

Public Consultation on Certification of Airport Screening Equipment

A. Profile	
1.1. Please insert your name and surname -open reply-(compulsory)	[REDACTED]
1.2. Can we contact you for further information?" -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Yes
1.2.1. Please provide an email address where we can contact you -open reply-(compulsory)	[REDACTED]
1.3. You are/represent -single choice reply-(optional)	A national administration
1.4. Name of Organisation -open reply-(compulsory)	Ministry of Security and Justice, National Coordinator for Security and Counterterrorism
1.5. Job title -open reply-(optional)	[REDACTED]
1.6. Day-time phone number -open reply-(optional)	[REDACTED]
1.7. In which country are you/is your organisation based? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	NL – Netherlands
1.8. What is your/your organisation's main sector of activity? -open reply-(optional)	Surveillance, Protection and Civil Aviation Security
1.9. What security solutions does your company produce/offer/use? -open reply-(optional)	Dutch appropriate authority for civil aviation security. Responsible for drawing up national regulation with regard to civil aviation security and determining security measures at Dutch airports
B. Problem Definition	
2.1.1. The efficiency of the certification process? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Positive effect
2.1.2. Research and development costs? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Positive effect
2.1.3. Commercialisation costs? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very positive effect
2.1.4. Time to market of equipment? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Positive effect
2.1.5. Legal certainty? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Positive effect
2.1.6. Passenger and staff security? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Do not know

2.1.7. Passenger flow - Facilitation of screening process - increasing throughput? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Do not know
2.1.8. Training of services personnel? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Do not know
2.1.9. Use of airport space? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Do not know
2.1.10. Competition with US competitors? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very positive effect
2.1.11. Harmonisation with third countries, for example the US. -single choice reply-(optional)	Very positive effect
2.2. Do you believe that test laboratories should be accredited on a EU level? -single choice reply-(optional)	Yes
2.2.1. Do you believe the test laboratories should be regularly audited? -single choice reply-(optional)	Yes
2.3. Has the current situation hindered you in becoming a ECAC - CEP test laboratory? -single choice reply-(optional)	No
C. Assessment of the Options	
1. " Baseline scenario ", the Commission would not launch any dedicated policy initiative to harmonise the certification procedures for airport screening equipment. -single choice reply-(compulsory)	No effect
2. " Recommendation ", recommending to Member States to mutually accept their national approval systems and/or to rely on the common evaluation process of the European Civil Aviation Conference. -single choice reply-(compulsory)	positive effect
3.1. The " directive-based approach ", is characterised by a set of detailed specifications which are laid out in the directive itself. -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very positive effect
3.2. The " standards-based approach ", is not based on specifications as detailed as under the old approach. The new approach focuses on essential requirements written in general terms. -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very positive effect
3.3. The " centralised approach ", whereby the certification would be done centrally by an EU agency, such as for example the European Aviation	No effect

<p>Safety Agency, which already today certifies centrally for the whole of the EU commercial aircrafts.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	
<p>1. "Baseline scenario", the Commission would not launch any dedicated policy initiative to harmonise the certification procedures for airport screening equipment.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>2. "Recommendation", recommending to Member States to mutually accept their national approval systems and/or to rely on the common evaluation process of the European Civil Aviation Conference.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	positive effect
<p>3.1. The "directive-based approach", is characterised by a set of detailed specifications which are laid out in the directive itself.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	Very positive effect
<p>3.2. The "standards-based approach", is not based on specifications as detailed as under the old approach. The new approach focuses on essential requirements written in general terms.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	Very positive effect
<p>3.3. The "centralised approach", whereby the certification would be done centrally by an EU agency, such as for example the European Aviation Safety Agency, which already today certifies centrally for the whole of the EU commercial aircrafts.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	positive effect
<p>1. "Baseline scenario", the Commission would not launch any dedicated policy initiative to harmonise the certification procedures for airport screening equipment.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>2. "Recommendation", recommending to Member States to mutually accept their national approval systems and/or to rely on the common evaluation process of the European Civil Aviation Conference.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>3.1. The "directive-based approach", is characterised by a set of detailed specifications which are laid out in the directive itself.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	Negative effect
<p>3.2. The "standards-based approach", is not based on specifications as detailed as under the old approach. The new approach focuses on essential requirements written in general terms.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	Very positive effect
<p>3.3. The "centralised approach", whereby the</p>	No effect

<p>certification would be done centrally by an EU agency, such as for example the European Aviation Safety Agency, which already today certifies centrally for the whole of the EU commercial aircrafts.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	
<p>1. "Baseline scenario", the Commission would not launch any dedicated policy initiative to harmonise the certification procedures for airport screening equipment.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>2. "Recommendation", recommending to Member States to mutually accept their national approval systems and/or to rely on the common evaluation process of the European Civil Aviation Conference.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	positive effect
<p>3.1. The "directive-based approach", is characterised by a set of detailed specifications which are laid out in the directive itself.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	Very positive effect
<p>3.2. The "standards-based approach", is not based on specifications as detailed as under the old approach. The new approach focuses on essential requirements written in general terms.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	Very positive effect
<p>3.3. The "centralised approach", whereby the certification would be done centrally by an EU agency, such as for example the European Aviation Safety Agency, which already today certifies centrally for the whole of the EU commercial aircrafts.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>1. "Baseline scenario", the Commission would not launch any dedicated policy initiative to harmonise the certification procedures for airport screening equipment.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>2. "Recommendation", recommending to Member States to mutually accept their national approval systems and/or to rely on the common evaluation process of the European Civil Aviation Conference.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	positive effect
<p>3.1. The "directive-based approach", is characterised by a set of detailed specifications which are laid out in the directive itself.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	positive effect
<p>3.2. The "standards-based approach", is not based on specifications as detailed as under the old approach. The new approach focuses on essential requirements written in general terms.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	Very positive effect

<p>3.3. The "centralised approach", whereby the certification would be done centrally by an EU agency, such as for example the European Aviation Safety Agency, which already today certifies centrally for the whole of the EU commercial aircrafts.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>Negative effect</p>
<p>1. "Baseline scenario", the Commission would not launch any dedicated policy initiative to harmonise the certification procedures for airport screening equipment.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>No effect</p>
<p>2. "Recommendation", recommending to Member States to mutually accept their national approval systems and/or to rely on the common evaluation process of the European Civil Aviation Conference.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>No effect</p>
<p>3.1. The "directive-based approach", is characterised by a set of detailed specifications which are laid out in the directive itself.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>positive effect</p>
<p>3.2. The "standards-based approach", is not based on specifications as detailed as under the old approach. The new approach focuses on essential requirements written in general terms.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>positive effect</p>
<p>3.3. The "centralised approach", whereby the certification would be done centrally by an EU agency, such as for example the European Aviation Safety Agency, which already today certifies centrally for the whole of the EU commercial aircrafts.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>positive effect</p>
<p>1. "Baseline scenario", the Commission would not launch any dedicated policy initiative to harmonise the certification procedures for airport screening equipment.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>No effect</p>
<p>2. "Recommendation", recommending to Member States to mutually accept their national approval systems and/or to rely on the common evaluation process of the European Civil Aviation Conference.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>No effect</p>
<p>3.1. The "directive-based approach", is characterised by a set of detailed specifications which are laid out in the directive itself.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>No effect</p>
<p>3.2. The "standards-based approach", is not based on specifications as detailed as under the old approach. The new approach focuses on essential requirements written in general terms.</p>	<p>No effect</p>

-single choice reply-(compulsory)	
<p>3.3. The "centralised approach", whereby the certification would be done centrally by an EU agency, such as for example the European Aviation Safety Agency, which already today certifies centrally for the whole of the EU commercial aircrafts.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>1. "Baseline scenario", the Commission would not launch any dedicated policy initiative to harmonise the certification procedures for airport screening equipment.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(optional)</p>	No effect
<p>2. "Recommendation", recommending to Member States to mutually accept their national approval systems and/or to rely on the common evaluation process of the European Civil Aviation Conference.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>3.1. The "directive-based approach", is characterised by a set of detailed specifications which are laid out in the directive itself.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	positive effect
<p>3.2. The "standards-based approach", is not based on specifications as detailed as under the old approach. The new approach focuses on essential requirements written in general terms.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>3.3. The "centralised approach", whereby the certification would be done centrally by an EU agency, such as for example the European Aviation Safety Agency, which already today certifies centrally for the whole of the EU commercial aircrafts.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	positive effect
<p>1. "Baseline scenario", the Commission would not launch any dedicated policy initiative to harmonise the certification procedures for airport screening equipment.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>2. "Recommendation", recommending to Member States to mutually accept their national approval systems and/or to rely on the common evaluation process of the European Civil Aviation Conference.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>3.1. The "directive-based approach", is characterised by a set of detailed specifications which are laid out in the directive itself.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>3.2. The "standards-based approach", is not based on specifications as detailed as under the old</p>	No effect

<p>approach. The new approach focuses on essential requirements written in general terms.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	
<p>3.3. The "centralised approach", whereby the certification would be done centrally by an EU agency, such as for example the European Aviation Safety Agency, which already today certifies centrally for the whole of the EU commercial aircrafts.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>1. "Baseline scenario", the Commission would not launch any dedicated policy initiative to harmonise the certification procedures for airport screening equipment.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>2. "Recommendation", recommending to Member States to mutually accept their national approval systems and/or to rely on the common evaluation process of the European Civil Aviation Conference.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	positive effect
<p>3.1. The "directive-based approach", is characterised by a set of detailed specifications which are laid out in the directive itself.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	Very positive effect
<p>3.2. The "standards-based approach", is not based on specifications as detailed as under the old approach. The new approach focuses on essential requirements written in general terms.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	positive effect
<p>3.3. The "centralised approach", whereby the certification would be done centrally by an EU agency, such as for example the European Aviation Safety Agency, which already today certifies centrally for the whole of the EU commercial aircrafts.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>1. "Baseline scenario", the Commission would not launch any dedicated policy initiative to harmonise the certification procedures for airport screening equipment.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>2. "Recommendation", recommending to Member States to mutually accept their national approval systems and/or to rely on the common evaluation process of the European Civil Aviation Conference.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>3.1. The "directive-based approach", is characterised by a set of detailed specifications which are laid out in the directive itself.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	Positive effect

<p>3.2. The "standards-based approach", is not based on specifications as detailed as under the old approach. The new approach focuses on essential requirements written in general terms.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>Positive effect</p>
<p>3.3. The "centralised approach", whereby the certification would be done centrally by an EU agency, such as for example the European Aviation Safety Agency, which already today certifies centrally for the whole of the EU commercial aircrafts.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(optional)</p>	<p>No effect</p>
<p>1. "Baseline scenario", the Commission would not launch any dedicated policy initiative to harmonise the certification procedures for airport screening equipment.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>No effect</p>
<p>2. "Recommendation", recommending to Member States to mutually accept their national approval systems and/or to rely on the common evaluation process of the European Civil Aviation Conference.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>No effect</p>
<p>3.1. The "directive-based approach", is characterised by a set of detailed specifications which are laid out in the directive itself.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>Positive effect</p>
<p>3.2. The "standards-based approach", is not based on specifications as detailed as under the old approach. The new approach focuses on essential requirements written in general terms.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>Positive effect</p>
<p>3.3. The "centralised approach", whereby the certification would be done centrally by an EU agency, such as for example the European Aviation Safety Agency, which already today certifies centrally for the whole of the EU commercial aircrafts.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>No effect</p>
<p>1. "Baseline scenario", the Commission would not launch any dedicated policy initiative to harmonise the certification procedures for airport screening equipment.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>No effect</p>
<p>2. "Recommendation", recommending to Member States to mutually accept their national approval systems and/or to rely on the common evaluation process of the European Civil Aviation Conference.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>Positive effect</p>
<p>3.1. The "directive-based approach", is</p>	<p>Positive effect</p>

<p>characterised by a set of detailed specifications which are laid out in the directive itself.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	
<p>3.2. The "standards-based approach", is not based on specifications as detailed as under the old approach. The new approach focuses on essential requirements written in general terms.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	Very positive effect
<p>3.3. The "centralised approach", whereby the certification would be done centrally by an EU agency, such as for example the European Aviation Safety Agency, which already today certifies centrally for the whole of the EU commercial aircrafts.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>1. "Baseline scenario", the Commission would not launch any dedicated policy initiative to harmonise the certification procedures for airport screening equipment.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>2. "Recommendation", recommending to Member States to mutually accept their national approval systems and/or to rely on the common evaluation process of the European Civil Aviation Conference.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	Positive effect
<p>3.1. The "directive-based approach", is characterised by a set of detailed specifications which are laid out in the directive itself.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	Very positive effect
<p>3.2. The "standards-based approach", is not based on specifications as detailed as under the old approach. The new approach focuses on essential requirements written in general terms.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	Very positive effect
<p>3.3. The "centralised approach", whereby the certification would be done centrally by an EU agency, such as for example the European Aviation Safety Agency, which already today certifies centrally for the whole of the EU commercial aircrafts.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>1. "Baseline scenario", the Commission would not launch any dedicated policy initiative to harmonise the certification procedures for airport screening equipment.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	No effect
<p>2. "Recommendation", recommending to Member States to mutually accept their national approval systems and/or to rely on the common evaluation process of the European Civil Aviation Conference.</p> <p>-single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	Positive effect

<p>3.1. The "directive-based approach", is characterised by a set of detailed specifications which are laid out in the directive itself. -single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>Very positive effect</p>
<p>3.2. The "standards-based approach", is not based on specifications as detailed as under the old approach. The new approach focuses on essential requirements written in general terms. -single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>Very positive effect</p>
<p>3.3. The "centralised approach", whereby the certification would be done centrally by an EU agency, such as for example the European Aviation Safety Agency, which already today certifies centrally for the whole of the EU commercial aircrafts. -single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>No effect</p>
<p>4.1. Should a harmonised certification procedure be based on the approval of a sample item (type-approval) or of each item produced? -single choice reply-(compulsory)</p>	<p>No opinion</p>
<p>4.2. According to you, are on-site acceptance tests necessary? -single choice reply-(optional)</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>4.3. Do you believe that on-site acceptance tests should be harmonised? -single choice reply-(optional)</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>4.4. Should manufacturers be informed about the testing procedures for equipment? -single choice reply-(optional)</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>4.5. Should manufacturers be informed about the details of the outcome of the tests so as to facilitate the improvement of the equipment? -single choice reply-(optional)</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>D. What role should the European Civil Aviation Conference (ECAC) and their Common Evaluation Process of Security Equipment (CEP) play in a harmonised scheme?</p>	
<p>5.1. The ECAC - CEP system should be considered in the establishment of an EU wide harmonised certification system for airport screening equipment. Do you agree/disagree?</p>	<p>Strongly agree</p>

-single choice reply-(compulsory)	
5.2 The work by the ECAC technical groups on developing standards should be retained in an EU wide harmonised certification system. Do you agree/disagree?	Strongly agree
-single choice reply-(optional)	
5.3. If you answered "agree/strongly agree" to question 5.2, what do you think ECAC's liability should be?	No liability
-single choice reply-(optional)	