate the effects on GA, and small businesses, and on other classes of affected stakeholder for whom benefits may be limited and costs disproportionate.</p>	<p>Considering the cost versus benefit of any significant regulatory change is now a specific step in the CAA's policy development process. The GA Unit will work with the General Aviation Partnership to resolve specific issues as they arise.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 25: where impact assessments depend on cost-benefit arguments, the CAA should a) pay particular attention to the sensitivity of costs and benefits to any assumptions made, particularly forecasts in relation to system capacity; and b) conduct a post-hoc review of the actual costs incurred and benefits delivered in practice to improve the quality and reliability of future impact assessments.</p>	<p>Considering the cost versus benefit of any significant regulatory change is now a specific step in the policy development process. There is also a step to assess the effectiveness and impact of such changes both during and post implementation to ensure that it did not impose excessive costs and to identify lessons learned relevant to future activities.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 26: the CAA should review and update all policies on GNSS usage to address practical risk compared to the status quo, not theoretical risk against an arbitrary standard. It should also seek to accelerate the introduction of GPS approaches to a larger number of UK GA focused airfields.</p>	<p>CAA has published CAP1122 to set out policy for a more proportionate approach to new instrument approach procedures at a much wider range of aerodromes. This policy will need to be further developed as work in this important area is taken forward. The CAA is working closely with the GA Community to facilitate aerodrome owners wishing to establish new GNSS approaches.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Interim recommendation 27: the CAA should design policies and procedures for ensuring that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where possible innovative new technologies are assessed for benefit vs. risk against current technologies on the basis of practical risk, not hypothetical hazard, using available information and data; • operational experience of new technologies can be incorporated into regulation in a timely and effective review process; and • due consideration is given to experience with such technologies in other, early-adopter states. 	<p>The DfT funded spectrum release programme, which is considering and encouraging the use of ground-breaking surveillance technology is a good example of the CAA's willingness to adopt this approach when appropriate. An example of assessing new technologies in a proportionate manner is the work underway between CAA and industry, with assistance from DfT, to define proportionate technical standards for ADS-B based electronic conspicuity.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 28: the CAA should carefully consider differences to ICAO standards, in particular phraseology and terminology, to evaluate whether the safety advantage of the UK difference is outweighed by the potential confusion to affected stakeholders.</p>	<p>In delivering any new or revised policy and regulation, the CAA does consider ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices and adopts ICAO procedures, terminology and phraseology where appropriate. Development of bespoke UK solutions is deemed appropriate only where there are demonstrable safety benefits for doing so. The UK is not unique in taking such an approach.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 29: the CAA should review the classification of lower airways and some Terminal Manoeuvring Areas (TMAs) as class A airspace, with a view to the use of class C or class D airspace in its place.</p>	<p>The CAA agrees; this is already underway with an internal lead paper looking at how they apply ICAO Airspace Classifications in a post-SERA environment.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Interim recommendation 30: the Government should require, as a matter of public policy, that reasonable access under Visual Flight Rules to controlled airspace is provided by Air Navigation Service Providers offering Air Traffic Control within that airspace, to users who are not the intended beneficiary of the airspace, at the cost of the intended beneficiaries of the airspace classification and at no cost to other users.</p>	<p>The Government agrees that there should be reasonable access to controlled airspace, which is a shared national asset, for Visual Flight Rules traffic. In the case of controlled airspace, the charging regime for air traffic services is covered in the Single European Sky charging regulation, under a user pays principle. Within these rules, it is an accepted principle that the beneficiaries of using controlled airspace should pay unless the flights are specifically exempted by the State from doing so, in which case the State pays the associated costs. Because of the way the UK decided to implement the charging regulation the costs to non-IFR users have already been minimised. The Government could, however, foresee circumstances where it would be fair and practical for VFR users to pay an appropriate contribution for services that provide benefit to them. We could not, therefore, enshrine the principle that as a general matter of public policy, VFR users should pay nothing. We are willing to consider further ideas/proposals from the GA community on this issue and would therefore encourage the FASVIG programme to consider this matter in detail and to formulate a credible proposal which Government and the CAA could examine.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 31: the CAA should review airspace design guidelines to ensure that controlled airspace reflects practical operational requirements, not theoretical requirements.</p>	<p>There is a balance to be struck between following ICAO design principles that include the requirement for containment and minimising the volume of CAS. We have already looked at SIDs in this light and determined that they ‘should’ be contained within CAS not ‘must’ be. The use of Transponder / Radio Mandatory Zones gives the CAA more options than were available previously and it will continue to explore other options in a post-SERA environment.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 32: the Government should implement, as a matter of public policy, an ongoing charge per unit volume to Air Navigation Service Providers who service controlled airspace, to incentivise efficient use of airspace as a shared resource.</p>	<p>The Government agrees there is a need to ensure that controlled airspace used by an air navigation service provider is monitored to ensure that it is still required and that the rationale for the airspace classification remains justified. The Panel’s recommendation is likely to be at odds with the Charging Regulation and may lead to a much broader debate on who pays for what. For example there may be an argument that restricting controlled airspace imposes a cost on users which it might be reasonable to reflect in a charge on GA. Government’s view is that the better approach is for the CAA to monitor the use of controlled airspace, perhaps more systematically than it has done in the past and to put in place measures to make the re-classification of controlled airspace easier.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Interim recommendation 33: designation of controlled airspace should be reviewed on a regular basis to confirm whether it is still justified against the original specification.</p>	<p>The designation is already reviewed at Stage 7 of the Airspace Change process normally 1 year after implementation. Further regular reviews are a resource issue for both the regulator, the air navigation service provider and the user community who need to provide their views to contribute on a regular basis.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 34: the CAA should facilitate the work of the FAS VFR Implementation Group to deliver significant improvements for GA.</p>	<p>The CAA is facilitating the work of the FASVIG by providing half of the funding for the project manager and providing meeting facilities and resources. The CAA have also integrated the group into the overall FAS programme governance arrangements alongside the FAS Industry Implementation Group (FASIIG) and high level Deployment Steering Group. The first major milestone for FASVIG is the production of a cross-sector Implementation Plan, which will set out the approach to deployment of specific VFR initiatives. The Implementation Plan concentrates in three areas: (i) Airspace, (ii) Regulation and (iii) Information Management. FASVIG aim to launch the Implementation Plan at the FASVIG conference in Spring 2015.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 35: the CAA should align national navigation equipment carriage requirements (Schedule 5 of the ANO) for General Aviation operators with those in EASA's Part-NCO as soon as possible, limiting any "airspace requirements" to requirements for compliance with Performance Based Navigation specifications.</p>	<p>The CAA will take steps to ensure that, subject to no unintended consequences, national equipage requirements are aligned with EASA regulations for non-commercial operations as soon as possible.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 36: the CAA should continue to support work on electronic conspicuity in collaboration with a broad range of stakeholders.</p>	<p>The issue of electronic conspicuity is being investigated by the Airspace and Safety Initiative (ASI) Electronic Conspicuity Working Group chaired by Martin Robinson of AOPA. The group is due to report in Oct 14 and the content of that report will be used to determine the next steps.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 37: adoption of electronic conspicuity technology should be encouraged by the delivery of benefit to users who choose to equip with it and not mandated by regulation.</p>	<p>The CAA recognises the need to continue to work with stakeholders through the Electronic Conspicuity working group to enable a technological solution, and in conjunction with EASA and EU NAAs promulgate the safety benefits of electronic conspicuity technology.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Interim recommendation 38: the CAA should ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the project is managed by the CAA's GA Unit; • a project plan and progress report on it is submitted in time for consideration by the Panel ahead of its final report; • the necessary work is taken forward as a matter of some urgency with a completion date of April 2015; • the GA Unit should also seek other possible funding options both to help the project and also to take forward its outcome after April 2015; and • the GA Unit should draw up a longer-term project plan to deliver the desired outcome as soon as practicable and taking into account any manufacturing and financial constraints. 	<p>The AOPA-led Electronic Conspicuity Working Group (ECWG) is investigating a range of current, emerging and future technological solutions to assess their potential benefits, impacts and costs to both the GA and non-GA community. The Group is due to deliver its recommendations to the CAA, including proposals as to how its findings should be taken forward, in Sep 14. Thereafter, working with the ECWG and having already secured a degree of DfT funding, the CAA anticipates establishing an Electronic Conspicuity Project, with the desired Project Management Plan, to further develop and, where possible, implement the ECWGs findings.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 39: the CAA should be mindful of the interface between EU regulation and its UK implementation. Where EU regulation does not appear to offer an acceptable regulatory solution through any reasonable interpretation, it should engage with EASA and the European Commission to resolve issues at their source. In doing so, in the interest of harmonisation, it should, wherever possible, work to achieve better regulation at the EU level, rather than seeking national exemptions or applying additional measures applicable only for the UK or to UK stakeholders.</p>	<p>Wherever possible the UK will aim to resolve issues at the EASA/European Commission level. The CAA will only apply additional measures where it believes it has the powers to do so under EU regulation and where there is a genuine safety case to do so. Since the GA Unit was set up the CAA has been increasing its engagement with EASA on GA. Head of the GA Unit is now Chairman of the EASA National Aviation Authorities GA Roadmap Group and is a member of the six-strong EASA GA Task Force. Together with representatives from the UK GA Community the UK is maximising its influence in EASA to achieve the engagement and outcome recommended here.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Interim recommendation 40: when stakeholders challenge unreasonable regulation, the CAA should either take responsibility for the safety basis of the regulation or identify the steps it is taking with EASA and the European Commission to improve the regulation in question.</p>	<p>The CAA already does this by using Alternative Means of Compliance, derogations, or rule change action. Examples include balloon pilot age limitations, balloon pilot rating revalidation, seaplane rating revalidation and continuation of revalidation examiner rating.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 41: The CAA should seek clarity from the European Commission on the intention and interpretation of Article 9 of the SERA regulation, and, if necessary, withdraw proposed national rules that are more restrictive than SERA equivalents but cover substantially the same subject matter.</p>	<p>The CAA has worked closely with the European Commission throughout the negotiation and implementation of SERA and believes it has correctly interpreted Article 9. The CAA will remove any rules that are superseded by the SERA regulation or are considered obsolete or can be addressed by other means. This process will be fully complete once the adopted SERA Part C text and its supporting AMC and GM are known. The CAA expects this to happen during 2015.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 42: the CAA should revise its interpretation of the term 'passenger' for the purposes of Part-FCL to avoid adverse consequences, and should offer guidance accordingly.</p>	<p>As set out in our GA Policy Framework, the CAA recognises the need wherever possible not to regulate where the level of risk is understood and accepted by informed participants, including passengers, and the activity does not represent a disproportionate risk to uninvolved third parties.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 43: the CAA should continue its efforts to eliminate 'gold-plating', and should ensure that those responsible for drafting policy and implementing rules understand the principles behind this initiative.</p>	<p>The CAA has publically stated that it 'will not gold plate. It will quickly and efficiently remove gold plating which already exists. The CAA has set up an anti-gold-plating web address to which examples of possible gold-plating may be sent for the CAA to examine and, if found to be gold-plating, remove these. The 'no gold-plating' initiative/ email address was launched on 1 Sept and will run until 17 Oct. Several replies have been received and all will be analysed after the closing date.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 44: the UK Government and CAA should continue actively to support the European GA Safety Strategy and Roadmap for Regulation of GA.</p>	<p>The CAA and Government will work closely with EASA to help deliver their stated aim of 'simpler, lighter, better rules for GA'. Since the GA Unit was set up the CAA has been increasing its engagement with EASA on GA. Head of the GA Unit is now Chairman of the EASA National Aviation Authorities GA Roadmap Group and a member of the six-strong EASA GA Task Force. Together with representatives from the GA Community, the UK is maximising its influence in EASA to achieve the engagement and outcome recommended here.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Interim recommendation 45: the CAA should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support the initiatives of the GA sub-committee of EASA’s Safety Standards Consultative Committee and endorse its document on issues in current regulation adversely affecting GA; • engage strongly (for example via a working group of national aviation authorities) in EASA’s work to find solutions to improve EU regulation of GA; and • ensure consistency of this work with UK national regulatory policy 	<p>The CAA fully supports the work of EASA’s GA sub-committee. The CAA now chairs EASA’s GA NAA Working Group and will make sure the Group is proactive in the review of EASA’s Basic Regulation to deliver ‘simpler, lighter, better rules for GA’. Since the GA Unit was set up the CAA has been increasing its engagement with EASA on GA. Head of the GA Unit is now Chairman of the EASA National Aviation Authorities GA Roadmap Group and a member of the 6 strong EASA GA Task Force. Together with representatives from the UK GA Community the UK is maximising its influence in EASA to achieve the engagement and outcome recommended here.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 46: the CAA should, once again, pursue the case with the Commission and EASA for a medical declaration to be used instead of a medical assessment for GA pilots, with limitations consistent with the principles of risk-based safety and informed consent, using the evidence base it has from UK NPPL and glider operations.</p>	<p>The CAA has already started discussions with a sub-group of the GA Partnership to explore opportunities to reform and reduce medical standards for the UK NPPL and possibly more widely. The CAA aims to consult publicly on any proposed changes this autumn. The CAA will use the experience gained through this work to build the case for wider EU reform.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 47: the CAA should continue to engage with the work of the Part-M GA taskforce, and work for a reduction in the administrative burden for GA maintenance.</p>	<p>The CAA naturally agrees with this recommendation and will continue its active engagement on this issue.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 48: The CAA should engage with other NAAs to examine the potential of joint development of systems and procedures to support implementation of EU regulation.</p>	<p>The CAA will work with all other European NAAs on joint initiatives wherever feasible and where it will directly benefit the UK’s GA community. As an example, the CAA already works with the EASA and Member State colleagues in the FCL Implementation Forum and the FCL TAG-SSCC sub Group in the area of pilot licensing.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Interim recommendation 49: the CAA should engage with other NAAs (particularly those of neighbouring member states) to ensure that cross-border training and aerial work is facilitated appropriately.</p>	<p>The CAA will do this where the opportunity arises and it is appropriate. Where specific bilateral agreements are required, for example in the area of nationally regulated aircraft, this is a matter for the Government and CAA will support as required.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 50: the CAA should review the lessons from the early adoption of Part-FCL to inform any future decisions on derogations.</p>	<p>The CAA agrees. Identification of lessons learnt and learning from them is now part of the CAA's policy development process.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 51: the CAA should review the consequences of the duality of EU and national regulation in all domains and take a strategic approach that balances the advantages of standardisation with the need to retain flexibility.</p>	<p>The CAA agrees. The CAA does not wish to impose additional burden for 'standardisation sake'.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 52: the DfT should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • commission economic research into the direct and indirect benefits of General Aviation to the UK economy, • consider the case for Government intervention to increase the impact of General Aviation on the economy; and • if there is a good case, consider what interventions could be adopted. 	<p>Ministers have agreed that economic research should be undertaken to assess the value of General Aviation to the UK economy and to develop options for potential policy interventions which could increase the contribution of GA to the economy still further. This research will take place in the second half of this year and will report early in 2015.</p>
<p>Interim recommendation 53: the DfT should write direct to a number of SMEs engaged in the manufacture of light aircraft to seek their views on what they consider to be the constraints to growth of their business ;and for this exercise to be low key and not a formal consultation and with a response due date of mid-February 2014.</p>	<p>The DfT wrote to a small number of SMEs engaged in the manufacture of light aircraft earlier this year. Two responses were received with information on the constraints to their businesses and thoughts on what the Government or the CAA could do to help drive such businesses forward in the coming years.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Final recommendation 1: The CAA should adopt a risk-based total-system approach to safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.1: Risk management should differentiate between stakeholder classes according to their ability to assess and control risk. • 1.2: Risk management should be quantitative to allow resources to be spent on the risks that optimize the benefits of expenditure across the whole system. • 1.3: Safety regulation should be evidence-based where possible and supported by good impact assessments and cost benefit analyses. • 1.4: Certification and approval should only be applied where the cost-benefit analysis justifies it. • 1.5: Safety regulation should foster innovation, not stifle it. • 1.6: Innovations should be compared with status quo safety situation, not an aspirational target. • 1.7: The legal framework and culture should support this approach.” 	<p>The CAA is currently undertaking a transformation programme to become a ‘performance based’ regulator. At the core of performance based regulation (PBR) is safety risk identification and management across the total aviation system. The transformation includes the work of the GA Unit. The principles proposed within this recommendation provide a practical framework for the CAA to adopt in delivering a risk-based approach to GA. CAA will also ensure that this approach meets their commitment to Better Regulation principles, particularly proportionality. CAA will need to exercise some caution with principle 1.6, in that it presumes that the status quo is considered acceptable, which may not always be the case.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Final recommendation 2: The CAA should regulate airspace equitably as a shared resource:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1: Controlled and regulated airspace should be no larger than is practically required to meet operational needs. • 2.2: Existing controlled and regulated airspace should be reviewed regularly. • 2.3: The beneficiaries of controlled and regulated airspace should meet its costs, including the cost of providing access to that airspace for other users.” 	<p>The CAA agrees the headline principle. 2.1 is already part of its existing process and 2.2 is agreed but a balance must be struck on how often a review takes place. Principle 2.3 will require further consideration, but in principle CAA agrees that reasonable access to CAS should be provided.</p>
<p>Final recommendation 3: The CAA should ensure that the single market, harmonisation and simplification benefits of EU regulation are realised in full:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.1: The CAA should support smarter EU regulation for GA. • 3.2: The CAA should take account of the benefits of harmonisation on total system safety. • 3.3: The CAA should avoid applying higher standards for UK stakeholders (gold-plating) than those set out in EASA regulations, even if the potential level of safety which could be achieved is higher. • 3.4: There should be no organisational gaps between the EU and the UK implementation of regulation. • 3.5: The CAA should cooperate with other NAAs in implementation of initiatives.” 	<p>The CAA has set up its GA Unit in part to enable better application of these principles in the work of the CAA. The GA Unit, the wider CAA and the Government recognise the need to challenge themselves now and in the future to ensure that these principles are applied.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Final Recommendation 4: The CAA should ensure its changed approach to regulating GA is embedded throughout the organisation.</p>	<p>The CAA recognises that delivering on its commitments to significantly reduce red tape burden on GA will require a fundamental and sustained shift in mindset at all levels within the organisation, including our front line staff, and approach. The essential elements of this approach will be;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Clear leadership from the Board of the CAA as demonstrated in its November 2013 response to the RTC, * A dedicated team which includes both policy makers and inspectors, established as the GA Unit knowledgeable about general aviation and whose individual performance will be judged against the CAA Board's statement. * A clear programme of activity, delivery against which will be transparently reported. * Transparent policy principles against which it will take decisions on regulation (the Policy Framework that the CAA is consulting on). * Effective engagement with the GA community , as evidenced in the establishment of the GBASF and creation of the GA Partnership to set priorities, gather feedback and stimulate sector appetite for delegation and deregulation. * Proactive engagement in the European arena as demonstrated by the Head of the GA Unit taking on the role of chair of the EASA National Aviation Authorities GA Roadmap Group and is a member of the six-strong EASA GA Task Force. * A programme of legislative changes in the UK and within EASA that will be necessary to facilitate the freedoms to which the CAA is committed. * The CAA have consulted on the GA Policy Framework (to be released to the public in November 2014) and this has already been used to deliver a better and more proportionate approach to the regulation of GA. Continued use of the framework will help permanently embed a more proportionate and risk based culture within the CAA. * The CAA have started a review of all areas of the Air Navigation Order (the main UK law covering aviation) that affect GA with a commitment to consult on further areas which can be deregulated. A public consultation on initial concepts will begin in late March 2015, with a second consultation on specific deregulatory proposals in September 2015 and changes to the ANO planned to come into force in 2016. This review will undertaken by thematic Working Groups consisting of staff from across the CAA following a process which cover the Better Regulation principles and those outlined in the GA Policy Framework thus helping change the culture within the CAA.

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Final recommendation 5: The CAA should review its approach to fees, rate of return to Government and service levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.1: The Government should commit to reduce the annual rate of return paid by the CAA. • 5.2: The CAA should reduce the fees and charges which it levies on the industry that it regulates. • 5.3: The CAA should define clear service levels for each area of the new GA unit, and publish service standards to encourage the achievement of targets. 	<p>The CAA has to recover its costs from those it regulates and in doing this are committed to being financially efficient and transparent in all charges. The rate of return to Government is set by HM Treasury and not within the gift of the CAA to determine; the share contributed by GA activities to the rate of return is approximately £120K p.a;</p> <p>* The key aim of the GA Unit is to reduce regulatory burdens and in doing so reduce the costs associated with compliance. Given that payroll is the most significant cost for the GA Unit, there is a direct conflict between the staff resource needed to implement this large and ambitious programme of work and achieving rapid, early cost reduction in the running of the GA Unit. CAA will have to strike an appropriate balance between the potentially much greater economic advantages of better, lighter regulation and any savings that could be achieved by direct cost reduction. One way CAA will endeavour to provide more resource at minimal cost is to gain greater participation from the GA Sector and they have already started to do this through the GA Partnership Group;</p> <p>* CAA are already committed to reviewing charges made to the GA Community within the programme of work and the adoption of appropriate targets and service levels which will need to be considered as part of this.</p>
<p>Final recommendation 6: The CAA should promptly set out plans for acting on its stated intention to deregulate and delegate.</p>	<p>Projects to deregulate and/or delegate current CAA activities form part of the GA programme of work. Crucial to the success of these aims will be the ambitions and risk appetite of the CAA, Government and the sector itself. The CAA will continue to work with all stakeholders and add specific projects to the GA programme as appropriate.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Final Recommendation 7: The Government should develop coherent policies on GA, and this should be supported and co-ordinated across all departments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.1: The Government should ensure that there is no further increase in the burden of regulation and a commitment to investigate ways to reduce it in relevant areas. • 7.2: The Government should appoint a GA champion and establish a permanent GA governance structure, with representation from relevant Government Departments, to review policies that affect GA and maintain the momentum of reform. • 7.3: Government policy should enable GA to help the regions and regional airports through connectivity, training and manufacturing.” 	<p>The Government is developing coherent policies in relation to GA. It is anticipated that the forthcoming economic research will identify examples of where policy interventions could help to stimulate the GA sector and reduce burdens. The Government is developing a new Governance structure for GA, which will improve oversight and delivery of improvements for the sector.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Final recommendation 8: Greater weight and consideration should be given in national, local and regional planning to the value of GA airfield including benefits of a network of GA airfields.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8.1: Safeguarding or retention (in planning terms) after consultation and in conjunction with the operators of sites should be provided by specific policy or statutory means including where appropriate by CAA safeguarding. • 8.2: Clarification of the designation and test and or re-classification or exemption should be sought in relation to classification of aerodromes as brownfield sites. • 8.3: Information should be provided directly to strategic airfields informing them of the benefits of their assets to the community and potential access to funding to assist with neighbourhood planning or designation of this kind of asset. • 8.4: There should be protection for GA in areas such as planning and airfield safeguarding. 	<p>The Government acknowledged, in the Aviation Policy Framework, that maintaining access to a national network of airfields is vital to the continuing success of the sector. The Government will consider whether the evidence produced as a result of the economic research into the value of GA provides further insights into the characteristics of a key airport on the national network. The National Planning Policy Framework urges local planning authorities to ‘identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen choice’ which could apply to airport infrastructure. Local development frameworks and other strategic planning documents should include aeronautical safeguarding, both for officially safeguarded aerodromes and for aerodromes where unofficial safeguarding procedures have been agreed between the operator and Local Planning Authorities. However the responsibility for aerodrome safeguarding rests with the aerodrome licence holder or operator.</p> <p>With regard to protecting airfields more generally from development on the site itself (for example, for housing) local authorities have the responsibility to consider the case for safeguarding land to protect the site. While the Government has no plans to change policy to make this a requirement, we do expect that, when planning for airports and airfields that are not subject to a national policy statement, plans should take account of their growth and role in serving business, leisure and training needs. One of the core planning principles in the NPPF is to encourage the effective reuse of land that has been previously developed (brownfield land). This is designed to protect greenfield areas and contributes to community wellbeing by bringing underused or derelict land bank into use.</p> <p>While brownfield land is defined as land that has been previously developed, it is down to local authorities to interpret that definition. Aerodrome owners or operators should engage with the local planning process to try and influence how the aerodrome site is defined in local planning policies. The Community Right to Bid gives communities a chance to nominate buildings and land as an asset of community value. If the local authority decides that the nominated asset meets the definition set out in the legislation it will add it to a register of assets. If the asset is put up for sale the community can trigger a moratorium on the sale for up to 6 months. This will give local groups the opportunity to get together and raise finance to bid to buy the asset. The Government has put in place a free advice service and made available £17.5 million of grants to support communities who want to take over buildings and land.</p> <p>The Government will look again at planning issues in relation to airfields once the economic research has been undertaken.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Final recommendation 9: The Government should actively pursue opportunities to stimulate growth of GA across all areas of policy and funding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9.1: The Government should champion GA contribution to aviation and aerospace. • 9.2: The Government should facilitate partnerships with key manufacturers to encourage development of GA expertise. • 9.3: The Government should evaluate potential technological developments in GA and the contribution they could make to the economy and employment. • 9.4: The Government should ensure that the enhanced navigation capability enabled via the established EGNOS programme should be recognised and implemented to assist GA and improved regional access. 	<p>It is anticipated that the forthcoming economic research into the value of the GA sector, will identify areas where Government can develop policies which will help to create a thriving GA sector. Improvements will also be made to the Governance of GA, so that there is oversight of the work which is happening, to ensure that this delivers agreed outcomes for the sector. Government's engagement with aerospace manufacturers is managed by BIS through its dialogue with ADS (the national aerospace trade association), and through the Aerospace Growth Partnership, this work can benefit UK manufacturers who supply into the GA market – for example, on engine, airframe and advanced systems projects. The GA community can also participate in the Knowledge Transfer Networks (KTNs), which facilitate innovation communities in the UK to connect, collaborate and find out about new opportunities in key research and technology sectors.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
<p>Final recommendation 10: The Government should encourage the development of UK aviation skills, regional connectivity and economic research into the sector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10.1: The Government should engage with major industry groups to develop a coordinated skills strategy for GA. • 10.2: The Government should ensure that visa requirements and training courses focussed on attracting overseas students are fully coordinated and communicated. • 10.3: The Government should ensure new courses for GA engineering apprenticeships are available and adequately funded and consider launching a test programme. • 10.4: The Government should encourage the use of PSO funds for new route development between regional airfields and a London airport. • 10.5: Government research on GA should focus on the economic value it could bring to the UK. 	<p>The Government is planning to evaluate the GA by market segment as part of its economic research. It will consider the size, value and potential for growth of the training sector in the light of this evidence. The Government has a range of schemes to support businesses of all sizes and these can be accessed by the GA community, as with other areas of business. It is for industry to identify its skills needs and how these may be supported through available public support schemes – for example, in respect of apprenticeship training funding. Consistent with this approach, BIS works closely with the aerospace manufacturing industry’s on skills where industry, has identified its strategic skills requirements for which it is looking to commit increased private investment against which the Government is considering support under the Employer Ownership of Skills programme. The UK has a great offer to attract the best international students. Those with the right qualifications, sufficient funds to cover their fees and maintenance costs, and a good level of English can study here with no annual limit on numbers. It is a fundamental Government rule that visitors to the UK must intend to return to their home country after their visit. For that reason, student visitors are not permitted to switch into longer term migration routes like Tier 4. However, we will consider further whether there is a particular problem regarding students who come to the UK to study English language training with the intention of immediately moving on to aviation training (where a high level of English language ability is a pre-requisite). The Government is reforming Apprenticeships to make them more rigorous and responsive to the needs of small and large employers.</p> <p>Implementation of these reforms will be facilitated by Trailblazers led by employers and professional bodies, including those in the aviation sector. As part of the 2013 Spending Round announcement the Government announced that £20million would be made available over the 2014-16 period to maintain regional air access to London through the establishment of a Public Service Obligation (PSO), where there was the probability that an existing air service would be lost.</p> <p>It was announced in the recent Budget that this fund would double in value to £20 million per year to ensure that the UK is able to maintain existing regional air links to London. Significantly it was also announced that applications will now also be allowed for start-up aid for new routes from UK regional airports which handle fewer than five million passengers per annum that meet the new EU aviation State aid guidelines which will provide the opportunity for airports outside the south east to improve connectivity and stimulate further economic growth in the regions.</p>

RTC recommendation	Comments
	<p>The Department for Transport is working with the Treasury to develop guidance which will explain how the funding process will operate. This will provide information for those organisations seeking to make applications for supporting air routes.</p>
<p>Final recommendation 11: The Government should ensure that border regulations and security and airport administrative procedures do not unnecessarily restrict GA activity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11.1: The notification period for GA flights should be reduced to a maximum of one hour and should not be required at ports of entry. • 11.2: The provision under the Terrorism Act which requires that pilots give Special Branch notification should be taken out and should adopt measures similar to those for other forms of transport. • 11.3: Border Force (BF) should work with the GA sector to improve notification procedures which secure them high quality information yet streamline notification procedures for GA pilots. • 11.4: The Government should develop a clear strategy on customs and immigration. • 11.5: The Government should negotiate improved co-operation with European authorities to enable flights originating in the UK to land at airfields that do not have customs facilities. 	<p>The Government is committed to delivering a safe and secure border and to preventing terrorism. General Aviation (GA) provides particular challenges for Border Force (BF) and the police because of the unscheduled and unpredictable nature of this traffic. Whilst security is the priority, the Government wants to ensure the smoothest passage possible for pilots, passengers and goods who provide no security, immigration or customs issues. In developing policies we seek to balance security requirements with the need to keep the regulatory burden on the sector to a necessary minimum. The Home Office has been working with HMRC to consider the advance notification framework for customs purposes and will consult on proposals to change the timescale for advance notification for designated customs ports to one hour before departure and consider views on the notification timescales for Certificate of Agreement airports taking into account the level of threat concerned. In addition, the Government will review the current notification provisions and their operations under the Terrorism Act 2000 to establish if a different approach can provide an appropriate level of security assurance without placing unnecessary burdens on the sector. Both Departments also recognise that the legislative framework for GA users crossing the border is complex and confusing and will look into communicating the requirements clearly to the sector to ensure that all processes and requirements are effective, clear and easy to understand. They will also endeavour to work collaboratively with the sector. A good example of this is the Collaborative Business Portal (CBP) for submission of General Aviation Reports (GARs) which has been developed in conjunction with GA.</p>