

**Question for written answer E-007786/2012
to the Commission**
Rule 117
Philip Bradbourn (ECR)

Subject: European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) fees

Concerns have been expressed about the extremely high level of EASA fees (with an hourly rate of EUR 246.38), which seems to be the result of high overhead costs at EASA, in particular for non-safety-related functions. This is a problem not only for small and medium-sized enterprises but also for large industries, which are confronted with fees much higher than those charged by non-EU authorities for their own industries. The EASA Advisory Board wrote a letter to the EASA Management Board in December 2011 complaining about the high level of EASA fees. This letter, which was supported by the entire EU industry (small and large industries), appears to have been ignored by EASA. The ongoing discussion at EU level over whether to require EU agencies such as EASA to finance their own pension contributions might further aggravate this problem.

1. What action plan will the Commission put in place to reduce unsustainable overhead costs at EASA and, consequently, EASA fees?
2. Could the Commission confirm that it will impose a moratorium on further fee increases at EASA, and therefore not increase EASA fees as result of the potential requirement for EASA to fund its own pension contributions?
3. Could the Commission confirm that it envisages further bilateral aviation safety agreements as a means of reducing EASA's cost base in the field of certification (through relying on oversight by authorities from third countries)?
4. How does the new EASA system of charging high fees for industry attendance at workshops (for example the Design Organisation Approval workshops) fit in with the EASA initiative to ensure better involvement of industry stakeholders in its activities? What action does the Commission intend to take in this respect?