



**CLASS 5 MEDICAL SELF DECLARATION POST IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW (PIR)
ASAP TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP
TASKING INSTRUCTIONS and REPORT
19 November 2025**

The Class 5 Medical Self-declaration PIR TWG is established and operates in accordance with the Terms of Reference of the Aviation Safety Advisory Panel (ASAP) dated June 2025 (or as amended).

MEMBERSHIP

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

The TWG consists of the following members:

- David Anderson
- Marty Peters
- Myles Breitreutz
- Michael Cleaver
- Andy Mulholland
- An Rendell
- Christopher Thorpe
- Steve Hitchen
- Dr Jeremy Robertson

CASA was represented by:

- Dr Kate Manderson
- Michelle Massey

The ASAP Secretariat was represented by Kirstin Pierpoint.

MEETING SUMMARY – 19 November 2025

Key Themes

1. Maximum Take-Off Weight (MTOW)

- The TWG was asked if they supported the MTOW. The TWG noted the current MTOW limit of 2000 kgs aligns with the risk profile and simplicity principles underpinning Class 5 Medical Self-declaration (Class 5), in that, MTOW is the proxy marker for acceptable speed, complexity, ground impact risk and coverage of the aircraft register. This MTOW brings Australia in line with the UK.
- TWG members questioned the MTOW set this level and it was explained that, in part, this was also chosen to align with principles of structural robustness for impact tolerance for buildings, that are based on motor vehicle impacts of similar sizes.
- It was noted that the 2000kg measure captures approximately 76% of the Australian civil aircraft register.
- Recommendations to ASAP:
 - TWG members agreed to maintain 2000kg MTOW.
 - Note industry interest in future alignment with MOSAIC standards and consider this in future Class 4 development.

2. Persons on Board (POB)

- The TWG was asked if they supported an increased POB limit to four with a safety pilot.
- Members were supportive of the increased POB to 4 people on board as the standard without a

safety pilot.

- The TWG noted the broad intent of the measure is for the private VFR single engine sector.
- TWG members suggested two pilots could create operational complexity, and that two pilots seemed to be an over-effective risk mitigator to allow the carriage of 4 POB.
- It was noted that the current limit of 2 POB aligns with RAAus.
- One TWG member suggested that family members should be a consideration for increased POB. The TWG provided strong feedback supporting four POB for family and cost-sharing purposes.
- TWG members agreed risk mitigation through aircraft type and operational context was sufficient.
- Recommendations to ASAP:
 - Increase POB to four without requiring a safety pilot. Maintaining the alignment with recreational intent and simplicity of Class 5.

3. Altitude Limit

- The TWG was advised an altitude of 10,000ft has always been a limit based on aviation medicine and hypoxia risk.
- The TWG discussed survey suggestions to include oxygen in the aircraft if pilots plan to go above 10,000ft. The TWG discussed that the general intent of Class 5 was to try and cover what the majority of people can do the majority of time, with further discussion on this to be addressed as part of any Class 4 medical.
- It was noted that one TWG member would like to expand altitude limits with specifications.
- A TWG member noted that glider pilots have always done high altitude flights under a self-declaration or medical practitioner approval with regulations and a specific training syllabus providing the safeguard. Even if Class 5 is not suitable for this sector there are still existing processes that are in place that can be used.
- The TWG noted the current altitude limit is supported by aviation medicine principles and existing regulations.
- Recommendations to ASAP:
 - The TWG recommends retaining the 10,000ft altitude limit.
 - One TWG member did hold dissenting views from gliding and powered aircraft sectors advocating for supplemental oxygen use above 10,000ft.
 - The TWG suggested a future review under Class 4 framework.

4. Airspace Access

- The TWG provided strong support for maintaining current access.
- Recommendations to ASAP:
 - Maintain current airspace access provisions.

5. Aerobatics

- The TWG was supportive of Class 5 being used for recreational aerobatics with solo operations. The TWG noted the measure is mitigated by existing regulations (e.g. non-built-up areas, solo operations).
- The TWG was advised that respondents to the consultation that wished aerobatics to be permitted agreed that solo operations over non-built up areas, with no air shows or public displays, was an appropriate risk mitigator.
- The TWG noted that aerobatics was not permitted in RAAus.
- The TWG suggested excluding competition and display aerobatics.
- Recommendations to ASAP:
 - Permit recreational aerobatics with no passengers, exclude aerobatic displays and competition aerobatics under Class 5.

6. Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and Night VMC

- The TWG noted the complexity and risk of IFR and night operations are not aligned with the Class 5 medical standard.
- The TWG agreed with consultation feedback that suggested these measures could be considered

under Class 4.

- Recommendations to ASAP:
 - Retain Day VFR limitation.
 - Consider IFR and night VMC under future Class 4 development.

7. Formation Flying

- The TWG discussed that they saw limited safety concerns in a Class 5 being used for formation flying. The TWG discussed that a second person in the aircraft may improve safety by providing an extra look-out.
- The TWG noted this measure is supported by experience and international practice. They discussed the size of formation should not be a barrier as individual pilots are only formed up against a maximum of three other aircraft regardless of the size of the total formation.
- Members of the TWG agreed that any issues with depth perception concerns are mitigated by training and discipline.
- Recommendations to ASAP:
 - Permit recreational formation flying under Class 5 allowing up to two POB.
 - The TWG agreed that formation aerobatics should be excluded.
 - Participation in air shows should be permitted subject to existing CASA safety controls. One TWG member opposed this view.
 - The TWG recommend CASA review medical standards for air show participation.

8. Medical Eligibility Criteria

- The TWG considered a suggestion to amend Class 5 eligibility criteria to allow applicants with previously diagnosed condition/s, that are now cleared, who have had their previous medicals cancelled/refused to be eligible for Class 5.
- Noting that the current restriction excludes individuals with resolved medical conditions, the TWG discussed and supported allowing a Class 5 medical if the individual's most recent medical was not refused or cancelled.
- One member noted that moving from a Class 2 immediately to a Class 5 assists with case management and oversight.
- Recommendations to ASAP:
 - The TWG would like to recommend that the current regulations are amended to remove the restriction or eligibility barrier that a pilot must never have had a Class 1, 2 or 3 cancelled or refused.
 - It was also recommended that CASA update guidance and training materials to support safe self-assessment, encouraging pilots to see a GP where appropriate.

9. ADHD and Stimulant Medication

- The TWG discussed the position to permit use of stimulant medication for ADHD under Class 5.
- The current regulations were developed from CASR Part 99 and DAMP testing, however, medical development suggests this may now be appropriate to consider.
- One TWG member agreed that currently available medical evidence would assist to build a safety case, and that it would be an appropriate change.
- The TWG advised this was supported by current medical evidence and alignment with driver licensing standards.
- One TWG member asked why this can't apply to other neurodiverse presentations? It was clarified that the medical condition didn't prevent people from flying, it was the use of the medication that was being considered.
- The TWG agreed and supports the inclusion and safety.
- Recommendations to ASAP:
 - Remove restriction on stimulant medication for ADHD.
 - Update guidance and training materials to support the safe use and self-assessment of ADHD medications.

○
Next Steps

- The secretariat to prepare draft report for TWG review.
- The final report will be submitted to ASAP for consideration.
- ASAP determine whether to provide formal advice to CASA’s Director of Aviation Safety.

PROCESS FOR ACHIEVING CONSENSUS

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

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

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

SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES –Report 1, 19 November 2025

Topic 1 – Maximum Take-Off Weight (MTOW)

FULL CONSENSUS / GENERAL CONSENSUS / DISSENT

Comments:

- TWG members agreed to maintain 2000kg MTOW.
- Note industry interest in future alignment with Mosaic standards and consider this in future Class 4 development

Topic 2 – Persons on Board (POB)

FULL CONSENSUS / GENERAL CONSENSUS / DISSENT

Comments:

The TWG recommended

- Increasing POB to four without requiring a safety pilot. Maintaining the alignment with recreational intent and simplicity of Class 5.

Topic 3 – Altitude Limit

FULL CONSENSUS / GENERAL CONSENSUS / DISSENT

Comments:

- The TWG recommends retaining the 10,000ft altitude limit.
 - One TWG member did hold dissenting views from gliding and powered aircraft sectors advocating for supplemental oxygen use above 10,000ft.
 - The TWG suggested a future review under Class 4 framework.

Topic 4 – Airspace Access

FULL CONSENSUS / GENERAL CONSENSUS / DISSENT

Comments:

- The TWG recommended maintaining current airspace access provisions.

Topic 5 – Aerobatics

FULL CONSENSUS / GENERAL CONSENSUS / DISSENT

Comments:

The TWG recommended:

- permitting recreational aerobatics with no passengers, and excluding aerobatic displays and competition aerobatics under Class 5.
- Following the meeting, absentee feedback was accepted by one member who opposed the permission of recreational aerobatics due to potential G force impact on the pilot. The member noted general consensus of the TWG.

Topic 6 – Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and Night VMC

FULL CONSENSUS / GENERAL CONSENSUS / DISSENT

Comments:

The TWG recommended:

- Retaining Day VFR limitation.
- Considering IFR and night VMC under future Class 4 development.

Topic 7 – Formation Flying

FULL CONSENSUS / GENERAL CONSENSUS / DISSENT

Comments:

The TWG recommended:

- Permitting recreational formation flying under Class 5 allowing up to two POB.
- The TWG agreed that formation aerobatics should be excluded.
- Participation in air shows should be permitted subject to existing CASA safety controls. One TWG member opposed this view..
- The TWG recommend CASA review medical standards for air show participation.
- Following the meeting absentee feedback was accepted by one member who opposed the permission of formation flying on a Class 5 medical self-declaration. The member noted general consensus of the TWG.

Topic 8 – Medical Eligibility Criteria

FULL CONSENSUS / GENERAL CONSENSUS / DISSENT

Comments:

The TWG recommended:

- Current regulations are amended to remove the restriction or eligibility barrier that a pilot must never have had a Class 1, 2 or 3 cancelled or refused.
- It was also recommended that CASA update guidance and training materials to support safe self-assessment, encouraging pilots to see a GP where appropriate.

Topic 9 – ADHD and Stimulant Medication

FULL CONSENSUS / GENERAL CONSENSUS / DISSENT

Comments:

The TWG recommended:

- Removing restriction on stimulant medication for ADHD.
- Updating guidance and training materials to support the safe use and self-assessment of ADHD medications.

CASA Lead Summary

Dr Kate Manderson

Comment:

The TWG provided an insightful, well-informed and comprehensive analysis of the issues. Ample opportunity was provided to present each participant's position and to discuss the relevant considerations. In CASA's opinion, the recorded outcomes are a fair representation of the TWG deliberations and recommendations.

ASAP Members Comment

Comment:

Appendices

- **Appendix 1 - ASAP and TWG Terms of Reference regarding Consensus (Extract)**
- **Appendix 2 – Class 5 Medical Self-Determination PIR TWG Tasking Instructions**

Appendix 1

ASAP and TWG Terms of Reference regarding Consensus (Extract)

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

Determining and Documenting Consensus

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