

**Non Conformities to AIR-OPS requirements issued by EASA on the content of some Italian Operator's Operations Manuals
(EASA inspections 03/2013 and 12/2014)**

Check list to be used by the Operators to review their OMs before June, 30 2015

Operator name _____ AOC n° _____		Date _____		
No.	Non Conformities (NC)	Is the NC present in the OM? (Yes/No)	State the OM sections checked (part/chapt/para)	State corrections implemented if NC is present
1.	No detailed description of the methodology of assessment flight crew CRM skills was published in the Operations Manual [ref. ORO.FC.215, ORO.FC.230(c), AMC1 ORO.FC.115&215 (h) and AMC1 ORO.FC.230 (b)(3)(ii)]			
2.	The Cabin crew recurrent training programme did not ensure training of actual opening of exits in emergency mode [ref. ORO.CC.140(c)(2)]			
3.	OM contained outdated information (e.g. reference to an aircraft type which was no longer operated and inclusion of Cabin Crew Initial Safety Training Syllabus, whereas the operator does not hold an approval for CC Initial Safety Training)			
4.	The OM Part D content contravened the conditions contained in the operations specifications with regard to P/RNAV & RNP-RNAV (RNP-1) operations. In addition, it was not kept up-to-date as it included a chapter non-applicable to its operations (Difference Training for an aircraft type no longer operated).			

Operator name _____ AOC n° _____			Date _____	
No.	Non Conformities (NC)	Is the NC present in the OM? (Yes/No)	State the OM sections checked (part/chapt/para)	State corrections implemented if NC is present
5.	OM contained superfluous data to operator's actual operations (e.g. HUDLS, use of EVS)			
6.	In several cases the content was not customised presenting the legal requirements but not the Operator's processes (e.g. Fuel check at regular intervals not defining the interval)			
7.	The operator could not demonstrate it had a formalised procedure to survey sites, such that its adequacy for use in relation to the type of helicopter could be ensured [ref. CAT.OP.MPA.105 and relevant AMC1]			
8.	CRM training syllabus was not tailored to the Crew Composition nor the type of operations conducted, and the training was performed every 3 years (CRM assessment was integrated in the checking activities.) [ref. ORO.FC.230(e) and relevant AMC1 point (a)(3); ORO.FC.115 and ORO.FC.215 and relevant AMC1, AMC1.1 and GM1]			
9.	OM Part A contained references to EFB although the operator was not using EFBs			
10.	Several items of OM Chapters B.2 and B.3 for helicopters consisted of references to the manufacturer's documentation, which was designed for single pilot operations only whereas the operator mostly conducted multi-crew operations			

Operator name _____ AOC n° _____			Date _____	
No.	Non Conformities (NC)	Is the NC present in the OM? (Yes/No)	State the OM sections checked (part/chapt/para)	State corrections implemented if NC is present
11.	Many chapters of OM Part D were a copy of the rule or AMC material without a description of actual operations (e.g. abnormal and emergency procedures checked during OPC, training performed on simulator or on helicopter/aeroplane, training on major system failures and procedures)			
12.	The OM D stated that "the annual helicopter/simulator training normally takes 1 hour flight" and that training on HHO and HEMS operations was performed additionally, whereas in some cases the hour of training also covered all HHO and HEMS items			
13.	The OM did not describe a method of categorisation of aerodromes and did not provide a list of aerodromes categorised as B or C [rif. AMC1 ORO.FC.105(b)(2);(c)]			
14.	The OM included provisions related to non-commercial operations of aircraft listed in their operations specifications. However the OM did not include an identification of the applicable requirements, and a clear identification of any differences between operating procedures used when conducting commercial and non-commercial operations [ref. ORO.AOC.125]			

Operator name _____ AOC n° _____				Date _____
No.	Non Conformities (NC)	Is the NC present in the OM? (Yes/No)	State the OM sections checked (part/chapt/para)	State corrections implemented if NC is present
15.	The Operator could not provide evidence of a system to verify each type/runway combination, prior to commencing Category III operations [ref.SPA.LVO105 and relevant AMC6]			
16.	OM chapter 8.8 stated that helicopters shall not be operated at altitude exceeding 10000 feet unless supplemental oxygen is provided to supply all members of flight crew; however the operator was conducting HEMS operations between 10000 ft and 130000ft without oxygen for flight crew (for a maximum of 30 minutes) on the basis of an exemption delivered by ENAC under Article 14(4)			

Signatures

Compliance Monitoring Manager _____

Flight Operations Postholder _____

Crew Training Postholder _____

Ground Operations Postholder _____