



**LICENSING AND FLIGHT TRAINING
ASAP TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG)
TASKING INSTRUCTIONS and **SECOND** REPORT**

3 – 4 MARCH 2020

The Technical Working Group (TWG) is established and operates in accordance with the Terms of Reference of the Aviation Safety Advisory Panel (ASAP) dated September 2017 (or as amended).

BACKGROUND

The ASAP was approached by industry members who raised concerns regarding issues with their experiences operating under Civil Aviation Safety Regulations (CASR) Parts 61, 141 and 142. Some problem areas are specific regulatory issues that, in many cases, do not require a significant amount of regulatory change to improve outcomes for industry. It is believed that some of these problem areas are causing high levels of cost or administrative impost without demonstrable safety benefits.

As part of standard process, CASA conducts a post-implementation review (PIR) of the CASR Parts, however this project is expected to be launched at a later date. The ASAP considered that some of the issues raised by industry could be addressed and resolved relatively quickly prior to the PIR process.

PURPOSE

During the 12 September 2019 ASAP meeting, CASA indicated that it had begun preliminary work internally to identify possible solutions for ‘pain-points’ that have been commonly raised by industry. The Panel discussed the need for CASA to continue its work and consult with industry further. As such, the ASAP agreed to establish a Licensing and Flight Training Technical Working Group (TWG).

The role of the TWG is to provide relevant technical expertise and industry sector insight to work with CASA to continue identifying problem areas associated with CASR Parts 61, 141 and/or 142 and develop possible solutions. The task of this TWG is to identify the main ‘pain-points’ and develop solutions that could be implemented relatively quickly, as opposed to consultation that would be part of a proper PIR project. However, this TWG may be required by the ASAP in the future for such consultation.

The Technical Working Group will:

- 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

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

In collaboration with CASA, the TWG is to:

1. Identify current safety concerns associated with CASR Parts 61, 141 and 142.
2. Identify current problem areas associated with CASR Parts 61, 141 and 142 that are causing cost and/or administrative impost without demonstrable safety benefit.
3. Review the status of the identified problem areas and prioritise them for resolution.
4. Develop and recommend solutions to the identified problem areas.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

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

CONSENSUS

A key aim of the TWG is that a consensus be reached, wherever possible, in the finalisation and preparation of advice for the Aviation Safety Advisory Panel and CASA.

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

MEMBERSHIP

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

The Licensing and Flight Training TWG consists of the following members:

David Chitty	Rod Ewels (<i>proxy for James Boland</i>)
Myles Tomkins	Rod Manning
Tim Holland	Shane Lawrey
Maddy Johnson	Ben Wyndham
Terry Fentiman	Pine Pienaar
Kerry Nolan	Phil Hurst
Max Bladon	Kevin McMurtrie

The TWG CASA Lead, Roger Crosthwaite, was supported by Mike Juelg and Tony Stanton during the meeting.

The ASAP Secretariat was represented by Matthew Di Toro.

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 come to an agreement on whether consensus (or otherwise) has been met on the outcomes discussed at the TWG meeting (or out of session).

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

SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES – TWG Meeting 3 - 4 March 2020

This meeting of the TWG worked towards achieving the overall TWG objectives as described in the ASAP TWG Tasking Instructions.

The summary of outcomes below seeks to consolidate the views of the TWG during the meeting, so its collective advice can be provided to the ASAP.

In addition to the below commentary, any issues raised in the TWG meeting will be provided to the TWG members, ASAP and CASA in the form of an issues register to ensure there is a common understanding of the areas where development work, rework or investigation is required.

A. What are the TWG's recommendations to the ASAP regarding the issues discussed at the meeting?

Comments:

The TWG reviewed the updated issues register with CASA's feedback and responses on the identified issues from the first meeting in December 2019. While the TWG was encouraged by CASA's work on the matters, they acknowledged that it was critical that the discussion on resolutions became action items. The TWG also acknowledged that some items will be on-going pieces of work where the TWG will be updated on progress in meetings.

Further detail of the discussion and outcomes are contained in the issues register (Appendix 3).

The high-level recommendations/outcomes from this meeting are:

- The TWG requests to establish 'sub-groups' that break out from the TWG to discuss specific matters further. This was successfully trialled on the matter of specialised training. Identified sub-groups to be established are:
 - Supervision requirements
 - Part 61 MOS PIR
 - RPC to RPL conversion
 - 3D endorsement on initial instrument rating flight tests

The TWG acknowledges that the membership of these 'sub-groups' may include current TWG members as well as other industry members, as determined by the ASAP.

- The TWG requests the ASAP (and CASA) to continue meeting with the TWG once every 3-4 months to effectively be the primary reference group.
- The TWG supported introducing a multi-engine helicopter class rating, which includes a multi-engine class rating training endorsement for instructors and examiners.
- The General, Sport and Recreational Aviation Branch at CASA will invite up to three TWG members to join the Flight Examiner Core Group to discuss issues relating to the Flight Examiner Rating.
- The TWG discussed the flight instructor initiative and supported its implementation. However, the TWG also recommended that the experience requirements for Grade 1 instructors is reviewed, particularly pertaining to the definition of ab-initio hours.
- The TWG were briefed by two members who met in a 'sub-group' to discuss matters on specialised training. The TWG has requested CASA to proceed working on the specialised training proposal.

CASA Lead Summary
ROGER CROSTHWAITE
<i>Comment:</i> I thank the TWG members for their time and contribution at their second meeting. CASA will work through the identified actions and will provide an update to the TWG before the next meeting.

Appendix

1. Extract from ASAP Terms of Reference
2. Licensing and Flight Training TWG Agenda – 3-4 March 2020
3. TWG issues register – updated post-meeting (as of 8 April 2020)

(extract) From ASAP and TWG Terms of Reference regarding Consensus

- 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.

ASAP Technical Working Group Licensing and Flight Training

03 – 04 March 2020

**CASA Office, Brisbane
Level 18, Hinkler Room
180 Ann St, BRISBANE QLD 4000**

A G E N D A

Day One – Tuesday, 3 March

Time	Topic	Presenter/s
9:30 am – 10:00 am	TWG members arrive CASA Office	TWG members
10:00 am – 10:15 am	START - Welcome, introductions, housekeeping	ASAP/CASA
10:15 am – 10:45 am	Status update on the issues register	CASA
10:45 am – 12:00 pm	Workshop on specialised training proposal	CASA
12:00 pm – 12:30 pm	Lunch Break	
12:30 pm – 1:30 pm	Review and discussion of the Part 61 flight test proposal	ALL
1:30 pm - 2:30 pm	Flight examiner issues workshop	ALL
2:30 pm – 2:45 pm	Afternoon tea	
2:45 pm – 3:45 pm	Flight examiner issues continued	ALL
3:45 pm to 4:45 pm	Multi-engine helicopter class rating options	ALL
4:45 pm – 5:00 pm	Wrap up of day one <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What further discussion is required from the issues register for Day Two? • Think about additional items to add to the issues register 	CASA

Day Two – Wednesday, 4 March

Time	Topic	Presenter/s
8:30 am – 9:00 am	Arrive for a 9:00am start	ALL
9:00 am – 10:30 am	Simulator instructor rating workshop	ALL
10:30 am – 10:45 am	Morning Tea	
10:45 am – 11:45 am	Multi-crew cooperation training – approval and instructor requirements – discussion on options	ALL
10:45 am – 12:30 pm	Continue discussion on the issues register and additional topics nominated by the TWG	ALL
12:30 pm – 1:00 pm	Lunch Break	
1:00 pm – 2:00 pm	Continue discussion	ALL
2:00 pm – 3:00 pm	Wrap up of Technical Working Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm issues • Prepare draft TWG report • Next steps 	ASAP

Licensing and Flight Training TWG - Issues Register – Progress update by CASA – 8 April 2020

OPEN ITEMS

	Identified problem areas	Detail/Discussion	Identified quick fixes	Further suggested solutions
1	FLIGHT EXAMINER RATING			
	Pre-requisites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current requirements are onerous and difficult to achieve for industry. The prescriptive hours requirements do not themselves give assurance of capability. Applicants are not always assessed on their merits. There should be better flexibility with the pre-requisites; such as recognising other experience and qualifications. Initial issue is a large barrier for all industry sectors; it has been identified that the flight examiner form is incorrect and must be amended with mention of regulatory over-reach. 61-FER: minimum hour requirement Previous version of the 61-FER had a section where an applicant could make a 'safety case' as to why they should be eligible for the rating or endorsement even though they do not meet the hours requirements. Mentoring challenges; Flight Examiners currently require their approval before they can get mentoring and it is sometimes difficult to arrange for a mentor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review table 61.1310 - i.e. look at other NAAs, consider merging some endorsements Review 61-FER: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> particularly in background statements remove the prescriptive hours and provide resume for review by panel (i.e. use the example used in the check pilot approval process form (Form 1215)) <u>Reason:</u> The assessment should be based on the capability of the person, meeting the prescriptive hours does not determine competency. Provide more scope to appoint operator limited examiners/check pilots Reconsider the ability of Operator Check Pilot approvals to permit training as instructors under the AOC (as per the revoked CAR 5 series 5.20 and 5.21, and CAO 40.2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestion of a dual pathway to obtain the qualification - i.e. minimum requirements vs. alternative means of compliance (safety case) Peer review panel could be explored (i.e. senior testing officers etc.) Consider giving operators more opportunity to develop their examiners based on their particular requirements – could lead to operator restricted rating
	Who conducts Instructor proficiency check (FPC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requirement for the FPC to be done by CASA is onerous and difficult to achieve. What is the safety value-add of CASA conducting an FPC on a Flight Examiner, prior to the addition of another privilege to their Examiner Rating (which is already subject to a flight test by CASA)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow industry examiners to conduct the FPC. 	
	Status Update post December meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CASA has developed a Summary of Proposed Change (SPC) for possible amendments to the Part 61 flight test and proficiency check scheme. The TWG will be given this prior to the second meeting for feedback and discussion. The SPC is open for discussion with the TWG to ascertain the best way forward. Discussion with CASA Branch Manager General, Recreational and Sport Aviation about the application form for the flight examiner rating, the prescriptive requirements for certain flight examiner endorsements and background at next meeting. Open up discussion on the subject including taking into consideration the SPC described above. 		
	Meeting 3 & 4 March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CASA provided an overview of the scheme, including how the experience requirements were copied over from the ATO scheme to the Part 61 scheme. CASA also provided an explanation of the process and the option to exercise discretion over the experience requirements where a reasonable case is put forward. The TWG acknowledged that flexibility is being applied, however there are cases that require reconsideration. CASA also provided advice on the reason behind having the FPC needs to be undertaken by CASA or a nominee. The TWG acknowledged this. The TWG were advised that several FEEs can be tested in one testing activity if they are compatible – mainly to be fair on the applicant and to ensure the testing is sufficient for each FEE. The TWG reiterated its strong concern over the shortage of flight examiners (particularly instructor and instrument examiners), and the fragmentation of specialisation of flight examiners. The TWG advised the commercial operations experience for the CPL flight test endorsement was difficult and not feasible in many cases. Agreed an alternative approach is needed. The TWG also reviewed the proposed Part 61 flight test scheme and while they supported the principle of relaxing flight-testing requirements (such as some current flight tests being done by non-flight examiners such as instructors or check pilots). The suggested proposed changes required more work and further discussion. Roger agreed to provide more detail in the table on the proposal. A proposal was put forward to invite perhaps 3 TWG members to join the Flight Examiner Core Group, run by General, Recreational and Sport Aviation Branch. 		
	Actions	1. Present and discuss flight test proposal		At TWG meeting
2. Provide a solution to the CPL flight test endorsement criteria		TBA	Open	
3. Update proposal and resubmit to TWG out of session		TBA	Open	

	Identified problem areas	Detail/Discussion	Identified quick fixes	Further suggested solutions
2	FLIGHT INSTRUCTOR RATING			
	Flight instructor requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 500 initial training hours required for a Grade 1 instructor is difficult to achieve, particularly due to the mix of training grade 2 conduct and the recent drain from general aviation to airlines. Grade 2 instructors tend to conduct advanced training which reduces ability to acquire initial time. The MCO training endorsement is not working properly and industry wants it fixed rather than using 142.040 approvals. Airlines used to train their approved training pilots in house. Now they have to use an instructor with the FIR training endorsement. The previously approved check pilots to train new instructors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change the Grade 1 instructor experience requirements to include training for initial navigation, initial multi-engine, instrument rating (would require change in definition). Recognise the train the trainer check pilots so they can conduct training for the instructor training. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CASA has developed a Flight Instructor and a Flight Test proposal which contains initiatives that address some of the problem areas raised by the TWG and industry. This will be circulated with the TWG Fix the MCO training endorsement Consider including other initial training, provide guidance on what mix of hours would be acceptable for other training endorsements Further review of train the trainer requirements.
	Status Update post December meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CASA has developed the Flight Instructor Initiative which will be given to the TWG prior to the second meeting for feedback and discussion. This initiative may resolve some of the issues raised. Further discussion required on the Grade 1 Instructor pre-requisites Link to be provided to TWG on the instructor rating initiative. MCP training endorsement – CASA’s proposal is to change the endorsement to separate MCC training from MPL training. See below in separate section Separate issue has arisen with regards the use of 142.040 approvals under different operators – see below in separate section 		
	Meeting 3 & 4 March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TWG suggested to expand the scope of the discussions on supervision (see more below under supervision) with the issues surrounding Grade 1 instructors, such as experience requirements. The TWG recommended that the initial flight training definition should be reviewed such as including initial navigation training, initial multi-engine etc. CASA provided an overview of the instructor rating initiative (noting already consulted) and changes are prepared for implementation through MOS and regulation change. Note, this proposal was presented with awareness of the flight test scheme, which is relates to especially on the scope of the proposed expanded scope of privileges of the grade 1 training endorsement. The TWG didn’t provide any alternative views on the proposal and indicated support for the expanded grade 1 privileges. 		
	Actions	1. Implement the FIR initiative – this is embedded in the proposed amendments to the MOS and the regulations	As soon as possible – in the drafting queue	Ongoing
	2. CASA prepare a discussion paper that outlines range of experience needed for grade 1 update – noting the FIR initiative	TBA	Open	
3	SPECIALISED TRAINING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low volume and specialised training for aerial work pilot authorisations is constrained by the current regulations The same issue arises for other low volume authorisations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a small team to focus on this specific matter, including members from the current TWG; separate focus on aerial work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A solution is being finalised for mustering training – consider using it for other situations.
	Status Update post December meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A small group, including two TWG members, are meeting with CASA for a workshop on specialised training on 27 February at the CASA Office in Canberra. An update will be provided to the TWG at the second meeting and opportunity to discuss the proposal. 		
	Meeting 3 & 4 March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TWG was updated on the outcomes of the specialised training breakout group which included two members. It was noted that it was important that the changes are specific to the type of training with concerns that the scope of specialised training did not unintentionally expand to other areas. Further discussion is required to finalise a few of the features of changes (such as notification admin) with a recommendation to then be presented to the ASAP (and CASA). 		
	Actions	1. Update the proposal into an SPC in anticipation of ASAP support.	As soon as possible	Open
4	CASA IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES [Closed]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A common issue experienced by industry members is the localised interpretation of the requirements in Part 61. This was experienced across all topic areas and is an individual issue faced by the industry. Different interpretations are given by different Regional Offices (and different FOIs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further guidance material or issuing of clarification notices on the intent of the regulations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TWG strongly supported the concept of a centralised decision-making body and the use of SMEs.
	Status Update post December meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CASA is currently undergoing the Regulatory Service and Surveillance Transformation (RSST). An update on the RSST is a standing meeting agenda item for the ASAP. In the context of Flight Crew Licensing (FCL), further guidance material or clarification notices on the intent of the regulations can be developed. The TWG can recommend the specific areas that they believe it is required the most. 		

	Identified problem areas	Detail/Discussion	Identified quick fixes	Further suggested solutions
	Meeting 3 & 4 March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TWG raised concerns about the potential lack of communication and opportunity to build relationships between CASA and industry without the ability to contact local office inspectors. 		
	Actions	1. CASA agreed to refer the concerns to the RSST team.		Feedback to RSST Closed
5	MULTI-CREW COOPERATION CERTIFICATE [Closed]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MCC certificate of completion of training is not required to be submitted by CASA so it is possible to make up a certificate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal for the MCC training certificate to be to be captured in CASA licensing system. 	
	Status Update post December meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CASA agrees with the proposal for the MCC training certificate to be captured in CASA licensing system. This will be progressed within CASA as a proposition as part of the Service Delivery Transformation (SDT) for myCASA. 		
	Actions	1. Proposal to be put to SDT project team for consideration		Feedback to SDT Closed
7	FLIGHT TEST NOTIFICATION [Closed]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Problem arises when a change of flight test examiner is needed within the 24-hour window. Currently, the regulation precludes this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal is to change the notification rules to provide flexibility. This may need to be done as an exemption, but the underlying principal for the notification system should be reviewed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the policy underlying the notification rules
	Status Update post December meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drafting instructions have been developed for an exemption to provide flexibility for the notification rules. Further discussion internally to review the policy underlying the notification rules and whether a regulation amendment is appropriate. 		
	Actions	1. CASA is progressing the change with an exemption as an interim solution prior to changing the regulation. Exemption is expected to be available by end of April.		Make exemption Make regulation amendment In progress
10	SIMULATOR INSTRUCTOR RATING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently, the licence document does not display the simulator instructor rating, and this causes confusion for pilots and operators. There could be improvements to the simulator instructor rating 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fix the licence document to display simulator instructor rating 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of simulator instructor rating
	Status Update post December meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Topic for discussion at the next meeting – consider setting up a small subgroup to address the issue for the longer-term use of the rating 		
	Meeting 3 & 4 March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TWG discussed matters relating to the simulator instructor rating and concerns were raised over the extent and complexity of the competency standards when the FIR units are included for training endorsements. The TWG suggested that those standards need to be reviewed and updated and can be included as part of the Part 61 MOS review (item 14). The TWG determined that no other changes were needed for the simulator instructor rating as long as the SIR is identified on the licence document. The SDT project already has this task linked to the development for the digital licence phase. 		
	Actions	1. Request change to licence document to display SIR.		Request made to SDT Closed
		2. Establish small group to review and proposed revisions to SIR – noting need to embrace new technologies as well		TBA Open
11	SUPERVISION: 1. Supervision of instructors 2. Supervision of students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The regulation does not prescribe the definition, and the SOM and Technical Assessors Handbook is being considered as the minimum acceptable level for supervision There was discussion on the requirements for supervision in Parts 141 and 142. Specific issue about minimum requirements with reference made to the SOM which includes direct and indirect supervision. The point was made that there is no definition of supervision and the SOM being declared by CASA as a minimum standard. Concern that this is over-reach of regulation. Regarding the monitoring of student progress by the HOO in 141.130, it does not require the HOO to personally fly with the students on a quarterly basis, however this is being enforced by stating the SOM is the minimum acceptable standard. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The operators should be allowed to specify how they will supervise instructors or monitor student progress in their Operations Manual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More guidance on supervision requirements
	Status Update post December meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Topic for further discussion with the TWG to discuss the key factors and principles for supervision. 		
	Meeting 3 & 4 March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TWG suggested that supervision should be determined by the operator to align with its operations and supervision requirements and defined in Operations Manual/Exposition. 		

	Identified problem areas	Detail/Discussion	Identified quick fixes	Further suggested solutions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TWG agreed that 'Supervision' included safety and training efficiency aspects which could include guidance, provide professional development, assist with decision making etc. Some TWG members believe that on-site supervision is beneficial for Grade 2 and Grade 3 instructors as they found it to be important to manage risk and maintaining training standards, whereas others held the view that on-site was not always necessary. The TWG recommended that an AC is developed for supervision for instructors and students, and for a small breakout group to be established. 		
	Actions	1. Establish breakout group to further discuss the subject with the aim of developing an advisory circular on the subject and acceptable means of compliance.		TBA Open
12	3D APPROACHES ON INITIAL INSTRUMENT RATING FLIGHT TESTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is becoming more difficult to get a slot to conduct an ILS in controlled airspace, particularly in certain areas of the country (e.g. SE Queensland). A simulator is currently approved to conduct 3D approaches for currency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simulators have advanced over time; therefore, the initial 3D test should be able to be conducted in the simulator once the student has shown competency in the aircraft for 2D approaches. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the requirement of conducting 3D approaches in an initial Instrument Rating flight test
	Status Update post December meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CASA to provide an update on the progression of this matter with further discussion with the TWG at the second meeting. A hot topic for a workshop to cover use of simulators, alternative to ILS and GLS for 3D endorsement 		
	Meeting 3 & 4 March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CASA informed the TWG that further discussion is required for a policy decision to determine the criteria required for using a FSTD for approval for initial ILS testing. CASA indicated a short-term fix is feasible that would provide relief through an amendment to the flight test and proficiency check standards. The TWG recommended a small breakout group to discuss the policy options for this matter 		
	Actions	1. Establish breakout group.		TBA Open
		2. CASA to provide out of session information about possible flight test and proficiency check interim solution		TBA Open
13	MULTI-ENGINE HELICOPTER CLASS RATING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issue raised and discussed briefly by the TWG. The main problem stems from availability of training endorsement training and therefore instructors, and availability of examiners to conduct the type rating flight test. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Options on how to deal with the core problem of gaining training and testing endorsements to be worked on. 	
	Status Update post December meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions on the impact the proposed flight test scheme need to be included under this topic to see what alleviations can be gained by that change On the agenda for the next TWG meeting, 		
	Meeting 3 & 4 March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TWG's proposition is to introduce a multi-engine helicopter class rating, but not applicable to multi-crew or complex rotorcraft – similar to how the scheme works with fixed-wing aircraft. This would also include a multi-engine class rating training endorsement for instructors and examiners. 		
	Actions	1. CASA to prepare a summary of proposed change and initiate processes to implement the change. To include provision for the training and testing endorsements for the class rating		Set up change project Open
14	PART 61 MOS PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TWG discussed issues with the Part 61 MOS that is isn't suitable in some areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and update the MOS 	
	Meeting 3 & 4 March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TWG proposed the MOS work be undertaken in 2020 Some TWG members offered to participate in the review. 		
	Actions	1. Establish a breakout group, circulate already developed amendments to the MOS		Set up change project Open
15	CONVERSION OF RPC TO RPL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It has become apparent that there is a lack of knowledge and standards of some students who convert their RPC to an RPL via the Part 61 recognition process. Problems can be seen later down the chain when students progress through their PPL and CPL training. A flight review may not be the most effective method to ensure equivalence in knowledge and standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposition is for a review of the process to convert the RPC to RPL via a smaller group which includes the key stakeholders. 	

	Identified problem areas	Detail/Discussion	Identified quick fixes	Further suggested solutions	
	Meeting 3 & 4 March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposition is for a review of the process that applies to converting an RPC to an RPL via a small group which includes the key stakeholders. The TWG discussed the need for a mapping process to be conducted to determine the difference between the RPC and RPL standards. 			
	Actions	1. Establish a breakout group and ensure key stakeholders are involved.			
16	MULTICREW PILOT TRAINING ENDORSEMENT (MCP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The training endorsement authorises the holder to do both ab-initio and MCC training, however many pilots conducting MCC training do not have ab-initio training experience and do not require it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider MCC only for multi-crew type rated aircraft and address the other cases at the operator level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resolve the transition policy for holders of 142.040 approvals to gain the training endorsement 	
	Meeting 3 & 4 March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TWG supported the proposition to remove initial flight training for the MPL from this training endorsement. 			
	Actions	1. CASA to initiate a change process to amend the training endorsement privileges to coincide with the FIR amendment		Set up change project	Open
		2. Develop policy on conversion of 142.040 approvals to amended training endorsement		Include in project	Open
17	CHECK PILOT / IPCs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TWG discussed the issue of check pilots and the limited scope of privileges such as instrument proficiency check – reference existing CASA exemption. The TWG also briefly raised the matter in the context of the new regulations and how check pilot roles were scoped. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and update the MOS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	
	Meeting 3 & 4 March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TWG recommends that the current scheme needs to be reviewed. CASA indicated competency standards were being developed for check pilots. The TWG also suggests that further clarification is required on what training a check pilot can conduct and whether they could also grant a type rating within a training and checking organisation. 			
	Actions	1. CASA to provide a SPC if necessary on changes including transition for current check pilots, where appropriate to address future training and checking requirements and in the meantime, address the current exemption in terms of transition.		Set up change project	Open
20	QUALIFICATIONS OF HEAD OF OPERATIONS (HoO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In some cases, it is difficult to appoint a Head of Operations for a Part 141 operator who doesn't hold a grade 1 training endorsement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance on the acceptable means of compliance for appointing a HoO. 		
	Meeting 3 & 4 March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CASA provided information to the TWG that a person who does not hold a grade 1 training endorsement can be appointed as a HoO. To summarise, it depends on the scope of training and the circumstances of the operator. Is it related to the supervision topic. The TWG discussed the issue and asked for guidance on what CASA would accept. The TWG included discussion on the possibility of having training provided for new HoOs. 			
	Actions	1. CASA to develop guidance material on the subject in conjunction with the work to be done on supervision.		Set up project	Open

CLOSED ITEMS

6	ATPL FLIGHT TEST [Deferred]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issue of the availability of examiners to conduct the ATPL flight test Why do we need an ATPL flight test? The extent of the type specific requirements. MCO training endorsement required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exemption is proposed in the short-term with a future MOS amendment. Proposal to integrate the ATPL flight test with a type rating flight test. 	
	Status Update post December meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further discussion at the next meeting depending on priorities. 		
	Meeting 3 & 4 March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposition is to combine the ATPL flight test with the type-rating flight rating test. To be discussed further offline. 		
8	COMMERCIAL PILOT LICENCE [Deferred]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion that the CPL qualification – skills and competency of newly qualified CPLs, could be improved; the lack of capability pertaining to command decision making is seen as a key factor. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider adding more scenario-based training. Industry broadly can assist each other, i.e. airlines assisting flying schools, to see if some improvements can be made.
	Status Update post December meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a TWG discussion topic. This can be discussed further at the second meeting if desired. 		
	Meeting 3 & 4 March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TWG agreed now was not the time to investigate this issue due to other priorities. However, it needs to come back to it in the near future. 		
9	ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES [Closed]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The timeframe to issue a licence is excessive (6-8 weeks was experienced by some in industry). This limits an individual's ability to continue training (i.e. FIR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvement to internal CASA processing for the issuing of licences. Allowance of students who pass CPL tests to train for FIR without physical issue of licence. 	
	Status Update post December meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The backlog of jobs in the Client Service Centre, particularly for Flight Crew Licensing, has significantly decreased since April 2019 due to the on-boarding of additional resources. Discussions are occurring internally in relation to the requirement to hold a physical license with endorsement to be able to conduct the privilege. This relates to the future Service Delivery Transformation (SDT) for Flight Crew Licensing on myCASA. 		
19	MULTI ENGINE CLASS RATING + CPL TEST COMBINATION [Closed]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TWG enquired about combining a M/E class rating and the CPL 		
	Meeting 3 & 4 March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TWG were informed by CASA that the two-tests can be conducted in the same activity and the two separate test forms are merely an administrative process. 		