

**RESTREINT UE/ EU RESTRICTED**



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Brussels, 28.4.2015  
C(2015)3016 final  
15/07/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 9 to 12 and from 16 to 17 March 2015**

**Inspection number: 15/07/BE/AA**

Commission européenne, B-1049 Bruxelles / Europese Commissie, B-1049 Brussel - Belgium. Telephone: (32-2) 299 11 11.  
Internet: [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/transport/index\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/transport/index_en.html)

**RESTREINT UE/ EU RESTRICTED**

**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. CONCLUSIONS.....	14



## **1. INTRODUCTION**

From 9 to 12 and from 16 to 17 March 2015 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 26 November 2014.

## **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. K. Bakelandt. The appropriate authority was represented by Mr M. Van Opstal (national coordinator), Mr F. Deckers, Mr G. Verbruggen, Mr T. Lelie, Mr N. Delvaux, Mr S. Wellemans, Mr P. Ferdinand, Mr P. Van Den Langenbergh, Mr L. Boterberg and Mr D. Van Linthout.

The inspection was conducted in two parts:

- the first part (9 – 12 March 2015) 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 12 March 2015 in the presence of the representatives of the appropriate authority.
- the second part (16 – 17 March 2015) was carried out at Antwerp airport (ANR) with the aim of confirming the effectiveness of the implementation of the NQCP in the field. This airport was selected following analysis of the annual reports submitted to the Commission by the Belgian appropriate authority from 2010 to 2013 where this airport was not reported to be subject to any compliance monitoring activity. An oral debriefing regarding the findings of the second part took place on 17 March 2015 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 fourth Commission inspection of the Belgian appropriate authority. The previous inspections were conducted in May 2004, September 2008 and June 2011.

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

The inspection file of Ostend airport is still open pending confirmation that all deficiencies identified during the inspection have been rectified.

#### **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 Antwerp airport. Several 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, operators and entities**, the Belgian national quality control programme did not establish frequencies for security audits and inspections other than the minimum frequencies required by the Commission Regulation (EU) No 18/2010. 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 the Annex to Commission Regulation (EU) 18/2010. The frequencies for inspecting all security measures covered by chapters 7 to 12 of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 at airports with an annual traffic volume of more than 2 million passengers were established by the appropriate authority to be at least every 12 months.

Belgium informed the Commission that it has 6 airports applying Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 in full, 39 "small airports", 59 heliports, 5 national air carriers, more than 80 foreign air carriers operating in the territory, 112 regulated agents, 131 known consignors and 2 regulated suppliers.

The appropriate authority reported having carried out 88 national monitoring activities in 2013 (61 security audits, 10 inspections and 17 tests) for which 121 man-days were recorded. In 2014, 254 monitoring activities were carried out (49 security audits, 26 inspections and 179 tests) for which 139 man-days were recorded.

The Commission inspectors analysed the national monitoring activities carried out in 2013 and in 2014. 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.



**RESTREINT UE/ EU RESTRICTED**

Airports (Pax in thousands) Operators Entities	2013				2014			
	Monitoring Activities			Man-days	Monitoring Activities			Man-days
	Sec. Audits	Inspections	Tests		Sec. Audits Validations	Inspections	Tests	
Brussels (22 000)	1	1	5	9	-	4	-	2
Charleroi (6 500)	-	-	-	-	-	2	43	22
Liege (302)	-	-	-	-	-	1	28	13
Ostend (253)	1	-	10	8	1	1	22	18
Antwerp (120)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kortrijk (70)	1	-	-	10	-	2	-	2
Air Carriers	-	-	-	-	-	11	86	19
Regulated Agents	4	9	2	40	1	5	-	8
Known Consignors	54	-	-	54	45	-	-	45
Regulated Suppliers	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2
Known Suppliers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ACC3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	8
<b>Totals</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>139</b>

The figures shown in this table demonstrate that airports, operators and entities were not subject to monitoring activities at regular intervals. Actually, the airport of Antwerp was not monitored for compliance since 2010 and known suppliers of airport supplies and in-flight supplies were not monitored in 2013 and 2014. In addition, operators and regulated suppliers were not subjected to regular monitoring.

As regards the **regular monitoring of the security programmes of airports, operators and entities** by the Belgian appropriate authority the review of the security programmes of two airports (Charleroi and Antwerp), two national air carriers (VLM Airlines and Jetairfly), one foreign air carrier (Hainan Airways), three regulated agents (Nippon Express Zaventem, Ziegler Deurne and G4S Antwerpen), two known consignors (Atlas Copco, Wilrijk and Umicore, Hoboken) and one regulated supplier (LSG Sky Chefs) confirmed the following:

- the security programme of Charleroi airport, recently updated and approved by the Belgian appropriate authority, was found mostly in line with Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 and with the NASP. On the contrary, the security programme of Antwerp airport (dated January 2015) 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. Procedures were missing in the event of detected or suspected mixing of screened departing passengers and unscreened persons and the use and the evaluation of TIP was not described in the program. In



## RESTREINT UE/ EU RESTRICTED

addition, some provisions of EU legislation recently adopted were not included in the programme;

- the Belgian appropriate authority did not systematically monitor air carrier security programmes to ensure these are in compliance with EU requirements. The content of the security programmes of VLM Airlines (dated August 2014 and approved by the appropriate authority) was mostly reflecting the repealed Regulation (EC) No 2320/2002 and the security programme of Jetairfly (dated September 2013) lacked information on in-flight supplies, details relating to the required competencies for training and internal quality control provisions. As regards foreign air carriers, the requested security programme of Jet Airways was not available for examination and the security programme of Hainan Airways did not fully comply with the EU requirements as regards aircraft searches;
- the security programmes of regulated agents, previously examined for compliance by the appropriate authority showed that the programmes were in general in line with the Regulation;
- the validation records and the security programmes of the known consignors, all operative in the vicinity of Antwerp airport, showed that, in general, they were in line with the regulatory requirements;
- the security programme of the reviewed regulated supplier, previously examined for compliance by the appropriate authority, lacked information on screening methods for in-flight supplies, the required competencies for training and the designation procedure of known suppliers of in-flight supplies;

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 reports of national monitoring activities carried out in 2013 and 2014 at airports, operators and entities confirmed the following:

- the appropriate authority reported having carried out a suitable combination of different methods for compliance monitoring including security audits, inspections and tests;
- covert tests were not carried out in areas of screening and protection of cargo;
- not all 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 the two Belgian airports with an annual traffic volume of more than 2 million passengers. In fact, in 2013, Charleroi airport was not subjected to compliance monitoring at all and although the areas of aircraft security, passengers and cabin baggage and hold baggage were audited at Brussels airport, the report of this security audit was never sent to the airport. In 2014, the areas of airport planning requirements, examination of vehicles, surveillance, patrols and other physical controls, protection of passengers, potential disruptive passengers and screening, protection and reconciliation of hold baggage were not inspected at Brussels airport;
- certain security measures defined in Annex I of Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 including security controls for in-flight supplies, explosive detection systems, threat



image projection and explosive detection dogs were not regularly monitored at several airports, operators and entities.

**Conclusion:** The airport of Antwerp, air carriers and some entities were not regularly monitored. In addition, the security programmes of airports, air carriers and regulated suppliers were not adequately monitored as some were not in line with the requirements. Further, 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 these in the field. The overall capability to swiftly detect potential deficiencies was therefore deemed to be insufficient. The results of the verifications at Antwerp airport support this finding as a number of failures have been detected by the Commission inspectors in several areas of security. 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 ANR airport.

- As regards the **common methodology** for compliance monitoring activities, the verifications and interviews confirmed the following:
  - as regards point 5.1 of the Annex to Commission 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 the Annex to Commission 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 the Annex to Commission 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 follow points 6 and 7 of the Annex to Commission Regulation (EU) No 18/2010;
  - as regards the requirement for a test protocol (point 8.2 of the Annex to Commission Regulation (EU) No 18/2010) the appropriate authority had developed a methodology for conducting tests in aviation security at the airports in Belgium. However, covert tests were carried out in the area of examination of vehicles without an established test protocol;
  - as regards chapter 10 of the Annex to Commission Regulation (EU) No 18/2010 the reporting of compliance monitoring activities did not always include the type of activities and recommendations when these were applicable as required in point 10.2 of this chapter. In addition, compliance monitoring activities were not reported or recorded in a standardised format allowing for an on-going analysis of



trends as required in point 10.1. Actually, there were two different structures of reporting. Finally, following a security audit in February 2013 and an inspection in December 2014 carried out at the airport of Brussels where deficiencies were identified, the appropriate authority did not report the relevant findings to the airport;

- as regards point 11.1 of the Annex to Commission Regulation (EU) No 18/2010, the harmonised classification system of compliance set out in Appendix II of the same Regulation was used.

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

- As regards the **swift correction** of failures, which is required in Chapter 12 of the Annex to Commission 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 appropriate authority was not always provided with the confirmation that the correction process was completed and did not systematically carry out follow-up inspections in order to ensure the effective implementation of remedial actions. In addition, when correction of deficiencies could not take place promptly compensatory measures were not always implemented. Actually, on two occasions the airport of Brussels was not provided with the reports of a security audit and of an inspection carried out by the appropriate authority in February 2013 and December 2014 where failures, including serious deficiencies, were identified by the national auditors. Besides, the inspectors were not provided with the evidence of records or reports of follow-up activities in the areas identified as not compliant with serious deficiencies in the above referred reports.

**Conclusion:** The obligations related to deficiency correction activities are therefore classified as "not compliant, with serious deficiencies".

- With regard to Chapters 2 and 16 of Annex to Commission 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. However, the appropriate authority was not able to provide the Commission inspectors with the evidence of having imposed enforcement measures in 2013 and 2014. The only example documented was the withdrawal of the status of LSG regulated supplier from 25 July to 11 October 2012 for failing to comply with requirements relating to access control to its premises and security training of its personnel.



And yet, the examination of national compliance monitoring reports carried out by the Commission inspectors revealed that a significant number of deficiencies, including serious deficiencies, identified by the national auditors were challenged by the airports, operators and entities in the corrective action plans. The correction of some of these deficiencies was then not appropriately followed up by the appropriate authority.

**Conclusion:** In view of the number of deficiencies and recurrent deficiencies identified by the national auditors in 2013 and 2014, the absence of any enforcement measures being taken by the appropriate authority is classified as "not compliant".

### **6.1.3 Availability of auditors for compliance monitoring activities**

With regard to Chapter 14 of the Annex to Commission 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 7 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 2014 this corresponded to an average of 28% for each of the auditors. The number of equivalent full time auditors was therefore 2;
- airports, operators and entities 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;
- not all security measures defined in Annex I of Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 and the corresponding implementing acts were regularly monitored in order to ensure the swift detection of deficiencies;
- the examined security programmes of one airport, three air carries and one regulated supplier did not fully comply both with the Regulation and with the NASP.

**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 Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 and Commission Regulation (EU) No 18/2010 were addressed as part of the inspection.

- Chapter 3 of the Annex to Commission Regulation (EU) No 18/2010 sets out common requirements as regards the content of the NQCP. The current Belgian national programme is dated from March 2015. 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;



## RESTREINT UE/ EU RESTRICTED

- the scope and methodologies for conducting inspections according to points 7.1 and 7.2 of the Annex to the Commission Regulation (EU) No 18/2010;
- the frequencies for conducting security audits and inspections other than the minimum frequencies required by the Regulation;
- 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 Appendix 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. The responsibilities for the implementation of these standards were clearly defined. The Belgian appropriate authority had approved risk assessments establishing frequencies and means of undertaking surveillance and patrols at national airports. However, the appropriate authority did not update the NASP since April 2011. Obligations relating to high risk cargo and mail, air cargo or mail carrier operating into the Union from a third country airport (ACC3) and some requirements relating to explosive detection dogs such as approval procedures, methodology of screening, quality control and test protocols were not reflected in the NASP. Nevertheless, the amendments to the Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 and its implementing acts were communicated to airports, operators and entities on a need to know basis. The appropriate authority has been working on a new version of the NASP which should be approved in June 2015.

**Conclusion:** The fact that the NASP was not maintained since 2011 is classified as "not compliant".

- The Annex to Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 and its implementing rules lay down detailed requirements for the the implementation of the air cargo security regime. The following observations were made:
  - 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 appropriate authority. The required declarations of commitments as defined by Attachment 6-A were made available by the appropriate authority;
  - all known consignors were on-site validated in line with the provisions by AVSEC inspectors of the Belgian appropriate authority before being granted this status. The required declarations of commitments as defined by Attachment 6-C were made available by the appropriate authority, including also their security programmes;
  - cargo and mail was not subjected to any security controls other than those referred to in §6.2.1 (a) to (g) of Commission Decision (2010) 774;
  - As regards ACC3 obligations, the appropriate authority has developed procedures for the application and validation of requests. These procedures do take into



## RESTREINT UE/ EU RESTRICTED

account Commission Regulation (EU) No 185/2010 and Commission Decision (2010) 774;

- There was a mechanism with which the AA ensured that cargo is flown in from third country airports in line with the ACC3 requirements only. The Belgian aviation security inspectorate worked in close cooperation with the traffic rights department, where a special procedure for granting traffic rights took into account the ACC3 validations. There was also a procedure for the request of an exemption for ad hoc flights.

**Conclusion:** The implementation of the air cargo security requirements is classified as "fully compliant".

- With regards to security training, the requirements for recruitment, training, certification or approval and recurrent training laid down in the Annex to Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 and its implementing rules were neither reflected in the NASP nor in any other national documentation. In addition, the appropriate authority did neither provide training for instructors nor approve and maintain a list of appropriate security training courses. The inspectors were informed that persons have successfully completed relevant training before being authorised to implement security controls unsupervised by instructors from other Member States based on the principal of mutual recognition. However, the verifications carried out at the airport of Antwerp revealed that the security awareness training and the specific training for security managers were provided by Belgian instructors not certified or approved by the appropriate authority. The appropriate authority only provided training to security managers and certified persons implementing screening of persons, cabin baggage, items carried and hold baggage. Further, e-learning security awareness training was made available to airports in order to train persons with unescorted access to security restricted areas.

**Conclusion:** The identified shortcomings, in particular the lack of provisions for security training, are classified as "not compliant with serious deficiencies".

- As regards the application of Article 4(4) of Regulation (EC) No 300/2008, Belgium has informed the Commission in 2013 of alternative security measures to derogate from the common basic standards at "small airports". Recently, an update was sent to the Commission to include Kortrijk-Wevelgem to the list of these airports.

**Conclusion:** This is classified as "fully compliant".

- As regards the application of Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 referring to more stringent measures, the appropriate authority informed the inspectors that there are no such measures in Belgium.

**Conclusion:** This is classified as "not applicable".

- 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**

ANR airport (which is an international airport with a yearly traffic volume of approximately 120.000 passengers) was selected as an example of an airport where compliance monitoring activities had not been performed for four years.

On-site verifications showed that several security areas that had not been monitored were found to have failures and the appropriate authority did therefore not ensure the required swift detection of deficiencies.

The following areas that 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 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 requirement relating to screening of passengers;
- certain requirements relating to security of cargo;
- certain requirements relating to airport supplies;
- certain requirements relating to security training;
- certain requirements relating to security equipment.

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.

## **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 airports, operators and entities;
- 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 the Annex to Commission Regulation (EU) No 18/2010;
- 7.3** Airports with an annual traffic volume of more than 2 million passengers should be inspected covering 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;
- 7.4** The appropriate authority should ensure that all individual security measures defined in Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 and the corresponding implementing acts are monitored at regular intervals at all airports, operators and entities in order to improve significantly the swift detection of failures.



- 7.5 The appropriate authority should ensure that all airports and regulated suppliers maintain security programmes complying with the legislative requirements and monitor air carrier security programmes of all airlines operating from Belgium;
- 7.6 The appropriate authority should report compliance monitoring activities in a standardised format, include in the reports all the elements set out in point 10.2 of the Annex to Commission Regulation (EU) No 18/2010 and when deficiencies are identified report the relevant findings to the airports, operators or entities subjected to monitoring;
- 7.7 The appropriate authority should ensure the implementation of compensatory measures when deficiencies cannot be rectified promptly and require the confirmation when the correction process was completed. In addition, follow-up activities should systematically be carried out in order to ensure the effective implementation of remedial actions;
- 7.8 The appropriate authority should use its enforcement powers to avoid recurrent deficiencies;
- 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 the Annex to Commission Regulation (EU) No 18/2010;
- 7.11 The appropriate authority should update its NASP and urgently implement the security training obligations at airports, operators and entities;
- 7.12 As regards the failures identified at ANR airport, the appropriate authority should swiftly take appropriate corrective actions.

## **8. 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.