



## Qualified Industry/Regulator Personnel

Aviation is a global industry covered by the *Convention on International Civil Aviation*, signed by Australia in Chicago on 7 December 1944 and the Chicago Convention came into force on **4 April 1947**. The legal instrument that gives effect to this in Australia is the Air Navigation Act 1920.

The Air Navigation Act requires the government to give effect to the Annexes of the Convention.

It is these Annexes, supported by ICAO's Resolutions, guidance documents, etc. that are easy to follow.

It is where you find the Standards for aircraft certification, continuing airworthiness requirements and personnel skills and qualifications. In maintenance, they provide the recommended minimum AME training syllabi for an avionic and mechanical AME including subject learning levels, time to teach each subject and course duration to be qualified. There is a very clear distinction between AME trade training for avionics, mechanical aeroplane and rotorcraft sectors and additional licensing training to be qualified as a LAME.

Most nations have adopted the ICAO minimum standards including course standards except Australia. EASR Parts 66/147 includes these ICAO minimum Standards.

This raises an issue for the industry, if government is not giving effect to the Convention Annexes Standards, then they are lowering Australia's aviation standing in this global aviation industry.

Within our aviation engineering maintenance system, there is a clear definition between, rotorcraft, piston powered aeroplanes and turbine powered aeroplanes.

To maintain these aircraft, maintenance personnel need to be qualified and licenced. Licencing gives the LAME privileges to certify the aircraft, or part of the aircraft (system) as "airworthy" at completion of maintenance and to sign the maintenance release after all maintenance has been completed. So why are these privileges and not a right?

- A privilege is something that can be given and taken away and is considered to be a special advantage or opportunity that is available only to certain people.
- This enables the regulatory authority to remove your privileges under their enforcement program.

Licences normally start at a "basic licence level" with added ratings like EASR has implemented, not one that has "exclusions" added. This simply means the Basic Licence is set too high a level. EASA's current "basic licence" is very different to what CASA has applied.

On the other hand, when LAMEs are employed by CASA their "qualifications" are very much different than their responsibilities in industry. One of the responsibilities of government is give effect to ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices. ICAO actually provides excellent training programs for regulators such as:

[Managing Compliance with ICAO SARPs.](#)

### ***"Primary Target Population***

*Senior and middle managers of State's CAAs in charge of operations in the main technical divisions/sections/departments related to direct implementation of ICAO SARPs as per ICAO Annexes.*

### ***Entry Requirements***

*Completion of the Introductory Online Module.  
English language proficiency to successfully follow the MCIS Course."*

Based on our meetings with Infrastructure and CASA management over the last 12 months, they definitely need to put all their management through this basic regulator training.

Like AME licencing training required to attain a licence, all CASA employees involved with regulatory development and monitoring, should have to complete this ICAO course before proposing regulatory change. From meetings we have had with Infrastructure, management involved with civil aviation should also do this training.

It should be part of their training before being promoted or being employed to a management position.

A fully compliant system with ICAO SARPs would be cost effective with a lot less red tape.

The FAR/EASR systems are very good examples of implementing and being compliant with SARPs.