Date Published 8/1/2026	AMROBA - NEWSLETTER	Volume 23 – Issue 1 January 2026

2026 – Start of Another Regulatory Reform Quarter?

Table of Content

2026 – Start of Another Regulatory Reform Quarter? 1
More of the Same or Progress? 1
1. Engineering personnel shortage since late 1990s 2
2. Chicago Convention Annex Compliance 2
RMIT Survey 4
3. Simplification – Some Suggestions 4
Summary: 4
Murphy's Law of Aviation 5

More of the Same or Progress?

This Century			
1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter

Safety in aviation is the responsibility of industry participants. Minimum "Standards" are global & the responsibility of the government to adopt and promulgate. Staying compliant with ICAO promulgated safety standards & practices is a government responsibility.

In December 1989, the CAA's "Lawry Report" of the "*Provision of Regulatory Services*" started the regulatory reform process that CAA/CASA embarked on with differing terms of reference created and revised by different governments and Agency management over time and 35 years later it has not been completed.

What can our members expect in the next quarter of this century? More of the same?

1. **Do all regulatory requirements still have a "head of power" in the legislation?**

When government directed the removal of Australia (CASA) certificating foreign aircraft with the introduction of Type Acceptance Certificates, (CASR Parts 21-35 – 1988) the requirement to comply with the foreign certificating Authority's ADs & mandatory requirements was applied & cancelled regulations and orders removed the head of power for many uniquely Australian ADs.

- An industry/CAA-CASA team was created to remove these ADs.
- Never completed their task, disbanded with new regime change in CASA.
- Industry today still must comply with unique requirements that have no head of power.

CASR 1998 unfinished regulatory change. Does anyone understand?

2. **Applied Procedures and Practices**

Under the CASR 1998 changes, many practices and procedures developed under previous regulatory requirements also lost regulatory support but linger on even though practices and procedures in the USA are simpler and safe.

Partial adoption of the FAR procedures and practices has not reduced costs to our employers

Even many European Procedures & Practices are more practical than what is being imposed.

3. **Adoption [partial] of EASR Parts 66/147 regulations**

Still not compatible with Australia's trade/licencing regulatory training system 18 years after CASR Part 66 was made. You cannot put a European system into Australia's education system. You can however put the European course standards into the Australian Qualification Framework end up with trade qualifications that support the licencing system.

The issues facing this industry are not industry created, they are regulatory created.

Whatever happened to governments of the 90s push to have harmonised Australasian regulatory system with NZ. Harmonising with New Zealand by adopting the NZ regulatory system would also harmonise with PNG and other Pacific nations.

Solution

Politians like Bob Collins (ALP) and John Anderson (Liberal) were supportive of Regional Harmonisation with NZ. **Time to resurrect to save Australia's general aviation**.

1. Engineering personnel shortage since late 1990s.

Unlike other Australian engineering trades and licencing agencies, aviation training and qualifications are not regulatory based on holding Australian Education Qualifications or equivalent. In the late 1990s, industry wanted to replace CASA examinations with national Australian Qualifications Framework qualifications to provide career pathways in civil aviation.

This would have provided a more qualified maintenance workforce, more professional sector with defined education pathways to attract and retain qualified personnel.

Civil Aviation engineering training/qualifications regulatory standards should follow similar Australian engineering/maintenance trade/licencing systems that use the Australia's National Vocation Education Training system qualifications.

Design engineers are accepted by CASA if they hold the appropriate University qualification, this approach needs to be applied to maintenance sectors for more than just aircraft maintenance personnel, it should apply to welders, ndt personnel, painters, .

CASA regulatory standards already provide the knowledge only aspects of the European system.

- It is important that the European nominal course hours also be adopted by CASA to enable the regulatory requirements for national competency-based courses to be met under Australia's National Vocation Education Training system.

CASA can fix this problem that has existed since 2007.

- Replace CASA trade-based examinations with acceptance of Australian Qualification Framework qualifications or equivalent (foreign) based on Part 66 trade modules.
  - AQF – AME/AMT Aeroplane – non pressurised tradesperson
  - AQF – AME/AMT Aeroplane – pressurised tradesperson
  - AQF – AME/AMT Helicopters – tradesperson
  - AQF – AME/AMT Avionics – tradesperson

CASA should retain its licencing examination (on-line) based on Part 66 Module 10 only.

This would simplify the system, provide career pathways, address shortage of personnel, improve trade skills and be more cost effective.

2. Chicago Convention Annex Compliance

The results so far of lodging "differences to ICAO Standards" have not seen industry growth or anymore global recognition in the civil aviation design/manufacturing sectors, general aviation, maintenance personnel training or the completion of regulatory reform of these sectors.

The same regulatory responsibilities that the Department was compelled to meet the civil aviation treaty (Chicago Convention) obligations of Member nation's responsibility to remain compliant with the Convention Annexes have never been applied to Agency Reform.

Air Navigation Act – Sec 26 Regulations

(1) The Governor-General may make regulations, not inconsistent with this Act:

(b) for the purpose of carrying out and giving effect to the Chicago Convention, as amended by the Protocols referred to in subsection 3A(2), any Annex to the Convention relating to international standards and recommended practices (being an Annex adopted in accordance with the Convention) and the Air Transit Agreement;

Note, the GG may make regulations to give effect to the Convention, para (b) "may" **was** treated as "**must**". These were presented to industry as an amendment without the need to lodge a difference. Industry accepted the amendments giving effect to remain harmonised globally.

Civil Aviation Act – Sec 98 Regulations ***(selective – relating to safety)***

(1) (c) for the purpose of carrying out giving effect to the *provisions* of the Chicago Convention *relating to safety*. Nothing about giving effect to Protocols or Annexes.

Productivity Improvement – Employers Priority

(*Depart of Finance 2025*) 'Improving Australia's productivity performance is a key priority for the Government. In an increasingly complex and interconnected environment, regulation and regulators play a critical role in supporting Australia's productivity through the effective management of risk, enabling innovation, and ensuring protections for Australians.

On 4 July 2025, six key themes were identified across the regulator response letters.

1. **Regulatory simplification** – making approvals and processes faster and easier to follow and improving rules, guidance and forms.
2. **Enabling digital and data capability** – applying AI and other digital solutions to work more efficiently and support innovation and growth.
3. **Better engagement** – working closely with stakeholders through co-design, better consultation and stronger feedback loops.
4. **Improved transparency and performance** – sharing work plans and using tools to measure and report on performance.
5. **Greater collaboration** – aligning registers and standards and reducing barriers to sharing data between agencies.
6. **Targeted reforms** – making changes in specific sectors that support innovation and efficiency while maintaining public trust.

I suggest you read Pip Spence's CASA submission to the Treasurer's Forum.

- *Harmonising certification standards for Advanced Air Mobility (AAM).*

What about harmonising all Australia's aircraft certification standards. Annex 8/FAR/EASR?

Simplification is not understood by many public servants responsible for regulatory costs.

We are the only country that has two different systems, procedures and practices being applied to maintenance organisations placing pressure on individuals to comply with each system.

This is not an aviation safety system as it puts maintenance staff in a position where they could apply the wrong regulatory system of maintenance certification to release to service when returning an aircraft to service.

Question:

Why is it that most civil aviation nation were able to harmonise with the FAR or EASR system within two (2) or three (3) years back in the 90s and Australia hasn't been able to achieve in 30 years? Most other nations completed their rewrites in the 90s, but not Australia. **Why?**

- CAA started reform post the Lawry Report – 1989
- CASA continued the regulatory reform and still has not completed it. **Why ?**
- During my period in CAA/CASA, it was changing directions by ever changing industry experienced Directors of Safety (CEOs), new Boards and Ministers.

Solution:

Scrap the current regulatory reform program and adopt the NZ civil aviation regulatory system to harmonise with our closest civil aviation engineering and training nation.

- Harmonise with current FAR Part 21 and subsequent regulations.
- Harmonise with current EASR Part 66 and remove the need for CASA to approve base trade training organisations. **Accept AQF qualifications**.
- Utilise and adopt FAR Part airworthiness and maintenance standards.
- Remove uniquely Australian requirements left over from previous regulatory requirements.

Is it Agency, Department or Minister responsibility to make it happen?

Continual reform that has not harmonise in 30 years is nlt acceptable.

RMIT Survey

RMIT University is conducting a study exploring growth and innovation in Australia's GA sector. Craig Dows, a PhD candidate at the School of Aerospace & Engineering at RMIT, has invited AMROBA members to participate in a short, anonymous online survey. Your input will help identify the factors that enable or hinder innovation and growth across the industry.

By taking part, you will:

- contribute to shaping the future of general aviation in Australia;
- support evidence-based research,
- receive a **$20 gift voucher** as a thank-you for your time.

This research has been approved by the RMIT University Human Research Ethics Committee. The survey takes approximately 15 minutes and participants must be over 18 and involved in Australian general aviation.

You can access the survey and Participant Information Sheet via the link below:

☞ **Take the General Aviation Research Survey!**

3. Simplification – Some Suggestions

"Simplification of government regulations

The Australian government is actively working on simplifying government regulations to enhance productivity and reduce compliance burdens. This initiative involves a consultative group that seeks fresh ideas top streamline compliance and reduce burdens on businesses, directors, and consumers. The Australian Securities and Investment Commission (ASIC) has issued a Regulatory Simplification Report, outlining multi-year initiatives to make regulation clearer, more assessable, and easier to navigate while maintaining consumer protections. The government's Economic Reform Roundtable also supports the regulation pendulum swinging back to making regulation more efficient by creating a single, national approach."

Though this report relates to business, simplification should be part of any regulators working principles day by day.

In Australia, registered businesses are required to report to the following government departments and agencies:

Department of Finance: Responsible for collecting and maintaining information about Australian Government entities and bodies.

Australian Business Register (ABR): Verifies business information and maintains the integrity of the Australian Business Number (ABN) system.

ASIC: Maintains registers of Australian companies and several other types of organisations, providing information

WHS Regulators: Work Health and Safety (WHS) laws are designed to ensure a safe working environment for all employees.

Summary:

No other country has been placed into a never-ending regulatory reform program.

No other country's aviation regulator has taken multi years to harmonise with either FAA or EASA.

Australia Department and Regulator agreed to this ***ICAO Harmonisation Resolution A29-3 1992*** and ***Certification Harmonisation Resolution A33 2000***.

When will a government make these a priority so Australian engineering aviation can compete globally?

Return to Index

Murphy's Law of Aviation

Also known as Dumkopf's Law if your name is Murphy

"Ever since the first aviation mechanic crossed a pair of flight controls, the universality of Murphy's Law has been continually demonstrated. It extends to all systems. The logical way of hooking up control or electrical cables, pitot static plumbing, hydraulic lines or fuel or oil lines is often the wrong way. The insidious characteristics of Murphy's Law must be brought into focus when considering the billions of manhours spent each year in the maintenance and repair of aircraft.

Murphy's Law was first cast by Joe Chase, Editor of the Flight Safety Foundation Mechanic's Bulletin, in early 1955. It grew out the percept developed and published by the Foundation in its Design Notes that "Procedures for adequate maintenance and operating practices established by designers should be consistent with average human effort, ability and attitude."

The Law as coined reads: "If an aircraft part can be installed incorrectly, someone will install it that way."

Unfortunately, these clever words lend themselves to many variations and interpretations; consequentially some people use the label Murphy's Law for things far beyond the original intent. The concept behind the Law is directly related to the original design of a piece of hardware. The idea is the drawing board types design a piece of equipment in such a manner that it may be installed in a way other than intended, some dear soul will surely put it on the wrong way.

When we start modifying the Law to include errors not related to the design characteristics, we destroy the effectiveness of the Law. The proper cause of a mistake doesn't get the proper attention, and we tend to say, "*Oh well, you must expect an occasional blunder like that*." After all, there is a Murphy in every crowd.

Once we become conditioned to this outlook, we cease to ask the all-important "why?" and the system for possible correction is bypassed and the pattern for reoccurrence is established. For safety's sake, please keep Murphy in his/her proper place and stick to the original Law.

Corollaries to Murphy's Law from all over the industry. While our aims are to preserve the original meaning of the Law for its intended use, we **present these corollaries to illustrate the views of others**.

- If anything can go wrong, it will.
- It is impossible to make anything foolproof because fools are ingenious.
- Specified environmental conditions will always be exceeded.
- Interchangeable parts won't.
- Any wire or tube cut to length will be too short.
- Identical units tested under identical conditions will not be identical in the field.
- Availability of a part is inversely proportional to the need for the part.
- Tolerances will accumulate undirectionally towards maximum difficulty of assembly.
- Hermetic seals will leak.
- After an instrument has been fully assembled, extra components will be found on the bench.
- A dropped tool will land where it can do the most damage (also known as the law of gravitation).
- Any safety factor set as a result of practical experience will be exceeded.
- Components that must not and cannot be assembled incorrectly will be.
- Any error that can creep in, will. It will be in the direction that will do the most damage.
- All constants are variable.
- In a complex calculation, one factor from the numerator will always move into the denominator.
- The most logical way to assemble a component will be the wrong way.
- In any given miscalculation, the fault will never be placed if more than one person is involved.
- The more innocuous a design change appears, the further its influence will extend.
- Dimensions will always be expressed in the least useable terms.
- After the last 16 screws are removed from an access panel, it will be discovered that the wrong access panel has been removed.

Using the "What if?" strategy helps us anticipate potential risks and prepare contingency plans, ahead of time. For instance, if unexpected technical glitches worry you, you can always have backup materials ready and factor in possible breakdowns when planning tasks.

Return to Index