



AMROBA Members Committed to Safety CASA Part 43 Proposal Not Committed to Safety

In AMROBA’s opinion, CASA **has not proposed** a safety-based change with its blinkered adoption of FAR Parts 43 & Part 91 aircraft minimum standards. There were no options proposed in the presentations by their road show. It is a *fait accompli* irrespective of the damage it will do to CASA approved AMOs. Neither were the ramification of adopting such an approach explained.

Obviously, CASA staff do not remember when Australia had a full independent LAME, same as the proposed IA, and the safety provisions past governments/Authority implemented to restrict their capability to reduce the number of incidents and accidents, some fatal.

Who can have faith in CASA’s consultation process if this is the outcome of the ASAP/TWG.

We know how to adopt the FARs, with sensible changes, to safely integrate with Australia’s societal and rural aviation needs. This proposal is no longer supported by AMROBA as it has been presented to industry during the roadshow. In fact, we are disappointed with the road show presentations.

The Road Show Stated:

“Under a new CASR part based on the US-FARs:

- **no maintenance organisation approval would be required** for carrying out maintenance of aircraft, engines or components other than propellers and instruments.
- a new individual authorisation—**Inspection Authorisation (IA)**—would be introduced
- CAR 30 approvals would be phased out
- CAR 30 organisations would have the option of **continuing to do business under the licence privileges of licensed aircraft maintenance engineers** or transitioning to a Part 145 Approved Maintenance Organisation (AMO) approval.”

What an insult to all those dedicated CAR 30 organisations around Australia that have contributed to a safe private and commercial aviation industry. **What a massive shift in liability.**

This is also a blatant proposal to remove CASA’s capability to perform Safety Oversight of this sector of aviation. This raises the question whether CASA is an aviation safety regulator of all sectors or only of selective sectors of aviation.

This proposal was presented as a *‘fait accompli’* to many of our members, and, many CASA field AWIs have stated it was also their understanding of the proposal.

NB: The **current Part 66** privilege of a LAME **does not permit** the LAME to determine an aircraft, or part of an aircraft, **as airworthy**. This FAA/IA privilege is based on the ICAO provision that will simply be provided by a CASA issued “authorisation” without proper training that the basic A&P mechanic and IA must have.

Unless those that are involved in aviation maintenance are appropriately knowledgeable, skilled and qualified, **safety is compromised**. The FAA ‘IA’ training is way beyond our VET training.

| ICAO AME Privileges Annex 1, 4.2.2.1 | Australia | US | EU |
|--|--|------------------------------------|---|
| “.... shall be to certify the aircraft or parts of the aircraft as airworthy after an authorized repair, modification or installation of an engine, accessory, instrument, and/or item of equipment, and” | This LAME responsibility was repealed in 1990 when CAA was ‘captured’. Also removed from VET training packages. Note: This is also an Annex 8 requirement | Exercised by the A&P holding an IA | Not included in EASA rules when JAA/EASA were also ‘captured’. Was available under CAA (UK) & others regulations pre JAA ‘consultation’. |
| “...to sign a maintenance release following inspection, maintenance operations and/or routine servicing”. | LAME responsibility though we have a unique MR interpretation | AMO, A&P mechanic & A&P+IA | Part 66 LAME |

Background

Since 1990, VET training has not provided the knowledge to determine airworthiness.

CASA Action Required Now.

CASA Action: Immediately amend CASR Part 66 to include the ICAO AME privilege to certify as “airworthy”. **This would obliterate the need for the FAA IA.**

Threat: Most LAME’s think they know, but it is what you don’t know that is dangerous.

Fact: AMROBA accepts there is a need for a properly qualified independent Part 66 LAME in some circumstances. **See Annex at end of this document.**

Note: We have been asking for this ICAO LAME privilege to be added to Part 66 for over a decade.

This is the most cost-effective method to regulatory recognise an independent LAME in Australia that meets the intent of the CASA proposal without creating a completely disparate system. Regulatory reform was meant to blend all the regulations.

History

Australia had an independent LAME, based on the IA, years ago with a much higher skilled LAME than what is being VET produced today. The recent CASA proposal does not require the proposed IA to be formally trained to hold equivalent qualifications to the A&P/IA knowledge, skills, qualifications and/or experience. It is actually proposing further deskilling.

The NZ system modified the FARs but they did not understand the US FBO (AMO) system where the FAA does not approve the AMO. It was never considered, the CAA(NZ) Part 43 “*Implementation Manager*” worked for CASA when it was adopting a modified FAR system back in 2002. That adoption included both ICAO LAME privileges.

Past Government/Authority Corrective Safety Actions.

To overcome deficiencies in the previous independent LAME system, past Governments/Authorities imposed regulatory restrictions to reduce many incidents and accidents, some fatal:

1. Independent flight control inspections were introduced to overcome flight control errors – some fatal.
 - a. **CAR 42 G needs to be added to Part 43.**
 - b. US does not have such a requirement and a simple search of the NTSB database shows they still have many flight controls rigging issues under Part 91.
2. FAR Part 145 includes “*Required Inspections*” performed by an “Inspector”, (not an A&P) who is normally IA qualified. Their system has specified checks identified in the worksheets, not just duplicate inspections like we have.
3. CASA AWIs still find flight control documentation errors.
 - i. However, no CASA auditing proposed under the proposed IA system – error rate will rise; guaranteed.
 1. IA only needs a fixed address, office or home, not a hangar.
 2. Not normally the hangar where they actually do Inspections.
 - IA only needs a fixed address, office or home, not a hangar
 - Not normally the hangar where they actually do Inspections
 - ii. CASA does not seem to do ramp checks of GA aircraft anymore.
 1. GA ramp checks found a lot of deficiencies in the past.
4. To reduce the number of engine (mainly piston) incidents and failures where the independent LAME had done the engine overhaul, this maintenance was added to Schedule 7 so that only CASA approved AMOs could perform engine case splitting that is required for overhauls.
 - a. **Amend CASR adoption of FAR Part 91.409 to include above requirements.**
 - b. The special equipment and manufacturer’s vendor data is not always available to individuals.
 - c. OEMs worldwide are even restricting the provision of data, etc. to NAA approved AMOs unless they become OEM Service Centres. This is a serious trend that is increasing and starting to restrict Australia approved AMOs capabilities.

- d. Unless you have access to all the vendors and all the modification data, replacing parts with those listed in the manufacturer's parts manual only can actually de-modify the engine.
- e. With many other components found to have sub-standard maintenance, components maintenance was inserted into CAR 30 to improve safety.

3. After incidents and accidents, some fatal, attributed to the independent LAME, and under government pressure, the annual and 100-hourly inspections (i.e. *maintenance release inspection*) and major modifications and repairs were added to Schedule 7 to reduce the level of incidents/accidents.

a. **Amend CASR adoption of FAR Part 91.409 to include above requirements**

b. To provide flexibility, the requirement to have a mobile AMO was added to CAR 30 to enable individual LAMEs to hold a mobile AMO facility approval.

c. The number of incidents and accidents markedly reduced with these changes.

d. AMROBA agrees that under certain circumstances, an independent LAME should be exempted from this standard. Refer to Annex at end of this document.

FAR Part 43 is not a stand-alone regulation. The requirements of the USA Aviation Criminal Code and other FAR standards, including airport regulations, enables FAA regulatory oversight provided by the FAA's Airport Division.

Cost Effective Compatible Alternative Proposal

It is simpler and more cost-effective to insert the IA, top of knowledge/skill levels of the A&P mechanic, into an EASA based AME/LAME system by adding the ICAO privilege to certify as airworthy to the privileges of LAMEs.

Current Negatives

Be aware, our current VET training system still does not provide the basic knowledge, practical skills or experience to support CASR Part 66 modular training packages.

Our training system is not EASA 2400/2000 classroom hours, it is 1250 to 1500 hours, depending on State funding, minus approximately 300 competency assessment hours used by the training facilities. (1000 hours of training)

- Piston engines have yet to be added to the VET training.
- VET is basically B1.1 & B2 focused.

Summary:

The most cost-effective system to enable an independent LAMEs to provide the capability of an FAA IA, is to amend the privileges of the current CASR Part 66 LAME. The following points need to be adopted ASAP to alleviate costs in non-airline maintenance.

- CASA has been preventing the adoption of the EASA LAME training since they introduced CASR Part 66/147 because would not promulgate the EASR specified classroom hours training standards.
 - o CASA has continually refused to promulgate these training standards over the last decade.
 - o Current Part 66 project manager agrees these EASA standards need promulgating.
- EASR Part 66 Module 10 will need additional classroom training hours added to include the ICAO Annex 1 LAME privilege to certify the aircraft, or part of an aircraft, as airworthy.
 - o Pre 1990, every LAME included this ICAO privilege in the training package.
 - o Training based on Chapter 3 of the ICAO AME Training Manual.

Important

CASA must state that they will adopt EASR Part 66 **B3** (mechanical aircraft <2000Kg) and **B2L** (avionics light) to help lower costs within GA.

- o Both these AME licences would make it easier for LAMEs to enter GA maintenance.
- o Basic career path entry level.
- State that CASR Part 66 will remain harmonised with EASR Part 66 in the future.

Circumstances Where an Independent LAME Could be Used.

AMROBA supports and proposes that the independent LAME, holding both ICAO privileges, can provide a useful role in certain circumstances under “operational/manufacturing” rules exempting them from complying with proposed safer Parts 91/43/CAR 30/**146**?

As long as the Registered Operator, under Part 91 only, provides all the necessary tooling, equipment, technical data revision service and facility to perform the maintenance equivalent to a CASA approved AMO, the following are examples where regulatory exemption from complying with proposed Part 91 aircraft inspection/maintenance requirements can be given:

1. Private Owner (Registered Operator) may employ a LAME to maintain their aircraft. a. Example: Packer’s facility (Australia), same as John Travolta’s facility (USA).
2. Aero Clubs
 - a. Would reinvigorate the Aero Club sector.
 - b. If Aero Club provides flight training, regulatory oversight through the training approval.
3. Aerialwork Operators
 - a. CASA regulatory oversight through the operator approval.
4. Part 149 Organisations
 - a. CASA regulatory oversight through the 149 approval

Organisational Approvals

- CASR Part 141: Recreational, private and commercial pilot flight training, other than certain integrated training courses
- CASR Part 142: Integrated and multi-crew pilot flight training, contracted recurrent training and contracted checking
- CASR Part 143: Air Traffic Services Training Providers
- CASR Part 144: Distribution organisations (Reserved)
- CASR Part 145: Continuing airworthiness—Part 145 approved maintenance organisations
- CASR Part 146:** *“Continuing airworthiness—Part 146 approved domestic maintenance organisations”*
- CASR Part 147: Continuing airworthiness—maintenance training organisations
- CASR Part 148: Unused
- CASR Part 149: Approved self-administering aviation organisations

CASA Own Risk Assessment

The CASA Risk Assessment Meeting in Brisbane recommended the transition of CAR30, without change, into the CASRs using an unused Part 140-149. Part 146/148 are unused.

AMROBA recommends the only addition requirement to CAR 30 is to legalise the “standard practice” that CAR 30 AMOs have been providing to registered operators:

- **Provision of airworthiness and maintenance control service for registered operators unless covered by Part 42/145.**

The above recommendations would enable a more cost effective, but extremely safer, system to be implemented in Australia.