Key Messages on EASA Proposal for Air Crew Fatigue[1]

- **Pilot fatigue** – due to the crews' long working hours and short rest times – contributes to **15-20% of all fatal air accidents** related to human error, as show the recent examples of the 2009 Colgan Air accident (USA) or the 2010 Air India accident.
- When drafting new EU-wide rules to prevent air crew fatigue, the EU Institutions must make **passenger safety** their **Number 1 Priority**.
- Pilots and cabin crew from across Europe call on the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) to provide air passengers with **safe and science–based rules** which are **designed to prevent accidents** rather than to avoid costs to the airlines.
- **Decades of scientific research**, including 3 scientific reports commissioned by EASA in 2011, **shows where the EU should set the crews' working limits** to prevent fatigue.
- But **EASA's** recent legislative **proposal disregards scientific** evidence on many points.
- This proposal is **insufficient to ensure safe operations for Europe's travelling public**:
  - **Night flying**: scientists are unanimous that flying at night should be **limited to 10 hours**, to prevent high levels of fatigue. But EASA proposes 11 hrs. Why?
  - **Standby**: EASA's new rules would expect a pilot to land plane and passengers safely after having been at work for over 18 hrs and awake for 21 hours. Is this safe?
  - **Long work days with high workload**: the rules must protect against the fatiguing effect of long days with multiple take-offs and landings. The scientists are unanimous on how to provide such protection. But EASA dismissed their advice. Why?
  - Many **other provisions** of the proposal **fall short of scientific recommendations**. Does EASA know better than the medical and scientific experts?
  - **Precautionary principle**: This is a generally accepted EU principle: if in doubt, choose the safest option! Why has this been ignored in EASA's proposal?
- As **these rules will** apply across Europe and replace existing *national* safety standards – which are *higher* in several EU countries – this will **lower flight safety levels** in several countries. Is this what crews and passengers should expect from their Safety Agency?
- As aviation safety professionals, we therefore **call upon EASA to**
  - **take its SAFETY mission seriously**,
  - **resist** the commercially driven **lobbying from the airlines**,
  - **protect Europe's travelling public** with safe science-based air crew fatigue rules.

Final, 11/05/2012

[1] EASA CRD-2010-14: http://www.easa.eu.int/rulemaking/docs/crd/2011/CRD%202010-14/CRD%202010-14.pdf

European Cockpit Association AISBL
Rue du Commerce 20-22, 1000 Brussels, Belgium | T +32 2 705 32 93 | F +32 2 705 08 77 | eca@eurocockpit.be | www.eurocockpit.be