

To: TREN CONSULTATION INSURANCE

Subject: response concerning discussion paper on the operation of Regulation EC 785/2005

Dear Sir, Madame,

I would like to respond to the Discussion Paper on the operation of Regulation (EC) 785/2004 on insurance requirements for air carriers and aircraft operators. I am the Project Manager of the operation of the Douglas DC-2 of the Dutch National Aviation Museum Aviodrome in the Netherlands. We operate our aircraft at airshows and events (non-commercial operation, no pax).

Q1

Not being an air carrier engaged in CAT I cannot answer this question.

Q2

Not operating within the general aviation category (see Q3)

Q3

Some of our vintage aircraft were grounded this year due to the high insurance fees.

The most unjust result of the new regulation was on the many relatively heavy historic aircraft on the airshow circuit in the UK and Europe. Such aircraft as the B17 Fortress, the Lockheed Constellation, the B25 Mitchell, the PB4Y Catalina, the DC3, the DC-2 and many others including an increasing number of classic turbine engined aircraft. These aircraft have relatively low utilization in terms of annual flying hours over which to amortize the huge increases in mandatory insurance cover premium now needed.

Many of these aircraft have a MTOM equivalent to those in commercial air transport yet fly but a fraction of the hours a CAT airliner might be expected to achieve. 2,000 hours is not unusual each year with an airliner yet a heritage machine used in airshows might only fly 20/30 hours a year. A factor of 100 in terms of the hourly cost of the insurance cover now needed. Till now it is not possible for us to get an insurance per flight hour, so the costs are the same as a regular 737 flying much more, in worse weather conditions (because they have to fly), over populated areas (we don't), etc.. Additionally the CAT operator will immediately be able to pass on the additional cost to the passenger or freight customer, we don't!

Perhaps the creation of a special category for such aircraft would be the solution

Certainly discussion is needed to determine how to classify a heritage aircraft since many of recent manufacture are certainly of heritage status. My use of the term heritage also includes those which might be considered historic by being manufactured prior to a certain date yet to be determined. Perhaps those constructed prior to 1960 might fall into that category since they are now approaching 50 years of age.

Q4

No

Q5

In my opinion such damage is the responsibility of the airport operator who is in the best position to prevent such unlawful interference while the aircraft is at the airport.

Q6

I have no idea whatsoever.

Q7

I cannot give a definite answer however it would seem to be a good idea.

Q8

I have no idea

Q9

I have no idea.

Q10 to Q13

I am not a community air carrier.

Q14

Yes.

Q15

In my considered opinion the answer must be no. Although they have to inform the passengers they are flying about the nature of their operation.

Best regards,

Dutch National Aviation Museum Aviodrome

Raymond Oostergo