



## **MAINTENANCE ENGINEER LICENSING (PART 66) ASAP TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG) TASKING INSTRUCTIONS and FOURTH REPORT 27 September 2022**

The Maintenance Engineer Licensing Technical Working Group is established to operate and report to the Aviation Safety Advisory Panel (ASAP) in accordance with the Terms of Reference of the ASAP dated November 2021 (or as amended).

### **PURPOSE**

The role of the TWG will be to provide relevant technical expertise and industry sector insight for the analysis and review of Civil Aviation Safety Regulations (CASR) Part 66 and Manual of Standards (MOS) in accordance with the agreed policy principles.

- Provide industry sector insight and understanding of current needs and challenges
- Provide current, relevant technical expertise for the development, analysis, and review of legislative and non-legislative solutions to the identified issues
- Assist with the development of draft regulation, guidance materials and other supporting materials
- Provide endorsement and or conditional endorsement of draft regulations, guidance materials and other supporting materials for consideration by the ASAP and CASA.
- Consider whether there are any related opportunities for improvement to CASR Part 147 (Maintenance Training Organisations) to ensure Part 147 is entirely compatible with Part 66 and provides complementary set of regulations.

### **POLICY OUTCOMES**

The core policy outcome for the reform of Part 66 is alignment, to the greatest extent possible, with European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) equivalent regulations. EASA regulations are widely recognised globally as a benchmark standard that is both practical and appropriate.

Other key objectives and policy outcomes to guide all activity on the reform of Part 66 regulations are to:

- reduce the complexity and streamline Part 66 regulations and the Manual of Standards (MOS)
- remove ambiguities and fix anomalies presently in the legislation and guidance material
- create a more progressive licensing system that includes a licence outcome appropriate for the general aviation sector of the industry
- improve the way privileges are stated on licence to provide clarity
- reduce the prescriptiveness of the Part 66 MOS and rely on the EASA knowledge modules as the licensing standard, in order to provide more flexibility for future development of training packages
- ensure legislation and training requirements maintain compliance with ICAO standards and recommendations
- work closely with the Aerospace Education and Training Industry Reference Committee (IRC) to establish a more efficient and structured training package for the complete licensing system, comprised of competency units that accurately align to the subjects contained within the EASA knowledge modules.
- seek to achieve recognition of prior learning between EASA and CASA

## SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

1. **Legislation.** Review and recommend changes to the Part 66 regulations and MOS, to achieve the policy outcomes.
2. **Licence privileges.** Review and recommend changes to clarify and improve the understanding of licence privileges to achieve the policy outcomes.
3. **Aeroskills training.** To assist, where necessary, in the development of a revised Aeroskills training package by the Aerospace Education and Training Industry Reference Committee (IRC) of the Department of Education.

## ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The TWG will provide a status report to the regular meetings of the ASAP on progress.

Recommendation and reports of the TWG will be provided to the Chair of the ASAP, through the secretariat.

Timelines for specific outputs will be developed as part of the initial work, with an update included with the first status report.

CASA	TWG Members
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Organise meetings and workshops, and produce agendas, papers and supporting materials</li><li>• Facilitate meetings and workshops</li><li>• Record insights and findings</li><li>• Communicate openly and consistently with TWG members about project status and issues</li><li>• Respect the time of all TWG members by minimising work required to achieve outcomes</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Commit to supporting the project objectives and timeline</li><li>• Engage and collaborate constructively at all times</li><li>• Prepare for working group activities by reviewing agendas, papers and supporting materials</li><li>• Provide timely and considered advice in meetings, and between meetings as required</li><li>• Respond to requests for feedback on draft materials within agreed timeframes</li></ul>

## CONSENSUS

A key aim of the TWG is that a consensus be reached, wherever possible, in the finalisation and preparation of advice for the ASAP.

The TWG will be guided by the ASAP Terms of Reference (Section 6 - attached) with respect to determining and documenting consensus.

## MEMBERSHIP

Members of the TWG have been appointed by the ASAP Chair, following ASAP processes.

The Maintenance Engineer Licensing consists of the following members:

- Mark Thompson
- Keith Blaik
- Stephen Re
- Steven Wright
- Darren Barnfield
- Mary Brown

- Rod Tomlins\*
- Mark Howe
- Aaron Smith
- Ted Goetz \*
- David Moffat \*

The TWG CASA project representative, Benjamin Challender, was supported by Matthew Costello during the meeting. Project leaders Mick McGill and Mick English, and MPL representative Craig Johnson were not present.

The ASAP Secretariat was represented by Kirstie Winter and Mwala Puteho.

\*Denotes members not present at meeting.

## MEETING SUMMARY – 27 September 2022

- The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the proposed discussion paper for Part 66 aircraft type ratings and to hear CASA's response to the TWG short term proposal for LAME licensing.
- The CASA project team outlined the purpose of the discussion paper was to provide a high-level series of suggestions to initiate a discussion with industry broadly. They highlighted that the proposal was not a decision paper and that no legislative drafting has been initiated.
- The TWG raised several issues related to the discussion paper in its current format and that it may be negatively received by industry due to the level of detail and focus. TWG members advised the following areas requiring further consideration:
  - Appendix A (*Summary of proposed changes to helicopter type ratings*) of the discussion paper may create confusion between fixed and rotary. It appeared to be helicopter driven while disregarding the fixed wing aspect. The TWG suggested clearer policy proposals having equal application to fixed wing aircraft
  - Specifics around engines have not been covered and similar policy principles would apply to engines.
  - There was too much granularity provided in some areas for a strategic discussion paper, while not enough detail provided to others.
  - It was perceived that it heavily penalised B2 licence holders. Technical detail needs to be about how a type rating applies to both a B1 and B2 licence holder.
  - Recognition of overseas type ratings as an appropriate NAA type approval, while understanding the balance and impact to Australian industry.
  - Scope to include AMEs who have completed aspects of their training/qualification, to give recognition to under a modular system, that may not be a full licence, to allow these persons to utilise these skills.
- The TWG recognised that the paper was a good starting point.
- CASA project team apologised for the delay in timeframe from the time of discussion on type rating to the production of this paper. CASA acknowledged the feedback provided and stated they were open to any written feedback from the TWG to ensure suitability for consultation. CASA will look to review the paper.
- Discussion on GA/LAME licences proposal was discussed.
  - CASA acknowledge the new TWG proposal to address LAME shortages whereby existing LAMEs would be issued additional privileges was potentially possible under the current regulations. The TWG stated a Maintenance Authority (MA) would allow for this to occur. CASA will review the proposal and advise further.
  - CASA noted that this proposal would only be effective in CAR 30 organisations and would not create any new LAMEs. The TWG identified that data demonstrates 75% of maintenance organisations are CAR 30 and the majority of these service the affected general aviation sector.

- Whilst the MA currently cannot be issued to Part 145 organisations, the TWG members did not feel that this was an impediment to moving forward as majority of these service air transport operations.
- Further licencing requirements and discussions are to be held over to the next meeting due to availability of specific SMEs.
- Other concerns raised by the TWG was the time taken by CASA to progress the GA licencing issues and felt there was a lack of resources or priority allocated to this significant issue.

### Process for achieving consensus

As required by the ASAP (& TWG) Terms of reference, there must be agreement by all participants on the method used for obtaining consensus.

To obtain consensus, the TWG will discuss their views on the provided material during the meeting then address the below Outcomes.

The CASA Lead has also provided commentary of the effectiveness of the TWG and whether it is believed that the recorded outcomes are a fair representation of the TWG from a CASA perspective.

### SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES – Fourth Report 27 September 2022

1. Does the TWG agree that the proposed policy and process for Part 66 aircraft type ratings is suitable for public consultation.

**FULL CONSENSUS / GENERAL CONSENSUS / DISSENT**

Comments:

The TWG does not agree that the Part 66 aircraft type ratings discussion paper is fit for consultation in its current format. The TWG raised concerns that in its current form, the paper would create negativity amongst industry.

The concept of grouping aircraft, both fixed wing and rotary wing for the purposes of type rating, the TWG fundamentally agree with, and this continues to align with the same principles used by EASA.

The TWG believes that if CASA is able to take on board the points raised and the wording/structure of discussion paper is reviewed, it may be fit for consultation. The TWG advise that consideration should be given through the redevelopment of this document, to presenting the information to demonstrate to the aviation community how these proposals and licencing options will benefit industry, 'provide hope' and workable solutions in the short term.

### CASA Lead Summary

**Ben Challenger**

Comment:

CASA thanks the TWG for their input on the type ratings paper. CASA agrees to incorporate the TWG's suggestions to ensure the intent of the paper and the proposals are clear to industry.

CASA will review the new TWG proposals and will continue to work with the TWG and the broader industry to improve licensing pathways for industry.

## **ASAP and Secretariat Comments:**

### **Appendix**

1. Extract from ASAP Terms of Reference

## Appendix 1

### ASAP and TWG Terms of Reference regarding Consensus (Extract)

- 6.1** A key aim of the ASAP is that a consensus be reached, wherever possible, in the finalisation and preparation of advice to the CEO/DAS.
- 6.2** For present purposes, 'consensus' is understood to mean agreement by all parties that a specific course of action is acceptable.
- 6.3** Achieving consensus may require debate and deliberation between divergent segments of the aviation community and individual members of the ASAP or its Technical Working Groups.
- 6.4** Consensus does not mean that the 'majority rules'. Consensus can be unanimous or near unanimous. Consensual outcomes include:
  - 6.4.1 Full consensus**, where all members agree fully in context and principle and fully support the specific course of action.
  - 6.4.2 General consensus**, where there may well be disagreement, but the group has heard, recognised, acknowledged and reconciled the concerns or objections to the general acceptance of the group. Although not every member may fully agree in context and principle, all members support the overall position and agree not to object to the proposed recommendation.
  - 6.4.3 Dissent**, where differing in opinions about the specific course of action are maintained. There may be times when one, some, or all members do not agree with the recommendation or cannot reach agreement on a recommendation.

#### Determining and Documenting Consensus

- 6.5** The ASAP (and Technical Working Groups) should establish a process by which it determines if consensus has been reached. The way in which the level of consensus is to be measured should be determined before substantive matters are considered. This may be by way of voting or by polling members. Consensus is desirable, but where it is not possible, it is important that information and analysis that supports differing perspectives is presented.
- 6.6** Where there is full consensus, the report, recommendation or advice should expressly state that every member of the ASAP (or Technical Working Group) was in full agreement with the advice.
- 6.7** Where there is general consensus, the nature and reasons for any concern by members that do not fully agree with the majority recommendation should be included with the advice.
- 6.8** Where there is dissent, the advice should explain the issues and concerns and why an agreement was not reached. If a member does not concur with one or more of the recommendations, that person's dissenting position should be clearly reflected.
- 6.9** If there is an opportunity to do so, the ASAP (or Technical Working Group) should re-consider the report or advice, along with any dissenting views, to see if there might be scope for further reconciliation, on which basis some, if not all, disagreements may be resolved by compromise.