



## 32 Years Ago – a New CAA – Now Dated

The Parliamentary Inquiry of the late 1980s was the catalyst to dissect the Authority into a number of new department/agencies. So started the decline in General Aviation.

The failure of the legislative carve up in the late 1980s of the previous department is now evident.

What replaced a single department was basically two largely off-budget Commonwealth statutory bodies, the Federal Airports Corporation FAC and the Civil Aviation Authority CAA.

CAA to CASA ***“The new organisation will need to establish its technical and managerial credibility in a field of provision requiring considerable specialised skill and technological sophistication”*** Minister’s speech.

The current Senate Inquiry open hearings demonstrates that the same inputs as have been made to previous aviation Inquiries are being repeated. Something is seriously wrong with the aviation structure in Australia.

The Parliament Inquiry in the late 1980s identified similar problems with the regulatory and approval process of participants in the industry and directed removal of economic regulations.

We expect the current Senate Inquiry will provide similar recommendations as past Inquiries.

Time to rewrite all aviation Acts of Parliament to stop future Inquiries. Government responsibility.

### Contents

**1. Single Aviation Market – Australasia & beyond 2**

*In the mid to late 1990s, Australia was negotiating a broader Open Skies agreement with New Zealand than what eventuated. The aim was to harmonise maintenance requirements as uniform as possible so Australian and New Zealand aircraft could be maintained in either country by each other’s LAMEs and AMOs. Today, there is little recognition of our government aviation documentation industry uses to release components to service. 2*

*To achieve a Single Aviation Market, we need the government to re-write aviation associated Acts of Federal Parliament to recognise the need for the government and CASA to enter into free trade (safety) aviation agreements with other trading nations including the USA, EU and Canada. 2*

*Benefits 2*

*Global Uniformity 2*

**2. Skills and Youth – Where Are They 3**

*Many managers of aviation businesses are not young and they do not see the young managers entering the industry. Where is the next generation of small operators and maintenance organisations. Look at the submissions to the Senate Inquiry, they clearly identify a breakdown between government and industry participants. Why would the young be interested? 3*

*Ever since CASA abandoned their own regulatory system developed over many decades and blindly adopting parts of foreign aviation system without sticking to the principles of ICAO, we have seen a decline in skills provided by a past generation. The previous system was written to integrate with the educational trade training system and added knowledge requirements were examine by the authority’s licencing section. It worked. 3*

*Ken. R. Cannane*  
Executive Director  
[amroba@amroba.org.au](mailto:amroba@amroba.org.au)

## 1. Single Aviation Market – Australasia & beyond

*In the mid to late 1990s, Australia was negotiating a broader Open Skies agreement with New Zealand than what eventuated. The aim was to harmonise maintenance requirements as uniform as possible so Australian and New Zealand aircraft could be maintained in either country by each other's LAMEs and AMOs. Today, there is little recognition in our government aviation documentation that industry uses to release components to service.*

*To achieve a Single Aviation Market, we need the government to re-write aviation associated Acts of Federal Parliament to recognise the need for the government and CASA to enter into free trade (safety) aviation agreements with other trading nations including the USA, EU and Canada.*

Government/CASA documents are not recognised by EASA, Canada and many other nations. The FAA has a process to recognise or issue a FAA document based on a CASA issued document. It is restrictive and costly. The USA is one market.

The Australian government has not achieved what they thought by splitting up the Authority in 1988. Only the government can change the Acts so this industry can create the jobs

Maybe they could start by introducing a project to achieve uniformity with the Australasian countries by adopting the the NZ regulatory system like PNG and other Pacific nations.

This proposal would enable VH registered; P2 registered and ZK, ZL, ZM registered aircraft to operate freely across each other's country.

### ***Benefits***

- Uniformity within the Australasia airspace would be beneficial to the economies of all countries within the Australasian airspace.

**Note:** "Australasia" is considered to be Australia, New Zealand, New Guinea, and the neighbouring islands of the Pacific.

- Encourages private and business aviation operators to confidently operate within each country knowing that if their aircraft needs maintenance, the AMO/LAME in that country could perform and certify completion of the maintenance and then return the aircraft to service.
- Uniformity of regulations should be an aim of the Pacific area of Australasia so interchange of technical staff is simpler and harmonised. Uniformity of qualifications is an underpinning aim of the Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition Agreements.

### ***Global Uniformity***

Uniformity globally of Australia's aviation design, manufacturing, maintenance and technical training capabilities must be achieved so government can obtain (free trade) aviation agreements with foreign aviation trading countries so our products and services are recognised by these countries.

We were once accepted by many countries but international standards changed in the late 1990s to introduce individual agreements with other national regulatory systems.

[Back to the Top](#)

## **2. Skills and Youth – Where Are They**

*Many managers of aviation businesses are not young and they do not see the young managers entering the industry. Where is the next generation of small operators and maintenance organisations. Look at the submissions to the Senate Inquiry, they clearly identify a breakdown between government and industry participants. Why would the young be interested?*

*Ever since CASA abandoned their own regulatory system developed over many decades and blindly adopting parts of foreign aviation systems without sticking to the principles of ICAO, we have seen a decline in skills provided by a past generation. The previous system was written to integrate with the educational trade training system and added knowledge requirements were examined by the authority's licencing section. It worked.*

When will CASA make reference to the Convention's Annex 1 referred trade training standards as was done in the past?

The Authority Basic examinations verified the trade skills training provided by each State also met the knowledge requirements of the ICAO standards.

The Authority promulgated the ICAO trade and licencing knowledge and trade skills in a publication as guidance for State trade training.

The system provided a steady stream of skilled, employable tradespersons.

All of this has been damaged by the move to adopt the EASA system that is not applicable to GA in Australia

The EASA system has been drastically changed to support GA but the slow machinery of CASA will mean they will waste years before the adopt.

How can the government, the Department and Agencies not realise that Australian jobs are being lost mainly because we are no longer uniform as close as practical to these Standards?

There is no system to promote aviation safety by prescribing "minimum" regulations (standards) in the interest of safety for design, manufacture, operations, maintenance... etc.

Unless this approach is taken within Australia, over prescriptive regulations and red tape will continue to have a major negative effect on creating jobs.

The government department and agencies are narrow focused and have not been supported to maintain and enhance their staff in the global trends of civil aviation, design, manufacture, maintenance, operations, airspace, aerodromes and training.

Unless those in government departments and agencies have a pioneering policy to keep Australia at least uniform with leading aviation markets like North America and Europe, we will not be able to compete in the world aviation market.

**2020 has been a year to forget – 2021 must be a year government becomes progressive and harmonises with at least the USA.**

[Back to the Top](#)