



SAFETY DECISION 2017-02

Issue 01

Date of Issue: 08th May 2017

SUBJECT:

ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TRAINING AND ASSESSMENT BODIES

REFERENCE PUBLICATIONS:

CAR PART II: CAR-FCL

CAR PART VIII SUBPART 4

REASON:

A lack of English language proficiency among pilots and air traffic controllers has been identified as a contributory factor to aviation accidents and incidents. Subsequent to the ICAO 32nd Assembly in 1998, ICAO considered English language proficiency, and strengthened relevant provisions of ICAO Annex 1 — Personnel Licensing and ICAO Annex 10 — Aeronautical Telecommunications.

Contracting States were obliged to take steps to ensure pilots and air traffic controllers are proficient in speaking and understanding the English language by 5 March 2008. Research indicates many States are not progressing at an acceptable pace with respect to timely implementation of language training.

Despite the advent of CAR-FCL which has the particularity to introduce an English proficiency assessment method in line with the ICAO Doc 9835 (i.e. requirement FCL.055), the GCAA remains concerned about its effective implementation within the UAE aviation system.

Therefore, the GCAA has decided to take a different approach towards organisations conducting English language assessment for applicants seeking a Flight Crew licence or an Air Traffic Controller licence to ensure they comply with AMC1 and AMC2 to requirement FCL.055 of CAR-FCL or ICAO Doc. 9835 at minimum.

The purpose of This Safety Decision is to:

- a) require all English Language assessment bodies accepted by the GCAA to comply with applicable requirement for each type of licence (i.e. requirement FCL.055(b) of CAR-FCL and its associated AMCs and ICAO Doc. 9835) before 1st October 2017;
- b) inform Aircraft operators and applicants for a Flight Crew licence requiring English Language Proficiency about the means of assessment acceptable to the GCAA from 1st October 2017;
- c) inform Air Traffic Control Units and applicants for an Air Traffic Controller licence about the means of assessment acceptable to the GCAA from 1st October 2017; and



- d) inform holders of a Flight Crew licence or Air Traffic Controller Licence endorsed with ELP 6 about the obligation to be re-assessed by 1st January 2022 unless already assessed by an organisation authorised by the GCAA.

Following promulgation of DG DIRECTIVE 09-2016 and the 20th CATCC held on 10th October 2016, the GCAA has agreed to:

- a) postpone the date of applicability of DG DIRECTIVE 09-2016 now renamed Safety Decision 2017-02;
- b) provide more transparency on the fee for ELP TO if the organisation already holds an ATO Certificate issued in accordance with CAR-ORA; and
- c) postpone the date of applicability of Requirement 4.

This Safety Decision applies to all English Language Proficiency assessment bodies accepted by the GCAA to conduct English Language Proficiency assessment for the issuance of a Flight Crew licence requiring an English Language Proficiency (ELP); or an Air Traffic Controller licence requiring an ELP.

This Safety Decision also provides essential information to Aircraft Operators, Approved Training Organisations, Air Traffic Control Units, applicants for a Flight Crew licence (hereafter called “Pilots”) requiring English language assessment and applicants for an Air Traffic Controller licence requiring English language assessment (hereafter called “Air Traffic Controllers”).

This Safety Decision complements CAR-FCL and CAR PART VIII Subpart 4. In case of contradiction with a provision of CAR-FCL or CAR PART VIII Subpart 4, This Safety Decision will supersede that provision.

This SAFETY DECISION cancels and supersedes DG DIRECTIVE 09-2016.

MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS:

No person shall be assigned an ELP 4 or more unless he has demonstrated compliance with the following safety objectives:

- a) communicate effectively in voice-only and face-to-face situations;
- b) communicate on common and work related topics with accuracy and clarity;
- c) use appropriate communicative strategies to exchange messages and to recognise and resolve misunderstandings in a general or work-related context;
- d) handle successfully the linguistic challenges presented by a complication or unexpected turn of events which occurs within the context of a routine work situation or communicative task with which they are otherwise familiar; and
- e) use a dialect or accent which is intelligible to the aeronautical community.



1. For Pilot licences:

- a) Items (a) to (l) of AMC1 to requirement FCL.055 describe the assessment elements, method, requirements and objectives.
- b) Item (m) of AMC1 to requirement FCL.055 requires concerned bodies to appoint suitably trained and qualified persons as assessors. An English native language instructor or trainer does not necessarily qualify as an English Level Proficiency assessor. Assessors are to be either aviation specialists or language specialists with additional aviation related training.
- c) Item (n) of AMC1 to requirement FCL.055 requires the language assessment body to have a management system and quality system to ensure compliance with, and adequacy of assessment requirements, standards and procedures. In addition, the language assessment shall be independent of the language training.

2. For Air Traffic Controller licences:

ICAO Doc 9835 must be used as guidance by assessors to achieve their assessment role and ensure compliance with the safety objectives. ICAO Doc 9835 is the manual of implementation of ICAO language proficiency requirements and contains guidelines for assessment, checklists for language testing and training methods.

3. For both (Pilot Licence holders and ATCO Licence holders):

The final rating is not the average or aggregate of the ratings in each of the six ICAO language proficiency skills described in AMC2 to FCL.055 but the lowest of these six ratings.

Mandatory Requirement 1:

- a) *From 1st October 2017, no organisation shall assess an applicant for an ELP to be endorsed on an UAE licence unless it holds a specific approval as an ELP Training Organisation (TO) authorised to conduct ELP assessment and provide English Language training. For organisations holding an ATO certificate (as per CAR-ORA), their privileges as ELP TO will be included in their ATO Training Specifications. (Refer to attachment A: GCAA Procedure Manual ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY for APPROVAL)*
- b) *No ELP TO may be approved to provide assessment and training for Pilots, Air Traffic Controller, or combination of both unless its assessment and training system includes the appropriate syllabus and methods, and appropriate and qualified personnel (i.e. instructors and assessors). (Refer to attachment A: GCAA Procedure Manual ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY for ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY and TRAINING)*
- c) *The ELP TO's approval shall remain valid for a maximum period of five years subject to:*
 - (1) *the organisation remaining in compliance with the Law and applicable relevant regulatory requirements including CAR PART III Chapter 9, and this Safety Decision;*
 - (2) *the GCAA being granted access to the organisation to determine continued compliance; and*



- (3) the associated fee has been paid (unless the organisation holds an ATO Certificate and has paid associated fee); and
(4) the certificate not being surrendered or revoked.

Mandatory Requirement 2:

From 1st October 2017, English Language Proficiency (ELP) assessments conducted by organisations not compliant with Mandatory Requirement 1 or showing unresolved concerns within their system against the safety objectives of requirement FCL.055(b) or ICAO Doc 9835 will be denied at the time of application for endorsement of the ELP (CAR-FCL or Appendix 3 of CAR PART VIII Subpart 4 refers).

Mandatory Requirement 3:

- a) From 1st January 2018, licences with an ELP 6 endorsement issued by a foreign State shall not be converted into ELP 6 unless the assessment has been conducted by an organisation approved by the GCAA.
b) Notwithstanding paragraph (a) above, those licences shall be converted with ELP 4 endorsement.

Mandatory Requirement 4:

On or after 1st January 2022, Holders of UAE licences endorsed with ELP 6 shall:

- a) have their English Language Proficiency re-assessed by an approved ELP TO; and
b) provide such evidence to the GCAA

unless their English Language Proficiency has already been assessed by an organisation authorised by the GCAA.

CONTACT:

licensing@gcaa.gov.ae



ATTACHMENT A: GCAA PROCEDURE MANUAL

GCAA PROCEDURE MANUAL

ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY



Contents

1. Initial approval	9
2. Operations Manual	9
2.1. Front page	10
2.2. Intro section	10
2.3. Operational section	10
2.4. Appendices	12
3. Approval procedure as ELP TO	13
3.1. Contact GCAA Licensing Directorate - Training Department	13
3.2. Submission and review of the Operations Manual	13
3.2.1. Operations Manual approval	13
3.2.2. Post holders	14
3.2.3. Staffing	15
3.2.4. Locations	16
4. Basic GCAA requirements for acceptance of a language assessment	16
5. Assessment policies	17
5.1. Enrolment for the assessment	17
5.2. Identification of the candidate	18
5.3. Languages To Be Assessed	19
5.4. Accepted methodologies for language assessment	19
5.5. Use of speech/voice recognition technology	20
5.6. Teleconferencing technology	20
6. The assessment	21
7. Plain language assessment	22
7.1. General	22
7.2. What a Plain language assessment should be?	22
7.3. What a Plain language assessment should NOT be?	24



8.	Recording	24
8.1.	Identification of the candidate	25
8.2.	Disputes/complaints	25
8.3.	Verification that the assessment was executed	25
8.4.	Compliance audit	25
8.5.	Audit of the performance of the assessors:.....	25
8.6.	Recording technology	26
8.7.	Assessment “a posteriori”	26
9.	Use of teleconferencing technologies.....	27
10.	Privacy and privacy statement.....	27
11.	Assessments by ELP TO of foreign licence holders and conducted on foreign territory	28
12.	Confirmation by GCAA of assessments performed by ELP TO.....	29
13.	Assessor recruitment standards	29
14.	Assessor standardization	31
14.1.	Initial Standardization	31
14.2.	Recurrent Standardization	32
14.3.	Code of conduct/ethics	32
14.4.	ELP TO oversight committee	33
15.	Grading.....	34
15.1.	Language proficiency assessment:.....	34
15.2.	Final grading	35
16.	Appeal: Procedure for feedback/disputes/complaints:.....	36
17.	Language proficiency certificate	37
17.1.	Certificate issuance conditions	37
17.2.	Partial pass	38
17.3.	Transfer of the documents to the candidate	38
18.	Re-assessment	38
19.	(Re)training	39
20.	“Shopping” type of candidates	40



21.	Candidate records.....	40
22.	Compliance Monitoring (Internal oversight)	41
22.1.	Compliance Monitoring Manager	41
22.2.	Scope of the Compliance Monitoring System:.....	42
23.	Oversight by the GCAA (external oversight)	42
	ANNEX I: APPLICATION FORM	44
	ANNEX II: ELP TO APPROVAL CERTIFICATE	45
	ANNEX III: GCAA LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT REPORT FORM	48
	ANNEX IV: GCAA LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY CERTIFICATE.....	49
	ANNEX V: CANDIDATE LIST	51
	ANNEX VI: ICAO LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT RATING SCALE.....	54
	ANNEX VII: GCAA LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT PRIVACY STATEMENT	55
	ANNEX VIII: GCAA LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT APPEAL PROCEDURE FEEDBACK/DISPUTE/COMPLAINT FORM	56
	ANNEX IX: ELP TO POST HOLDER AND LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSOR CODE OF CONDUCT/ETHICS: ...	60
	ANNEX X: GCAA AUDIT CHECKLIST OF ELP TO	63



These are the requirements for organizations, in order to obtain (and maintain) an approval as GCAA ELP TO (English Language Proficiency Training Organisation):

1. Initial approval

1. GCAA does not approve individual assessors, only organizations (legal entities), as ELP TO. Qualified and standardized assessors can be added to the list of recognized assessors of an ELP TO.
2. Every organization seeking approval as GCAA ELP TO may be invited to a meeting with the GCAA, during which the highlights of the approval procedure and GCAA language proficiency policies are highlighted. After this meeting the organization should organize its procedures and methodologies in compliance with the applicable regulations, to be eligible for approval as GCAA ELP TO.
3. For an initial approval, the organization is asked to provide/compose/develop the following:
 - Operations Manual (OM) of the ELP TO
 - List of the assessors, individual approval request form of the assessors (+relevant resume), clarifying their role (linguistic/operational assessor, or both) in a standard GCAA format.
 - Development of the ELP TO assessment methodology (test)
 - Development of a Quality (or Compliance Monitoring) System
4. After approval of the Operations Manual, the assessors should be standardized according to the developed and approved procedures. The test should be tested on a test-population, to reach operational status of the test, assessors and systems used, prior to the approval.
5. The test, testing methods and tools, as well as the facilities will be audited, prior to the approval of the organization, as ELP TO.
6. The GCAA approval of an ELP TO will be valid for 5 years
7. A template of the Approval Certificate of a GCAA approved ELP TO can be found in Annex II.

Note: ELP 6 assessment will be conducted by ELP TO which have demonstrated an acceptable level of standards. ELT TO applying for ELP 6 may be required to show additional evidence of their capabilities.

2. Operations Manual

The Operations Manual can be a separated manual or combined with an existing operation manual of the Organisation. The Operations Manual (OM) of the ELP TO should contain the following topics herein described:

(NOTE: For the ease of approval of the manual, it is recommended that all ELP TO would adhere to the proposed order of the Operations Manual. This allows both the ELP TO, as GCAA to verify quickly the



completeness of the manual and allows for objective manual comparison, should it be required).

If the Operations Manual is integrated in an existing operation manual, it should contain a cross-reference table.

2.1. Front page

(CENTRE OF THE FRONT PAGE)

Title: Operations Manual - Language Assessment Body, Name of the organization

Logo of the organization

Approval designator (ELP TO-0XX, Serial number awarded by GCAA, upon start of the approval procedure)

(BOTTOM OF THE FRONT PAGE)

Revision number, date of effectiveness of the revision of the OM (starting with ORIGINAL)

2.2. Intro section

Table of content (Listing of the chapters and indication of their page in the OM)

List of effective pages (Revision number of each chapter, or page, by choice of the ELP TO)

Approval of the document (signed by the AM and CMM of the ELP TO. It should contain also the date of signatures)

Record of revision

Revision policy of the ELP TO

Abbreviation list

2.3. Operational section

a) Identification of the ELP TO

Name of the ELP TO (and name of the organization, if different)

Address and contact data of the organization (mobile and e-mail)

Identification of the AM and CMM (+ contact data)

b) Assessment methodology

Description in detail of the various sections of the test

Grading of the various sections of the test

Sample questions of the various sections of the test

c) Languages the ELP TO wishes to be approved for English



- d) Accountable Manager and Post holders
 - Initial post holders (Accountable Manager – Compliance Monitoring Manager)
 - Post holder replacement procedure
 - Post holder nomination criteria

- e) Location
 - Fixed location criteria

- f) Recording
 - Recording methodology & systems
 - Back-up of the recordings

- g) Privacy policy
 - Privacy policy of the ELP TO
 - Privacy policy actions for the assessors
 - Privacy statement/Complaint procedure to be signed by the candidate

- h) Grading
 - Criteria for individual grading by each assessor
 - Common grading by the panel, in case of different opinions Third party advice
 - Final grading
 - Communication with the customer Issuance of the certificate

- i) Candidate records
 - Identification of the candidate

- j) Individual candidate number

- k) Privacy statement

- l) Assessment record of the language assessment
 - (level 1->6, for all 6 ICAO holistic descriptors for language assessment)



m) Assessor criteria

Recruitment criteria of new assessors
Recruitment procedure of new assessors Code of conduct/ethics for assessors

n) Standardization

Initial standardization of new assessors
Recurrent (regular) (re)standardization

o) Compliance Monitoring

Organigram of the ELP TO
Contact details of the CMM (Compliance Monitoring Manager)
Audit cycle (planning), on a month-to-month basis, over 2-year period Findings grading
Findings allocation policy (level 1-2-3) + applicable delays per level Root cause analysis
Corrective actions – Closing findings Recording and follow-up tool of findings

p) Disputes

How do customers express and communicate their disputes with the ELP TO (contact details)?
Dispute procedure/flow of the ELP TO
How is the dispute procedure communicated to the customer? Investigation procedure of a dispute
Assignment of results of investigation and final decision making Feed-back procedure to the customer
Follow-up
Documenting and record-keeping of the dispute

2.4. Appendices

Appendix I: Copy of the approval certificate (to be issued by GCAA)
Appendix II: Copy of resume of the assessors (according to the ELP TO internal template) and list of examiners (stating the role and starting/end date as assessor for the ELP TO)
Appendix III: Candidate record (blank)



- Appendix IV: Assessment record
- Appendix V: Terms and Conditions/Privacy statement
- Appendix VI: Feedback form/Appeal form/Appeal procedure
- Appendix VII: Certificate issued to the candidate (blank)
- Appendix VIII: GCAA ELP TO Audit forms

3. Approval procedure as ELP TO

3.1. Contact GCAA Licensing Directorate - Training Department

The GCAA Licensing department is responsible for oversight of ELP TO for language proficiency assessments. If the ELP TO is integrated to an ATO then the GCAA Licensing department may conduct its oversight activities along with other Departments of the GCAA (e.g. Department of Flight Operations for ATO operating complex aircraft).

Each organization seeking an ELP TO approval may be invited to a kick-off meeting, where the essential requirements of this manual will be highlighted.

The following documents must be submitted to GCAA for approval of the organization as GCAA ELP TO:

1. Operations Manual
2. Copy of the trade licence.
3. Application form of the Post Holders + Relevant resume, demonstrating relevant knowledge and experience, for the post applied for. If those persons are already appointed for similar positions for another Approval than ELP TO then the GCAA will re-assess them without need for application.
4. List of initial assessors + Relevant resume, demonstrating aptitude to serve as either linguistic assessor, professional assessor, or both
5. Example of a candidate's record, with all the relevant document, checklists, assessment documents, etc.

3.2. Submission and review of the Operations Manual

The ELP TO's Operations Manual should be submitted for approval. This may/usually does require a number of resubmissions, of versions containing requested modifications of what was stated in the Operations Manual. The final first version of the Operational Manual that is to be approved by GCAA, will bare REVISION NUMBER "ORIGINAL". The first revision, after initial approval of the Operations Manual shall bare DESIGNATION "REVISION 1".

3.2.1. Operations Manual approval



The following aspects of the Operations Manual (OM) will be verified in detail:

- Competence in the English languages, approval is sought for, demonstrated by the candidate ELP TO. Style, choice of appropriate vocabulary, writing errors, syntax errors etc. in the Operations Manual (OM) proposed to GCAA, demonstrate the “in house” language competences of the ELP TO.
- Coverage of the items listed in chapter 2 of this document.
- Profoundness of the procedures described. The OM is the handbook for daily activities that should provide solid guidelines to various standard and unexpected situations for post holders, assessors and candidates (It should reflect the actual situation of the ELP TO, it should not to be considered as a means only to acquire approval as ELP TO). Audits will be performed partially based on this document, but also partially on the ELP TO’s own Procedure Manual.

When the manual is deemed ready for approval by GCAA, the appropriate post holders and assessors, as well as other qualified staffing is designated and all other relevant documents are provided, an audit will be performed by GCAA, of the facilities, assessment methodology and tools, recording and record keeping, etc.

This should lead to an approval of the organization as GCAA approved ELP TO, with an individual approval number. This procedure is estimated at 90 days from the date of application.

Each ELP TO will be provided with a GCAA approval certificate. The Annex I to the approval certificate contains an overview of the approved/assigned assessors, in their respective roles. The list is approved by GCAA for initial approval only. Changes and updates are governed by the ELP TO, according to the approved procedure in the ELP TO Operations Manual. An update of the list of assessors (Annex I to the approval certificate) is forwarded to the GCAA, for information. Adherence to the recruitment procedures for new assessors will be part of audits of the ELP TO by GCAA.

In the case that an organization approved as ELP TO discontinues its activities as approved ELP TO, it should return its approval certificate to GCAA, with undue delay. Also in case of revocation of the certificate by GCAA, after establishment of findings of serious nature, the approval certificate should be sent back to GCAA immediately.

3.2.2. Post holders

1. Accountable Manager (AM)
2. Compliance Monitoring Manager (CMM)

The Accountable Manager should be able to demonstrate management training/experience, both in



people management and financial management. Various backgrounds may qualify for the approval as AM.

The Compliance Monitoring Manager should demonstrate training/experience in Quality/ Compliance Monitoring in the aviation, or general industry and/or audit techniques.

The post of Accountable Manager and Compliance Monitoring Manager cannot be combined unless authorised by the GCAA.

Both may be active as linguistic, or operational examiner within the ELP TO, but may not perform audits on their own activities within the ELP TO, to avoid conflict of interest.

3.2.3. Staffing

For initial and continued approval, the ELP TO must be sufficiently staffed. This means the number of post holders, daily management and assessors must be sufficient to guarantee a minimum service level, taking into account health issues, unavailability, or other obligations (career/private life).

While defining the MINIMUM STAFFING the following should be considered:

- Assessors are required per standard assessment (1 operational assessor, 1 linguistic assessor)
- GCAA requests a physical back-up of each assessor
- Having an assessor that can cover both roles (operational and linguistic assessor), does not diminish this minimal staffing number
- AM and CMM are required. The AM and CMM posts may be accepted as being the same person for an ELP TO with documents and demonstration to assure independence of the audits.
- Being a post holder as well as an assessor is allowed for a GCAA approved ELP TO.

The minimal staffing requirement does not oblige the ELP TO to hire full-time employees. It can be a cluster of freelancers working together under the same approval, according to the same methodology. Minimum availability of each assessor must however be guaranteed and monitored by the ELP TO.

However, if it is found that the team of assessors is not available for audits, on multiple occasions, or during prolonged periods of time, will lead to a revocation of the certificate and suspension of operations.

Full-time availability of the staff is not mandatory, but assessors hardly availability/active, or already heavily involved in other aviation related activities, may be refused, asked to be removed from the list of assessors of the ELP TO.



“Ghost assessors” that or not, no longer, or hardly active within the ELP TO, should be stimulated to increase their activities, or in case of confirmed seizure of activities as language proficiency assessors be proactively removed and not kept on the list of assessors, to provide a realistic image of the actual situation and number of collaborators of the ELP TO.

All staff working for the ELP TO, must adhere to the Operations Manual as approved by GCAA, under the supervision of the Post Holders (AM and CMM). All must sign the code of conduct/ethics for assessors and/or post holders. This document can be found as Annex IX.

3.2.4. Locations

The ELP TO should compose a list of fixed locations where assessments will be performed in the Operations Manual. These should contain:

- Space: the surface of the assessment location should be sufficient to comfortably accommodate the assessors, all the candidates and the necessary assessment equipment
- Environment: A comfortable room temperature must be achieved. Too hot and too cold assessment locations are to be refused by the ELP TO, as they negatively influence the performance of the candidate.
- Provisions of electric current: for the recording purposes, sufficient electric plugs must be available, to assure all the assessment equipment can be used in accordance with the approved assessment methodology.
- Lighting: The assessment location must have sufficient luminosity
- Noise: A valid language proficiency assessment is taken in a room that shelters the candidate from environmental and background noises. Occasional noises are permissible, but continuous, very intense noises that disturb the candidate and the recording of the assessment, negatively influence the assessment and may render the assessment invalid.

Hotel bedrooms, hotel lobbies, bars, pubs, or other public places are not accepted as valid assessment locations. Meeting rooms of hotels, ATO class rooms, school classrooms, or valid alternative facilities are to be rented/booked by the ELP TO in accordance with the self-imposed and approved assessment locations, criteria. Occasional exceptions to the rule should be documented by the ELP TO, explaining why/where/when a deviation from the standards was required.

4. Basic GCAA requirements for acceptance of a language assessment



These are the 7 PRIMARY CONDITIONS of GCAA for a valid language assessment, for endorsement of language proficiency on an UAE licence:

1. Annual listing of ALL THE ASSESSMENTS, taken by UAE ELP TO (also in case of assessment of foreign candidates) in a standard GCAA template (Refer to Annex V).
2. Identification of the candidate: By assigning a unique sequence number to each individual candidate, XX-20YY-0ZZZZ: XX = Approval reference of the ELP TO, YY = year, ZZZZ = Sequence number of the candidate: 0 -> 9999, or higher (or equivalent numbering method, accepted by GCAA, for foreign approved ELP TO), listed in a standard template (even when no certificate was issued), which can be found in Annex V.
3. Assessment of the candidate by 2 EXAMINERS (1 OPERATIONAL AND 1 LINGUISTIC EXAMINER), AS A STANDARD, in accordance with CAR-FCL.055 (m), if both competencies cannot be demonstrated in 1 person. Exceptions to the 2-person assessment must be granted on individual basis, by notification of GCAA prior to the assessment, or approved alternative means of compliance in the Operations Manual.
4. The assessors operate under the approval of an organization, with approved assessment methodologies, laid down in an approved Operations Manual and under continuous oversight by a Compliance Monitoring Manager (or Quality Manager), not the same physical person as the assessor.
5. Audio-(visual) registration of the assessment, accessible to the GCAA, for verification of the identity of the candidate, verification the assessment was effectively performed, etc.)
6. Signed privacy agreement between the candidate and the ELP TO, also taking into account the highlights of the appeal procedure.
7. Issuance of a certificate to the candidate in accordance with Annex IV, or a self-composed document.

5. Assessment policies

A language assessment must consist of 5 main parts:

1. Registration for an assessment
2. Identification of the candidate
3. The language proficiency assessment should consist of Assessment of AVIATION RELATED, PLAIN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY
4. Grading
5. Communication of the result to the candidate, providing a certificate

5.1. Enrolment for the assessment



Each ELP TO must develop and describe a registration methodology in the Operations Manual (OM). The ELP TO is free to determine the means and procedure, but must cover the following items:

- Easy to comprehend registration procedure for the customer
- Choice of dates/hours, based on transparent availability
- Confirmation of booking
- Cancellation / No show / Showing up late / Illness / Traffic problems / Request for postponement / etc. policies of the ELP TO. Procedures should contain legally binding conditions, and demonstrate fairness with regards to the candidate. Unfair/illegal practices will not be approved by GCAA.

5.2. Identification of the candidate

Positive identification of the candidate must be achieved, prior to the start of the language proficiency assessment. The assessors must reach certainty regarding the fact that the candidate is who he/she proclaims he/she is. Acceptable means of verifying identity of a candidate are:

- ID-card, passport, or drivers' license (with picture)
- Pilot, or AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS licence

Failing to establish positive identification, should lead to a postponement of the assessment, or reporting to the Accountable Manager of the doubt, regarding the identity of the candidate.

Identification should be achieved face-to-face, in the vicinity of the candidate, by at least one of the assessors: Identification using teleconferencing methods only, is not permitted. This explains why at least one assessor should be in the room with the candidate, when using teleconferencing aids for the assessment. Not only will this benefit identification of the candidate, but help exclude any fraud, or assistance from third parties, during the assessment.

Each candidate must receive an individual sequence number, also to be added to the certificate, issued by the ELP TO to the candidate. The specific number starts with the following designation: XX-2014-00YY (X = Approval number of the ELP TO, Y = Rank of the candidate in the list of candidates assessed over the course of the applicable year, in order of appearance, by date of the assessment).

The list of candidates assessed by the ELP TO is to be forwarded to GCAA once every year (over the course of January), so statistical analysis can be performed and quality checks can be performed between the certificates offered by candidates, vs results provided by the ELP TO. The list (Excel format) contains candidate's first name, name, license type, license number, country of issue, date of the exam, LP level obtained.



5.3. Languages To Be Assessed

English only, assessment programs of other languages is not allowed.

5.4. Accepted methodologies for language assessment

- a) The core of the assessment of aviation related, plain language proficiency, is the language proficiency interview, by a panel of 2 assessors (1 operational assessor, 1 linguistic assessor).
- b) Topics discussed between the panel of assessors and the candidate, must be aviation related MAINLY.
- c) The essence of civil aviation related language assessment is verbal communication. However, spelling, spelling errors, making the candidate write and all related variants, SHOULD NOT be part of the assessment, nor should it be a criterion for the grading of the candidates' language proficiency. Technical accuracy of what was discussed is not to affect the language assessment.
- d) A candidate must throughout the entire assessment be evaluated in his/her own "working" environment: A pilot must be assessed in his/her role as a pilot and not be requested to take the role of Air Traffic Control Officer (AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS), or vice versa, AT ANY GIVEN TIME during the assessment. This explains the approval of ELP TO specifically for pilots, or AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS (or both, if different assessment methodologies are developed for both by the ELP TO).
- e) If an assessment consists partially of an objective/multiple choice/written/computer assisted test, it should be used by the panel of assessors, IN SUPPORT of their final decision. The objective test is NOT to determine the final outcome of the grading. If the judgment of the assessors is different, the panel of assessors always has the final decision regarding the grading of the candidate.
- f) The panel of 2 ASSESSORS (1 linguistic assessor and 1 operational assessor) is the standard approach to language proficiency assessment. A person that responds to both requirements, may act in either roles, within the panel of 2 assessors, provided the assessor can demonstrate objectively his/her aptitude to assume both the role of linguistic and operational assessor.
- g) The assessment may be performed by 2 assessors, of which one is not physically in the same room. Teleconferencing technologies are permitted to assist the assessor that is physically present with the



candidate(s), from a distance (see “Teleconference Technology” below).

h) Recording of the assessment is also permitted, for assessment à posteriori. This as long as 2 assessors (1 linguistic and 1 operational) perform the assessment. A record of the assessment by both assessors must be kept in the candidate’s record of the ELP TO.

i) The panel of 2 assessors may be replaced by voice/speech recognition technologies. Objective proof however must be provided that the ELP TO provides objective proof (delivered by an independent validation entity, or GCAA) of the validity/equivalency of the assessment methods to human interaction (see “use voice/speech recognition technologies” below).

j) If software, or electronic programs/systems are used to assess, or help assess the candidates’ language proficiency, there is to be no extra system difficulty, that adversely affects the grading of the candidate: the user-friendliness of the software must be of such nature, that any person, no matter what age, or educational background, should be able to obtain a correct assessment of his/her language proficiency.

k) Language assessment should be based on the 6 ICAO criteria: COMPREHENSION, FLUENCY, INTERACTION, VOCABULARY, PRONUNCIATION, STRUCTURE. The rating scale for ELP may be found in AMC2 to CAR-FCL.055.

5.5. Use of speech/voice recognition technology

Speech/voice recognition technology may still be used for the plain language testing part of a language assessment, under the following conditions:

- Objective, scientific proof must be delivered that proves the computer-generated assessments are equivalent to human face-to-face assessment (using statistical criteria, certified by an independent organization).
- The test must be either Air Traffic Controllers, or pilot specific (in terms of read-backs by the candidate).
- There must be a clear identification procedure of the candidate (link candidate-results).
- The recordings must be accessible to the competent authority of oversight.

5.6. Teleconferencing technology

At least 1 person of the panel of 2 assessors must be on-site, during the assessment. This for the following



reasons:

- Identity control of the candidate
- Explain the assessment to the candidate
- Test the candidate for interaction in plain language

If the second assessor is participating “live” in the assessment, as it takes place, his/her voice should be audible during the recordings. It is therefore advisable, that at the beginning of the assessment, both assessors and the candidate clearly state their name, at the beginning of the recording.

If a second assessor is not present during the recording, his/her assessment should be made a posteriori (after the assessment). A clear and elaborate grading sheet must be filled in and kept in the candidate’s record, as proof of the assessment by the second assessor.

Also in case the internet connection was lost, the assessment by the second assessor must be performed a posteriori, and documented as described in the previous chapter. Negotiation between the assessors and the final grading must be motivated/documentated on one of the grading sheet of the candidate.

The conditions for the use of teleconferencing technologies are:

- Choice of sufficient technological reliability in the systems/methodology chosen
- Recording capability simultaneously, to ensure possible assessment a posteriori, in case of any technical malfunction
- The linguistic assessor may be “off-site”, the operational assessor must be present “on site” during the assessment, for the purpose of assessing the interactivity.

6. The assessment

A valid GCAA approved/accepted language proficiency assessment consists of:

a plain language test (between candidate and both operational and linguistic assessor). It is acceptable that a test of plain language in a work-related context could contain a scripted test task or a prompt in which standardized phraseology is included. The test task may be used as a warm-up or as a means of setting a radiotelephony context in which to elicit plain language responses from the test-taker. If phraseology is included in a test prompt, care should be taken that it is used appropriately and that it is consistent with ICAO standardized phraseology.)



An assessment should last minimally 20 minutes per candidate.

7. Plain language assessment

7.1. General

Plain language testing is ideally achieved (to assess all 6 ICAO holistic descriptors), by a panel of 2 assessors: 1 operational assessor and 1 linguistic assessor, by means of an interview.

The plain language interview should assess the following:

1. **READING CAPABILITIES** of the candidate: Does the candidate understand a written message, NOTAM, safety notification?
2. **COMMUNICATION CAPABILITIES** of the candidate: Assessment of the candidates' ability to communicate regarding aviation related topics, outside of the standard ICAO phraseology

Refer to ICAO DOC 9835 for the development of a viable, acceptable language proficiency assessments.

7.2. What a Plain language assessment should be?

The plain language assessment should be A CONVERSATION BETWEEN HUMANS, in an aviation related context, regarding aviation related topics and realistic emergency/urgency situations, the candidate can relate to (and is expected to have knowledge of). The ELP TO and the assessors should develop/apply various scenarios for leisure/professional pilots.

6 ICAO holistic descriptors must be assessed during the plain language assessment. The ICAO rating scale can be found in AMC2 of CAR-FCL.055.

GCAA heavily emphasizes on the human aspect of language proficiency. As language is a matter of many nuances and typically human, quite like emotions, which -considering the current status of technological evolution- can't be assessed with the same amount of nuances and sensitivities by a machine/software, as by a human being. Objective/scientific proof (not a statement by the developers themselves), is required if PC-based technologies are to be used anymore for language assessments, as a replacement for a human panel of assessors.



A candidate should be tested in the own role, he/she is used to: AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS must be interviewed regarding AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS related subjects, PILOTS must be interviewed regarding PILOT related subjects. This explains the lack of cross-crediting between PILOTS and AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS.

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS-aimed language proficiency assessment methodologies that are “pilot-ized”, or PILOT-aimed language proficiency assessment methodologies that are “AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS-ized”, will not be accepted. If an organization wants to offer language assessments for both pilots and AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS, 2 very distinct tests must be developed (or all the aspects must analyzed and assessed and specifically adapted, where necessary).

NOTE: Common observed mistakes between pilot/Air Traffic Controllers aimed methodologies:

- A VFR-pilot (without instrument training, nor qualification) receives instructions to intercept an ILS during the ELP-test. As this pilot is not used to it, nor trained or qualified for it, he/she receives a lower grading than the one which he/she would be awarded, had the assessment methodology been more specific for the candidate.
- A VFR-pilot who only flies in the UAE, receives instructions from a recording. The accents used are accents the candidate is not used to. Hard to understand accents should not be used to assess comprehension of the candidate. Language proficiency is aimed at assessing the candidates’ ability to understand the standard form of a language and express him/herself without too much of an accent. It is not aimed at testing his/ability to understand and pick-up messages in all possible variants and accents of a certain language, all over the World.
- An Air Traffic Controllers is asked to describe the various parts of a wing, or how a stall is caused. The Air Traffic Controllers does not hold a flying license, so is not at all trained, nor supposed to have any technical knowledge regarding these subjects.
- An instrument rated pilot is asked to provide AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS instructions in a “cover all ELP-test” (valid both for AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS and pilots). Pilots that never took the role of AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS (for example when providing instruction in a simulator), will experience difficulty taking the role of the “other person on the frequency”.

To avoid complaints with regards inadequate testing been forwarded to GCAA. It is the task of each ELP TO (AM, CMM and all the assessors) to assure the questions posed and methodologies used, are TO THE POINT, RELEVANT AND FAIR. GCAA holds the right in cases of complaints, whereby the questions posed, or methodologies used, caused or contributed to the award of an incorrect grading to the candidate, after inquiry by either the CMM of the ELP TO, or after independent inquiry by GCAA, to declare the assessment



invalid and to be retaken at the expense of the ELP TO. In that case, modification of the assessment methodology and the Procedure Manual may be imposed on the ELP TO.

Incorrect questions, unadapted methodologies will lead to a level 2 finding.

7.3. What a Plain language assessment should NOT be?

The plain language assessment should not be:

- An attestation by a friend, or a known instructor “that this person speaks a certain language”
- Asking for a “declaration on honor” that a person is capable of communication in a particular language.
- A written test that grades (among other) the writing skills of the candidate.
- A memory test. A candidate is not to be graded on his/her ability to remember a massive amount of (insignificant) details, to distinguish the difference between level 4-5-6.
- Based on a PC interface or system that imposes system knowledge or experience, to allow for establishment of the correct level of language proficiency of the candidate.
- A theoretical interview. Strictly taken: Even if the candidate is making technically inaccurate statements, but all this was pronounced with impeccable language proficiency, the candidate should be awarded a level 6. The language proficiency assessment is NOT a technical interview.
- To obtain a level 6, a candidate must not possess perfect knowledge of the language assessed. Level 6 is not strive for linguistic perfection, reserved for native speakers only.
- Not awarding level 6 to candidates that deserve it “because than we can generate recurrent business in a few years, at the end of the validity of the language proficiency”, may also lead to a suspension of the approval of an ELP TO, as such a decision is based on commercial interests of the ELP TO, rather than the benefit of the candidate.

8. Recording

A language assessment must be recorded at least auditive, but preferably audio-visually, for various reasons:

1. Identification of the candidate
2. Reassessment in case of disputes, by an internal ELP TO, or external independent assessor
3. Verification that the assessment was executed
4. Help during compliance audits (both for internal audits within the ELP TO, as by the competent authority of oversight)
5. Audit of the performance of assessors



6. Guidance material for internal ELP TO training (to demonstrate differences in levels)
7. Guidance material for standardization of assessors

8.1. Identification of the candidate

The recording can help with the identification of the candidate (a posteriori), in case of doubts and establish with reasonable certainty that it was the candidate him/herself that performed the language assessment and not a stand-in.

Both the candidate and the assessors should introduce themselves at the beginning of the recording of the test.

8.2. Disputes/complaints

Self-over estimation, underestimation of the test, unfamiliarity with what to expect during the test, or any other misconception, may lead to disappointments and unsubstantiated disputes by candidates, against the ELP TO, or the assessment. In some cases however, there are substantiated reasons, or room for debate, between the candidate and the ELP TO.

8.3. Verification that the assessment was executed

The GCAA may request the recordings at all times, to verify whether or not an assessment was performed. In case of the failure to cooperate, or failure to provide the recording, loss, or non-existence of recording of the assessment, GCAA withholds the right to refuse to accept language proficiency certificates, for issuance of language proficiency on an UAE licence. In such cases already issued language proficiency endorsements on licenses may be revoked and the assessment may have to be taken again, at the expense of the ELP TO.

8.4. Compliance audit

The recordings can be used for the purpose of internal audits by the Compliance Monitoring Manager (CMM), of the ELP TO, to verify adherence to the procedures described in the OM of the ELP TO. Copies of the recordings may be requested by GCAA for the same purpose: external audits, in the light of permanent oversight of the ELP TO by the GCAA.

8.5. Audit of the performance of the assessors:

The CMM and GCAA may review recordings, to verify standardization of the assessors, fairness and



adherence to the code of conduct of the ELP TO, demonstrated by the assessors, teamwork of the panels of assessors, grading of the candidate etc.

8.6. Recording technology

The ELP TO must select and test a sufficiently viable technology for the recording of the assessment. These are the conditions:

- Reliability: If in more than 10% of the assessments technical difficulties are observed (reported by the assessors to the AM, or CMM), leading to excessive set-up times, delays of the assessments, lack of quality of the recordings, incomplete recordings, etc., the ELP TO should improve, or change the technology used for the recording.
- Minimal recording quality: The recording is useless, if the candidate is not clearly identifiable on the recording. The ELP TO should select video-recording technology with sufficiently high values of the following parameters: recording resolution, number of frames recorded per second, sound caption as well as overall video and audio-recording capability.
- With regards to avoiding Terra bytes of recordings, that must be stored for 5 years, the ELP TO may impose certain maxima to recording capability, as long as the recording is well audible and identification of the candidate and the surroundings is not a problem.

8.7. Assessment “a posteriori”

An entire assessment may be recorded for assessment at a later date. In such cases the ELP TO must develop, or purchase a user license of an existing interface and recording methodology. The ELP TO must also train and work with “system operators”. These are to be and can provide basic guidance and assistance to the candidate, during the assessment. The qualities and tasks of the “System Operators” are:

- Trained in the Operations Manual of the ELP TO.
- Adhere to the agenda as agreed to by the ELP TO, or set-up own appointments with customers. Notify customers in time of delays/changes in the agenda.
- Focal point for candidates unable to adhere to the agenda, as was agreed upon. Proposal of new dates to candidates.
- Set-up of the assessment technology/interface.
- Trained in the use and problem solving of the automated methodology.
- Identification of the candidate and/or signature of a privacy statement (should this not have been performed upon registry for the assessment, by the candidate).
- Provide instructions regarding the sequence of the assessments, and the use of the interface, or operate



it for the candidate.

- Ensure the quality and effectiveness of the recording.
- Ensure the data transfer to the ELP TO server, or storage/transport/delivery (in secured circumstances).
- Provide information and realistic delays with regards to assessment and communication of the final result, by the ELP TO.

These are the conditions for a valid assessment “a posteriori”:

- 1 System operator must be present throughout the full duration of the assessment, with the candidate.
- 2 Assessors (1 linguistic and 1 operational) should perform the assessment.
- Both assessors must compose/fill out a report, regarding the assessment.
- Both assessors must communicate, after completing one, or more assessments (preferably after each assessment). There is to be not more than 24 hours of delay between the assessment and the communication with the other assessor and the outcome of the negotiation between both assessors to establish the final result, must be documented.
- The ELP TO must objectively demonstrate how INTERACTION will be tested.

9. Use of teleconferencing technologies

With the evolution and modern day maturity of teleconferencing technologies, as well as the globalization and aim to reduce the ecologic footprint, the GCAA is open to using teleconferencing technology for language proficiency assessments, as an alternative to the 2 person panel of assessors, under the following conditions:

- To reduce economic footprint during foreign assessments (beyond UAE borders), the GCAA will accept assessments performed with 1 assessor physically present during the assessment and 1 present from a distance, using teleconferencing technology. Using teleconferencing technology as a standard for language proficiency assessment on UAE territory will not be accepted in a primary phase.
- The other assessor must be audible in the recordings of the assessment and actively participate in the assessment.
- Both assessors must communicate, after completing one, or more assessments (preferably after each assessment). There is to be not more than 24 hours of delay between the assessment and the communication with the other assessor and the outcome of the negotiation between both assessors to establish the final result, must be documented.

10. Privacy and privacy statement



A language assessment must be recorded for various reasons. The recordings however, must be treated with respect and a level of security, by the ELP TO:

- Prior to the start of the assessment, the candidate is requested to grant permission for the recording. If there is no consent for the recording, there is no means of performing the assessment and the assessment must be postponed, or annulled. Ideally the request to record the assessment is presented to the customer in the terms and conditions, upon registry for the assessment. This must however be made sufficiently clear to the customer (not included in the small print, or in between the other, mostly financial terms and conditions) on the website of the ELP TO, or by presenting the candidate with a separate document, to be signed by the candidate, prior to the start of the assessment.
- The ELP TO must compose a procedure for the privacy-policy, with which the recordings will be treated: The recordings are not to be shared on the company website, distributed internally among assessors/collaborators of the ELP TO, social media, the internet, media, or any other public accessible means. Copying, performing back-ups and accessibility to the recordings must be limited to the AM and CMM of the ELP TO, or their assigned deputy. The recordings may only be shared with GCAA, if it issues the licence of the candidate. In case of court order, or judicial investigation, or air accident/incident investigation, the ELP TO is obliged to cooperate with the judicial system, or state officials, without prior permission of GCAA.
- The candidate must be made aware of the rights he/she has with regards to the UAE privacy legislation, if any. Serious violations against privacy legislation may lead to revocation of the certificate of the ELP TO and suspension of further language assessments for GCAA. The recording must be kept for 5 years after the assessment. It is advisable to electronically delete the recordings after 5 years, to prevent privacy violations, in a systematic manner, described in the Operations Manual of the ELP TO. Records regarding the candidate, and the results obtained, may be kept longer than 5 years, although there is no legal requirement for this. A proposal for a privacy statement can be found in Annex VII.
- Together with the privacy statement, the candidate should receive an explanation on the procedure to request for feedback to the ELP TO, if he/she has questions regarding the language assessment, or wishes to receive more feedback regarding the grading (STAGE 1). Only after receiving feedback by the CMM of the ELP TO, can the candidate launch a formal dispute/complaint (STAGE 2). This dispute/complaint must be investigated in depth by the AM of the ELP TO. If after the inquiry by the AM and communication with the candidate regarding the findings, still no agreement can be reached, the GCAA may be contacted to act as mediator in the dispute/complaint. The standard GCAA feedback/dispute/complaint form can be found as Annex VIII and must be adhered to by all stake holders in language proficiency.

11. Assessments by ELP TO of foreign licence holders and conducted on



foreign territory

Mutual recognition of language proficiency certificates is not guaranteed between States. Efforts are made in that sense, but until further notice, caution should be observed by all involved.

The GCAA recommends the following approach to ELP TO, with regards to language proficiency assessments for foreign licence holders and language proficiency assessments conducted on foreign territory:

- Contact the foreign Competent Authority of Oversight of the licence holder and request authorization to perform language proficiency assessments for their license holders (in general), IN WRITTEN.
- Provide the foreign Competent Authority of Oversight with a copy of the approval document of the organization as ELP TO and if so required a copy of the Operations Manual of the ELP TO.
- Only after the written authorization is received, the ELP TO should perform the language proficiency assessment of the foreign license holder.
- Neither GCAA, nor the foreign Competent Authority of Oversight can guarantee acceptance a posteriori of a language proficiency certificate that was issued without explicit authorization by the Competent Authority of Oversight, responsible for the issuance of the license of the candidate.

12. Confirmation by GCAA of assessments performed by ELP TO

- GCAA will happily assist organisations to verify the approval status of its ELP TO.
- GCAA will not individually verify each individual assessment organized by its ELP TO.
- This service may be chargeable.

13. Assessor recruitment standards

The ELP TO may compose a recruitment and selection procedure to hire and train new language proficiency assessors. This procedure is to be described in the ELP TO Operations Manual, to be approved by the GCAA and strictly adhered to. Under those conditions, the ELP TO may add new language proficiency assessors without prior permission by GCAA.

These are the GCAA conditions for selecting new OPERATIONAL ASSESSORS:

1. Hold, or have held a commercial pilot, or AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS license, with operational experience in aviation (airline operations, training,...) AND
2. ELP Level 6, either as AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS, or pilot, AND
3. Representative appearance, well-mannered, well-behaved (representative function)

These are the GCAA conditions for selecting new LINGUISTIC ASSESSORS:



1. Hold a post high school degree (Bachelor, or Master degree) in language related matters (translator, language teacher,...), AND
2. Teaching, training, translating, or practical experience in general, or aviation related industry, AND
3. Representative appearance, well-mannered, well-behaved (representative function)

The AM, or his/her deputy, also an accepted language proficiency assessor of the ELP TO, should interview the candidate language proficiency assessor and assess the aptitude of the candidate to fit the profile requested by the ELP TO. Other points of interest are:

- Communication in English, BOTH VERBAL AND IN WRITING since he/she may have to communicate in writing with candidates, other assessors and Competent Authorities of Oversight. The level of written and verbal skill, demonstrated by language proficiency assessors, Post Holders and all other collaborators communicating on behalf of the ELP TO, should at all times be of the highest level achievable.
- Attitude towards adherence to procedures.
- Attitude towards filling in paperwork correctly and consistently.
- Professionalism, appearance, behavior.
- Attitudes towards grading, communicating bad news.
- Attitudes towards candidates.

Any candidates that meet the relevant GCAA requirements, stipulated per type of assessor, may be enrolled as language proficiency assessor with an ELP TO, without prior consent of GCAA. In case of doubt (or when a valuable candidate does not meet all the requirements, but is deemed an asset to the team, after the interview), GCAA should be contacted, prior to enrollment, for approval.

GCAA holds the right at all times, to refuse candidate language proficiency assessors a priori (before the candidate language proficiency assessor is enrolled) and a posteriori, based on demonstrated poor communication skills, reported ill-behavior with regards to candidates, repetitive failure to adhere to ELP TO Operations Manual, negligent attitude with regards to the paperwork, or overall inaptitude for either role as language proficiency assessor, due to poor adherence of the ELP TO to selection and enrolment procedures.

The ELP TO manages the list of its assessors itself, after initial approval and forwards it to the GCAA.



14. Assessor standardization

14.1. Initial Standardization

Every candidate deserves a language proficiency assessment according to equal standards, of similar content and with application of the same grading standards, independent from who the assessors are.

Once a language proficiency assessor meets the requirements to start as language proficiency assessor for the ELP TO, the ELP TO should provide initial standardization training for the assessor.

This initial standardization training should consist of:

- Highlights in the history of language proficiency assessment in aviation (ICAO, GCAA legislation) and its importance for aviation safety. This document can be used for that purpose, or ICAO Doc 9835.
- Highlights of the applicable legislation: so he/she can act as a kind of GCAA representative of Language Proficiency policy and clarify various aspects of the language proficiency legislation to candidates.
- ICAO rating scale
- Highlights of (the history of) the ELP TO, composition, post holders
- ELP TO Operations Manual (OM)
- Candidate training folder
- The assessment: language proficiency assessment
- Grading
- Recording technology
- Privacy policy, confidential treatment of data
- GCAA as the Competent authority of oversight
- Code of conduct/ethics to be adhered to by all ELP TO assessors
- Internal ELP TO procedures
- Feedback/dispute/complaint procedure
- Who to contact in case of doubts/questions

Ideally candidates for language assessor observe X-number of assessments (to be determined in the ELP TO OM), or perform a number of assessments under supervision of a third/“senior ELP TO” assessor, present at the assessment, to analyze the performance of the candidate assessor and knowledge of and adherence to the ELP TO procedures. Once the new language proficiency assessor is deemed to be “ready for duty”,



he/she may be added to the list of assessors of the ELP TO.

The ELP TO must keep an assessor file, for all its assessors. This should contain:

- Contact data
- Relevant resume (containing experience and training relevant for the job as language proficiency assessor, either in the linguistic, or operational role, or both)
- Highlights of the initial interview (date, strong points, weak points of the candidate)
- Standardization training forms (initial and recurrent)
- Agreement to the code of conduct/ethics of the ELP TO

14.2. Recurrent Standardization

Since 2008, language proficiency legislation and requirements have evolved rather significantly. ICAO Doc 9835 allowed for various interpretations by the ICAO members, leading to significantly different approaches between ICAO member states. As language proficiency assessors of ELP TO also have an important role of informing candidates of the actual situation of the applicable legislation (and interpretation by the competent authority of oversight) it is imperative that all ELP TO organize regular standardization meetings, among their active language proficiency assessors.

The terms for valid recurrent standardization meetings are:

- Organized at least once a year within each ELP TO
- Recorded agenda and minutes of meeting
- Attendance of at least 50% (preferably 100%) of the active assessors
- Absences are to be recorded (documented if excused for a valid reason)
- Failure to attend 2 consecutive meetings, should result either in automatic removal from the person from the list of active language proficiency assessors of the ELP TO, until Individual recurrent standardization has been organized in such cases and documented within the ELP TO, before the assessor can act on behalf of the ELP TO again.

14.3. Code of conduct/ethics

Every approved assessor is supposed to sign the GCAA code of conduct/ethics for language assessors and ELP TO post holders. This signed document is to be kept by the ELP TO, in the individual assessor's file. This document can be found in Annex VIII.

This code of conduct/ethics both points out the "correct" way for an approved language assessor to operate,



the individual responsibilities of the assessor, but also protects the individual assessor from wrong approaches imposed by ELP TO management.

14.4. ELP TO oversight committee

The ELP TO should compose a procedure to guarantee its oversight over the correct conduct of its assessors. In cases of complaints of unfair/undesired attitudes/behavior(s) by assessor(s) active within the ELP TO, each ELP TO should apply an equal approach to handle these matters in a correct/fair/standardized way, imposed by GCAA:

1. Each complaint regarding assessor conduct/behavior/attitude should be treated and documented in a standard way, internally by the ELP TO, by using the GCAA feedback/dispute/complaint form for language proficiency assessments.
2. The complaint is to be investigated by the compliance monitoring manager, or a deputy designated in the ELP TO's Operations Manual.
3. After gathering evidence/testimonies, the assessor should be invited by a committee of oversight within the ELP TO (consisting of at least 2 persons), so he/she can give his/her version of the facts, in a serene/non-accusative/objective atmosphere.
4. The oversight committee of the ELP TO will draft a report of the complaint a summary of all the testimonies gathered (protecting the identity of the plaintive) and reach a conclusion/proposal for corrective action.
5. If improvements of the ELP TO procedures are necessary/possible, this should be reflected in an update of the ELP TO Operations Manual.
6. In case of unintentional erroneous behavior/poor judgement, or decision making by the assessor(s) involved, the assessor(s) should receive a warning in written, that future similar occurrence may lead to more serious consequences.
7. In case of repeated, or serious/intentional misconduct/neglect/malpractice on behalf of an assessor, this may lead to temporary suspension of the assessor, resignation, or refusal to continue the cooperation. Especially for cases where sanctions are imposed upon an assessor, the ELP TO must document the case in a standardized fashion, in accordance with the ELP TO's Operations Manual. In case of general interest, the GCAA may have to be informed, at the discretion of the AM.
8. Generic, undetailed feedback can be provided regarding the matter to the plaintive. All efforts necessary should be made to re-establish good relationships with the plaintive(s).
9. Unsubstantiated, wild accusations, should be avoided at all costs by all stake holders. If any party was wrongfully accused, the AM of an ELP TO must ensure all necessary to reinstate the person/party accused. Wrongful accusations may also be transferred to GCAA, by the AM of the ELP TO, to inform



about the wrongful accusations.

15. Grading

A language proficiency certificate should only be issued if the language assessment is passed successfully.

The general concern should be safety of the flight conducted and efficiency of the radio-telephony in flight, demonstrated by the candidate. Other self-imposed extra assessment criteria by the ELP TO, or the individual assessor should be avoided.

15.1. Language proficiency assessment:

The language assessment must be graded in accordance with the ICAO-rating scale. 6 holistic descriptors must be assessed on a scale, ranging between 1 and 6 (6 being the highest grading). In accordance with the ICAO guidelines, the lowest grading of the 6 holistic descriptors should be the overall outcome of the language assessment. GCAA allows flexibility on this last ICAO requirement: Imagine the following situation:

Comprehension:	LEVEL 6
Fluency:	LEVEL 6
Interaction:	LEVEL 6
Vocabulary:	LEVEL 6
Pronunciation:	LEVEL 3
Structure:	LEVEL 6
OVERALL ICAO GRADING:	LEVEL 3

According to the strict application of the ICAO-recommendation, the candidate would not receive a language proficiency certificate. Discrepancies between results obtained in the various holistic descriptors, of this magnitude, may be an indication that something went wrong during the assessment, or other human factors may have negatively influenced the outcome of the result. The factors identified, should be taken into consideration in the final grading of the candidate, to achieve a fair and realistic grading.

In cases where there are human aspects in favor of the candidate, the panel of assessors, or the AM may award a higher grade (going against ICAO-philosophy), as long as this is documented. In case of sustained



results, after verification, or suspected safety issues, due to confirmed low grade in one of the holistic descriptors, the overall grading must be maintained: in such case the lowest grade should be kept as the overall grading.

The ELP TO should install safety nets that help identify excessive fluctuations between the results of candidates, on the various holistic descriptors, to identify possible problems with the grading, prior to communicating the results with customers.

The ELP TO should compose a procedure for review of the grading by the AM, in cooperation with the panel of the 2 assessors that performed the language proficiency assessment, or designate a separate team to reevaluate the assessment a posteriori, in case of abnormal discrepancies of the results, obtained for the various holistic descriptors.

In case software is used for a part of the grading, the system must under no circumstances offer extra difficulties, that negatively influence the outcome of the grading of the candidate: Memorizing exercises, hard to understand systems, focus on irrelevant details, will not be accepted as viable systems, to perform part of the language proficiency assessment.

The CMM of the ELP TO should include in his/her Quality/Compliance surveys the analysis for consistency in the grading. GCAA will also evaluate this, based on the list to be filled in regarding all candidates assessed and forwarded to GCAA once per year.

An automated, or PC-based system should not award a final grading during, or right after the language proficiency assessment. ELP TO using speech/voice recognition software, should leave final assessment to a human panel.

15.2. Final grading

The operational assessor should correct - the assessment answer form (in paper), or obtain the results from a PC-based software. Each of the assessors (linguistic and operational) should perform individual grading of the candidate's performance (during, or after the assessment). This should be of the following kind:

Language assessment: Min. level 4 on all 6 holistic descriptors? => PASS

Before communicating the result to the candidate, a deliberation should be organized between both assessors, behind closed doors. Only when agreement is reached, is the result to be communicated to the



candidate. In rare cases where there is disagreement, the ELP TO should provide a procedure to reach a final verdict (postponing the decision, asking immediate, or postponed advice from the AM, final decision to be taken by the AM).

NOTE: Assessors should avoid providing feedback DURING THE EXAM. Both positive remarks (“Good!”, “Nice!”), as negative expressions (“Hmm...”, long silences, facial expressions of doubt, disagreement), should be avoided (without losing friendliness and human interactivity). Too positive reactions during the exam, may trigger unrealistic expectations among candidates towards the overall result (“I was sure I was going to obtain a level 6, based on the reactions of the assessor during the assessment..”). Too negative impressions, during the assessment, may also negatively influence the outcome of the assessment, leading to increasing uncertainty of the candidate and grading below the actual level of language proficiency of the candidate.

16. Appeal: Procedure for feedback/disputes/complaints:

GCAA developed a standard appeal procedure, TO BE ADHERED TO BY ALL CANDIDATES AND ELP TO. Reference to Annex VIII for the correct initiation, follow-up and closure of a request for feedback, a dispute, or complaint by a candidate. These are the general conditions for disputes/complaints, regarding language proficiency assessments:

1. Each candidate must be informed correctly regarding the dispute/complaint procedure, by the ELP TO: the candidate has a right to feedback and can when using the correct procedure, enter in dialogue with the ELP TO, to offer suggestions for the benefit of all language assessment stakeholders.
2. The candidate should be invited to fill out a standard GCAA-feedback/dispute/complaint form regarding language proficiency assessment and send it to the ELP TO address (or transfer it via softcopy)
3. GCAA is NOT to be included in the initial dispute/complaint process. Any inclusion of GCAA services in initial stages of disputes/complaints, the candidate will be reoriented to the ELP TO.
4. The ELP TO is to deal INTERNALLY with the dispute/complaint. The CMM of the ELP TO has the overall responsibility over the initial phase of STAGE 1: the request for feedback. The CMM (Compliance Monitoring Manager) will gather information regarding the assessment and provide feedback to the candidate regarding the way in which the assessment was performed and which aspects of the language assessment contributed to the decision of the overall result. This is a basic first analysis of the language proficiency assessment as is intended to assist the candidate in a future re-assessment.
5. If the issue of the candidate with one or more aspects of the language proficiency assessment is of more serious nature, or the answer provided by the CMM does not solve the difference in opinion between the ELP TO and the candidate, the candidate is invited to launch a dispute/complaint procedure (STAGE 2).



6. Stage 2 of the appeal procedure will be handled by the AM (Accountable Manager) of the ELP TO. The AM is to use all assets available, to perform an in-depth analysis of the circumstances and content of the disputed language proficiency assessment. These may be: Interviews of the assessors, or the candidate, negotiation with post holders within the ELP TO, review of the ELP TO's Operations Manual or asking advice to the GCAA. The AM should take into account all aspects, to establish a full analysis of the circumstances leading up to the complaint of the candidate.
7. Taking into consideration all the available information, the AM should make a documented decision that is to be communicated to the candidate, using the standard GCAA feedback/dispute/complaint form (which can be found in Annex VIII).
8. ONLY if steps 1-7 do not lead to a mutual understanding/acceptance of the result by all parties, the GCAA may be consulted, either by the candidate, or the ELP TO and be requested to act as mediator in the dispute between the ELP TO and the candidate.
9. Initially the GCAA will in case of lasting disputes between the ELP TO and the candidate, only verify if the dispute/complaint procedure, as described in this document and in the Operations Manual of the ELP TO, was adhered to.
10. The GCAA will only reassesses the recording in exceptional cases, either at the request of another CAA, or following a civil court order, or request, or if the dispute between the ELP TO and the candidate can't be resolved among each other.
11. If the approved ELP TO reassessment procedure was not adhered to, the assessment may be declared invalid and should be taken again, at the expense of the ELP TO. Incomplete records and recording of the language proficiency assessment will automatically lead to declaration of an invalid test by GCAA, in case of a complaint. No extra fees are to be charged to the candidate in case an assessment must be taken again, when improper adherence by the ELP TO to internal procedures, or at the specific request of GCAA.

At the result of the appeal, this document may be amended.

17. Language proficiency certificate

17.1. Certificate issuance conditions

ONLY in the case of a pass of the language proficiency assessment, will a certificate be issued by the ELP TO to the candidate. The certificate issued by the ELP TO should give a clear indication of the following aspects:

- Name, contact data of the ELP TO
- Name of the candidate, license number (if applicable)
- Role the candidate was tested in: PILOT – AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS – OTHER (f.e. Language assessment)



for ground handlers, using the airport GND frequencies)

- Obtained level of the language assessment: 4 – 5 – 6

17.2. Partial pass

There should not be a system of “partial pass”.

17.3. Transfer of the documents to the candidate

To allow for quality control after the assessment, negotiation and advice from 3rd parties within the ELP TO and final verification of the paperwork by the AM of the ELP TO, the certificate with the result of the assessment is not to be processed on site and handed over to the candidate. It is recommended that the documents (Certificate) would as a standard be sent via post and/or mail to the candidate AFTER the assessment.

18. Re-assessment

In the case of a fail (or in the case of obvious technical reasons), a re-assessment is not to be taken within 24 hours and should ideally be taken within the same ELP TO. Re-assessment is not recommended without retraining. ELP TO should not consult candidates to try the test again and again, until a pass is achieved (where feelings compassion overtake the objective assessment). ELP TO may be asked to provide more feedback in cases of recurrent fails: what were the causes, or contributory factors for a “fail” and what kind of retraining was proposed/performed? These questions may be posed both to the candidate, as the ELP TO(s) involved, upon the annual evaluation, if candidate names reappear repeatedly in the listings.

Candidates that failed the entire assessment twice, may not be accepted for re-assessment without proof of retraining by an ELP TO.

Candidates that failed the entire assessment twice, must be reported to GCAA, to avoid “shopping” by candidates: trying a language assessment at various ELP TO, until a weak level 4 (minimum) is obtained. Training will be recommended by GCAA to the candidate, prior to re-assessment, at the same, or other ELP TO. There is no shame in multiple “fails”, but it is an indication that the candidate must elaborate the knowledge of a specific language to be able to communicate effectively in an aviation environment. This way he/she can contribute to flight safety both for him/herself, as well as the entire flying community. This until an objective and defensible/solid level 4 (or higher) can be obtained by the candidate.



19. (Re)training

ELP TO must provide language training to their candidates. This does not mean that ELP TO should mandatorily also act as language training provider (this is permitted and these training activities are outside of the scope of the Competent Authority of Oversight), but should provide options to the candidates for (re)training, by having agreements with language training providers (training centers, or individual trainers for R/T- and plain language) available in the area. With “Area” we refer to training centers/individual trainers located in, or active within a reasonable distance from the LOCATION WHERE THE ASSESSMENT WAS ORGANIZED.

An ELP TO must list its partners (training centers, or individual trainers) in the field that can provide plain language training. Especially ELP TO active across UAE, at various/varying locations, must perform the often not evident task of finding training centers, or individual trainers that can provide aviation related language training. Ideally the ELP TO composes a template for standard communication of the data of the ELP TO’s recommended/ preferred training centers, or individual trainers, to interested candidates, that require additional training. Reference is made to the ICAO Document CIR 323 – AN/185 “Guidelines for Aviation English Training Programs” to set up specific training programs for aviation related plain (English) language training.

Operational assessors of the ELP TO and, linguistic assessors may provide language training, outside of the ELP TO. These assessors may not be involved in assessing the candidate within the ELP TO.

NOTE: Individual assessors providing language outside of an ELP TO should bare in mind that it may become operationally very difficult to avoid situations where a candidate appeared in front of an assessor team, where the candidate received training by either, or both assessors, making it hard to –in extremis- have to reschedule the assessor panel. Assessors active within a ELP TO should only provide language training in close cooperation with the AM of the ELP TO, to avoid conflicts of interest during the language assessment.

Each ELP TO should at least be able to provide candidates that want to prepare for a (re-)assessment with contact data of training centers, or trainers that can provide general, or aviation related language (+ fixed conditions). For the benefit of efficient training, it is advised that the ELP TO would not only hand the above described data of the language training centers and/or trainers, but also clearly indicate where the candidate should try to achieve improvement, in order to successfully pass a future re-assessment. In the case of a re-assessment, the ELP TO is encouraged to request a proof of (re-)training, before accepting the candidate for



a first re-assessment. For a second re-assessment, a request of retraining is mandatory.

20. “Shopping” type of candidates

A minority of weaker candidates will repeatedly perform the assessment at various ELP TO, just until a feeble “pass”, or level 4 is obtained. This is not the aim of language testing. The aim is to train pilots/AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS to a level that allows sufficient minimal/comfortable/easy/professional communication, for the benefit of aviation safety.

ELP TO should discourage re-assessment without retraining and impose minima (to be described in the OM), before accepting a candidate for re-assessment. Based on the lists provided by the ELP TO at the beginning of each calendar year, reappearing names, may trigger closer monitoring by the competent authority, in the light of continuous oversight of ELP TO and language assessment in general.

Candidates that failed the entire assessment twice at the ELP TO must be reported to GCAA and are not to be accepted by this (or other) ELP TO, without a proof of retraining.

GCAA believes that aviation is a democratic right for all, so no matter what background a person has, he/she should be able to achieve the dream of flight. This however must be taken seriously and executed safely. Sufficient demonstration of language proficiency are a part of that condition, which can be met by anyone putting sufficient effort in (re-)training, should it be necessary. Efficient communication should be a common goal.

21. Candidate records

The ELP TO should keep an individual record of a candidate. The candidate records may be kept either in hard or soft copy: full digital storage (with planned/regular back-up) is an accepted method of record keeping. The data should however be easily printable, or consultable by GCAA in case of audit/inspection.

Each candidate record should be maintained by the ELP TO in a secured location (or server), for the duration of 5 YEARS, after the assessment was performed.

The location where the ELP TO’s will store the hardcopy (if applicable), or the procedure of back-ups should be described in the OM of the ELP TO.



A procedure for active destruction/deleting files, for the purpose of privacy protection, should also be described in the ELP TO OM, once the mandatory 5 years of record keeping has expired.

The candidate's record should contain the following documents, copies, scans, or files:

1. Individual candidate's sequence number (XX-20YY-0ZZZZ)
2. Copy, or scan of a proof of identity (with picture): Identity card, passport, drivers' licence,...¹ or
3. Copy, or scan of the license (if applicable), or at least note of the license number and type²
4. Privacy statement, signed by both the ELP TO and the candidate and agreement with the terms and conditions of the ELP TO (including the agreement with the appeal procedure)
5. Copy of the language proficiency certificate

22. Compliance Monitoring (Internal oversight)

According to the GCAA Air Crew Regulation, AMC1 to CAR-FCL all ELP TO must compose a "quality system" (from here on referred to as Compliance Monitoring System). The ELP TO must designate a manager of the Compliance Monitoring System (CMS), who will assume responsibility for the continued operations of the CMS. The Accountable Manager (AM) of the ELP TO is the overall responsible for the CMS and should award sufficient funding for the correct functioning of the CMS of the ELP TO.

22.1. Compliance Monitoring Manager

Candidates for the post of Compliance Monitoring Manager of an ELP TO, must meet following requirements:

1. Training, or experience in Compliance Monitoring in aviation, or general industry, AND
2. Familiarity with civil aviation and/or language proficiency

Post Holders of the ELP TO must be proposed and approved by the GCAA. The Compliance Monitoring Manager must perform continuous oversight over the activities of the ELP TO (and its compliance with

¹ The copy of the proof of the identity provided by the candidate may be replaced by the following:

- Hold the proof of identity clearly in front of the camera (that performs the audiovisual recording of the assessment). (One assessor must be on site with the candidate, for GCAA. Full teleconferencing is not accepted by GCAA).
- Have the candidate state his/her name clearly on the audiovisual recording

² See footnote 1



applicable legislation and the ELP TO's approved Operations Manual) and report directly to the Accountable Manager (AM). The CMM is responsible for the operation of the Compliance Monitoring System (CMS), under the responsibility of the Accountable Manager.

22.2. Scope of the Compliance Monitoring System:

The Compliance Monitoring Manager should perform regular audits, to verify compliance of the ELP TO, with the applicable International (ICAO) and UAE legislation. The full scope of activities of the ELP TO should be audited at least once, within a period of 24 months. For the items to be audited this manual refers to AMC1 to CAR-FCL.055 (n) (2):

(2) The quality system established by a language assessment body should address the following:

(i) management;

(ii) policy and strategy;

(iii) processes;

(iv) the relevant provisions of ICAO or Part-FCL, standards and assessment procedures;

(v) organizational structure;

(vi) responsibility for the development, establishment and management of the quality system;

(vii) documentation;

(viii) quality assurance program;

(ix) human resources and training (initial and recurrent);

(x) assessment requirements;

(xi) customer satisfaction.

Audits must be documented by the CMM. Findings must be reported to the AM.

23. Oversight by the GCAA (external oversight)

1. The full scope of activities of the ELP TO will be audited by GCAA, also within a period of 24 MONTHS.
2. The audits performed by GCAA comprise:
 - a. Quality and Administration (Compliance Monitoring): Audit of internal Compliance Monitoring



- System of the ELP TO, compliance with the applicable legislation and adherence to the procedures as described in the approved Operations Manual of the ELP TO.
- b. Management structure, post holders, staffing, assessor team
 - c. Assessor files: requirements, initial and recurrent standardization, recruitment standards and suitability of the assessors.
 - d. Candidate files
 - e. Candidate list
 - f. Assessment grading: The GCAA may bring a “dummy” candidate to the assessment, which was assessed internally at GCAA, to benchmark/compare the use of the ICAO rating scale, by the audited ELP TO.
 - g. Assessment method: Are the language proficiency assessment methods and questions/systems/tools used, appropriate and used as approved? Is the question database relevant and regularly revamped and analyzed?
 - h. Review of recordings of candidates
3. Audits are announced/planned in cooperation with the ELP TO
 4. The audit forms used by GCAA can be found in Annex X. This way the processes within the ELP TO can be continuously aligned with GCAA expectations.
 5. Spot checks (unannounced inspections by GCAA), to assist in language assessments, or at random, or targeted requests for recordings of language assessments, are possible. Full access to the ELP TO and its files, at all times and cooperation with GCAA auditors and inspectors is expected, by at least the AM of the ELP TO, or its deputy.
 6. Annually a list of all language assessments performed by the ELP TO must be forwarded to GCAA, or made available to GCAA, in electronic format and/or on the ELP TO-intranet, server, accessible to GCAA. The standard template, available on the GCAA website is to be used for this purpose, so listing of all candidates and statistical analysis can be performed.



ANNEX I: APPLICATION FORM

Refer to LIF-ELP-001



ANNEX II: ELP TO APPROVAL CERTIFICATE



APPROVAL CERTIFICATE

This certificate is issued to:

NAME OF THE ORGANIZATION

Whose business address is:

Address of the organization

Number:

Upon finding that this organisation complies in all relevant aspect with CAR-FCL and CAR-ORA relating to the regulation of the language Proficiency in civil aviation, it is empowered to operate as an approved ELP TP with the following privileges:



English Language Proficiency (ELP) testing



The following language proficiency levels, may be issued

with corresponding validity:



Level 4 (Operational Level)

4 years



Level 5 (Extended Level)

6 years



Level 6 (Expert Level)

UNLIMITED

This certificate, unless cancelled, suspended or revoked, shall continue in effect until:

Date of first issue:

Date of initial issue of the approval certificate

Date of variation:

Date of last variation of the approval certificate



ANNEX III: GCAA LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT REPORT FORM

This document can be used for grading R/T competences and Language Proficiency in accordance with Air Crew Regulations, during a formal language assessment at an approved ELP TO.

Name of the candidate: Candidate

ID:.....

Date and location of the assessment:.....

Holistic descriptor:	Grading: 1 -> 6:	Remarks:
Pronunciation		
Structure		
Vocabulary		
Fluency		
Comprehension		
Interaction		
Overall grading:		
Result/outcome (after negotiation panel of assessors): LEVEL Comments (useful input/remarks for future reference):		

Name & Signature operational assessor:

Name & Signature linguistic assessor:



ANNEX IV: GCAA LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY CERTIFICATE

This document certifies Language Proficiency in accordance with Air Crew Regulations, of a candidate in civil aviation, after a formal language assessment at an approved ELP TO.

Name of the candidate:.....

ELP TO-Sequence number of the candidate:.....

Address:

Name of the ELP TO:

with approval reference:

Date and location of the assessment:.....

Copy of the ELP TO approval certificate (to be attached to the certificate): YES NO

Type of License held: PPL CPL ATP AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Number:

Tested in the role of: PILOT AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Language Proficiency assessment:

English Other:.....

Level obtained: Level 3 Level 4 Level 5 Level 6

Name linguistic assessor: Name operational assessor:

Signature linguistic assessor: Signature operational assessor:



Stamp of the ELP TO:



ANNEX V: CANDIDATE LIST





ANNEX VI: ICAO LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT RATING SCALE

See AMC2 to FCL.055



ANNEX VII: GCAA LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT PRIVACY STATEMENT

I, undersigned

.....

candidate for a language proficiency assessment at (name of the ELP TO):

.....

confirm that I have been briefed by the organization regarding the following:

In order to pass a valid language proficiency assessment on the UAE territory, or for endorsement of a language proficiency on a UAE licence, the GCAA demands that (at least a part of) the assessment would be recorded on audio-visual media. This for reasons of identification of the candidate, proof of examination and for reproduction purposes in case of disputes of the content and outcome of the assessment. Neither the recording, nor the data forthcoming from the recording may be shared by the ELP TO with third parties. Only the GCAA and the ELP TO have the right to view and analyze the recordings. The recordings must be kept for a period of 5 years by the ELP TO, after which they are erased in a standardized fashion.

Date: Signature:

(Date) (Signature)



ANNEX VIII: GCAA LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT APPEAL PROCEDURE FEEDBACK/DISPUTE/COMPLAINT FORM

This document is to be used as a standard form for a candidate to provide feedback to a ELP TO, regarding a language proficiency assessment taken by their assessors. This document is also to be used in case of request for feedback regarding the language proficiency assessment, in a first stage and utter a dispute/complaint (only!) in a second stage, if upon receiving feedback from the ELP TO, the candidate and the ELP TO still cannot reach agreement, a dispute/complaint procedure can be launched as a second stage. GCAA is not to be included in these proceedings, until stage 1 and 2 have been completed/exhausted.

STAGE 1a: Details of the candidate (to be filled in by the candidate):

Name of the candidate: Candidate ID:

Date and location of the assessment:

Nature of the communication (stage 1a):

Provide feedback / Tips to the ELP TO

Request feedback regarding the grading, or other aspects of the language proficiency assessment, performed by the ELP TO

Further explanation/elaboration by the candidate:

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Signature of the candidate: Date:

This document is to be sent to the CMM of the ELP TO that provided the language proficiency assessment



STAGE 1b: Feedback by the CMM of the ELP TO

Name of the CMM: ELP TO ID:

Feedback by the CMM:

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Proposed action plan by the CMM:

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Signature of the CMM: Date:

Date of communication to candidate:

STAGE 2a: Complaint/dispute by the candidate:

Upon receiving feedback from the ELP TO, I wish to express a dispute/complaint regarding:

- Content of the language proficiency assessment
- Procedures applied by the ELP TO / Lack of compliance to the ELP TO's procedures Grading of the
- language proficiency assessment
- Attitude / behavior / actions of the assessor(s)/ELP TO Management/Post Holders Other:

Motivation by the candidate:

.....
.....



.....

Signature of the candidate: Date of communication to ELP TO:

STAGE 2b: Treatment of the complaint/dispute by the AM of the ELP TO:

Name of the AM: ELP TO ID:.....

Date of reception of the complaint/dispute (stage 2):

Investigative actions taken by the AM, regarding the dispute/complaint:

- Review of the recording of the language proficiency assessment, date:
- Interview of the assessors involved in the language proficiency assessment, date: Review of the
- procedures applied by the ELP TO, compliance with the ELP TO's procedures Review of the grading of the language proficiency assessment
- Review of the Attitude / behavior / actions of the assessor(s)/ELP TO Management/Post Holders Other:

Motivation by the Accountable Manager (AM) of the ELP TO:

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Decision by the Accountable Manager of the ELP TO:

.....
.....

Proposed action plan by the Accountable Manager of the ELP TO:

.....
.....

Decision and action plan accepted by the candidate? YES NO

Signature of the AM: Signature of the candidate:

If a settlement cannot be reached between the ELP TO and the candidate, mediation by the GCAA may be requested (ONLY if stages 1 and 2 have been correctly applied and exhausted). Please contact GCAA:



examination@gcaa.gov.ae and include a copy of the entire document. Both the ELP TO and the candidate may in that case apply for mediation in the dispute.



ANNEX IX: ELP TO POST HOLDER AND LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSOR CODE OF CONDUCT/ETHICS:

I, undersigned

.....

candidate for language proficiency assessor / Post holder of the ELP TO (name of the ELP TO):

.....

confirm that I have been briefed by the ELP TO, and will fully adhere to the following code of conduct/ethics, while representing the GCAA, as post holder of the ELP TO, or acting as language proficiency assessor.

CC 1: A language proficiency assessment shall be conducted in fairness, independent of the candidate's age, gender, race, or other distinguishing features, without prejudice, or preference. Hurtful, disrespectful, or other negative remarks will be avoided at all times and inappropriate behaviors towards candidates will be avoided.

CC2: A former language, or R/T teacher will not act as language proficiency assessor of a candidate. The language proficiency assessor should inform the AM of the ELP TO of any existing personal, professional, or hierarchal relationship between the language proficiency assessor and a candidate, so the AM can decide if there is a conflict of interest for the language assessment and motivate/document the decision.

CC3: Conflict of interest of any kind is to be reported to the AM of the ELP TO, preferably prior to the language proficiency assessment, or with undue delay, after the assessment. Any existing relationship personal/ professional should not influence the outcome/grading of the language proficiency assessment, be it in the positive, or negative sense.

CC4: The assessor/post holder will see to it that every candidate can perform the language proficiency assessment in standardized circumstances and all necessary steps will be undertaken by the assessor, to inform the candidate correctly about the evolution of the assessment and create a relaxed environment for the candidate.



CC5: The language proficiency assessment is to be executed in a standardized fashion, in accordance with the ELP TO's approved Operations Manual.

CC6: Grading of the language proficiency is to be executed in a standardized fashion, applying the 6 holistic ICAO descriptors, applied to plain language assessment, not in accordance with self-imposed lower, or higher grading standards.

CC7: The candidate will not be informed of the outcome/grading of the assessment, until after negotiation in private was concluded and a decision was reached, in constructive cooperation with the other assessor.

CC8: The candidate will be informed in a neutral, objective manner about the grading of the language proficiency assessment. Personal remarks, negative/disrespectful attitudes towards the candidate should be avoided, disappointment of the candidate should be dealt with diplomacy, attempting to keep good relations with the candidate, even in case of an unexpected outcome/grading.

CC9: The most professional and most respectful communication will be adhered to, in order to inform the candidates and other language assessment stake holders correctly and politely, as the language proficiency assessor is acting as an external representative for the authorities, in all his/her communication.

CC10: A GCAA approved assessor will grant all cooperation to an inquiry, based on complaints, either within the ELP TO, or external, performed by GCAA.

CC11: The privacy of the recordings will not be handled carelessly. Recordings are not to be distributed to other parties than with the AM of the ELP TO and GCAA, unless authorized specifically otherwise. Files are not to be withheld, copied, nor destroyed, for personal interest.

CC12: Upon and after termination of the cooperation between an assessor and an ELP TO, the items stated in CC1 through 11 continue to apply.

CC13: Each language proficiency assessor, or post holder has the duty to observe colleague assessors, point out approved ELP TO procedures and how to adhere to them correctly. He/she should point out possible violations against the ELP TO's approved procedures to colleague assessors, as a cooperative team. The same applies with regards to language proficiency legislation, or the code of conduct/ethics, in a constructive



fashion. Only if this has no effect, this will be reported to the CMM, or AM of the ELP TO. Only if this still has no effect, nor leads to any improvement, GCAA will be advised.

CC14: It is the personal responsibility of each assessor, to report irregularities imposed by the ELP TO management to the CMM, or to the GCAA, or other authority body responsible for the suspected violation, if internal reporting does not generate improvement/rectification. It is the individual responsibility of the assessor, or ELP TO post holder, not to cooperate, nor contribute to illegal practices. Assessors and post holders that have collaborated, imposed or contributed to illegal, inappropriate behaviors with regards to other language proficiency stake holders, can and may be held personally accountable.

(*) This list of terms and conditions for the code of conduct/ethics is not exhaustive and may be elaborated by the ELP TO. The ELP TO may elaborate the list below, with further topics of the internal code of conduct/ethics, within the ELP TO:

Date: Signature:



ANNEX X: GCAA AUDIT CHECKLIST OF ELP TO