



NOTA DE ESTUDIO

GRUPO DE EXPERTOS SOBRE FACILITACIÓN (FALP)

SÉPTIMA REUNIÓN

Montreal, 22 – 26 de octubre de 2012

**Cuestión 5 del
orden del día: Enmiendas del Anexo 9**

**PROPUESTAS PARA ENMENDAR LOS SARPS DEL ANEXO 9
RELATIVOS A LAS PERSONAS CON IMPEDIMENTOS**

(Nota presentada por el Relator del Grupo de trabajo sobre personas con impedimentos)

Por falta de recursos, sólo se han traducido el resumen y el apéndice.

RESUMEN

La sección H, Capítulo 8 del Anexo 9 contiene normas y métodos recomendados (SARPS) que tratan sobre el acceso de las personas con impedimentos a los servicios de transporte aéreo internacional. El Grupo de expertos FAL ha pedido a su Grupo de trabajo sobre personas con impedimentos (PWD WG) que examine y revise, según corresponda, estos SARPS como parte de su labor de actualización de las directrices existentes sobre este asunto que figuran en la Circular 274, *Acceso al transporte aéreo de las personas con impedimentos*.

Medidas recomendadas al Grupo de expertos FAL:

Se invita al Grupo de expertos FAL a examinar las propuestas descritas en la presente nota y convenir en que se enmiende el Anexo 9, según figura en el Apéndice.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Annex 9 – *Facilitation* to the Convention on International Civil Aviation (“Chicago Convention”) contains international Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) relating to persons with disabilities. Chapter 1 of Annex 9 defines “Person with disabilities” as “Any person whose mobility is reduced due to a physical incapacity (sensory or locomotor), an intellectual deficiency, age, illness or any other cause of disability when using transport and whose situation needs special attention and the adaptation to the person’s needs of the services made available to all passengers.” Section H, Chapter 8 of Annex 9 contains three Standards and fifteen Recommended Practices that address accessibility to international air transport by persons with disabilities.

1.2 The Standards oblige all Contracting States to ensure that all airport facilities and services are adapted to the needs of persons with disabilities and that persons with disabilities have adequate access to air services. The Recommended Practices set out the measures that entities including States, airports, aircraft operators, ground handling operators and travel agents should take to assist persons with disabilities along their entire journey, from the beginning to the end.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 Following the fifth meeting of the Facilitation Panel (FALP/5, 2008), the Persons with Disabilities Working Group (PWD WG) was set up to revise the existing guidelines for persons with disabilities, found in Circular 274, *Access to Air Transport by Persons with Disabilities* (1999). A revised draft version of the guidelines was considered by the Panel at its sixth meeting, in 2010. The Panel agreed that the PWD WG should continue its work on revising the guidelines, under the direction of its Rapporteur, who would present a report at the present (FALP/7) meeting. The Panel also agreed that the Working Group should review and revise, as appropriate, the existing SARPs of Annex 9 on PWD, taking into consideration any proposals made in this regard.

2.2 During the inter-session, proposals to amend Standard 8.34 and several Recommended Practices were considered by the WG, in addition to a proposal that had been made by the United States at FALP/6 (FALP/6-WP/14 refers). These proposals are set out in the paragraphs that follow. The actual changes, agreed to by the PWD WG, are reflected in the Appendix to this paper.

2.3 **Proposal to amend Recommended Practice (RP) 8.22**

2.3.1 RP 8.22 reads as follows: “*When travelling, persons with disabilities should be provided with special assistance in order to ensure that they receive services customarily available to the general public. Such assistance includes the offering of information and directions in media that can be understood by travellers with cognitive or sensory disabilities.*”

2.3.2 The International Disability Alliance (IDA), a network of regional and global disabled people’s organizations, suggested the insertion of a new Standard requiring airport, airline and other assistance staff to preserve the dignity of PWDs. This is to ensure that the provision of such assistance preserves the dignity of PWDs. This suggestion was supported by Australia, but as an RP. However, the PWD WG is of the view that this sentiment can be accommodated within the subject matter of RP 8.22.

2.3.3 Canada suggested that the last sentence in RP 8.22, addressing the communication of information, be moved to RP 8.25. RP 8.22 speaks generally to the provision of assistance. However, the medium in which information is provided is but one of the many types of assistance that can be provided. As RP 8.25 addresses the provision of information in accessible formats, the last sentence of RP 8.22, suitably amended, would be more appropriately placed there. The WG agrees with this suggestion.

2.4 **Proposal to amend RP 8.24**

2.4.1 RP 8.24 reads as follows: “*Contracting States should take the necessary steps with aircraft operators, airports and ground handling operators to establish minimum uniform standards of accessibility with respect to transportation services for persons with disabilities, from arrival at the airport of departure to leaving the airport of destination.*”

2.4.2 The IDA felt that it is important that States publish their minimum accessibility standards, and this should be reflected in the RP. The WG agrees with this proposal because this addition will help to create awareness and promote compliance.

2.5 **Proposal to amend RP 8.25**

2.5.1 RP 8.25 reads as follows: “*Contracting States should take the necessary steps with aircraft operators, airports, ground handling operators and travel agencies to ensure that persons with disabilities are given the information they need, and should take the necessary steps to ensure that airlines, airports, ground handling operators and travel agencies are in a position to give those passengers the assistance necessary for them, depending on their needs, to help them in their travel.*”

2.5.2 As mentioned above, in paragraph 2.3.3, Canada proposed that the last sentence of RP 8.22 be amended and moved to RP 8.25. Therefore, the amended RP 8.25 would read: “. . . *persons with disabilities are given the information they need, in formats that are accessible to those with cognitive or sensory disabilities, and should take . . .*” To this, Germany suggested adding the words “where possible” before the words “in formats” as it is of the view that the proposed change would result in a need to implement extensive and cost-intensive measures along the process chain and that there is an extremely low percentage of blind and deaf passengers. However, the Rapporteur felt that the RP already encourages aircraft and airport operators to provide persons with disabilities the information they need and the amended text in RP 8.25 clarifies that the information be provided in a format which can be understood. Providing information in accessible formats can generally be accomplished by electronic means which are readily available and inexpensive. The WG agrees to retain the amendment, as is.

2.5.3 Canada, while agreeing that travel agencies should provide any necessary information to persons with disabilities to facilitate their travel plans, proposed deleting the reference to such agencies. The reason is that it is not common practice for travel agencies to provide assistance beyond the communication of information. It was also noted that RP 8.26, which addresses the provision of training to those who provide assistance does not include travel agencies. The WG agrees with this amendment.

2.6 **Proposal to amend RP 8.26**

2.6.1 RP 8.26 reads as follows: “*Contracting States should take all necessary steps to secure the cooperation of aircraft operators, airports and ground handling operators in order to establish and coordinate training programmes to ensure that trained personnel are available to assist persons with disabilities.*”

2.6.2 Proposals from Australia and Canada resulted in the following amendment of the provision, to ensure consistency with existing terminology: “. . . *secure the cooperation of aircraft operators, airports and ground handling operators . . .*” The WG agrees with this amendment.

2.7 **Proposal to amend RP 8.28**

2.7.1 RP 8.28 reads as follows: “*Contracting States should ensure that lifting systems or any other appropriate devices are made available in order to facilitate the movement of elderly and disabled passengers between the aircraft and the terminal on both arrival and departure as required where telescopic passageways are not used.*”

2.7.2 Canada suggested amending the text to create consistency and update terminology to reflect language used in Annex 9 (“persons with disabilities” instead of “elderly and disabled passengers”). The WG agrees with this suggestion.

2.8 **Proposal to amend RP 8.29**

2.8.1 RP 8.29 reads as follows: *“Measures should be taken to ensure that the hearing- and vision-impaired are able to obtain flight information.”*

2.8.2 The United States recommended that the words “service-related” should be inserted in between the words “flight” and “information”, so that the RP covers a broader scope. Germany proposed that the word “reasonable” be added before “measures.” The Rapporteur was of the view, however, that this term is subjective in nature and would thus lessen the intent of what already is a non-binding RP. The WG agrees that “service-related” should be added to the text.

2.9 **Proposal to amend RP 8.30**

2.9.1 RP 8.30 reads as follows: *“For elderly and disabled persons being set down or picked up at a terminal building, reserved points should be located as close as possible to main entrances. To facilitate movement to the various areas of the airport, access routes should be free of obstacles.”*

2.9.2 Canada suggested the provision be amended to clarify its intent and to ensure that it is the terminal as a whole, beyond the entrance areas, that should be free of obstacles. The UK advised that “designated” points be used, instead of “reserved” points, as the latter term may confuse users. The PWG WG agrees to these suggestions.

2.10 **Proposal to amend RP 8.33**

2.10.1 RP 8.33 reads as follows: *“Direct transfer from one aircraft to another of passengers, particularly elderly and disabled passengers, should be authorized, where necessary and possible, whenever this is warranted by deadlines in making connecting flights or by other circumstances.”*

2.10.2 Canada’s interpretation of this provision was that the RP was crafted to ensure that elderly and disabled passengers received assistance from changing from one flight to another as quickly as possible in order to make their connections. The reference to “authorize” may suggest allowing such persons avoiding customs or security checks, and this would not be permitted by many (or any) States. Canada therefore suggested that this RP be rewritten as follows, so as to clarify the intent of the provision: *“When assistance is provided to transfer persons with disabilities from one aircraft to another, it should be provided as efficiently as possible in order that they reach their connecting flight on time.”*

2.10.3 Australia supported this amendment, but suggested changing the portion of the text reading “in order . . . on time” to “with due regard for connecting flights,” to ensure that efforts are made to provide service in way which considers the need to reach a connecting flight, but recognizing that there are instances where it is not possible to reach a connecting flight. The WG agrees to both amendments.

2.11 **Proposal to amend Standard 8.34**

2.11.1 Standard 8.34 reads as follows: *“Contracting States shall take the necessary steps to ensure that persons with disabilities have adequate access to air services.”*

2.11.2 Canada suggested that the word “adequate” be replaced by the word “equal” as persons with disabilities should have equal access to air services. This principle is reflected in Standard 8.27 which indicates that Contracting States **shall** take the necessary steps **to ensure** that airport facilities and services **are adapted** to the needs of persons with disabilities. Australia recommended, however, that the word “equivalent” should be used, as “equal” does not reflect that, in some cases, persons with disabilities require a different (rather than an equal) level or type of access to facilitate travel. The WG agrees that reference should be made to “equivalent” access.

2.12 **Proposal to amend RP 8.35**

2.12.1 RP 8.35 reads as follows: “*Contracting States should introduce provisions by which aircraft coming newly into service or after major refurbishment should conform to minimum uniform standards of accessibility with respect to equipment on board aircraft which would include movable armrests, on-board wheelchairs, lavatories and suitable lighting and signs.*”

2.12.2 Canada suggested that the last line should be amended such that it reads: “. . . on-board wheelchair, **accessible washrooms** ~~lavatories~~ and suitable . . .” The WG agrees to this amendment.

2.13 **Proposal to amend RP 8.36**

2.13.1 RP 8.36 reads as follows: “*Wheelchairs, special apparatus and equipment required by persons with disabilities should be carried free of charge in the cabin where, in the view of the aircraft operator, space and safety requirements permit or should be designated as priority baggage. Service animals accompanying passengers with disabilities should also be carried free of charge in the cabin, subject to the application of any relevant national or aircraft operator regulations.*”

2.13.2 Canada proposed that RP8.36 be divided into two separate provisions, each dealing with a single issue. Therefore, the second sentence, dealing with service animals, would become a new RP8.36bis. As for the first sentence, Canada suggested that it be amended to expand the provision to include all disability aids and to clarify that such aids should be carried free of charge, whether taken on board in the cabin or checked-in. The UK suggested that the specific reference to wheelchairs should be deleted from the paragraph; although space may be available on board to store a personal wheelchair, there could be a demand for that space and wheelchairs should therefore be stored in the hold. Small mobility aids, such as crutches, sticks, cushions or wheelchair accessories should be carried in the passenger cabin provided they can be securely stored. The reference to wheelchairs has been struck to address the concern raised by the UK and because the broader term “disability aids” is all encompassing. The United States recommended that the phrase “in the view of the aircraft operator” should be deleted because compliance with safety requirements is an objective standard and is not subject to what the operator believes. Australia agreed that disability aids should be carried free of charge. However, as there also may be weight limitations on the carriage of such aids, it was suggested that the term “weight” be inserted after the word “space”. The WG agrees to these amendments. Germany suggested that “should” be replaced with “may:” however, in all ICAO Annexes, the word “shall” is used in Standards and “should” is used in RPs, so the requested change was not made.

2.13.3 With regard to the second sentence on service animals, Canada proposed that the provision be amended to emphasize that service animals should remain with the PWD. The WG agrees to this amendment. To Germany’s suggestion that the term “service animal” be defined, the Rapporteur is of the view that each Contracting State has different regulations regarding types of animals and levels of certification they accept. By referring broadly to service animals, without defining them, this allows each State to apply the provision to their own definition of “service animal.” Switzerland also requested that the term “service animals” be defined, or changed to “assistance dogs”. Concern was expressed that the lack of a definition could cause conflicts where a person travels from one Contracting State that accepts a

variety of service animals to another that accepts only service dogs. The Rapporteur is of the view that because of the differences in what various Contracting States accept as service animals, it is difficult to create a definition. Additionally, the term “service animals” is language that already exists in the Annex and it does not appear to have been problematic thus far. Furthermore, the concerns raised can be addressed by existing language at the end of RP 8.36 “... *subject to the application of any relevant national or aircraft operator regulations.*” This caveat would appear to allow for Contracting States or air carriers to defer to their own regulations in circumstances where a person is travelling between Contracting States which may have different views on the acceptance of service animals.

2.14 **Proposal to amend RP 8.37**

2.14.1 RP 8.37 reads as follows: “*In principle, persons with disabilities should be permitted to determine whether or not they need an escort and to travel without the requirement for a medical clearance. However, advance notice should be mandatory where assistance or lifting is required. Aircraft operators should only be permitted to require passengers with disabilities to obtain a medical clearance in cases of medical condition where it is clear that their safety or well-being or that of other passengers cannot be guaranteed. Furthermore, aircraft operators should only be permitted to require an escort when it is clear that a person with disabilities is not self-reliant and, as such, the safety or well-being of that person or that of another passenger cannot be guaranteed.*”

2.14.2 Canada recommended that both RP 8.37 and RP 8.38 be re-drafted such that 8.37 addresses the need for a medical certificate and 8.38 addresses the need for assistance and for an assistant. Portions of 8.37 have been moved to 8.38 to group assistant provisions together and the portion of 8.37 which refers to advance notice has been moved to a new RP 8.38.1. This allows each RP to address a different issue instead of having 3 issues mixed in 2 RPs. The existing wording of RP 8.37 is unclear as it asks for a certificate to be provided where it is clear that safety cannot be guaranteed. The intent of this provision is to seek medical confirmation of a person’s fitness to fly where fitness is unclear and may pose a safety risk. The re-drafted text (as in the Appendix) attempts to clarify this intent. The WG agrees to this amendment.

2.15 **Proposal to amend RP 8.38**

2.15.1 RP 8.38 reads as follows: “*If the presence of an escort is required, Contracting States should encourage aircraft operators to offer discounts for the carriage of that accompanying person.*”

2.15.2 As previously set out in 2.14.2, Canada suggested that both RP 8.37 and RP 8.38 be re-drafted such that 8.37 addresses the need for a medical certificate and 8.38 addresses the need for assistance and for an escort. Portions of RP 8.37 have been moved to 8.38 to group escort provisions together. The reference to medical clearance should be deleted from 8.38 as it is covered in RP 8.37, as amended. The Rapporteur suggested that the term “escort” be replaced with “assistant” for consistency of language with the Manual and to avoid confusion with the “escorts” that may be required in relation to inadmissible persons and deportees (Chapter 5 of Annex 9 refers).

2.15.3 The United States suggested that the term “self-reliant” be removed as the only ground to prevent a person with a disability to travel alone is that such person’s (or other passengers’) safety would be jeopardized. The WG agrees with the amended text for RP 8.38 found in the Appendix.

2.16 **Proposal to insert a new RP 8.38.1**

2.16.1 The existing text of RP 8.37 contains a sentence relating to “advance notice” (“However, advance notice should be mandatory where assistance or lifting is required”). As previously set out in 2.14.2, Canada suggested that this sentence be removed from RP 8.37 and be incorporated into a new provision of its own in order that the 3 issues addressed in 8.37 and 8.38 be addressed in their own RP for better clarity. The Rapporteur suggests that such advance notice should not be “mandatory” but “encouraged” in recognition of the fact that Contracting States may have different views on such notice. Advance notice has been elaborated upon in the draft Manual, at Sections 3.11-3.13.

2.17 Germany suggested that the word “strongly” be inserted into the text, before the term “be encouraged”. The WG agrees to the amended text for the new RP 8.38.1 found in the Appendix.

APÉNDICE

Enmiéndese el Capítulo 8 del Anexo 9 como sigue:

H. Facilitación del transporte de los pasajeros que requieren asistencia especial

I. Generalidades

8.22 **Método recomendado.**— En sus viajes, las personas con impedimentos deberían recibir asistencia especial para asegurar que se les proporcionan los servicios de que dispone habitualmente el público en general. La asistencia debería prestarse de tal manera que se respete la dignidad de la persona. ~~Esa asistencia incluye también la información y las instrucciones suministradas por medios comprensibles para los viajeros afectados por impedimentos cognitivos o sensoriales.~~

8.23 **Método recomendado.**— *Los Estados contratantes deberían cooperar a fin de adoptar las medidas necesarias para facilitar el acceso de las personas con impedimentos a todos los servicios en la totalidad de su viaje, desde que empieza hasta que termina.*

8.24 **Método recomendado.**— *Los Estados contratantes deberían tomar las medidas necesarias, en coordinación con los explotadores de aeronaves, de aeropuertos y explotadores de servicios de escala para establecer y publicar normas mínimas uniformes respecto al acceso a los servicios de transporte de las personas con impedimentos, desde el momento de la llegada al aeropuerto de salida hasta que abandonen el aeropuerto de destino.*

8.25 **Método recomendado.**— *Los Estados contratantes deberían tomar las medidas necesarias en coordinación con los explotadores de aeronaves, de aeropuertos, explotadores de servicios de escala y agencias de viaje para asegurar que las personas con impedimentos cuentan con la información necesaria en formatos accesibles a aquellos con impedimentos cognitivos o sensoriales y asegurar asimismo que las líneas aéreas, aeropuertos, y explotadores de servicios de escala y agencias de viaje están en condiciones de proporcionar a tales pasajeros la asistencia que requieren durante los viajes, según sus necesidades.*

8.26 **Método recomendado.**— *Los Estados contratantes deberían tomar todas las medidas necesarias para obtener la cooperación de los explotadores de aeronaves, de aeropuertos y explotadores de servicios de escala, con objeto de establecer y coordinar programas de capacitación para asegurarse de que se dispone de personal entrenado para asistir a las personas con impedimentos.*

II. Acceso a los aeropuertos

8.27 Los Estados contratantes tomarán las medidas necesarias para asegurar que las instalaciones y servicios aeroportuarios se adaptan a las necesidades de las personas con impedimentos.

8.28 **Método recomendado.**— *Los Estados contratantes deberían asegurarse de que se ofrezcan vehículos equipados con elevadores u otros dispositivos apropiados, a fin de facilitar el movimiento de las personas con impedimentos entre la aeronave y el edificio terminal, tanto a la llegada como a la salida, según sea necesario, cuando no se empleen pasarelas telescópicas.*

8.29 **Método recomendado.**— *Deberían adoptarse medidas para asegurar que las personas con deficiencias auditivas o visuales puedan obtener la información ~~de~~ relacionada con los servicios correspondientes al vuelo.*

8.30 **Método recomendado.**— *Deberían situarse lo más cerca posible de las entradas principales en el edificio terminal, puntos ~~reservados~~ designados para recoger o dejar a las personas con impedimentos, ~~a las que se vaya a dejar o recoger.~~ Para facilitar el movimiento en las diversas áreas dentro del aeropuerto, las rutas de acceso deberían estar libres de obstáculos.*

8.31 **Método recomendado.**— *Cuando el acceso a los servicios públicos sea limitado, debería hacerse todo lo posible para proporcionar servicios de transporte terrestre de fácil acceso y a precio razonable, adaptando los sistemas de transporte público actuales y previstos o suministrando servicios especiales de transporte a las personas con necesidades de movilidad.*

8.32 **Método recomendado.**— *Deberían proporcionarse a las personas con necesidades de movilidad, instalaciones de estacionamiento adecuadas y deberían tomarse medidas apropiadas para facilitar su desplazamiento entre las zonas de estacionamiento y los edificios de la terminal.*

8.33 **Método recomendado.**— *~~Debería autorizarse, siempre que sea necesario y posible, el trasbordo directo entre dos aeronaves de los pasajeros, especialmente de las personas de edad avanzada o con impedimentos, cuando el tiempo disponible para alcanzar vuelos de enlace u otras circunstancias así lo justifiquen.~~ Cuando se preste asistencia para el trasbordo de personas con impedimentos de una aeronave a otra, ésta debería proporcionarse de la manera más eficiente posible, teniendo debidamente en cuenta los vuelos de enlace.*

III. Acceso a los servicios aéreos

8.34 Los Estados contratantes tomarán las medidas necesarias para asegurar que las personas con impedimentos dispongan de acceso ~~adecuado~~ equivalente a los servicios aéreos.

8.35 **Método recomendado.**— *Los Estados contratantes deberían establecer disposiciones al efecto de que las aeronaves que entren por primera vez en servicio, o que hayan sido objeto de una remodelación importante, se conformen a las normas mínimas uniformes de acceso en cuanto al equipo a bordo de la aeronave, entre el cual deberían incluirse brazos de asiento abatibles, sillas de ruedas de a bordo, lavabos accesibles e iluminación y letreros adecuados.*

8.36 **Método recomendado.**— *Las sillas de ruedas, los aparatos especiales y el equipo ayudas para personas con impedimentos que necesiten las personas ~~con impedimentos~~ en cuestión deberían transportarse gratuitamente en la cabina si ~~hay espacio suficiente~~ y lo permiten los requisitos de espacio, peso y seguridad ~~a juicio del explotador de aeronaves,~~ o bien deberían transportarse gratuitamente y designarse como equipaje prioritario. ~~Los animales guía que acompañen a los pasajeros deberían transportarse también sin cargo en la cabina, a condición de que se apliquen los reglamentos nacionales o del explotador de aeronaves pertinentes.~~*

8.36bis **Método recomendado.**— *Los animales guía que acompañen a las personas con impedimentos deberían transportarse también sin cargo en la cabina, en el suelo, a los pies del asiento de la persona, a condición de que se apliquen los reglamentos nacionales o del explotador de aeronaves pertinentes.*

8.36.1 **Método recomendado.**— Los Estados contratantes que restrinjan el transporte de dispositivos accionados por batería, incluidas las ayudas para la movilidad que contengan baterías, notificarán prontamente a la OACI tales restricciones para su inclusión en el Doc 9284, *Instrucciones Técnicas para el transporte sin riesgos de mercancías peligrosas por vía aérea* y asegurarán que los explotadores de aeronaves pongan esa información a disposición del público y de conformidad con el Capítulo 2, 2.5 del Anexo 18.

8.37 **Método recomendado.**— *En principio, debería permitirse a las personas con impedimentos que determinen por sí mismas si necesitan o no un acompañante y que viajen sin necesidad de autorización médica. Sin embargo, debería ser obligatorio dar aviso previo cuando sea necesario asistirlos o precisen de equipos elevadores. Sólo debería permitirse a los explotadores de aeronaves que exijan a las personas con impedimentos que obtengan un certificado médico cuando, debido a su estado de salud, no sea evidente que estén en condiciones de viajar y pueda ponerse en peligro no puede garantizarse la seguridad o bienestar de los pasajeros en cuestión o de los demás pasajeros. Además, sólo debería permitirse a los explotadores de aeronaves que exijan un acompañante cuando sea evidente que la persona con impedimentos no es autosuficiente y que por ello no puede garantizarse la seguridad o bienestar de la persona en cuestión o de los demás pasajeros.*

8.38 **Método recomendado.**— *En principio, debería permitirse a las personas con impedimentos que determinen por sí mismas si necesitan o no un asistente. Si es necesaria la presencia de un acompañante asistente, los Estados contratantes deberían instar a los explotadores de aeronaves a que ofrezcan descuentos para el transporte de la persona acompañante del asistente. Además, sólo debería permitirse a los explotadores de aeronaves que exijan un asistente cuando sea evidente que no puede garantizarse la seguridad o bienestar de la persona con impedimentos o de los demás pasajeros.*

8.38.1 **Método recomendado.**— *Debería instarse encarecidamente a dar aviso previo cuando sea necesario prestar asistencia o se precisen equipos elevadores.*

Nota del Relator:

Se han reorganizado los párrafos 8.37 y 8.38 de modo que en el párrafo 8.37 se trate la necesidad de un certificado médico y en el párrafo 8.38 se trate la necesidad de asistencia o de un asistente. La parte del párrafo 8.37 que trata sobre el aviso previo se ha trasladado y tratado en el (nuevo) párrafo 8.38.1.