

2022 – YEAR OF EXPECTATIONS - # 2

By now, everyone has seen the Senate’s RRAT’s video meeting where CASA management virtually destroyed themselves & CASA’s creditability. The Senate Committee is right, CASA in its current organisational structure and management must change. It has failed as an independent government agency with a Board.

In the 1980s Australia had **4200 approved Operators** using **nearly 6000 aircraft** commercially = a **lot of direct and indirect jobs**. Why wasn’t this industry been sustained and continued to grow and create jobs? Regulatory change is the main reason why.

The structure and focus of pre-CAA/CASA were on guiding industry for being responsible for safety and helping current and new participants to be commercially safe and viable with the least amount of red tape as possible.

The lack of expertise in civil aviation administration demonstrated by current CASA executive management in the Senate public hearings simply identifies why Australia’s civil aviation has been in decline in the last twenty to thirty years.

This is not the team to bring Australian civil aviation back to viability, or to obtain global harmonisation for engineering fields of design, manufacture or maintenance.

CASA CEO, Pip Spence, obviously has no regulatory/industry technocrats to provide the wisdom to lead civil aviation back to growth by being harmonised globally. It must be restructured and refocused by Government.

Past and present governments must take responsibility. Past CASA CEOs are also responsible.

The video of CASA being belittled by these Senators was embarrassing to all CASA staff, ex CASA employees and, sadly, what the Senators said about CASA was supported by just about all in industry, especially in the non-airline sectors.

[Continued.](#)

- **Comparisons – Items 2 & 3**

AMROBA has had a look at the relieving provisions in America, Canada and European aviation legislation that are never considered by CASA project managers developing regulations.

When developing regulations, you must consider the effect on employment in the industry and if it restricts an individual or a small business, then relieving regulations are needed.

For instance, the American aviation legislation has the least number of economic regulations. The Canadians regulatory structure is what Australia is aspiring to introduce and the European regulations have way more flexibility than Australian regulations that partially copied the EU regulations. The government/CAA review carried out in the mid-1990s determined that the USA FAR structure, refer the [SHELL model](#), would be adopted in Australia.

Content

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | Year of Expectations – Part 2 | 2 |
| • | Reduction of Red Tape | 2 |
| • | Canada’s Approach..... | 2 |
| 2. | CASR Part 66 – EASA Part 66 Revisited | 3 |
| • | CASR Part 66 & EASR Part 66. | 3 |
| • | EASA Regulatory Structure is Quite Different. | 3 |
| • | GM 66.A.45 Endorsement with aircraft ratings. | 4 |
| • | GM 66.A.45(b) Endorsement with aircraft ratings..... | 4 |
| | Summary: | 4 |
| 3. | FAR – EASR Engineering Parts flexibility..... | 5 |
| 4. | Appendix 1 - Canadian AME Licencing | 6 |

1. Year of Expectations – Part 2

Cont. from front page. Pre-CASA, regulations had to “carry out and give effect” to the Convention Annexes. The civil aviation general aviation survived very well under the ICAO based system.

Why was this treaty obligation abandoned when the Civil Aviation Act & Regulations were made? Was/is there a public service hidden policy to close down small aviation businesses?

It is obvious to many experienced people in industry what has to be done to return to the days of DCA/DOA/DOT, when the regulatory system was growing a safe and viable industry that created thousands of direct and indirect jobs. Industry knows It can be resurrected so non-airline aviation is seen as a viable means of transport within Australia. It is a pity the regulators and politicians don’t.

We know there are many good inspectors in CASA being let down by their managers and the internal management structure that has been implemented within CASA. We know that the system is not working and is adding red tape. Many of these inspectors are very frustrated at the ineffective, inefficient and red tape added-cost systems that were brought in by previous CEOs. Many feel like these executives have set the CEO up to fail. Maybe this is the ‘iron-ring’ that all refer to when discussing the problems within CASA preventing them from operating efficiently and effectively. Civil aviators can and they do operate safely.

Maybe the CASA Board and CEO need to study the ICAO *Airworthiness Manual (Doc 9760)* and *Manual of Procedures for Operations Inspection, Certification and Continued Surveillance (Doc 8335)* to understand what the CASA organisational structure should look like and the qualifications of the Certification, Maintenance and Flying Operations Inspectors.

Senate Recommendation to re-constitute CASA.

AMROBA totally agrees and fully supports this statement by the Senate Chair.

Why don’t we have an industry aligned regulator as recommended in the ASSR?



- **Reduction of Red Tape**

Performance based/outcome-based regulations supported by standards is not understood by CASA. CASA is an independent government agency that creates red tape with whatever they address. Unlike past DCA/DOA/DOT and Canada (similar legislative system), the Minister is far removed from CASA.

The Board was supposed to take the place of the Minister but the Board does not have full governance over CASA. ASSR Recommendation. The Statement of Expectations by DPM to the Board requires the Board to publish minutes of its future meetings. That will be interesting. What do they direct?

- **Canada’s Approach.**

The [Canadian Aviation Regulations](#), are based on performance-based regulations and referenced standards. e.g., *CAR403.01 Subpart 3 Aircraft Maintenance* makes interesting reading. Appendix 1 includes the equivalent regulation to CASR Part 66. They didn’t change their licence system but since **July 26, 2011**, a [Canada-European Union Bilateral Aviation Safety Agreement \(BASA\)](#) has been in force.

“The recognition by one Party of a maintenance organisation under the jurisdiction of the other Party pursuant to section 5 of this Procedure shall be based upon the

maintenance organisation adopting a supplement to its maintenance manual which shall, at a minimum, provide the following:"

How far away are we from getting such an agreement with the USA, Canada & EASA? AMROBA has witnessed 20 costly years to achieve nothing but increased costs.

[Back to the Top](#)

2. CASR Part 66 – EASA Part 66 Revisited

Nearly twenty years since CASA introduced Part 66, there is still no CASA acceptance of NVET qualification simply because CASA has not worked with the Education Department to attain NVET qualifications for each of the Part 66 modules they introduced into Australia. NVET does not have "AME" qualifications, it has uniquely Australian "Aeroskills" qualifications.

This is a failure of government/public service to provide appropriate qualifications because of the silo approach by government and aviation public servants.

Every other trade-based system can achieve this coordination but not aviation maintenance training, why? Even CASA Pilot training is achieving it.

There has never been a correctly titled "Aircraft Maintenance Engineer" NVET course. It is included in the "Metal Engineering Apprenticeship" (MEA) and is titled "Aeroskills". The Australian and New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations (ANZSCO) describes the job as **Aircraft Maintenance Engineer** (avionics, mechanical and structures) but our NVET system does not use these titles. Bureaucrats!!!

- **CASR Part 66 & EASR Part 66.**

The other question is, why is CASR Part 66 so different and deficient when compared to the EASR Part 66 system that CASA adopted, sorry, partially adopted.

This AME licence system was never right for Australia and is a major roadblock to getting aviation back on its feet. EASA is continually amending to relieve industry costs – Australia has not been keeping harmonised with their changes.

If properly adopted, Australian LAMEs could do an EASA approved aircraft type training course to add ratings to their licence. Why does CASA have to approve EASA approved manufacturer's training courses? It all adds to unnecessary costs.

- **EASA Regulatory Structure is Quite Different.**

The have Regulations supported by Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC) and Guidance Material (GM).

One would think the **regulations** would be the same, the AMCs would be MoS and GMs would be ACs or other form of advisory material.

No, GM text is found in the CASR Part 66 MoS – why? Because it adds "red tape".

Sample of CASA Red Tape.

EASA provides a Q&A system on their webpage. Part 66 Q&As identify why our Part 66 training costs are so high and is making it extremely hard to upskill our LAMEs. We looked at the need for practical training associated with additional aircraft type ratings. Very interesting result.

EASA Ans: *Yes, if the following conditions are met for the theoretical + practical parts of type training:*

1. *the course has been attended and the exams passed in a Part-147 approved training organisation,*
2. *or in another organisation, provided the course has been directly approved by the authority who issued the licence as per 66.B.130,*

But the need for practical training is in paragraph (3) on next page.

3. and for B1, B2 and L5 licences, **in case where the aircraft type is the first in a licence category or subcategory**, an OJT training has been performed (derogation for Group 2 and 3 aircraft see 66.A.45(d))

This interested us to find out more. So, what if it isn't the first aircraft type in a category or sub-category?

- **GM 66.A.45 Endorsement with aircraft ratings.**

At the end of this GM is an important Note.

Note: OJT means 'On-the-Job Training' ([Appendix III to Part-66, Section 6](#)) and is only required for the first aircraft rating in the licence (sub)category.

Only required for the first aircraft rating in the licence subcategory.

EASA further explains this in the following:

- **GM 66.A.45(b) Endorsement with aircraft ratings**

1. An aircraft type rating includes all the aircraft models/variants listed in column 2 of [Appendix I to AMC to Part-66](#).
2. When a person already holds a type rating on the licence and such type rating is amended in the [Appendix I to AMC to Part-66](#) in order to include additional models/variants, **there is no need for additional type training for the purpose of amending the type rating in the licence.** The rating should be amended to include the new variants, upon request by the applicant, without additional requirements. However, it is the responsibility of the licence holder and, if applicable, the maintenance organisation where he/she is employed to comply with [66.A.20\(b\)3](#), [145.A.35\(a\)](#), [M.A.607\(a\)](#), and [CAO.A.040](#) as applicable, before he/she exercises certification privileges.
3. Similarly, type training courses covering certain, but not all the models/variants included in a type rating, are valid for the purpose of endorsing the full type rating.

Note: "CAO" reference is a Part CAO/AMO of aircraft that are not classified as complex motor-powered aircraft and are not listed in an air operator certificate of an air carrier.

M.A.607 also refers to EASA's Subpart F – Maintenance Organisation

(EU 3 classes of maintenance organisations – not one)

66.A.20(b)3: The wording 'has the adequate competence to certify maintenance on the corresponding aircraft' means that **the licence holder and, if applicable, the organisation where he/she is contracted/employed, should ensure that he/she has acquired the appropriate knowledge, skills, attitude and experience to release the aircraft being maintained.**

Note: This is a responsibility of the LAME and employer, if employed by an AMO.

AMC 145.A.35(a): "The sentence the organisation shall ensure that certifying staff and support staff have an adequate understanding of the relevant aircraft and/or components to be maintained together with the associated organisation procedures' **means that the person has received training and has been successfully assessed on:**

- the type of aircraft or component;
- the differences on:
- the particular model/variant;
- the particular configuration."

Summary:

It highlights that CASA's executive managers and CASA policy must direct that the flexibility clauses, the real cost reduction clauses, must be left out of the Australian version of EASA regulations. After 20 years of failure, maybe the EASA system should be retained for the airlines only and adopt the intent of FARs for the rest of aviation.

[Back to the Top](#)

4. Appendix 1 - Canadian AME Licencing

Division I – General

Application

403.01 This Subpart applies to

- **(a)** holders of an aircraft maintenance engineer (AME) licence and applicants for the issuance or renewal of such a licence; and
- **(b)** approved training organizations that provide aircraft maintenance training courses, and persons applying to become approved training organizations.

Requirement to Hold AME Licence

- **403.02 (1)** Subject to subsection (2), no person shall exercise the privileges of an aircraft maintenance engineer (AME) licence unless the person:
 - **(a)** holds an AME licence issued pursuant to this Subpart;
 - **(b)** exercises the privileges in accordance with the ratings and any limitations endorsed on the licence; and
 - **(c)** exercises the privileges in accordance with Part V.
- **(2)** A person who does not meet the conditions specified in subsection (1) may sign a maintenance release if the person holds a restricted certification authority issued pursuant to Part V.

Issuance and Endorsement of AME Licence

403.03 Subject to section 6.71 of the Act, the Minister shall, on receipt of an application submitted in the form and manner specified in Chapter 566 of the Airworthiness Manual, issue an aircraft maintenance engineer (AME) licence to the applicant or endorse the applicant's AME licence with a rating, where the applicant provides documentation to the Minister that establishes

- **(a)** the applicant's citizenship; and
 - **(b)** that the applicant meets the requirements set out in Chapter 566 of the Airworthiness Manual in respect of:
 - **(i)** minimum age,
 - **(ii)** training,
 - **(iii)** knowledge,
 - **(iv)** experience, and
 - **(v)** skill.

Validity Period of AME Licence

403.04 Subject to section 403.05, an aircraft maintenance engineer (AME) licence is valid for the period specified in the licence.

Recency Requirements

- **403.05 (1)** No holder of an aircraft maintenance engineer (AME) licence shall exercise the privileges of the licence unless
 - (a) the licence was issued within the preceding 24 months; or
 - (b) the holder of the licence has, for at least six months within the preceding 24 months,
 - (i) performed aircraft maintenance,
 - (ii) supervised the performance of aircraft maintenance,
 - (iii) supervised in an executive capacity the performance of aircraft maintenance, or
 - (iv) served as an aviation maintenance instructor or supervised another aviation maintenance instructor in an aircraft maintenance training course provided by an approved training organization.
- **(2)** The holder of an AME licence who is not in compliance with subsection (1) shall regain currency in accordance with the standards set out in **Chapter 566 of the *Airworthiness Manual*** prior to exercising the privileges of the licence.

What more do you need?

Everything is in the referred *Airworthiness Manual*; Division 1 describes the AME standards and Division II prescribes the Training Organisations. Many information notes are included.

[Back to the Top](#)

LAME eBook Support

AMROBA has obtained a special rate for the Emperious eBook.

Members using it have given it a tick in assisting getting a licence.

"I used the eBook and it provided excellent visual and knowledge that enabled me to pass the first 3 CASA examinations that I have sat."

The 'Emperious' eBook matches the system of learning that young employees have grown up with within schools.

<https://youtu.be/03t18Bq3Ibo>

<https://youtu.be/q9PDCV2bsY0>

[Back to the Top](#)
