



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

**4 – 5 DECEMBER 2019**

*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 has been approached by industry members who have raised concerns regarding issues with their experiences operating under Civil Aviation Safety Regulations (CASR) Parts 61, 141 and/or 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 and/or administrative impost without demonstrable safety benefits.

As part of standard process, CASA will conduct 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 complete PIR process.

**PURPOSE**

During the 12 September 2019 ASAP meeting, CASA indicated that it has 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 will be 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"><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 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	James Boland
Myles Tomkins	Rod Manning
Tim Holland	Shane Lawrey
Maddy Johnson	Ben Wyndham
Terry Fentiman	Pine Pienaar
Davide Ierkic	Phil Hurst
Max Bladon	

The TWG CASA Lead, Roger Crosthwaite, was supported by Mike Juelg 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 4-5 December 2019**

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 ascertain the views of the TWG at this time, so their 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 to ensure there is a common understanding of the areas where rework or investigation is required.

### **A. What are the high priority problem areas associated with CASR Part 61, Part 141 and/or Part 142 identified by the TWG?**

#### *Comments:*

The TWG identified a number of problem areas associated with CASR Part 61, Part 141 and/or Part 142. There are many issues specific to each industry sector, but the TWG were able to identify some of the more significant problem areas. The relatively quick fixes to some of the identified problem areas were also discussed (further detail is outlined in Appendix 3).

The identified problem areas include, but are not limited to:

- Flight Examiner Rating
- Flight Instructor Rating
- Specialised Training
- Multi-Crew Cooperation (MCC)
- Administering/implementation of regulations by CASA (See 'General Comments' below)

The TWG noted that further discussions would be required at the next TWG meeting to expand on some problem areas, and to identify additional items and solutions.

The TWG agreed that of the identified problem areas, they could not necessarily be prioritised as an ordered list because the degree of priority differs for different TWG members and sectors of industry. However, the TWG were in full consensus in strongly recommending that CASA works quickly to implement quick fixes as soon as possible to provide relief for industry.

The TWG also agreed that it was appropriate for small teams of industry and CASA to focus on specific matters to then report back to the TWG. This includes the areas of specialised training and the multi-engine helicopter class rating. These teams should include members from this TWG.

The TWG requests that CASA circulates the Flight Test and Flight Examiner proposal and the Instructor Rating Initiative with members. CASA indicated that the proposals contain initiatives that address some problem areas raised by the TWG and broader industry.

### General comments:

The TWG identified a significant common issue associated with the majority of the problem areas discussed. This issue pertains to the localised interpretation and application of the regulations by the CASA inspectorate, across all regions. Importantly, the TWG also identified that in most cases the individual interpretations did not provide a demonstrable safety benefit. The TWG strongly urges CASA to improve consistency in decision making amongst the inspectorate and recommends developing strategies to do so, for example, through further guidance material or the issuing of clarification notices for the inspectorate on the intent of the regulations.

The TWG also stated that the satisfactory solution to the inconsistent interpretation and application of Part 61, Part 141/142 regulatory material will be a determinant factor to the successful transition to the new flight operation regulations.

### CASA Lead Summary

#### ROGER CROSTHWAITE

##### *Comment:*

I would like to thank the TWG members for their time and contribution during their first meeting. I note that there are many different matters that are yet to be discussed and I look forward to another constructive discussion at the next meeting.

CASA will review the specific issues raised by the TWG. We will begin work on the relatively simple fixes that have already been discussed, and for others, CASA will develop propositions to take back to the TWG for discussion. It will also be an opportunity for CASA to discuss the scope of work and time required to work on the discussed resolutions for some of the specific issues.

At this stage, we are intending on scheduling a meeting during the first week of March as this will give CASA some time to conduct a thorough review of the issues raised by the TWG.

### Appendix

1. Extract from ASAP Terms of Reference
2. Licensing and Flight Training TWG Agenda – 4-5 December 2019
3. Summary of identified problem areas – 4-5 December 2019
4. TWG individual submissions – further discussion required

**(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**

**04 – 05 December 2019**

**CASA Office, Melbourne  
Level 13, Boardroom  
720 Bourke St, DOCKLANDS VIC 3008**

## **A G E N D A**

### **Day One – Wednesday, 4 December**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Presenter/s</b>
10:00am – 10:30am	TWG members arrive CASA Office	TWG members
10:30am – 10:45am	START - Welcome, introductions, housekeeping	ASAP/CASA
10:45am – 11:00am	TWG Tasking Instructions and Terms of Reference	ASAP
11:00am – 12:30pm	Review and validate the list of regulatory development topics	ALL
12:30pm – 1:00pm	Lunch Break	
1:00pm – 2:00pm	Continue review and validation	ALL
2:00pm - 2:30pm	Additional topics nominated by TWG	ALL
2.30 pm – 2.45 pm	Afternoon tea	
2.45 pm – 4.30 pm	Discussion of the topics nominated by TWG	ALL
4.30pm – 5.00 pm	Wrap up of day one <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What further discussion is required for Day Two?</li></ul>	CASA

## Day Two – Thursday, 5 December

Time	Topic	Presenter/s
8.30 am – 9.00 am	Arrive for a 9:00am start	ALL
9.00 am – 10.30 am	Prioritise list of topics	ALL
10.30 am – 10.45 am	Morning Tea	
10.45 am – 12.30 pm	Development of top priority topics	ALL
12.30 pm – 1.00 pm	Lunch Break	
1.00 pm – 2.30 pm	Continue development of top priority topics	ALL
2.30 pm – 3.00 pm	Wrap up of Technical Working Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirm issues</li> <li>• Prepare draft TWG report</li> </ul> Next steps	ASAP

## Licensing and Flight Training TWG - Issues Register - Meeting #1 (4-5 December 2019)

	Identified problem areas	Detail/Discussion	Identified quick fixes	Further suggested solutions
1	<b>FLIGHT EXAMINER RATING</b>			
	Pre-requisites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>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.</b></li> <li>• There should be better flexibility with the pre-requisites; such as recognising other experience and qualifications.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Mentoring challenges; Flight Examiners currently require their approval before they can get mentoring and it is sometimes difficult to arrange for a mentor.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review table 61.1310 - i.e. look at other NAAs, consider merging some endorsements</li> <li>• Review 61-FER: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ particularly in background statements</li> <li>○ 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))</li> <li>○ <u>Reason:</u> The assessment should be based on the capability of the person, meeting the prescriptive hours does not determine competency.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide more scope to appoint operator limited examiners/check pilots</li> <li>• 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)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion of a dual pathway to obtain the qualification - i.e. minimum requirements vs. alternative means of compliance (safety case)</li> <li>• Peer review panel could be explored (i.e. senior testing officers etc.)</li> <li>• Consider giving operators more opportunity to develop their examiners based on their particular requirements – could lead to operator restricted rating</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The requirement for the FPC to be done by CASA is onerous and difficult to achieve.</li> <li>• 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)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow industry examiners to conduct the FPC.</li> </ul>	
2	<b>FLIGHT INSTRUCTOR RATING</b>			
	Flight instructor requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The initial training hours required for a Grade 1 instructor is difficult to achieve, particularly due to the mix of hour requirements and the recent drain from general aviation to airlines</li> <li>• The MCO training endorsement is not working properly and industry wants it fixed rather than using 142.040 approvals.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change the Grade 1 instructor experience requirements to include training for initial navigation, initial multi-engine, instrument rating (would require change in definition).</li> <li>• Recognise the train the trainer check pilots so they can conduct training for the instructor training.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Fix the MCO training endorsement</li> <li>• Consider including other initial training, provide guidance on what mix of hours would be acceptable for other training endorsements</li> <li>• Further review of train the trainer requirements.</li> </ul>
3	<b>SPECIALISED TRAINING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low volume and specialised training for aerial work pilot authorisations is constrained by the current regulations</li> <li>• The same issue arises for other low volume authorisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish a small team to focus on this specific matter, including members from the current TWG; separate focus on aerial work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A solution is being finalised for mustering training – consider using it for other situations.</li> </ul>



	Identified problem areas	Detail/Discussion	Identified quick fixes	Further suggested solutions
4	<b>CASA IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further guidance material or issuing of clarification notices on the intent of the regulations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TWG strongly supported the concept of a centralised decision-making body and the use of SMEs.</li> </ul>
5	<b>MULTI-CREW COOPERATION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MCC certificate of completion of training is not required to be submitted by CASA so it is possible to make up a certificate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal for the MCC training certificate to be to be captured in CASA licensing system.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider MCC only for multi-crew type rated aircraft and address the other cases at the operator level.</li> <li>Provide the option of pre- and integrated MCC for type ratings.</li> </ul>
6	<b>ATPL FLIGHT TEST</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The issue of the availability of examiners to conduct the ATPL flight test</li> <li>Why do we need an ATPL flight test?</li> <li>The extent of the type specific requirements.</li> <li>MCO training endorsement required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exemption is proposed in the short-term with a future MOS amendment.</li> <li>Proposal to integrate the ATPL flight test with a type rating flight test.</li> </ul>	
7	<b>FLIGHT TEST NOTIFICATIONS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Problem arises when a change of flight test examiner is needed within the 24-hour window. Currently, the regulation precludes this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review the policy underlying the notification rules</li> </ul>
8	<b>COMMERCIAL PILOT LICENCE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider adding more scenario-based training.</li> <li>Industry broadly can assist each other, i.e. airlines assisting flying schools, to see if some improvements can be made.</li> </ul>
9	<b>ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvement to internal CASA processing for the issuing of licences.</li> <li>Allowance of students who pass CPL tests to train for FIR without physical issue of licence.</li> </ul>	
10	<b>SIMULATOR INSTRUCTOR RATING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently, the license does not display the simulator instructor rating.</li> <li>There could be improvements to the simulator instructor rating</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fix the license document to display simulator instructor rating</li> <li>Review of simulator instructor rating</li> </ul>
11	<b>SUPERVISION:</b> <b>1. Supervision of instructors</b> <b>2. Supervision of students</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The regulation does not prescribe the definition, and the SOM and Technical Assessors Handbook is being considered as the minimum acceptable level for supervision</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The operators should be allowed to specify how they will supervise instructors or monitor student progress in their Operations Manual</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More guidance on supervision requirements</li> </ul>

	Identified problem areas	Detail/Discussion	Identified quick fixes	Further suggested solutions
	<b>3D APPROACHES ON INITIAL INSTRUMENT RATING FLIGHT TESTS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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).</li><li>• A simulator is currently approved to conduct 3D approaches for currency</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review the requirement of conducting 3D approaches in an initial Instrument Rating flight test</li></ul>

## **Parts 61, 141, 142 TWG Melbourne 19**

General complexity of the new rules is deterring the use and understanding of them. If CASA is to hold industry accountable for the radical change, then, they too should adopt the same standard as industry is required to do. For instance, an FOI has an opinion on a rule, this should only be enforced if clear guidance material has been produced in accordance with the rule.

### **Flight Examiner issue**

Last week, CASA released the “Flight Training Organisations Risk Register”. The number one item that has been defined as **Extreme**, is the lack of Flight Examiners (FE). One of the solutions documented is to allow 457 visas to be issued to resolve this.

This issue is not the pilots required, but how CASA implements the interpretation of the 61.1310.

For instance, 61.1310 item 6, requirements for issue of an Instrument Rating Flight Test Endorsement. This requires only an Instrument Training endorsement for the specified aircraft category, however, the application 61-FER requires a minimum of 500hrs. This does not consider competency but meeting an hour requirement.

Unless you have been a career Grade 1 Flight Instructor, then it is very unlikely you would have obtained 500hrs of Instrument training time. On the other hand, someone may have trained instrument 25 years ago and has done very little since, yet could apply.

To become or add additional endorsements for a FER, CASA requires you to do a Flight Instructor Proficiency Check (FPC) with them in the last 24 months. This does not imply that that test is assessing you to put you up for the Examiner test. The reason given is to see if you are safe to fly with a CASA officer on the FER test.

Last week, an instructor was tested for his FPC to become a FE. CASA sent one of their Examiners to do this initial FPC so that he could then put in the application for the FER test. The examiner himself last taught ab-initio flight training in 1998. His full extent of training was 10 months and he has never trained Instructors and does not have the minimum of 500hrs as required teaching instructors as per 61-FER. This CASA examiner, however, is deemed to be more suitable than industry examiners, who, like myself, teach and test instructors every day. It is not just that we have had to jump through the excessive hour requirements, but we are both current and competent in what we do.

The second factor from this FPC test by CASA is lack of manpower. I have been put back to do an additional FER endorsement test due to shortage of CASA testing officers. CASA examiners are testing what they should not be testing i.e. FPC, rather than what they should be testing, FER. This has also taken work from the industry with no improved safety outcome.

CASA have put such stringent requirements on hours and the cost of each test and burden of the slow system for a FER, pilots are not enticed to become a FE.

### **Remedy**

1. Industry do FPCs
2. CASA assess on competency, not on number of hours for issue of FER endorsements.
3. Use senior industry Examiners to test FER, at least, renewals.
4. CASA testing officers have at least the minimum experience that industry requires when testing.

### **Supervision of Instructors 61.1246**

CASA is enforcing Direct and Indirect supervision of instructors. This wording is used on page 50/109 Technical Assessors Workbook.

- *The applicant must have a sufficient number of management/supervisory positions to effectively supervise and monitor the standard of instruction. For example, if an operator employs instructors with grade 3 and grade 2 training endorsements, a sufficient number of instructors holding a grade 1 training endorsement must be available to provide direct and indirect supervision.*

The rule, however, does not specify this Direct and Indirect supervision.

#### *61.1246 Limitations on exercise of privileges of grade 3 training endorsements*

*(1) The holder of a grade 3 training endorsement is authorised to conduct an activity mentioned in column 2 of item 3 or 3A in table 61.1235 only if the holder is acting under the supervision of the holder of a grade 1 training endorsement.*

*(2) The holder of a grade 3 training endorsement is authorised to pilot an aircraft in the exercise of the privileges of the endorsement only by day under the VFR.*

*(3) The holder of a grade 3 training endorsement (helicopter) is authorised to conduct flight training involving a simulated engine failure only if the holder has completed at least 100 hours of flight training under the endorsement.*

CASA is stipulating, in writing, that both the Technical Assessors Handbook and Sample Operations Manual (SOM) for Part 141 are the minimum acceptable level for supervision. This means we are now back to the old Direct and Indirect Supervision. The SOM has gone even further by stating;

#### *1B1.2.2 Supervision of flight training activities and junior instructors*

*The HOO will nominate an instructor holding a Grade 1 training endorsement (the 'supervising instructor') to be rostered for duty on days when the HOO is rostered off duty to supervise flight training activities. This includes the supervision of flight instructors who only hold a Grade 3 training endorsement.*

This is now stopping ALL Grade 3 instructors operating unless there is a Grade 1 at the airfield on duty as a minimum.

### **Remedy**

Allow the Operator to specify how they will supervise their Instructors in their Operations Manual. Monitor and audit the safety outcomes.

### **Monitoring by the HOO of student progress 141.30**

The SOM states;

#### *1A7 Monitoring standards of training*

*On a quarterly basis, the HOO will:*

- *compare average student hours at the completion of each licence level between the current period and previous periods*
- *monitor training by conducting training flights with a representative sample of students in various stages of training to assess their actual performance against expected performance*

CASA have stipulated this as a minimum standard, but again is just the opinion of the SOM.

The Technical Assessors workbook only specifies audit periods;

*The number of audits required will vary dependent upon the size of the organisation and the scope of the training. The applicant's schedule for internal audits should ensure that all aspects relating to the conduct of the activities are audited within a 12 month period.*

Part 141.130 does not require the HOO to personally fly with the students on a quarterly basis, however, CASA is enforcing the HOO to do so by stating that the SOM is the minimum acceptable standard.

### **Remedy**

Allow the Operator to say how they will monitor student progress, and CASA use their surveillance to monitor the outcome.

### **Part 142 Integrated CPL training**

The 150hr integrated CPL course and reduced hour PPL course of training have been put under Part 142. These are the only single pilot courses under Part 142. The FAA and NZCAA have both put those reduced hour integrated courses under Parts 141.

The issue for industry is because of the excessive extra staff levels required to comply with Part 142 over Part 141. The integrated course includes the intensive training including structured ground theory, however, what safety risk does this apply if conducted under Part 141?

Schools have tried combining organisations to try and reduce staff costs, other schools have had to stop conducting training for certain providers that require the integrated courses, others have cut costs to meet the same price comparison as a 150hr course to maintain their livelihood. Has this increased safety?

### **Remedy**

To put the integrated CPL and PPL training courses into Part 141. This would still have the same requirements for the intensive course (ground theory, no RPL recognition etc), yet remove the burden and cost associated with the Part 142.

### **3D Approaches on initial Instrument Rating Flight Tests**

It is getting harder to be able to get a slot to be able to conduct an ILS in controlled airspace. In SE Queensland, we can only fly the ILS at Oakey at night for 2 hours or weekends. Brisbane and the Gold coast both will not allow training in. It is very difficult to be able to organise an Examiner that is willing to fly at night to do the ILS.

With the advancement of simulators, 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.

### **Remedy**

If the simulator is approved to conduct 3D approaches for currency, then they should be approved to be used to conduct initial 3D approach endorsement issue. What safety risk is there?

### **Part 61 MOS FIR competency elements**

The Part 61 MOS has the same elements of competency for all the Flight Instructor Training Endorsements.

### **Remedy**

Adopt the draft competencies that are already in existence.

### **NVR3.12 Engine Failure during cruise**

This risk over reward of conducting engine failures at night in training. No simulated engine failures should be conducted both at night or in IMC.

### **Part 61 MOS Multi Engine aeroplane instrument endorsement.**

The MOS requires NVR3 to be conducted for the issue of the instrument rating, however, the Rule 61.890 item 2 does not require this.

### **Remedy**

Remove the requirement for NVR3 from the MOS.

## Part 6 TWG

### Key Issues:

SUMMARY	ISSUE	FIX	REF
1. Rotary OPC	Make equivalent to Part 137.240 + CP to CP exemption		See Instrument 104/18 / Part 137.240 when reviewed
2. OPC Notification	<p>Operator Proficiency Checks for Private Pilot Application are required under CASR Part 137.240. These checks are also allowed to be conducted by one Private Pilot Application Chief Pilot of another Private Pilot Application Chief Pilot under CASA EX104/18.</p> <p>Section 6 of the Exemption requires the user to 'notify CASA in writing of the check'.</p> <p><u>No</u> notification is required of an APC conducted directly under Part 137.240 – ie by Chief Pilot of their own staff.</p> <p>However, this raises the issue of lack of capture of this data on pilot's licence/electronic record with CASA – causing various problems for international ops, new employers etc. This is now even more important as industry is looking for ways to protect itself through due diligence from licence fraud – thanks to recent case of non-member who was successfully prosecuted for licence fraud.</p> <p>Using ridiculous amount of common sense, many of my members have tried to advise CASA through CLARC/Service Centre of the conduct of an APC</p>	<p>Either:</p> <p>a) Simply advise AAAA members to NOT notify CASA via CLARC/Service Centre using Form 61-1517 – but instead send an email to their local office advising of the conduct of the APC under the exemption – thereby fulfilling the requirements of the Exemption. The weakness of this is that data is not captured for inclusion on licence statements. – OR -</p> <p>b) Actually get CLARC/Service Centre to change their approach and accept the Form 61-1517 from any Chief Pilot etc and enter data onto ARN records – OR -</p> <p>c) Develop self-service portal system that recognises Chief Pilot approval and links it to an ARN, then create new window for advice re: conduct of APCs that would link to the candidate's ARN. – OR -</p> <p>d) Abolish the requirement in the</p>	Discussed with Mark Sullivan (CLARC)

	<p>using EX104/18 by using CASA Form 61-1517 – Annual Proficiency Check for Aerial Application – and submitting it to CLARC/Service Centre.</p> <p>CLARC/Service Centre have very consistently rejected these forms as they either do not have flight test number (it is not flight test), they are not an examiner or 141 (not required by using the Exemption), with the Service Centre clearly demonstrating they do not understand either Part 137 or the exemption.</p> <p>In addition, form 61-1517 simply replicates the competencies for the rating – the APC is not a rating renewal but a proficiency test. The AAAA Form which we developed in 2007 and since refined – is a direct result of the lack of any explanatory material coming from CASA – and which is included in the Standard Ops Manual – is far superior.</p>	<p>Exemption for notification to CASA – this would also simplify the eventual inclusion of this issue into Part 137 – although the weakness is lack of licence statement detail.</p>	
3. OPC – renewal of rating renews all endorsements – regardless of experience of checker	<p>Problematic potentially for safety – e.g. person with no fire experience renewing OPC for fire vision ‘g’ approved and vice versa</p>	<p>Reconsider support of overall restructure of Application rating / endorsements</p>	<p>61.R 61.745</p>
4. OPC is renewal of class rating / OPC counts as ‘biennial’		<p>Clarification from CASA would be useful</p>	<p>61.745 (3) (e)(j)</p>
5. OPC - Night g endorsement renewal		<p>Clarification that on OPC for the rating renewal will renew the endorsements attached to it – e.g. night g</p>	
6. Need to include	<p>FOIs confused about privileges etc of the AA</p>		<p>61.R</p>



Automating printing of low-level ratings on licences where the pilot holds and a special application rating	Rating – which clearly incorporates the privileges of a Low Level Rating		
7. Abolish the special application rating / special application endorsement duplication	This is linked to the abolition of the fire endorsement altogether	Return operation to operators	61.R
8. Firefighting endorsements - abolish	<p>Return to operation to operators.</p> <p>The endorsement no longer has the support of AAAA/AHIA/NAFC</p> <p>Consider the wider application of this to all operation training eg sling / shooting etc</p> <p>Still need to capture the approval somewhere – consider an endorsement issued after recommendation by operator – see current exemptions – without CASA field staff reinterpretation</p>	<p>Abolish the firefighting endorsement.</p> <p>Embed the current endorsements, add the original AAAA proposed supervision and mentoring, and ensure an operator endorsement leads to the loss of power to go firebombing.</p> <p>Ensure fire approvals are captured by CLARC portal.</p>	See CASA EX57/18 and EX56/18
9. Firefighting exemption	CASA staff have reinterpreted the exemptions to still require an examiner to test and issue - the actual intent of the exemption was to fix this exact problem as we don't have enough examiners	<p>Revise the exemptions to clarify the endorsement is issued by CASA on the recommendation of the operator.</p> <p>If absolutely necessary, provide all fire operators with 61.040 approval</p>	See CASA EX57/18 and EX56/18
10. Change the name of firefighting endorsement to firebombing endorsement as originally intended	Superseded if CASA agrees to abolish the fire endorsement		61.R

11. Du l-se t tr ining requirement for firefighting not chiev ble by most of fixed wing industry	See bove		From previous t skforce uncompleted business
12. Abolish 50 hours per ye r trigger for retr ining with ex miner	As se sons get shorter nd more difficult to m n ge, it would ssist industry gre tly to remove this 50 hour trigger nd repl ce with the need to do n OPC with the oper tors nd then perh ps 5 hours of supervision....	Abolish 50 hour requirement.  Repl ce with other s fety me sures eg OPC + limited supervision / risk m n gement	137.240
13. Ex miner recency requirements	Recency requirements on speci lised Ex miners etc too onerous (eg 50 hours per ye r of eri l pplic tion when they lre dy h ve over 10,000 hours of g)	Perh ps repl ce with more relev nt continuing profession l development – which AAAA is interested in providing (see below)	137.240 nd 61.R
14. Ex miner Profession l Development	St rt discussion with industry for provision of CDP progr m – simil r to AAAA Profession l Pilot Progr m – but focussed on the p rticul r sector they re involved in.	Industry provision of CDP progr m th t includes CASA spe kers on st nd rdis tion etc	
15. Simplific tion of Ex miner requirements for eri l work ops –	As new eri l work P rts t M rch 2021 will not require AOC – only certific te, remov l of complexity for P rt 141 nd Ex miner pprov ls for eri l work tr ining should be pursued.	New p thw ys for tr ining of eri l work ops – signific nt simplific tion of requirements	
16. Speci list Instructors - Applic tion	Origin lly ( bout 2005 or so) there w s greement the P rt 61 would en ble 'speci list instructors' - with cert in experience - to undert ke limited tr ining nd other duties in re s where they h d expertise - while working under n 'ex miner' - or ATO s we were thinking b ck then.  Th t w y n' g' speci list instructor could work under n ATO/Ex miner	Simplify eri l work speci list instructors to be:  2000 hours g or LL 5 hours in RHS Principles nd Pr ctice of Instruction Test by g ex miner  Do couple under supervision of their Ex miner	

		<p>NO requirement to have Class 3 instructor rating or do 150 hours of circuits</p> <p>Approved to do OPCs, 50 hour renewals etc (see letter for abolition)</p>	
17. Supervision of new application pilot – HOFO nominee	The HOFO of an aerial application operator should be able to nominate a person in the company to conduct supervision other than the HOFO where they have appropriate experience.	Add the words – ‘or nominee with suitable experience’	61.1130
18. Cross recognition of testing / multiple ratings in one test/renewal	Eg Examiner renewal / instructor renewal	Provide broad head of power to permit certifying renewals to be conducted at the same time to standard of ‘the examiner is able to form an opinion of suitable competency without testing every single competency including in each rating being tested’	
19. RPL embedded/codified/standardised in certificates	<p>Part 61 MOS aerial application competencies should include clear RPL for application ratings holders.</p> <p>AAAA used asterisks to denote already covered competencies in our submission of competencies to CASA from ATOS etc – rewritten by CASA with no consultation and clear RPL removed</p>	Clear and direct RPL for those candidates already holding aerial application ratings/endorsements or low-level ratings	61.R
20. RPL – rotary to fixed wing – Aerial Application	<p>RPL and experience requirements etc are not counted when transitioning from one to the other – despite the competencies being identical other than the aircraft flying component...</p> <p>Improved pathway for RPL when transitioning from</p>		61.R MOS

	rot ry to fixed wing nd vice vers for pplic tion r ting etc		
21. Review of P rt 61 MOS ex min tions nd syll bus – eri l pplic tion	Aeri l pplic tion ex ms need rewriting long with syll bus to reflect v il ble excellent study m teri ls.	AAAA interested in m n ging whole process s we do for chemic l licencing.	61 MOS
22. Review 61 MOS competencies	Review of P rt 61 MOS eri l pplic tion nd firefighting competencies required by experienced tr iners to test v lidity nd simplify		61 MOS
23. Supervision of eri l work inexperienced pilots	Potenti l extension of principle of supervision for inexperienced pilots cross ll low-level sectors b sed on eri l pplic tion model of risk m n gement		61.R



Australian International **Aviation College**

3<sup>rd</sup> December 2019

ASAP Technical Working Group  
Licensing and Flight Training  
CASA Office  
Melbourne

Dear TWG,

Please accept my apologies for not being able to be in attendance for the first meeting scheduled in Melbourne 04-05 December 2019 as I have travel commitments that I could not change. I look forward to attending in person all future TWG meetings.

Please find below some areas that are detailed in the list of regulatory development areas that I think could be considered and discussed further.

I trust you all have a constructive meeting and I wish everyone a pleasant summer holiday festive season.

Yours faithfully

Kevin McMurtrie  
Head of Operations  
Flight Examiner

Australian International Aviation College



### **Item 12. English Language Proficiency**

This is just a suggestion. The CASA Exemption and the MOS state two requirements for a person to be considered as a GELP Holder. One requirement is to be assessed by CASA, an Examiner or an approved person that the candidate is able to meet the competencies detailed in Part 61 MOS Unit GEL, Section 2 Elements and Performance Criteria and Section 3 Range of Variables. The second requirement is to provide evidence to CASA, an examiner, a HOO, or a Flight Instructor G1 nominated by the HOO, the evidence being detailed in Section 5 of the MOS GEL unit. The unit then specifies the evidence list from 5.1.2 (a) through (f). I would like to draw attention to 5.1.2 (f) the IELTS, TOEIC and TOEFL General English Proficiency tests. I assess Chinese students in mainland China for flight screening into our organisation's flight training program. One common occurrence I notice is variation in General English Language Proficiency (GELP) with students who have completed an IELTS assessment. I think the main issue is the time interval between when the student performed their IELTS assessment and when I (or another foreign flight training college) interview and assess the students. Their GELP may have been at an IELTS 5.5 or higher standard when they completed the assessment, however after many months, and possibly 12 months or more before starting flight training in a flight training provider in Australia, the student's GELP has deteriorated. It may be worth considering a validity period on the numerous General English Proficiency tests.

### **Item 15. Foreign cadet pilots – exemption from Class 1 medical for CPL flight test**

My views on this item may be biased as I declare I have an interest in training foreign cadet pilots, and the exemption provides a practical method of compliance to CASR 61.235(2)(c) and also reduces the cost burden and complexity of undergoing a Class 1 Medical assessment in Australia, when the applicant holds or has held the equivalent (or higher) standard of medical in their home country. I would encourage consideration to be made to not make this requirement any more burdensome. I don't believe there is a safety issue with a foreign cadet performing a CPL flight test on a CASA Class 2 medical certificate, as it is highly unlikely that a cadet enrolled in an airline sponsored Part 142 training course will ever exercise the privileges in commercial operations of their CASA issued CPL licence in Australia. Once the student completes the training course, which depending upon student ability is for a duration of 13-16 months, the student returns to their home country to then start the process of converting their CASA issued Class Rating, CPL and Instrument Rating to the foreign country equivalent. To change to a requirement that registered and sponsored foreign airline cadets would need to hold a Class 1 Medical Certificate to take a CPL flight test would place an unnecessary cost, resource and time burden on the flight training colleges that conduct foreign airline cadet pilot training, and no safety case to support it. My suggestion would be that any future regulations are drafted to reflect the already practical alternative means of compliance provided by CASA EX101/18.



### **Item 69. Flight simulation training devices**

The first bullet point in Item 69 states that the current regulations do not adequately support the lower fidelity devices and new technologies. An example of this is the current training credits, recency credits and instrument proficiency check credits that the current regulations provide for Flight Training Devices that are complex and representative of a certain aircraft model compared to a generic desktop synthetic training device. When comparing two devices and their features:

1. TRU Simulation DA42 Full Flight Trainer (Capital Expenditure \$500,000 AUD)
  - a. Representative of the aircraft model (cockpit controls, flight controls)
  - b. Avionics (actual Garmin G1000 PFD, MFD and Garmin Firmware)
  - c. Flight characteristics close to representative with the exception of stalling and landing
  - d. 200-degree high definition visual system
  - e. Visual system that simulate cloud, day/night, precipitation, snow, fog, wind, turbulence, lighting, thunderstorms, traffic, airframe ice.
  - f. Visuals that are representative of actual airport and geographical environments.
  - g. Ability to invoke realistic malfunctions of all aircraft systems;
  - h. Compliance requirements to implement a Simulation Quality Management System (SQMS)
  - i. Requirement to conduct quarterly QTG checks and annual CASA recertification.
2. ELITE or AeroGuidance Synthetic Trainer (Capital Expenditure \$15,000.00 AUD)
  - a. Desktop PC driven
  - b. Computer displays for visual system, which generally just display a generic instrument panel and some horizon.
  - c. Generic flight controls
  - d. Generic radio stack
  - e. Two-year fidelity check for ongoing certification.

The disparity between the training benefit that a student will gain between these two types of devices is considerable, however the training credits, to the best of my knowledge are equivalent. A solution would be for the regulations to recognise the higher level of complexity, actual aircraft model representation and real training benefits students gain from higher fidelity, static Flight Training Devices as opposed to the generic desktop synthetic trainers that offer identical training credits as the more complex FTDs. It would be beneficial to discuss and for CASA to consider the complexity and aircraft model representation that the more complex static devices offer, and provide regulatory changes that would offer additional training credits in areas such as:

- a. NVFR aeronautical experience (not just the instrument time credits)
- b. Flight Instructor Design Feature Endorsement credits – i.e., Manual Propeller Pitch Control or Retractable Undercarriage (for example, an emergency gear



extension can be performed in DA42 FTD, it cannot be practiced or simulated in the actual aeroplane.

- c. IAP3D (ILS) initial issue for instrument rating flight test

The following table details the credits that both a complex, and aircraft representative FTD such as a TRU Simulation DA42 FFT and a simple generic desktop synthetic trainer can offer. Under the current regulatory system, both can only offer the same level of training credits.

RPL navigation endorsement	1 hour dual instrument time
PPL	1 hour dual instrument time
CPL	5 hours dual instrument time
ATPL	25 hours instrument time 25 hours aeronautical experience
Instrument Rating	10 hours dual instrument time 20 hours instrument time
Private instrument rating	10 hours instrument time
Instrument Proficiency Checks	1 instrument approach 2D IAP 3D IAP Azimuth lateral guidance CDI lateral guidance Single pilot operations (IAP, 2D, 3D, Azimuth, CDI)
Instrument Approach Procedures	DGA NDB VOR and VOR/DME RNP APCH LNAV (GNSS) ILS
Night VFR Rating (aeroplane)	2 hour dual instrument time