

**Report from Mary Anne Stevens on the meeting of the Flight Crew Licensing and Training Panel of ICAO (FCLTP) held in Montreal, January 31<sup>st</sup> to February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2005.**

About 35 people from Europe, North America, Asia, Africa and Australia participated in the two-week meeting, together with representatives from a few interested organizations. I participated as the FAI representative with observer status.

The panel met to review reports from the Working Groups which had been assigned various segments of the tasks which had been undertaken by the Panel. The Panel had been asked to propose a new structure for pilot licencing, including the Private Pilot License (PPL), the Commercial Pilot License (CPL), the Air Traffic Pilot License (ATPL) and the new Multi-crew Pilot License (MPL), to consider standards for the use of training devices and to consider guidance material for competency-based training, in addition to a few other issues (such as allowing commercial pilots to continue flying after age 60). The FCTLTP reports to the ICAO Air Navigation Committee (ANC) which has the power to recommend amendments to ICAO Annex 1, containing the standards for pilot licences.

As was reported previously, in an effort to reduce repetition in Annex 1, a proposal had been made to re-structure the licence requirements so that the general requirements for each type of licence would be grouped, then followed by the requirements specific to each category of aircraft. During the course of the Working Group meetings, an effort was made to do this for all aircraft, including balloons and gliders, however the Working Group had previously formed the opinion that the glider licence should be not be included in the PPL and CPL structure, but should be kept separate.

**The issues of greatest interest to the FAI**

**1. Inserting the balloon licence under the PPL and CPL structure or leaving it outside with the glider licence**

I went to this meeting with the impression that the balloon licence would be brought into the PPL/CPL structure, and that all there was left to discuss were the requirements which would be set for each one. It was during this discussion that I raised the issue of the medical requirement being inappropriate to balloons (and gliders). (Discussion paper #11 is attached at Annex A).

In order not to spend the time of the entire group on the details of the balloon licence, a smaller group of interested parties met after the main meeting had been adjourned for the day. Just before that meeting I was informed by one of the ICAO officials that the ICAO medical section was undergoing changes, but that they would never accept the idea of a balloon CPL with less than a Class 1 medical. When I raised this in the small group, some of the countries who had been supporting the idea of a balloon CPL then changed their position, and said that they could not support a balloon CPL which required a Class 1 medical. In the end, this small group recommended that

balloon licences be left outside the PPL/CPL structure in the same manner as glider licences, but with an additional recommendation for a minimum of 35 hours of flight time, including 20 hours as PIC balloon, in order to carry passengers for remuneration. Giving it the status of a recommendation means that countries may choose to follow the recommendation or not.

This revised approach was accepted by the Panel.

## **2. When is an airship not an airship?**

The Working Group recommend the adoption of a standard for airship pilot licences in PPL and CPL. They also recommended that airship licences only cover airships larger than 4600 cubic meters. This would leave each country with flexibility to establish the requirements for pilot licensing for airships of less than 4600 cubic meters.

Both recommendations were accepted by the Panel.

The proposed airship licensing standard is attached at Annex B.

## **3. The issue of medicals for balloon and glider pilots**

Although many of the participants at the Working Group and at the Panel seemed to agree with our arguments, the only thing we could do at this meeting was ask that the matter be referred to the ICAO Medical Provisions Study Group. The FCLTP agreed to this.

Unfortunately the Panel's agreement may not mean much, given that the Medical Provisions Study Group was disbanded for having no work to do. In addition, the position of ICAO medical officer is in a state of flux, given that the incumbent has gone into semi-retirement and the person who will be taking over the position will not likely be starting until the Fall.

I have asked that this issue be included on a list for consideration for future work, however there may not be much value to such a list at this point, since a Medical Provisions Study Group will not be convened for this issue alone.

### **Next steps**

The Air Navigation Commission's Working Group on Panels will conduct an initial review of the Panel's report and recommendations around the middle of April, right at the beginning of the ANC's next session. The report will then be submitted to the formal session of the ANC soon after that. If accepted by the ANC, the recommendations would likely go out to member countries for ratification in the Fall.

A recommendation for further consideration of balloon licenses was included in the list of future work. At the same time the Working Groups were disbanded, given that they had completed the work they had been assigned.

I appreciate the efforts you all made to provide me with the support I needed for these meetings, and I believe that the results are largely positive. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions you may have on any of the issues I have described, or on anything else to do with these meetings.