



**Australian Government**  
**Civil Aviation Safety Authority**

## **Aviation Ruling**

### **Compliance with Supplemental Inspection Documents**

**Effective Date:** This ruling is effective from 31 December 2015.

**Catchwords:** CARs 42, 42A, 42B, 42C, 42L, 42M, 42V, Schedule 5  
SIDS  
Maintenance schedules

#### **Issue**

- 1 The purpose of this ruling is to state when manufacturer's supplemental or structural inspection documents however described, including the Cessna Supplemental Inspection Documents (SIDs), issued as Instructions for Continued Airworthiness for an aircraft or the aircraft's aeronautical products, are required to be complied with.

#### **Background**

- 2 The *Civil Aviation Regulations 1988* (CAR) provides Registered Operators with three maintenance schedule options for Australian aircraft:
  - 2.1 CAR 42A – Manufacturer's Maintenance Schedule,
  - 2.2 CAR 42B – CASA Maintenance Schedule (Schedule 5 of CAR), and
  - 2.3 CAR 42C – Approved System of Maintenance.
- 3 If the Registered Operator has elected to use the CAR 42A Manufacturer's Maintenance Schedule, the requirement on the Registered Operator to comply with instructions for continued airworthiness; such as SIDs programmes and other manufacturer's supplemental or structural inspection programmes, will be identified by the manufacturer and will form part of the manufacturer's maintenance program for that aircraft, which must be complied with when maintaining the aircraft.
- 4 If the Registered Operator has elected to use the CAR 42B CASA Maintenance Schedule - actions such as inspection, checking, cleaning and lubrication must be undertaken at specified intervals typically every 100 hours or 12 months. Part 2 of the CASA Maintenance Schedule does not specifically reference special

inspections such as SIDs programmes and other manufacturer's supplemental or structural inspection documents, overhaul or replacement of any aircraft component installed in or fitted to the aircraft. However, maintenance actions must always be carried out in accordance with approved maintenance data in accordance with CAR 42V, and therefore compliance with SIDs and other manufacturer's supplemental or structural inspection documents is mandatory.

- 5 If the Registered Operator has elected to use a CAR 42C Approved System of Maintenance to maintain their aircraft, having regard to the requirements of CARs 42L and 42M, a System of Maintenance for an aircraft, for which a SIDs programme and other manufacturer's supplemental or structural inspection documents exist, should not be approved if a SIDs programme or similar inspection requirements are not incorporated in the System of Maintenance for the aircraft. The System of Maintenance will be defective and the Registered Operator must request CASA to approve a change to the system in accordance with CAR 42(c)(i). Further, if the System has any airframe inspection requirements, as noted above, maintenance actions must always be carried out in accordance with approved maintenance data in accordance with CAR 42V, and therefore compliance with SIDs and other manufacturer's supplemental or structural inspection documents is mandatory.

#### Implementation – Cessna aircraft

- 6 CASA is aware of the current compliance timeframes for Cessna SIDs and the difficulty that may be encountered in immediately complying with them. To provide operators sufficient time to achieve full compliance with these instructions for continued airworthiness, exemptions for Cessna aircraft have been issued providing for the following compliance timeframes:

#### Compliance Table

Aircraft Series	Operational Category	Compliance Date
300 * 400**	All	31 December 2014
200	Aerial Work/Charter	30 June 2015
200 100	Private Aerial Work/Charter	31 March 2016
100	Private	30 June 2016

#### Notes

\* Where an existing FAA approved Cessna Maintenance Manual, Chapter 4 Airworthiness Limitations Section includes the requirement for the incorporation of SIDs, this must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of CAO 100.5 Paragraph 9, for example the model T303.

\*\* Cessna 441 Conquest/Conquest II aircraft that have the Aeronautical Engineers Australia (AEA) Life Extension Program incorporated in accordance with CASA STC SVA 528 are to be maintained in accordance with the AEA Maintenance Manual Supplement Document No. MMS13757.030-01 or subsequent approved revisions.

## **Aviation Rulings**

Aviation rulings are advisory documents setting out CASA's policy on a particular issue. CASA makes rulings available to CASA officers and the public to ensure that there is a consistent policy adopted in administering particular aspects of the air safety regulatory regime. Rulings are intended to apply to a range of factual situations and are necessarily general in nature.

CASA will proceed on the basis that a person who relies on a ruling is complying with the law, as long as that person:

- i) Exercises due care in acting in reliance on the ruling – ie a person who carelessly misreads the test of a ruling will not be entitled to rely on that misreading;
- ii) Relies on the ruling in good faith – ie CASA will not allow a person to frustrate the intent of the ruling by adopting an extreme or contrived interpretation of the words of the ruling which results in consequences that were clearly unintended by CASA at the time the ruling was issued;
- iii) Only relies on the clear statements of fact and policy in the ruling – ie the ruling is completely self-contained and does not permit any additional interpretation of the relevant law, or application of the policy to different fact situations.

A user of aviation rulings should also be aware that a ruling is only a statement of CASA's policy. It is not a restatement of the law. Accordingly, while rulings are drafted to be consistent with the law referred to in the ruling as understood by CASA from time to time, they cannot displace any inconsistent legal requirements. You should notify CASA's General Counsel if you believe that compliance with this ruling would lead to a breach of a legal requirement or if you believe that a ruling is based on an erroneous factual assumption.

**Mark Skidmore AM**  
Director of Aviation Safety

**18 December 2015**