

ICAO Language Proficiency Requirements – Safety Promotional Material

Reference: Commission Regulation (EU) 1178/2011, Commission Regulation (EU) 2015/340, ICAO Doc 9835

CIVIL AVIATION DIRECTORATE

Transport Malta, Malta Transport Centre, Pantar Road, Lija LJA 2021 Malta. Tel:+356 2555 5625 Fax:+356 2123 9278 info.tm@transport.gov.mt www.transport.gov.mt

This PEL notice is being issued in order to bring to the attention of Approved Training Organisations, Pilots and Air Traffic Controllers the latest Safety Promotional Material issued by the joint ICAO-EASA LPRI Task Force, on the ICAO language proficiency requirements for pilots and air traffic controllers, as attached to this PEL notice.

ICAO and EASA closely worked to streamline and harmonize the LPR activities across the EUR Region and optimize support to States. It is through this process that the attached safety promotion material was developed for all parties concerned.

PERSONNEL LICENSING SECTION

PEL Notice 72 - ICAO LPR – Safety Promotional Material	Version 1.0 15/11/2019	Page 1 of 1
--	---------------------------	-------------

ICAO language proficiency requirements for pilots and air traffic controllers (Full Version)

ICAO Language Proficiency Requirement, what does it mean?

ICAO language proficiency requirement refers to the ability of air traffic personnel and pilots to communicate in English in a level of language of at least ICAO Level 4. The reason is simple: **Safety!** This document is intended for all stakeholders to understand what the requirements are, the regulation in place, recommendations and best practices, where to find this documentation, and to take action as deemed necessary.

1 Background to ICAO language proficiency requirements (LPRs)

Text source: ICAO Circular 318-AN/180, chapter 1

The decision to address language proficiency for pilots and air traffic controllers was first made by the 32nd Session of the Assembly in September 1998 as a direct response to several fatal accidents, including one that cost the lives of 349 persons, as well as to previous fatal accidents in which **the lack of proficiency in English was identified as a contributing factor**.

The intent was to improve the level of language proficiency in aviation worldwide, and reduce the communication breakdowns caused by lack of language skills.

Although language skills are required for any language used in the aeronautical communication, the focus has been on English language proficiency. ICAO introduced language provisions to ensure that air traffic personnel and pilots are proficient in conducting and comprehending radiotelephony communications in the English language, including requirements that the English language shall be available on request at all stations on the ground serving designated airports and routes used by international air services.

The advantages of an elevated international standard of aviation English are:

- Improved communicative understanding of all parties.
- Standard phraseology is less likely to cause confusion and misunderstanding.
- Increased situational awareness of flight crews in relation to other aircraft, both in the air and on the ground.
- A higher standard of communication internationally.
- A broader range of English comprehensions by flight crews in their profession.

In March 2003, the ICAO Council adopted a comprehensive set of **Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs)** that strengthened language proficiency requirements for pilots and air traffic controllers involved in international operations. The applicability had been progressive until March 2011 when all aeroplane, airship, helicopter and powered-lift pilots, air traffic controllers and aeronautical station operators were mandated to demonstrate the ability to speak and understand the language used for radiotelephony communications to the level specified in the language proficiency requirements.

These language proficiency requirements **affirmed that ICAO standardized phraseology should be used whenever possible** and required that when phraseology is not applicable, pilots and air traffic controllers should demonstrate a minimum level of proficiency in plain language.

The effective use of **plain language is vital** in routine operational situations in which phraseology provides no “ready-made” form of communication and is especially critical in unusual or emergency situations.

The minimum **skill level requirements** are embodied in the ICAO language **proficiency rating scale** and the **holistic descriptors** that appear in Attachment A and Appendix 1 of Annex 1 – Personnel Licensing, respectively.

2 Current regulatory framework

ICAO SARPs:

Annex 1 – Personnel Licencing
Chapter 1, section 1.2.9 Language Proficiency
Attachment A and Appendix 1

Annex 6 – Operation of aircraft
Part I - Chapter 3.1, section 3.1.8
Part II – Chapter 2.1, section 2.1.1.6, 3.3.1.5
Part III – Chapter 1, section 1.1.8

Annex 10 – Volume II, Aeronautical communications
Chapter 5, section 5.1.1.1, 5.2.1.2,

Annex 11 – Air Traffic Services
Chapter 2, section 2.31
Appendix 2

PANS-ATM doc 4444, chapter 12, 12.2

EU Regulation:

REGULATION (EU) 2018/1139 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 4 July 2018 on common rules in the field of civil aviation and establishing a European Union Aviation Safety Agency, and amending Regulations (EC) No 2111/2005, (EC) No 1008/2008, (EU) No 996/2010, (EU) No 376/2014 and Directives 2014/30/EU and 2014/53/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council, and repealing Regulations (EC) No 552/2004 and (EC) No 216/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council and Council Regulation (EEC) No 3922/91
Annex VIII paragraph 4.4

COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) 2016/1185 amending Implementing Regulation (EU) No 923/2012 as regards the update and completion of the common rules of the air and operational provisions regarding services and procedures in air navigation (SERA Part C) and repealing Regulation (EC) No 730/2006

SERA.14015 Language to be used in air-ground communication
AMC1 SERA.14015
GM1 SERA.14015
GM2 SERA.14015

Flight crew:

Commission Regulation (EU) 1178/2011
FCL.055
APPENDIX 2 Language proficiency rating scale - Expert, extended and operational levels.
AMC1, AMC2 and AMC3 FCL.055

ATCOs

Commission Regulation (EU) 2015/340
ATCO.B.030 Language proficiency endorsement
ATCO.B.035 Validity of language proficiency endorsement
ATCO.B.040 Assessment of language proficiency
ATCO.B.045 Language training

Official publications

ICAO resolution A38-8
ICAO Doc 9835, Manual on the Implementation of ICAO Language Proficiency Requirements, 2nd ed.

ICAO Circular 318, Language Testing Criteria for Global Harmonization, 2009
ICAO Circular 323, Guidelines for Aviation English Training Programmes, 2009
ICAO Doc. 10045 MET/14

3 A proficient speaker in aeronautical communications

Text source: Doc 9835, 2nd ed, ch 4

ICAO LPRs consist of a set of holistic descriptors (Appendix to Annex 1) which provide all-embracing **characteristics of proficient speakers**:

1. *Proficient speakers shall communicate effectively in voice-only (telephone/radiotelephone) and in face-to-face situations.*

Radiotelephony communications lack the facial cues, body language and listening cues found in usual face-to-face situations. Communications without such cues are considered to be more difficult and challenging, requiring a higher degree of language proficiency than face-to-face interactions. In addition, other features of radiotelephony communications make it a unique kind of communicative event. For example, the sound quality may be poor, with distracting sounds and communicative workload of the air traffic controller or a pilot may be heavy, with a corresponding need for efficiency and brevity.

2. *Proficient speakers shall communicate on common, concrete, and work-related topics with accuracy and clarity.*

Context is an important consideration in communications, and an individual's language proficiency may vary in different contexts. This holistic descriptor limits the domain of the communicative requirements to work-related topics; that is, air traffic controllers and pilots are expected to be able to communicate about issues in their field of professional practice. Language proficiency should not be limited to standardized phraseology and should range across a relatively broad area of work-related communicative domains.

3. *Proficient speakers shall use appropriate communicative strategies to exchange messages and to recognize and resolve misunderstandings (e.g. to check, confirm, or clarify information) in a general or work-related context.*

Linguists have identified strategic competence as an important part of language. One aspect of strategic competence important to air traffic controllers and flight crews is the ability to recognize and resolve potential misunderstandings, e.g. having strategies to check for comprehension in a meaningful way, such as asking for a readback. Equally important is the ability to rephrase or paraphrase a message when it is apparent that a message was not understood. Sometimes the phraseology "Say again" should be understood as a request for clarification rather than repetition. Air traffic controllers and flight crews should understand that silence does not always indicate comprehension. On the part of native-speaking air traffic controllers and flight crews, strategic competence can include an appreciation of the threats presented by cross-cultural communications and a sensitivity to strategies to confirm comprehension.

4. *Proficient speakers shall handle successfully and with relative ease the linguistic challenges presented by a complication or unexpected turn of events that occurs within the context of a routine work situation or communicative task with which they are otherwise familiar.*

One of the more challenging events in all communications, including those involving the use of a second language, is when the unexpected happens. Human Factors experts have emphasized the threat of letting our expectations hinder our interpretation of reality. Sometimes, a complication or an unexpected event can lead to a communication breakdown. It is important for air traffic controllers and flight crews to have sufficient language proficiency and the strategic skills to manage a dialogue through any unexpected event. It is the nature of the work of controllers and pilots to adhere to strictly defined procedures and regulations and yet to be able, when confronted

with a new situation, to demonstrate substantial flexibility in their response. This holistic descriptor emphasizes the need for language skills practiced and demonstrated in this context.

5. *Proficient speakers shall use a dialect or accent which is intelligible to the aeronautical community.*

A first and natural response to this holistic descriptor is to inquire which dialects or accents would be considered intelligible. One answer is to consider how this issue has traditionally been handled among native-speaker controller populations. In the United Kingdom, for instance, a great variety of regional dialects and differences exist. Air traffic control applicants and trainees are informally screened for use of a dialect appropriate to the international aviation context. A determination of what constitutes a strong regional dialect or marked accent is based on the extensive experience and good judgement of the trainer or assessor. When an individual demonstrates a strong regional dialect or marked accent, one determined to be easily understood only by those most familiar with the dialect, that individual is counselled to use a dialect more widely acceptable or is provided with additional elocution or speech training.

4 ICAO rating scale explained

Text source: Doc 9835, 2nd ed , ch 4

The ability to speak and understand the language used for radiotelephony that is currently required for pilots, air traffic controllers and aeronautical station operators should be **demonstrated based on the holistic descriptors and language proficiency rating scale to at least Level 4**. Operational Level 4 is considered the minimum level of proficiency to ensure an acceptable level of safety.

The ICAO rating scale delineates six levels of language proficiency across six skill areas of linguistic performance: pronunciation, structure, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension and interactions.

Below is a brief explanation of **OPERATIONAL LEVEL 4** descriptors.

Pronunciation	<i>Pronunciation, stress, rhythm and intonation are influenced by the first language or regional variation, but only sometimes interfere with ease of understanding.</i>
----------------------	--

What it means:

Operational Level 4 speakers demonstrate a marked accent, or localized regional variety of English.

Occasionally, a proficient listener may have to pay close attention to understand or may have to clarify something from time to time. Operational Level 4 is certainly not a perfect level of proficiency; it is the minimum level of proficiency determined to be safe for air traffic control communications. While it is not an Expert level, it is important to keep in mind that pronunciation plays the critical role in aiding comprehension between two non-native speakers of English.

Structure	<i>Basic grammatical structures and sentence patterns are used creatively and are usually well controlled. Errors may occur, particularly in unusual or unexpected circumstances, but rarely interfere with meaning.</i>
------------------	--

What it means:

Operational Level 4 speakers have good command of basic grammatical structures. They do not merely have a memorized set of words or phrases on which they rely but have sufficient command of basic grammar to create new meaning as appropriate. They demonstrate local errors and infrequent global errors and communication is effective overall. Level 4 speakers will not usually attempt complex structures, and when they do, quite a lot of errors would be expected resulting in less effective communication.

Vocabulary	<i>Vocabulary range and accuracy are usually sufficient to communicate effectively on common, concrete and work-related topics. Can often paraphrase successfully when lacking vocabulary in unusual or unexpected circumstances.</i>
-------------------	---

What it means:

A speaker at this level will usually be able to manage communication on work-related topics, but may sometimes need clarification. When faced with a communication breakdown, an Operational Level 4 speaker can paraphrase and negotiate meaning so that the message is understood. The ability to paraphrase includes appropriate choices of simple vocabulary and considerate use of speech rate and pronunciation.

Fluency	<i>Produces stretches of language at an appropriate tempo. There may be occasional loss of fluency on transition from rehearsed or formulaic speech to spontaneous interaction, but this does not prevent effective communication. Can make limited use of discourse markers or connectors. Fillers are not distracting.</i>
----------------	--

What it means:

Speech rate at this level may be slowed by the requirements of language processing, but remains fairly constant and does not negatively affect the speaker's involvement in communication. The speaker has the possibility of speaking a little faster than the ICAO recommended rate of 100 words per minute if the situation requires (Annex 10, Volume II, 5.2.1.5.3 b)).

Comprehension	<i>Comprehension is mostly accurate on common, concrete and work-related topics when the accent or variety used is sufficiently intelligible for an international community of users. When the speaker is confronted with a linguistic or situational complication or an unexpected turn of events, comprehension may be slower or require clarification strategies.</i>
----------------------	--

What it means:

As with all Operational Level 4 descriptors, comprehension is not expected to be perfectly accurate in all instances. However, pilots or air traffic controllers will need to have strategies available which allow them to ultimately comprehend the unexpected or unusual communication. Unmarked or complex textual relations are occasionally misunderstood or missed. The descriptor of Operational Level 4 under "Interactions" clarifies the need for clarification strategies. Failure to understand a clearly communicated unexpected communication, even after seeking clarification, should result in the assignment of a lower proficiency level assessment.

Interaction	<i>Responses are usually immediate, appropriate and informative. Initiates and maintains exchanges even when dealing with an unexpected turn of events. Deals adequately with apparent misunderstandings by checking, confirming or clarifying.</i>
--------------------	---

What it means:

A pilot or air traffic controller who does not understand an unexpected communication must be able to communicate that fact. It is much safer to query a communication, to clarify, or even to simply acknowledge that one does not understand rather than to allow silence to mistakenly represent comprehension. At Operational Level 4, it is acceptable that comprehension is not perfect 100 per cent of the time when dealing with unexpected situations, but Level 4 speakers need to be skilled at checking, seeking confirmation, or clarifying a situation or communication.

The scope and focus of the ICAO Language Proficiency Rating Scale are specific and unique in several important ways:

Text source: Doc 9835, 2nd ed, ch 4

- a) the ICAO Rating Scale addresses only spoken language (speaking and listening); it does not address reading and writing skills;
- b) the ICAO Rating Scale has a distinct aeronautical radiotelephony focus; it addresses the use of language in a work-related aviation context, voice-only communications, using strategic competences for safe communications in case of complications or unexpected turn of events, and emphasizing intelligibility in an international community of users;
- c) ICAO Operational Level 4 does not target high degrees of grammatical correctness or native-like pronunciation. Grammar, syntax, vocabulary and pronunciation are judged primarily to the extent that they do not interfere with effective oral communication; and
- d) the final rating is not the average or aggregate of the ratings in each of the six ICAO language proficiency skills but the lowest of these six ratings.

A person's overall proficiency rating is determined by the lowest rating assigned in any of the language proficiency skills of the rating scale. This is essential because the Operational Level 4 descriptors were developed as the safest minimum proficiency skill level for aeronautical radiotelephony communications. A lower score on any one feature indicates inadequate proficiency; for example, pilots with Operational Level 4 ratings in all areas except pronunciation may not be understood by the air traffic controllers with whom they must communicate.

An individual must demonstrate proficiency at Level 4 in all categories in order to receive a Level 4 rating.

5 ICAO Rated Speech Sample Training Aid

Text source: <https://cfapp.icao.int/rssta/>

The ICAO Rated Speech Sample Training Aid (RSSTA), developed under the auspices of the International Civil Aviation English Association (ICAEA), is designed to:

- Raise awareness of what constitutes an acceptable or unacceptable level of English for communication between pilots and ATCs according to the ICAO scales
- Provide examples of performance at each of the ICAO levels 2-6
- Serve as an accurate and reliable reference for users
- Promote rating standardisation between different raters and test service providers and between different regions of the world
- Act as a training tool for the initial and recurring training of raters and examiners
- Support ICAO's efforts to enhance proficiency test standards

You may access the audio files free of charge here:

<https://cfapp.icao.int/rssta/RSSTA.cfm>

6 The role of native and non-native English speakers

Text source: Doc 9835, 2nd edition, ch 5

The ICAO language proficiency **requirements apply to native and non-native speakers alike**. Because English is the most commonly used language for international aviation communications, many non-native speakers of English will require language training to improve their language proficiency. Nonetheless, the burden for improved communications should not be seen as falling solely on non-native speakers.

Miscommunication can occur between native speakers of the same language. It can occur as a result of a linguistic error or feature (*ambiguity, homophony, etc.*) or as a result of human carelessness (*poor enunciation, sloppy microphone work, too much data in a single transmission, or impatience*). Miscommunication can also occur between non-native speakers or between a native speaker and a non-native speaker as for the same reasons, in addition to other sources of error specific to non-native English use.

Reducing the risks associated with **miscommunication** in radiotelephony **requires** concerted **effort** and widespread **cooperation**. Native and non-native English-speaking pilots and controllers will benefit from an improved understanding of how language functions, with a focus on strategies that aid comprehension and clarity. Native speakers of English, in particular, have an ethical obligation to increase their linguistic awareness and to take special care in the delivery of messages.

International cooperation in this regard is important. The burden can be shared in a number of ways:

- a) Contracting States can ensure that their use of phraseology aligns as closely as possible with ICAO standardized phraseology;
- b) native and other expert users of English can acquire strategies to improve cross-cultural communications;
- c) native and other expert users of English can refrain from the use of idioms, colloquialisms and other jargon in radiotelephony communications and can modulate their rate of delivery; and
- d) native speakers are under the same obligation as non-native speakers to ensure that their variety of English is comprehensible to the international aviation community.

Text source: Doc 9835, 2nd edition, ch 3

Radiotelephony communications bring together an international community of speakers whose pronunciation of the common language, English, will be influenced by regional varieties or by their mother tongue and whose levels of proficiency are unequal. This aeronautical community is defined by its shared knowledge of the aeronautical domain and, in particular, the conventions of radiotelephony communications. This shared knowledge is however counterbalanced by differences in language proficiency levels. This places different responsibilities on the shoulders of all users:

- a) users with low proficiency must undertake training in order to reach the minimum level acceptable to ensure safe operations; and
- b) users with high proficiency must accommodate their use of language so as to remain intelligible and supportive to less proficient users.

7 Language training in aviation

Text source: ICAO Circular 323 - AN/185, ch 1

The ICAO Language Proficiency Requirements apply to **achieving and maintaining proficiency** in all languages used in radiotelephony communications. However, as English is the language most widely used in common by the global aviation community, and the one which there is a requirement to provide, it is in improving levels of spoken English that the community's main focus currently lies.

Language training in aviation has specific objectives, content, criteria of proficiency, conditions of use and professional and personal stakes that set it apart from the teaching of language in any other area of human activity:

- Language is designed to ensure unambiguous pilot-controller communication;
- The language used employs a very specific set of vocabulary, expressions and functions;
- Operational efficiency, rather than linguistic correctness, is the ultimate criterion by which proficiency is assessed;
- Communication is predominantly oral and most often with no visual contact;
- The question of communication may not only impact the safety of the travelling public and individual careers, but also potentially have considerable economic repercussions on all individuals involved in the aviation industry, directly through testing and training costs and indirectly by its effect on staffing.

In addition to addressing non-formulaic, work-related language, aviation English training must adopt an essentially communicative approach to language learning **with the main focus on speaking, listening and interactive skills**. Although grammar, syntax, vocabulary and reading underlie oral communications, the primary objective of aviation English training is voice-only communication.

Content-based language instruction is appropriate to aviation professionals because the language becomes the vehicle for learning meaningful and appropriate content; language is not seen as auxiliary to other aviation training, but as integrated with aviation training.

It is well known to what extent **motivation** drives efficient learning. If we see the relevance of what we are learning we learn it all the more readily. Equally, if the content and function of the language learnt are relevant to real-life operational situations, it will be more easily and naturally available and applied when it is required.

Remember: Text source: Doc 9835, 2nd edition, ch 7

Language proficiency training must be clearly distinguished from test preparation.

Language proficiency training aims to go beyond the test and provide the extensive practice that is necessary to consolidate language skills for use in real-world operational situations, build confidence and ensure adequate safety margins when operating in stressful conditions.

8 Post implementation – lessons learned and challenges ahead

Eight years have passed since the introduction of the requirement. There is a general consensus that LPRs have now moved beyond the implementation phase yet there remain a number of unresolved issues. All relevant stakeholders, and in particular, the Agency and the Member States have also accumulated valuable experience and collected useful feedback, that need to be accounted for.

Despite all available guidance material and numerous international and regional conferences and meetings offering extensive information on many relevant language training and language testing issues, the level of commitment to standardized approach in the implementation of LPRs remains varied.

LPRs were originally designed to improve the standard of language proficiency, in particular English, in a safety-critical aeronautical environment. However, the words '*... shall demonstrate the ability to speak and understand the language used for radiotelephony communications*' have sent the industry stakeholders in many different directions.

Instead of putting focus on improving the level of '*effective communication in voice-only and face-to-face situations on common, concrete and work related topics, using appropriate communicative strategies to exchange messages and recognize and resolve misunderstandings, and handle successfully the linguistic*

challenges presented by unexpected turn of events within the context of a routine work situation, using a dialect or accent which is intelligible to the aeronautical community', LPRs seem to have become more about the demonstration of communicative ability through 'a method of assessment approved by the competent authority.'

Most efforts are directed at language tests and testing rather than at attaining, improving and maintaining effective communicative ability of aviation professionals through meaningful training and practice.

A large variety of processes to ensure the demonstration of English language proficiency has been put in place by the Member States: tests delivered by the competent authorities themselves, tests delivered by one or more testing centres accepted by the competent authorities, demonstration conducted during proficiency checks for revalidation of class and type ratings, online tests, tests delivered by one examiner, tests delivered by a combination of an aviation and a language expert, and many more.

However, there is still a lot to be done with some of the main issues identified being to:

- keep improving communicative skills of all participants in aeronautical communications
- emphasise the importance of continuous language training in an aeronautical (real-world) context
- highlight that communication in an international aeronautical environment is a shared responsibility
- ensure harmonization of language testing of aviation professionals – e.g. 'easy' and 'difficult' tests, candidates presenting a Level 4 certificate not being able to communicate effectively during a job interview or simulator sessions, etc.
- see that Agency / Regulators closely monitor ongoing maintenance of tests that they approve as LPR compliance tools

We must bear in mind that:

The language proficiency of pilots and air traffic controllers is a safety issue.

A large variety of processes to ensure the demonstration of English language proficiency has been put in place by the Member States: tests delivered by the competent authorities themselves, tests delivered by one or more testing centres accepted by the competent authorities, demonstration conducted during proficiency checks for revalidation of class and type ratings, online tests, tests delivered by one examiner, tests delivered by a combination of an aviation and a language expert, and many more.

For further information on finding LPRI related websites in your CAA, consult Table 1.

Table 1. EASA Member States Language Proficiency-related website

AUSTRIA	https://www.austrocontrol.at/jart/prj3/ac/main.jart?rel=de&content-id=1311169872780
BELGIUM	https://mobilit.belgium.be/fr/transport_aerien/licences/language_proficiency
BULGARIA	
CROATIA	http://www.ccaa.hr/english/detalji-novosti_31/air-safety-order-aso-2013-007-certification-and-oversight-of-language-proficiency-assessment-bodies_439/
CYPRUS	http://www.mcw.gov.cy/mcw/dca/dca.nsf/All/AC7EE2935DB37895C22583280032B915/\$file/AIC%20C%20003-18%20-%20Formal%20evaluation%20english%20language.pdf
CZECH REPUBLIC	

DENMARK	http://selvbetjening.trafikstyrelsen.dk/civilflugt/Dokumenter/English/English%20Forms/Personnel%20Licensing/(LPA)%20Application%20form%20for%20approval%20as%20a%20language%20proficiency%20assessor.pdf
ESTONIA	
FINLAND	https://www.traficom.fi/en/transport/aviation/flight-and-language-examiners
FRANCE	https://www.ecologique-solidaire.gouv.fr/contrôle-compétences-linguistiques
GERMANY	https://www.lba.de/DE/Luftfahrtpersonal/Sprachanforderungen/Sprachanforderungen.html
GREECE	http://www.yppa.gr/en/licensing-training/degrees-licences/pilots-qualifications-administrative-operations
HUNGARY	
ICELAND	
IRELAND	https://www.iaa.ie/personnel-licensing/pilot-licences-(eu-regulations)/english-language-assessment
ITALY	https://www.enac.gov.it/sicurezza-aerea/certificazione-del-personale/personale-di-volo/piloti/language-proficiency
LATVIA	http://www.caa.lv/en/services/test-of-english-for-aviation
LIECHTENSTEIN	
LITHUANIA	
LUXEMBOURG	https://dac.public.lu/documentation/Licence_personnel_navigant/Procédure-DAC-LIC-203-1-Language-Proficiency.pdf
MALTA	http://www.transport.gov.mt/aviation/examinations/language-proficiency
NETHERLAND	https://www.ilent.nl/documenten/publicaties/2014/12/16/informatieblad-beperkte-language-assessment-body
NORWAY	
POLAND	http://www.ulc.gov.pl/pl/publikacje/wiadomosci/3516-nowy-system-egzaminowania-pilotow-z-jezyka-angielskiego-od-sierpnia-2014r?highlight=WylsYW5ndWFnZSIsInByb2ZpY2IibmN5IiwibGFuZ2VhZ2UgcHJvZmljaWVvY3kiXQ==
PORTUGAL	
ROMANIA	http://www.caa.ro/pages/competenta-lingvistica
SLOVAKIA	
SLOVENIA	https://www.caa.si/sistem-izvajanja-izpitov.html
SPAIN	https://www.seguridadaerea.gob.es/lang_castellano/cias_empresas/comp_linguistica/cecl_listados_pdf.aspx
SWEDEN	
SWITZERLAND	https://www.bazl.admin.ch/bazl/en/home/specialists/training-and-licences/pilot/radio-telephony-and-language-proficiency-test.html
UNITED KINGDOM	https://www.caa.co.uk/Commercial-industry/Pilot-licences/Applications/Language-Proficiency/

– END –