

RESTRENTUE



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR MOBILITY AND TRANSPORT

Directorate E – Air Transport
Aviation Security

26 July 2011
MOVE/E5/IO
11/14/BE/AA

COMMISSION INSPECTION REPORT

**Monitoring the application of Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 establishing common rules
in the field of civil aviation security by**

BELGIUM

Carried out from 20 to 24 June 2011

Inspection number: 11/14/BE/AA

RESTRENTUE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
2. CONDUCT OF THE INSPECTION.....	3
3. OBJECTIVE OF THE INSPECTION.....	3
4. LEGAL BASIS FOR THE INSPECTION.....	4
5. BACKGROUND.....	4
6. MAIN FINDINGS.....	4
7. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION.....	13
8. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.....	14
9. CONCLUSIONS.....	14

1. INTRODUCTION

From 20 to 24 June 2011 the European Commission undertook an inspection of the Belgian Civil Aviation Authority (BCAA), which has been nominated as the appropriate authority for the coordination and monitoring of the implementation of the common basic standards for aviation security in Belgium.

This inspection was notified to the Belgian appropriate authority by letter of 25 March 2011.

2. CONDUCT OF THE INSPECTION

The appropriate authority was cooperative in the preparation of the inspection and delivered the pre-inspection questionnaire on time.

The Commission inspection team was composed of Mr A. Teles Grilo (team leader) and Mr. M. Carvajal. The appropriate authority was represented by Mr F. Durinckx, Mr H. Spruyt, Mr J. Grodek (national coordinator), Mr G. Nys, Mr N. Delvaux and Mr S. Wellemans.

The inspection was conducted in two parts:

- the first part (20 – 22 June 2011) was carried out at the premises of the appropriate authority in Brussels, during which the application of the national civil aviation security quality control programme (NQCP) was monitored. Assessments of the national civil aviation security programme (NASP) were also carried out. An oral debriefing regarding the findings of the first part took place on 22 June 2011 in the presence of the representatives of the appropriate authority.
- the second part (23 – 24 June 2011) was carried out at Liege airport (LGG) with the aim of confirming the effectiveness of the implementation of the NQCP in the field. This airport was selected following analysis of the results of one security audit, inspections and tests performed by the Belgian appropriate authority in 2009, 2010 and 2011. An oral debriefing regarding the findings of the second part took place on 24 June 2011 in the presence of representatives of the appropriate authority.

The Commission inspectors together with the representatives of the appropriate authority also debriefed the airport operator in a separate meeting regarding the findings identified at the airport.

3. OBJECTIVE OF THE INSPECTION

The objective of the inspection was to monitor the application by Belgium of Regulation (EC) No 300/2008. Emphasis was put on the assessment of the Belgian regulatory framework for aviation security and the compliance monitoring activities performed by or under the supervision of the Belgian appropriate authority.

4. LEGAL BASIS FOR THE INSPECTION

The inspection was carried out on the basis of Article 15 of Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 and in accordance with Commission Regulation (EU) No 72/2010 of 26 January 2010 laying down procedures for conducting inspections in the field of civil aviation security.

The inspection covered the following EU Regulations:

- Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2008 establishing common rules in the field of civil aviation security and repealing Regulation (EC) No 2320/2002, as amended;
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 272/2009 of 2 April 2009 supplementing the common basic standards on civil aviation security laid down in the Annex to Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council, as amended;
- Commission Regulation (EU) No 1254/2009 of 18 December 2009 setting criteria to allow Member States to derogate from the common basic standards on civil aviation security and to adopt alternative security measures;
- Commission Regulation (EU) No 18/2010 of 8 January 2010 amending Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council as far as specifications for national civil aviation security quality control programmes are concerned;
- Commission Regulation (EU) No 185/2010 of 4 March 2010 laying down measures for the implementation of the common basic standards on aviation security, as amended;
- Commission Decision 2010/774/EU of 13 April 2010 laying down detailed measures for the implementation of the common basic standards on aviation security, as amended.

5. BACKGROUND

This was the third Commission inspection of the Belgian appropriate authority. The previous inspections were conducted in May 2004 and in September 2008.

The Commission has also conducted inspections at the airports of Liege, Brussels, Antwerp and Charleroi in the past.

All inspection files were closed following confirmation of rectification of identified deficiencies.

6. MAIN FINDINGS

The inspection findings are based on assessments of legal acts, internal administrative decisions and documentation, national compliance monitoring reports, various kinds of security programmes presented at the appropriate authority premises as well as verifications at Liege airport.

Some deficiencies were identified regarding compliance with Regulation (EC) No 300/2008. However, this does not imply that other issues not addressed in this report are classified as fully compliant.

6.1 Review of the implementation of the national quality control programme

This review was based on the assessment of three major issues related to the implementation of the NQCP: the adequacy of compliance monitoring activities, their effectiveness and the availability of auditors for compliance monitoring.

6.1.1 Adequacy of compliance monitoring activities

Article 11(2) of Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 requires inter alia *regular monitoring* of all airports, operators and entities situated in the Member State concerned so as to allow for *swift detection* of deficiencies. To verify compliance, Commission inspectors made an assessment of the frequency and scope of the monitoring activities.

As regards the **regular monitoring** of airports, the Belgian national quality control programme did establish frequencies for security audits and inspections. However, the frequencies for inspecting all security measures covered by chapters 7 to 12 of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 were not determined by the appropriate authority based on a risk assessment. Nevertheless, the inspectors' evaluation confirmed that the compliance monitoring took into consideration the threat level, the size of the airports and the standard of implementation as required in Article 4(2) of Annex II to Regulation (EU) 18/2010.

Belgium informed the Commission that it has 5 airports, applying Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 in full, 5 national air carriers, 144 foreign air carriers operating in the territory and 110 regulated agents.

The appropriate authority reported having carried out 311 national monitoring activities in 2009 (32 security audits, 86 inspections, 191 tests and 2 surveys) for which 192 man-days were recorded. In 2010, 189 monitoring activities were carried out (71 security audits, 15 inspections and 151 tests) for which 170 man-days were recorded. In 2011, up to May, 29 monitoring activities were carried out (25 security audits and 4 inspections) for which 53 man-days were recorded.

The Commission inspectors analysed the national monitoring activities carried out in 2009 and in 2010. The following table shows the compliance monitoring activities at airports, operators and other entities in Belgium broken down by the number of monitoring activities and the man-days actually spent by the national auditors in the field.

Airports (Pax in thousands) Operators Entities	2009				2010			
	Monitoring Activities			Man-days	Monitoring Activities			Man-days
	Sec. Audits	Inspections	Tests		Sec. Audits	Inspections	Tests	
Brussels (17 180)	3	42	126	83	15	-	38	32.5
Charleroi (5 200)	-	13	33	19	10	8	60	39
Liege (299)	1	8	14	12	12	-	46	20
Antwerp (163)	-	3	2	4	-	1	2	2
Ostend (214)	-	1	3	2	2	-	5	6
Air Carriers	-	13	6	26	-	6	-	6.5
Regulated Agents	28	-	-	34	32	-	-	64
Catering	-	3	4	4	Included in airports' activities			
Cleaning	-	3	3	8	Included in airports' activities			
Totals	32	86	191	192	71	15	151	170

The figures given in this table demonstrate that airports were subject to monitoring activities at regular intervals. However, operators, in particular foreign air carriers operating in Belgium, were not subjected to regular monitoring.

As regards the **swift detection** of potential deficiencies by the Belgian appropriate authority, the assessment of the Commission inspectors was based on factors such as the deployment of a variety of methods to monitor compliance and its scope.

The verified list of national quality control activities including the detailed assessment of a sample of 18 reports of national monitoring activities carried out in 2009, 2010 and 2011 at airports, operators and entities as well as the review of security programmes of the airports of Brussels and Liege, two national air carriers (Brussels Airlines and Jetairfly) and two foreign air carriers (Royal Air Maroc and Syrianair) confirmed the following:

- the appropriate authority reported having carried out a suitable combination of different methods for compliance monitoring including security audits, inspections, tests and surveys. However, the scope of inspections carried out in 2010 did not always cover at least one set of directly linked common basic standards listed in Appendix I of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 18/2010. As a result, compliance with the security objectives could not be adequately assessed as requirements which impact on each other closely were not always considered together;
- in 2010, covert tests were not carried out in areas of protection of aircraft, protection of cargo and screening of cargo;
- not all sets of directly linked security measures covered by chapters 1 to 6 of the Annex I of Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 and the corresponding implementing acts

were adequately inspected at two airports with an annual traffic volume of more than 2 million passengers in 2010. In fact, aircraft security searches were not inspected at Brussels airport and examination of vehicles, surveillance, patrols and other physical controls, demarcated area of the airport, potential disruptive passengers, screening of hold baggage and reconciliation of hold baggage were not inspected at Charleroi airport;

- the reviewed airport security programmes of Brussels and Liege indicated that although both of them had been recently updated, they did not describe all the methods and procedures which are to be followed by the airport operator in order to comply both with Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 and with the NASP. In addition, the security programme of Liege airport did not include sufficient measures for internal quality control;
- the Belgian appropriate authority did not systematically monitor air carrier security programmes to ensure these are in compliance with EU requirements. While the security programme of Royal Air Maroc, dated August 2010, was mostly in line with the EU requirements, the programme of Syrianair was dated June 2009 and the inspectors confirmed that it did not cover certain EU requirements. As regards Belgian air carriers, the reviewed security programmes of Brussels Airlines and Jetairfly confirmed that a significant number of the new EU requirements were not reflected in the programmes.

Conclusion: Operators were not regularly monitored. In addition, the national compliance monitoring did not adequately cover all relevant security measures and did not provide the appropriate authority with a comprehensive overview of the implementation of security measures in the field. The overall capability to swiftly detect potential deficiencies was therefore deemed to be insufficient. The results of the verifications at Liege airport support this finding as failures have been identified by the Commission inspectors in areas of security not reported as deficient in the national inspection reports. The adequacy of compliance monitoring activities is therefore classified as "not compliant with serious deficiencies".

6.1.2 Effectiveness of compliance monitoring activities

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of monitoring activities, the methodology used, the swiftness of correction and the use of enforcement powers were assessed. The assessment was based on a review of a sample of inspection reports and on an on-site verification at LGG airport.

- As regards the **common methodology** for compliance monitoring activities, the verifications and interviews confirmed the following:
 - as regards point 5.1 of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 18/2010, the methodology for conducting monitoring activities conformed to a standardised approach, which included tasking, planning, preparation, on-site activity, the classification of findings and the completion of the report;
 - as regards point 5.2 of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 18/2010, compliance monitoring activities were based on a systematic gathering of information by means of observations, interviews, examination of documents and verifications;

- as regards point 5.3 of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 18/2010, the compliance monitoring activities undertaken did include both announced and unannounced activities;
- as regards the methodology used when conducting inspections the appropriate authority did not always follow points 7.1 and 7.2 of Annex II to Reg. (EU) No 18/2010;
- as regards the requirement for a test protocol (point 8.2 of Annex II to Reg. (EU) No 18/2010) the appropriate authority had developed a methodology for conducting tests in aviation security at the airports in Belgium;
- as regards chapter 10 of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 18/2010 the reporting of compliance monitoring activities did not always include all the elements set out in point 10.2 of this chapter. Some reports analysed by the inspectors did not include the name of the auditors or the classification of compliance. In addition, most of the reports covered several monitoring activities and a compilation of them were sent to the monitored entities several months after the identification of deficiencies. This had an impact on the swift correction of failures by the airports, operators and entities;
- as regards point 11.1 of the Annex II of Regulation (EU) No 18/2010, the harmonised classification system of compliance set out in Appendix II of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 18/2010 was not always used in full.

Conclusion: The inconsistencies in the inspection methodology led to the classification of "not compliant".

- As regards the **swift correction** of failures, which is required in Chapter 12 of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 18/2010, the Commission inspectors assessed a sample of inspection reports, subsequent action plans and letters to and from the operators monitored. The verifications confirmed that the appropriate authority has developed deficiency rectification activities, including the obligation of inspected entities to submit in a systematic manner corrective action plans within established deadlines. However, the airports, operators and entities were provided with compiled reports of several monitoring activities carried out during several months and could therefore only submit their action plans several months after the identification of deficiencies. For instance, recurrent serious deficiencies identified by the national auditors at Charleroi airport in the areas of access control (§1.2) and screening of persons other than passengers and items carried (§1.3) on 28/09/2010, were confirmed during the next inspections on 19/10/2010 and 18/11/2010 but were only reported to the airport at the end of November 2010. As a result, these deficiencies were still not corrected on 10/12/2010. In addition, the appropriate authority was often not provided with the confirmation when the correction process was completed and did not systematically carry out follow-up inspections in order to ensure the effective implementation of remedial actions. Finally, when correction of deficiencies could not take place promptly compensatory measures were not always implemented.

Conclusion: The obligations related to deficiency correction activities are therefore classified as "not compliant".

- With regard to Chapters 2 and 16 of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 18/2010, the previous inspections already established that the appropriate authority has clearly

been provided with the necessary **enforcement powers** to ensure the effectiveness of its national civil aviation security programme. The enforcement powers of the Belgian auditors were further evident in Article 38 of the "Réglementation de la Navigation Aérienne", where their role and powers were stated and the mechanism for initiating a legal proceeding is set out in §2. Article 32 of this regulation describes the fines regime and Article 45 establishes the administrative sanctions. The appropriate authority has developed a stepped approach as regards deficiency rectification and corresponding enforcement measures including administrative penalties and fines for individuals and for legal entities failing to comply with the requirements set out in the NASP. The appropriate authority provided the Commission inspectors with the evidence of having taken the following enforcement measures:

- in 2010, two warnings served on staff for having by-passed the security screening checkpoint;
- in 2011, the withdrawal of the airport identification card of a staff member for unruly behaviour towards security staff.

However, the verifications carried out by the Commission inspectors including the visit at LGG airport revealed that a significant number of deficiencies identified during national compliance monitoring were still not corrected.

Conclusion: In view of the Commission the examples of enforcement measures provided by the appropriate authority were not proportionate with the breaches of security nor did they reflect the number of recurrent deficiencies identified by the national auditors in 2010. This is therefore classified as "not compliant".

6.1.3 Availability of auditors for compliance monitoring activities

With regard to Chapter 14 of the Annex II of Regulation (EU) No 18/2010, the Commission inspectors analysed whether sufficient auditors were available for performing all compliance monitoring activities. During the period assessed in this inspection, the appropriate authority used 4 out of 8 national auditors for monitoring compliance in the field. The interviews and verifications carried out by the inspectors confirmed the following:

- the national auditors only spent part of their working time on national compliance monitoring activities in the field. In 2010 this corresponded to an average of 60% for four of the auditors. The number of equivalent full time auditors was therefore 2.5;
- operators were not monitored regularly;
- inspections at Brussels and Charleroi airports did not cover all security measures set out in chapters 1 to 6 of the Annex I of Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 at least every 12 months;
- the compliance monitoring activities carried out by the national auditors did not include all detailed security measures assessed together within sets listed in Appendix I of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 18/2010, so as to allow for swift detection of deficiencies;
- follow-up activities in order to ensure the swift and effective correction of deficiencies were not routinely carried out.

Conclusion: The availability of auditors for compliance monitoring activities at airports, operators and other entities is currently not sufficient to implement an effective audit system. This is therefore classified as "not compliant with serious deficiencies".

6.2 Review of the implementation of the regulatory framework

The implementation of the regulatory requirements related to Regulations (EC) No 300/2008 and (EU) No 18/2010 were addressed as part of the inspection.

- Chapter 3 of the Annex II of Regulation (EU) No 18/2010 sets out common requirements as regards the content of the NQCP. The current Belgian national programme is dated from August 2009. This version has been revised to include the new requirements in force as from 29 April 2010. The examination carried out by the inspectors revealed that this revision did still not include the following provisions:
 - some of the definitions required in the Regulation;
 - the risk assessment to determine the frequency for inspecting all security measures covered by chapters 7 to 12 of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 300/2008;
 - the scope and methodologies for conducting inspections according to points 7.1 and 7.2 of Annex II to the Regulation (EU) No 18/2010;
 - the obligation for implementing compensatory measures when deficiencies identified by the national auditors cannot be rectified promptly;
 - the obligation for airports, operators or entities subjected to compliance monitoring activities to provide the appropriate authority with confirmation when the deficiency rectification process has been completed;
 - the Appendixes I, II and III.

Conclusion: This is therefore classified as "not compliant with serious deficiencies".

- Article 10 of Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 requires the establishment of a NASP. The current version of the NASP was adopted in April 2011. The programme includes detailed measures for the implementation of the common basic standards. A review of the programme confirmed that in general it reflected Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 and its implementing legislation. The responsibilities for the implementation of the common basic standards were clearly defined in the NASP. However, the appropriate authority did not establish the frequencies and the means of undertaking surveillance and patrols at airports and even though the provisional frequency of screening in-flight and airport supplies was determined, this was not based on a risk assessment. Further, the requirement for vehicles to display vehicle passes in airside areas was not clearly mentioned in the NASP. Consequently, this was reflected in the examined Liege airport security programme.

As regards the implementation of the air cargo security requirements, the following observations were made:

- the legal requirements related to obligations for the security of cargo are listed and detailed in the NASP;
- all applicants for regulated agent status have submitted security programmes to be examined and have been subject to an on-site verification before being granted this status by the Belgian appropriate authority. However, not all required declarations

[REDACTED]

of commitments as defined by Attachment 6-A were retained by the appropriate authority;

- a review of a sample of three regulated agents' security programmes (TNT, SWISSPORT site at Liege airport and BPL site at Mount Saint Guibert) previously examined for compliance by the appropriate authority showed that the programmes were mostly in line with the Regulation;
- cargo was not subjected to security controls other than those referred to in point 6.2.1 (a) to (f) of Commission Decision 2010/774/EU. However, the appropriate authority did not allow regulated agents to use explosive trace detection methodology. Further, the Belgian NASP does not allow for exemptions from screening cargo other than those referred to in the Regulation;
- the requirements related to obligations for regulated agents, known consignors and protection of cargo in the NASP were found to be in compliance with the Regulation.

With regards to security training, the requirements for recruitment, training, certification or approval and recurrent training mostly met the provisions of the Regulation. However, these provisions have not been fully implemented yet. The content of security training courses which are being developed by the appropriate authority at the European Aviation Security Training Institute (EASTI) are still not completed. For instance, the e-learning security awareness training course which was not operational in 2008 during the last Commission inspection of the appropriate authority was found still not implemented.

In Belgium, there are no instructors other than some of the representatives of the appropriate authority. All security training is given by EASTI.

As a result, the verifications carried out at Liege airport confirmed that staff with access to critical parts of the security restricted area for more than one year were still not provided with the required security awareness training.

Conclusion: The identified shortcomings, particularly the lack of implementation of security training requirements are classified as "not compliant with serious deficiencies".

- As regards the application of Article 4(4) of Regulation (EC) No 300/2008, Belgium has not informed the Commission of alternative security measures to derogate from the common basic standards at "small airports". However, verifications showed that at least 23 airports were not included in the list of Belgian airports that apply Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 provided by the appropriate authority.

Conclusion: This is classified as "not compliant with serious deficiencies".

- As regards the application of Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 referring to more stringent measures, the appropriate authority of Belgium has informed the Commission of such measures.

Conclusion: Without prejudice to a more detailed assessment of the relevance, objectiveness, and proportionality of these measures as well as the requirement to be non-discriminatory, this is classified as "fully compliant".

- As regards the implementation of notifications given in accordance with Article 15 of Regulation (EU) No 72/2010, inspectors verified that action was taken by the appropriate authority to inform its airports accordingly.

Conclusion: This is classified as "fully compliant".

6.3 Verification of the effectiveness of national monitoring activities at airport level

LGG airport (which is an international airport with a yearly traffic volume of approximately 300.000 passengers) was selected as an example of an airport where compliance monitoring activities had recently been performed.

The following monitoring activities at LGG airport were documented as having been performed by or under the supervision of the Belgian appropriate authority:

- Several inspections and tests in 2009;
- A security audit and several tests in 2010;
- A follow-up audit in 2011.

On-site verifications showed that the effectiveness of both the national monitoring activities and subsequent deficiency rectification activities were not satisfactory. This assessment is based on the fact that the announced rectification of certain identified deficiencies was not confirmed by the on-site verifications of the Commission inspectors. In addition, some security areas that had been classified as compliant or were not identified as deficient were found to have failures, including serious deficiencies in the areas of screening of persons other than passengers and items carried, in-flight supplies and airport supplies.

The annex to this report provides technical notes of the on-site verification. The appraisal of the observations made and listed in the technical notes should be considered as of an indicative nature.

6.3.1 Deficiencies corrected

Commission inspectors were able to verify whether deficiencies identified during the above national monitoring activities were properly rectified. The correction of deficiencies was confirmed in the following areas:

- certain requirements relating to access control;
- certain requirements relating to screening of persons other than passengers and items carried;
- certain requirements relating to examination of vehicles;
- certain requirements relating to surveillance, patrols and other physical controls;
- certain requirements relating to screening of passengers;
- certain requirements relating to screening of hold baggage;
- certain requirements relating to air carrier mail and air carrier materials;
- certain requirements relating to security equipment.

6.3.2 Deficiencies not corrected

Commission inspectors noted that the following deficiencies still existed, even though the appropriate authority stated that they had been rectified:

- certain requirements relating to access control;
- certain requirements relating to screening of persons other than passengers and items carried;

- certain requirements relating to security of cargo;
- certain requirements relating to security training.

6.3.2 Other shortcomings identified

The following areas that had been assumed to be compliant or were not monitored by the appropriate authority were found to have shortcomings:

- certain requirements relating to airport planning requirements;
- certain requirements relating to access control;
- certain requirements relating to surveillance, patrols and other physical controls;
- certain requirements relating to aircraft security search;
- certain requirement relating to screening of liquids, aerosols and gels;
- certain requirements relating to in-flight supplies;
- certain requirements relating to airport supplies;

7. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

Following the identification of the above deficiencies, Commission inspectors have identified a set of recommendations which should be followed as a matter of priority.

- 7.1** The appropriate authority should swiftly increase its regular monitoring of operators;
- 7.2** The appropriate authority should carry out tests to examine the effectiveness of the implementation of at least the security measures set out in point 8.1 of Regulation (EU) No 18/2010;
- 7.3** The scope of inspections should be reviewed to ensure that all individual security measures defined in Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 and the corresponding implementing acts are inspected at regular intervals and that inspections cover the sets of directly linked measures listed in Appendix I to the Annex of Regulation (EU) No 18/2010, in order to improve significantly the swift detection of failures.
- 7.4** Airports with an annual traffic volume of more than 2 million passengers should be inspected covering all sets of directly linked security measures set out in chapters 1 to 6 of the Annex I of Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 at least every 12 months;
- 7.5** The compliance monitoring activities should assess the implementation of the national civil aviation security programme using in full the harmonised classification system of compliance set out in Appendix II of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 18/2010;
- 7.6** The appropriate authority should include in the reports of compliance monitoring activities all the elements set out in point 10.2 of the Annex II of Regulation (EU) No 18/2010;
- 7.7** The appropriate authority should ensure the effective implementation of rectification measures within established timeframes and ensure the implementation of compensatory measures when the deficiencies cannot be rectified promptly;
- 7.8** The appropriate authority should use its enforcement powers to avoid recurrent deficiencies;

- [Stamp]
- 7.9 The appropriate authority should ensure that the available auditors have significantly more time to carry out compliance monitoring activities covering all detailed security measures at airports, operators and entities;
- 7.10 The appropriate authority should swiftly update its NQCP in order to include all provisions set out in Regulation (EU) No 18/2010;
- 7.11 The appropriate authority should ensure that all airports maintain an airport security programme complying with the new legislative requirements and monitor air carrier security programmes of all airlines operating from Belgium;
- 7.12 The appropriate authority should update its NASP and urgently implement the security training obligations at airports, operators and entities;
- 7.13 The appropriate authority should ensure the full application of EU rules at all its airports or adopt alternative security measures that provide an adequate level of protection for airports where traffic is limited to one or more of the categories listed in Article 1 of Regulation (EU) No 1254/2009;
- 7.14 As regards the failures identified at LGG airport, the appropriate authority should swiftly take appropriate corrective actions.

8. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

In official correspondence dated 29 July 2011, the appropriate authority informed the Commission of the following immediate actions taken to remedy those serious deficiencies which were identified by the Commission inspectors at LGG airport as having a potential impact on the overall level of the civil aviation security in the Community and would therefore require the application of Article 15 of Regulation (EU) No 72/2010:

- All the doors at LACHS Cargo allowing access to CSRA are now under control of the security staff and the windows at the offices were locked. The concerned security staff implementing screening of persons other than passengers and items carried were subjected to re-training on access control rights;
- The appropriate authority has established the frequency and the means for screening airport and in-flight supplies based on a risk assessment. A detailed procedure on how and when to screen supplies being taken into the CSRA has been put in place following by strict monitoring of its implementation. Training was provided to staff responsible for screening airport and in-flight supplies in line with chapter 11 of Regulation (EU) No 185/2010;
- All the entities handling in-flight and airport supplies, which because of their nature cannot be screened, were invited to apply for regulated suppliers and known suppliers. The appropriate authority together with the airport operator is providing guidance for the swift designation and approval of these entities.

9. CONCLUSIONS

The appropriate authority of Belgium is urged to address the findings and recommendations and to submit an action plan, specifying actions and deadlines, to remedy the cases of non compliance identified during the Commission's inspection, as specified by Article 11 of Regulation (EU) No 72/2010.