



Comment-Response Document 2013-01(B)

Embodiment of safety management system (SMS) requirements into Commission Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 — SMS in Part-M

CRD TO NPA 2013-01(B) — RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I — 12.5.2016

Related Opinion: 06/2016

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Comment-Response Document (CRD) contains the comments received on NPA 2013-01(B), published on 21 January 2013, and the responses provided thereto by EASA.

Based on the analysis of comments and on additional focused stakeholder consultation, Opinion No 06/2016 is developed.

Said Opinion introduces safety management in continuing airworthiness management through the creation of a new Annex Vc (Part-CAMO) to Commission Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 dedicated to continuing airworthiness management organisations (CAMOs), which are managing aircraft operated by licensed air carriers and/or complex motor-powered aircraft (CMPA), representing an estimated 65 % of all currently approved CAMOs. Only Part-CAMO-approved CAMOs will be required to implement SMS based on a set of proportional management system requirements.

The new Annex Vc (Part-CAMO) will supersede the current Subpart G of Annex I (Part-M) to Commission Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014. The changes introduced to the Part-M Subpart G requirements are globally aligned with the general authority and organisation requirements adopted in the other domains (Aircrew, Air Operations, ADR, ATM/ANS).

Applicability		Process map	
Affected regulations and decisions:	Commission Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014; Commission Regulation (EU) No 748/2012; Decision 2015/029/R	Concept paper:	No
Affected stakeholders:	Air operators; CAMOs; competent authorities	Terms of reference (Issue 2):	25.2.2016
Driver/origin:	Safety	Rulemaking group:	No
Reference:	N/A	RIA type:	Full
		Technical consultation during NPA drafting:	No
		Publication date of the NPA:	21.1.2013
		Duration of NPA consultation:	4 months
		Review group:	No
		Focused consultation:	Yes
		Publication date of the Opinion:	2016/Q2
		Publication date of the Decision:	2017/Q2



Table of contents

1. Summary of comments and responses	3
2. Individual comments and responses	5



1. Summary of comments and responses

445 comments were received on NPA 2013-01(B) 'Part-M' from interested parties, mainly from industry, and a small number of individual commenters, representing together 75 % of the NPA comments, and from eight NAAs, representing 25 % of the NPA comments.

Industry and individuals:

Association of Dutch Aviation Technicians NVLT
AEA
Aerospace Industries Association
Air France
Airbus
Andreas Keiser
AOPA-Sweden
Baines Simmons Limited
British Gliding Association
Cengiz Turkoglu - City University London
Martinair Flight Academy
DLH and LHT
Europe Air Sports
European Aviation Quality Group (EAQG)
European Sailplane Manufacturers
Federation of Aerospace Enterprises in Ireland
French Aviation Industry Federation (FNAM)-
GAMA
Haitec
Howard Torode
Kaunas Aircraft Maintenance Services
KLM Engineering & Maintenance
Luftsport Verband Bayern / Germany
NFLC, Cranfield University, UK
Northern Aerotech
OGMA
Rega/Swiss Air-Ambulance
Ryanair
SEAS
Stefan Stroeker
SVFB/SAMA
Thomson Airways



Competent authorities:

Austro Control Ltd.
CAA The Netherlands
Direction Générale de l'Aviation Civile, France
Ente Nazionale per l'Aviazione Civile, Italy
Federal Office of Civil Aviation, Switzerland
Finnish Transport Safety Agency
Luftfahrt-Bundesamt
Swedish Transport Agency
United Kingdom CAA

A summary of the comments on NPA 2013-01(A) and NPA 2013-01(B) is provided in the Explanatory Note to Opinion No 06/2016.

Comments made on NPA 2013-01(B) will also be considered in Phase II of RMT.0251 (MDM.055). This concerns in particular the following comments:

368	370	375	376	377	413	378	381	382	384
385	392	388	397	451	452	445	450	172	409
410	276	415	430	424	432	435	436	437	440
184	351								



2. Individual comments and responses

In responding to comments, a standard terminology has been applied to attest the Agency's position. This terminology is as follows:

- (a) **Accepted** — The Agency agrees with the comment and any proposed amendment is wholly transferred to the revised text.
- (b) **Partially accepted** — The Agency either agrees partially with the comment, or agrees with it but the proposed amendment is only partially transferred to the revised text.
- (c) **Noted** — The Agency acknowledges the comment but no change to the existing text is considered necessary.
- (d) **Not accepted** — The comment or proposed amendment is not shared by the Agency.



CRD table of comments and responses

(For the resulting implementing rule text, please refer to Opinion No 06/2016)

(General Comments)

-

comment 42

comment by: SVFB/SAMA

ECOGAS, the "European Council of General and Business Aviation Support"
draft v130430-2341 (repetition of general comments to NPA 2013-01a)

ECOGAS is supporting the approach to address Safety Management with a holistic approach, reducing duplication of different functions of the past to manage safety and integrating QM fully into the SM.

Our comments are based on our MRO members encompassing organisations with one staff up to organisations with more than a few hundred and up to several thousands.

We have no doubt that for major organisations a SM is not only a must but done in the way it is depicted in 2013-01a, it should not only promote safety but could have the cited positive economical effect if done properly.

Our critical comments are mainly targeting SM where it concerns SME's.

The introduction of "complex" organisations is beneficial.

However the past experience with SMS in some NAA's has clearly delivered feedback, that SM for Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) MRO's had no benefit, it only produced a (waste) of paper.

We therefore propose to set the limits where the SM becomes mandatory quite higher for Part M/F and Part 145.

In addition we request more parameters to make the differentiation and to come to tailored solutions.

The approach to have only two categories: small up to 20 and major from 21 up to 20'000 and more is far from proportionate for most SME's.

We propose the following differentiation, also in line with 2012-01 c SMS in 145. Such differentiation would grant safe operation AND promote economical organisations:

Definition: an organisation **unit** is either a Flight Operation, a ATO, part 145, a component shop, a line station , a CAMO etc.

shift-work (with a 3 shift system) 365x24 counts for **2 organisation units**, a 2 shift system for **1 orga unit**.

1) a) Organisation with only **one** organisational unit, no shift work < 200 => **not complex**

b) Organisations with **2** org units > 150 complex

(e.g : just part M/F and a day only two shift system would count for 2 orga units)

c) Organisations with **3** org units > 100 complex (e.g: Part 145 and a full shift system would count for 3 org units)



- d) Organisations with 4 org units > 50 complex
(e.g Part 145, shift system and CAMO, 4 org units > any organisation with > 50 is complex)
- e) Organisations with 5 or more org units > 20 complex
(e.g. ATO, Part 145, CAMO and 3 line stations > any orga with > 20 would be complex)

2) For part M/G there should be given a similar differentiation.

In respect to M/G organisations: the CAMO process can be quite complex overseeing different organisations, locations, operators and so on and a similar set of deciding parameters should be established for CAMO.

An partial alternative approach would be to exempt all activities with aircraft below 5.7 T regardless of their type of Operation, Commercial or non commercial, with the exemption of CAT (Airline and airline like)

Both proposals are taking into account **com(2011) 670 final** from the Commission to the council and the European Parliament¹ and are an expression of a data driven and risk based approach. Currently and for some years to come, the data to change to a data driven approach according this same communication will not be available and it would not be correct to force regulation critical for the economical survival on SME's without proved data.

For organisations with <10 a statement of the owner and a straightforward explanation as to how the owner is assuring safety withing his organisation should satisfy the requirement. .

Such description should be no more than 1 to 3 pages for organisations with up to 10 staff, about 10 pages up to 50. This should remain a user friendly set of pages of organisations up to 100 staff. Thereafter the processes are due to dimension, distances and staff involved justifying more voluminous paperwork, as there will be dedicated staff to prepare, promote and train the material successfully.

We will only comment few details of the NPA 2013-1a,b,c itself and only where we see a priority need, because in general the description is well designed and understandable.

Many of the well intended proposals will remain without the intended economical effect due to wrong limits set in the basic regulation elsewhere.

This problem would be solved by mandating all aircraft up to 5.7 T to cabable part M/F MRO's as long as they stay below the above given limits. This would leave airlines and charter MRO's to the 145 where they belong to. It would also need further transfer of Part M themes into 145, a reduction of Part M for Business Aviation and a much simpler Part M light for leisure aviation.

If this is not done most organisations will remain with the part 145 in order to keep the glider towing, the sightseeing and the ATO training aircraft as their clients und thus imposing on them the regulation well adapted for organisations > 200 staff.

1



	<p>This sharing of effort and concentration on identified issues will lead to action being taken cross the Union in a coordinated fashion, thus leading to a joined-up approach to safety management. Such an approach will lead to legislation and guidance material being focused on the issues that can make a difference, on oversight targeted on areas of greatest safety significance, and on research and recommendations being directed accurately at the high risk areas. It will also ensure the best use of limited resources by focusing them on those areas where greatest safety benefits can be achieved.</p>
response	<p>Same as comment #147 on NPA 2013-01 (C) 'Part-145'.</p> <p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>Regarding the types of operations that should be considered as commercial operations and commercial air transport (CAT), CAT —for the purpose of Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014— only refers to the operations of licensed air carriers (Regulation (EC) No 1008/2008).</p> <p>On the issue of proportionality, it is important to note that, unlike the ICAO SMS framework, the EASA management system framework proposed with NPA 2013-01(B) provides maximum flexibility to industry as all detailed provisions on safety risk management, compliance monitoring, safety training and communication, are included at AMC level. This ensures that the provisions can be applied whatever the size, nature and complexity of the organisation. The proposed degrees of complexity are in fact elements to be considered under the organisation's safety risk management.</p> <p>Regarding the impact of SMS on small organisations not involved in maintenance or continuing airworthiness management of large aircraft or aircraft used for CAT, the comment is accepted: the related opinion will not impose the implementation of SMS on those organisations. They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements. In addition, the new 'light' Part-M will introduce further alleviations for all ELA2 aircraft and for helicopters certified for up to four occupants and up to 1 200 kg maximum take-off mass (MTOM), <u>regardless of the type of operation</u>. Organisations involved in the continuing airworthiness management of complex motor-powered aircraft (CMPA) or aircraft used for CAT will be required to implement a management system including safety risk management processes, as defined in the new Part-CAMO.</p>
comment	<p>81 comment by: <i>René Meier, Europe Air Sports</i></p> <p>As a general remark to start with Europe Air Sports, European Powered Flying Union (EPFU), and the Aero-Club of Switzerland do hope that the work done by the "Part-M for General Aviation Task Force" will immediately be integrated in all relevant positions and that for a considerable time from now on no new changes arrive.</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <p>Up to now the entirety of the General Aviation community suffered enormously under the provisions of by Part-M. We urgently need alleviations considering the complexity of our operations.</p>



	<p>Reading what is proposed we still have the feeling to be confronted with a draft based to a great extent on the assumptions "commercial air transport". The requirements for General Aviation operations, particularly of sports and recreational activities, are not taken in account.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The related opinion will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in continuing airworthiness management of CAT aircraft or CMPA). They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements.</p> <p>In addition, the new 'light' Part-M (RMT.0547) will introduce further alleviations for all ELA2 aircraft and for helicopters certified for up to four occupants and up to 1 200 kg MTOM, <u>regardless of the type of operation</u>.</p>
comment	<p>87 comment by: <i>Luftfahrt-Bundesamt</i></p> <p>General comment</p> <p>The LBA is aware of the fact that Annex 19 to the ICAO Convention requires the implementation of a Safety Management System (SMS) in more or less every organisation involved in civil aviation activities. This also includes organisations covered by Commission Regulation (EC) No 1321/2014.</p> <p>However, experience made with the implementation of an SMS in larger organisations (mainly air carriers) shows that a certain size of an organisation is needed i.e. for providing a solid source of information leading to an adequate level of statistical integrity of data necessary for successfully running an SMS. The same arguments apply as far as the role of the supervising authority is concerned.</p> <p>This means that the application of SMS requirements to smaller maintenance organisations or CAMOs may lead to proportionality problems as these organisations will not be able to derive data from their activities in such a way that statistical certainty is achieved. Consequently, NAAs will run into problems as far as approving and surveying these systems is concerned. These circumstances were, in our view, one major outcome of the EASA Safety Conference 'SAFETY COVERSIGHT: Managing Safety in a Performance Based Regulatory Environment' which was held in Cologne from 10 to 11 October 2012.</p> <p>We therefore recommend not to apply strictly the SMS rules for smaller organisations. Instead, it may be sufficient to acknowledge that, in this case, the Quality/Management System requirements within Commission Regulation (EC) No 1321/2014 are adequate to fulfil the ICAO SMS constraints. Insofar, it may be necessary to collaborate on the issue with ICAO accordingly.</p> <p>Taking account of the above, we really doubt that the introduction of SMS rules for smaller organisations will increase safety but we are sure that corresponding rules will put further bureaucratic burdens on NAAs and the companies themselves. This should be avoided, taking account of the limited staff resources within the NAA's organisations.</p>
response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>The related opinion will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in continuing airworthiness management of CAT</p>



aircraft or CMPA). They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements.

For the other CAMOs, SMS is proposed to be implemented in the form of general management system requirements complemented by specific acceptable means of compliance (AMCs) with more detailed provisions. This aims to ensure that the additional safety-management-related tasks can build upon the existing quality system. The general principle is to ‘upgrade’ the existing management systems for aviation safety by complementing them with specific elements to proactively identify hazards and manage the related risks. This will certainly entail transition costs, but these can be compensated as the system will also increase organisational efficiency by reducing threats and errors and maximising opportunities for improvement. The implementation of these safety-management-related policies and processes will also be required to ensure effective compliance with Regulation (EU) No 376/2014.

Regarding proportionality, unlike the ICAO Annex 19 SMS framework, the management system framework proposed by EASA allows for much more flexibility for industry to implement the new provisions as they see fit. The genuinely new management-system-related elements are hazard identification, safety risk management and taking effective risk mitigation actions. The related AMCs will not propose any specific standard methodology for the organisation to acquire safety data or to assess risks. The only prescriptive element included in relation to hazard identification is the establishment of an internal safety reporting scheme. Moreover, it should be considered that the management of safety must not only focus on operational aspects, it also needs to address organisational and systemic aspects, and there is potential in any type of organisation to assess its system and processes, including changes thereto, in order to identify risks and opportunities. This is important for organisations to define their own specific performance requirements as a basis for defining related performance metrics and data needs.

In view of ensuring efficient use of resources at the level of industry and competent authorities, EASA strives to ensure consistency in organisation approvals through the application of the same basic management system requirements in the different domains: through the adoption of a common management system framework, the implementation of safety management processes will be facilitated for those organisations holding more than one approval and safety risks stemming from the interfaces between these organisations will be better managed. In the same way, competent authority procedures can be streamlined on the basis of common core authority requirements applicable across domains.

comment	201	comment by: Airbus
response	<p>Please find attached compilation of all Airbus comments on NPA 2013.01.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>To ensure traceability, all individual Airbus comments to NPA 2013-01(B) have been</p>	



entered individually into the CRT and are included in the core part of this CRD.

comment 203

comment by: *British Gliding Association*

BGA Comments NPA 2013-01 (B) SMS

General comments

British Gliding Association

How small organisations are to resource and deliver Human Factors training is unclear as many will not have the resources in time or money to support it. This training should be offered by the competent authority at no or very little cost to the participant as part of the Part 66 licence. Larger organisations should use Part 147 training.

The whole concept is reinforcing the argument for a Part M “light” for aircraft not involved in commercial air transport irrespective on the size of complexity of the organisation.

Changing the term “Quality System” to “Management System” is ill founded. Everyone concerned with aircraft maintenance understands what “Quality” means in its various functions; “Management” means something completely different and is more aligned with the running of the organisation.

It appears that this NPA has not taken in account the currently running NPA 2012-17 and NPA 2012-15 both of which have implications on this NPA.

The NPA introduces a second Human Factors syllabus to that proposed in NPA 2012-15 “L” License again supporting the argument to make this NPA applicable only to complex aircraft and CAT.

response

Partially accepted.

NPA 2012-17 ‘Part-M General Aviation Task Force (Phase I)’ and subsequent work on Phase II have been considered in the development of the related opinion.

The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT and are not managing CMPA). Linked to that, those organisations will not have to introduce human factors (HF) training nor assess HF-related competences of their staff. They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements.

NPA 2012-15 ‘B2L and L licences’ defines the HF-related elements that should form part of the Part-66 training syllabus for the new B2L and B3 licences; it does not propose any changes to Part-M.

Regarding the term ‘quality system’ changed to ‘management system’:

Organisations involved in continuing airworthiness management of CMPA or aircraft used for CAT will be required to implement a management system including safety risk management processes, as defined in the new Part-CAMO, aligned with that already applicable in the area of aircrew and air operations. All other organisations, which are eligible for the new Part-CAO, will see no major changes to the existing Section A requirements.

The Part-CAMO management system builds upon those elements that are already in place today in any approved organisation, i.e. the quality-system-related provisions that deliver



the ‘compliance monitoring function’ of the new management system requirements. As current provisions related to ‘quality system’ deal with the monitoring of compliance, related reporting and corrective action processes, for the introduction of additional safety-management-related functions (such as safety risk management), it is proposed to adopt more neutral language at implementing rule (IR) level. This also considers that there are multiple types of quality systems defined in different international or national standards, with different meanings and scopes. It is, therefore, proposed to refer to a ‘compliance monitoring function’ instead of ‘quality system’ that, together with the other required functions and processes, make up the organisation’s management system for safety. This is aligned with existing provisions in the areas of aircrew and air operations (see ORA.GEN.200 in Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 as amended by Regulation (EU) No 290/2012 and ORO.GEN.200 in Regulation (EU) No 965/2012).

As stated in the Explanatory Note of NPA 2013-01(B) ‘Part-M’, this change to terminology at IR level does not require organisations to change the designations of their quality system personnel or department: it is left to the organisation to decide how to refer to this function and to determine the most suitable organisational set-up allowing to manage all functions required by the new Part-CAMO. This is why the related opinion proposes to embed the safety-management-related functions into the general management system provisions, which provide flexibility for organisations to implement these as they see fit. This aims to ensure flexibility for organisations in terms of organisational aspects.

comment	<p>243 comment by: Thomson Airways</p> <p>In principle this NPA is supported in its entirety with a few minor comments. It is good that EASA are now making common rulemaking proposals across the different rulemaking areas.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p>

comment	<p>260 comment by: FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation</p> <p>There is a real lack of readiness in this NPA. The requirements always refer to the principles of Part-145 regulation. Therefore, the FNAM is asking to the EASA to bring this regulation clearer for the organisations which will have to apply it.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The text will be reviewed to ensure that it properly reflects the scope of NPA 2013-01(B).</p>

comment	<p>272 comment by: AIR FRANCE</p> <p>AFR Comments : Risk assessment is the core of this revision, therefore nowhere it is defined through an AMC or GM some methods to address risk assessment. We suggest to</p>
---------	--



response	<p>introduce a dedicated AMC or GM related to risk assessment method or to initiate a EASA Workshop on this subject.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>A dedicated guidance material (GM) on safety risk assessment was included in NPA 2013-01(C) (refer to GM3 145.A.65(a)(3)), and it was referenced in NPA 2013-01(B) under GM1 M.A.712(a)(3).</p> <p>The safety-risk-management-related AMCs will not propose any specific standard methodology for the organisation to acquire safety data or to assess risks. This provides organisations with flexibility to adopt tools and methods that fit their specific needs and to define their own specific performance requirements.</p> <p>EASA will support the implementation of SMS in the area of continuing airworthiness through the development of safety promotion material to facilitate the development of procedures and tools addressing hazard identification, risk assessment, performance measurement and safety communication within organisations.</p> <p>A safety promotion task will be proposed for the planning cycle 2017–2021.</p>
comment	<p>273 comment by: AIR FRANCE</p>
response	<p>AFR Comments : The term "Just culture" is not state of the art. The just culture only deals with personnel behaviour in case of error or violation. We suggest to implement the "just and fair culture" instead of "just culture" which takes into account the personnel behavior and environment issues (Quality documentation, organization...).</p>
response	<p>Same as comment #465 on NPA 2013-01(C).</p> <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The terminology used in Regulation (EU) No 376/2014 should be used:</p> <p>“‘just culture’ means a culture in which front-line operators or other persons are not punished for actions, omissions or decisions taken by them that are commensurate with their experience and training, but in which gross negligence, wilful violations and destructive acts are not tolerated;’</p> <p>‘Just and fair culture’ is not used either in the ICAO Safety Management Manual (Doc 9859).</p>
comment	<p>279 comment by: UK CAA</p>
	<p>Please note that the UK CAA provides the document page number against the comment to which it relates to facilitate ease of entering the comments on the CRT. However, it appears that the page numbers on the CRT document do not match up with the page</p>



	numbers on the document on the NPA webpage. UK CAA have adjusted the page numbers against their comments according to the CRT.
response	Noted.

comment	292	comment by: <i>European Sailplane Manufacturers</i>
	<p>The European sailplane manufacturers do not suppose the changes as described in this NPA2013-01 - at least not for their sector or organisations dealing only with ELA2 aircraft.</p> <p>The main reasons - also explained in more detail in following comments) are:</p> <p>...No safety benefit for sport and recreational aviation has been proven.</p> <p>...Introduction will make 1321/2014 much more complicated.</p> <p>...Introduction of SMS procedures will result into a modification of organisation manuals for all organisations which means a lot of effort and money.</p> <p>...Within the General Aviation Communities this should be coordinated by regarding bodies (i.e. the General Aviation Part-M Task Force and the General Aviation Group appointed by the management board).</p>	
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The related Opinion will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT and are not managing CMPA). They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements.</p> <p>In addition, the new 'light' Part-M (RMT.0547) will introduce further alleviations for all ELA2 aircraft and for helicopters certified for up to four occupants and up to 1 200 kg MTOM, <u>regardless of the type of operation</u>.</p>	

comment	293	comment by: <i>European Sailplane Manufacturers</i>
	<p>The whole NPA2013-01 is a fine example why EASA rulemaking and associated rules are not appreciated by stakeholders of the General Aviation communities:</p> <p>A) The proposed rule changes are motivated by the needs of commercial air transport. This is a good reason (everyone wants to board an airliner from time to time...), but not for our sector of aviation.</p> <p>B) Studying, analysing and commenting the proposed change is nearly impossible for a person still required to earn money by doing some productive work. NPA2013-01A...30 pages NPA2013-01B...218 pages</p>	



NPA2013-01C...184 pages
 In total this means that for everybody concerned with a CAMO / M/F / 145 organisation there is a need to read through more than 400 pages of text!!!!!!!
 This by far exceeds the possibilities of small organisations which would be affected.
 (And we believe it also exceeds the possibilities of other stakeholders, including NAAs...)

C) Possibility of General Aviation stakeholders to influence the text of the NPA was not given.
 It is a shame that the only possibility to influence the outcome of such a fundamental change to 1321/2014 for General Aviation stakeholders is by commenting this NPA. This should be improved by giving at least the General Aviation Part-M Task Force and the still to be appointed General Aviation Group a possibility to participate before such a NPA is being published.

Therefore the sailplane manufacturers can only offer their displeasure in the regard of how this NPA was prepared and published.

Additionally it has to be understood that this exactly is the way to introduce disproportionate rules which will after some time need just another "improvement" by more rulemaking activities. (At least good time for rulemakers...)

response

Same as comments #538 on NPA 2013-01(C).

Partially accepted.

The comment on the **extent of the NPA** is noted; however, EASA chose to segregate NPA 2013-01 in three batches (NPA (A), (B) and (C)) to allow stakeholders to identify those elements that are most relevant to them. Detailed lists were provided identifying the provisions that are fully aligned between Part-M and Part-145, thus allowing commenters to limit the extent of material to be reviewed. Also, all elements that are fully aligned with the corresponding authority and organisation requirements contained in the rules applicable to aircrew and air operations (Regulations (EU) Nos 209/2012 and 965/2012 respectively) have been duly identified.

The **Part-M General Aviation Task Force** was represented by ECOGAS in the Focused Consultation Group, which was established to assist EASA with the drafting of the opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I. In addition, it was consulted on the applicability of SMS and its recommendations were considered for the related opinion: the implementation of SMS will not be required for General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT and are not managing CMPA). They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements.

Finally, the new 'light' Part-M (RMT.0547) will introduce further alleviations for all ELA2 aircraft and for helicopters certified for up to four occupants and up to 1 200 kg MTOM, regardless of the type of operation.

comment

301

comment by: *European Sailplane Manufacturers*



For the European sailplane manufacturers there are some fundamental flaws in the proposed changes regarding introduction of SMS procedures.

A) Again Part-M gets much more complicated.

This was THE MAIN concern General Aviation stakeholders gave during the workshop in October 2011.

Since 2008, when 1321/2014 became the applicable rule for continuing airworthiness including non-commercial aviation, the majority of problems being discussed has been the too complex rule structure and that neither NAAs nor the "industry" (mostly small to very small organisations) fully understand the rule.

B) Proportionality is not there.

Admittedly some concepts have been included into NPA2013-01 (A, B and C) to alleviate the load for small / simple organisations.

But these alleviations still include the need to install additional procedures which will in parallel mean that the according approvals and manuals have to be amended, additional tasks will have to be fulfilled, etc..

If it is taken into account that the whole concept has been motivated only by the needs of commercial air transport, it has to be seen that this change is not proportionate for the sport and recreational flying sector.

C) Proposed changes in the GM / AMC will not be understood.

A large effort has been spent to explain in the GM / AMC the way how SMS shall be introduced.

Unfortunately this will be in English language only as this material will not be translated into the different languages.

But when making rules for the typical small organisations of the sport and recreational flying sector, it has to be understood, that here often persons are working who really know how to improve safety in aviation, but which do not necessarily understand English language.

Therefore the proposed changes will not be understood and consequently cannot function as intended.

Therefore the sailplane manufacturers oppose the proposed rule amendments until these shortcomings have been addressed properly.

Additionally we demand that this issue will be discussed and solutions found in the regarding bodies (Part-M Task Force and General Aviation Group).

response

Accepted.

The **Part-M General Aviation Task Force** was represented by ECOGAS in the Focused Consultation Group, which was established to assist EASA with the drafting of the related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I.

In addition, the Group was consulted on the applicability of SMS and its recommendations were considered in the development of the related opinion: the implementation of an SMS will not be required for General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in continuing airworthiness management of CAT aircraft or CMPA). They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements.



Finally, the new 'light' Part-M (RMT.0547 — Opinion No 05/2016) will introduce further alleviations for all ELA2 aircraft and for helicopters certified for up to four occupants and up to 1 200 kg MTOM, regardless of the type of operation.

comment 318 comment by: *Federal Office of Civil Aviation, FOCA, Switzerland*

A common Management System for organisations is very much appreciated. Using a common wording for the same issue throughout the EASA regulation is also appreciated.

response Noted.

comment 326 comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation*

FNAM (Fédération Nationale de l'Aviation Marchande) is the French National Professional Union / Trade Association for Air Transport, grouping as full-members:

- CSTA: French Airlines Professional Union (incl. Air France)
- SNEH: French Helicopters Operators Professional Union
- CSAE: French Handling Operators Professional Union
- GIPAG: French General Aviation Operators Professional Union
- GPMA: French Ground Operations Operators Professional Union
- EBAA France: French Business Airlines Professional Union

And as associated members:

- SAMERA: French Airport Material Handling & Catering Professional Union
- UAF: French Airports Professional Union

Introduction

The NPA 2013-01 introduces many changes in comparison with

- The Commission Regulation (EC) No 1321/2014;
- The Decision No 2003/19/RM;
- The Acceptable Means of Compliance and Guidance Material related to Commission Regulation (EC) No 1321/2014.

The comments hereafter SHALL BE considered as an identification of some of the major issues the FNAM asks EASA to discuss with third-parties before any publication of the proposed regulation.

In consequence, the comments hereafter SHALL NOT BE considered:

- As a recognition of the third-parties consultation process carried out by the European Parliament and of the Council;
- As an acceptance or an acknowledgement of the proposed regulation, as a whole or of any part of it;
- As exhaustive: the fact that some articles (or any part of them) are not commented does not mean the FNAM has (or may have) no comments about them, neither the FNAM accepts or acknowledges them All the following comments are thus limited to our understanding of the effectively published proposed regulation, notwithstanding their consistency with any other pieces of regulation.

FNAM General Comments

The implementation of the Safety Management System (SMS) within the Part-M and Part-



145 organisations is a vast programme. All organisations, complex and non-complex ones will be affected by this future regulation. It will have a real economic impact on them and will increase the workload due to the high number of new requirements which will need to be implemented.

The success of this future regulation implementation depends on the flexibility given to the organisations and how it will be integrated to the organization's work activities.

The FNAM welcomes this NPA considering that this latter will imply a strengthening of the harmonisation and the Level Playing Field within the European States thanks to the enforcing of their same level of safety.

In order to give to the EASA the point of views of the members of the FNAM, you will find below the general comments.

The FNAM is considering the following axes to enhance the project of regulation of the Commission:

1. The transition period to implement the new requirements should be extended to a longer period due to high volume of changes it represents;
2. The perimeter of application of this NPA has to be redefined and a more specific classification of the type of organisations should be achieved;
3. The Human Factor principles should be reconsidered;
4. The coherence with already existing SMS in other fields (Flight Operations, Approved Training Organisation..) should be made.

These axes are detailed below.

1. The transition measured schedule to implement the new requirements should be extended to a longer period due to high volume of changes it represents

The SMS will bring many changes within the organization of the companies. It has to be more progressive in order not to bring an administrative burden to these latter. The number of requirements enhanced by this NPA will generate an increase of work and of resources to satisfy them.

For instance,

☐☐ New responsibilities are assigned to the Safety Manager which involve new technical knowledges from him/her: *"The organisation should identify a person who fulfils the role of safety manager, and who is responsible for coordinating all safety management related processes and tasks. This person may be the accountable manager, or a person with an operational role in the organisation."* (AMC1 M.A.616(a)). Any organization will have to train their proper manager or find a new manager with the appropriated level of knowledges. This action will require time and will lead to additional costs for the organisations. This is not appropriate considering their actual economic situation.

☐☐ A risk assessment has to be carried out before each operational changes, major organisational changes, changes in key personnel, and changes that may affect the maintenance, ect. However, all these analysis will require a colossal work from the organisations and will involve an increase of the resources. It may be even more difficult for the SME to undertake this assessment analysis. Thus, the FNAM is asking to the EASA to give to the organisations a certain level of flexibility on the identification of items on which risk assessment has to be established.

Additional time should be given to the organisations in order to allow them to be able to adapt their structure to the new requirements. It will help the organisation to show full compliance with the new management system. Thus, the FNAM is asking to the EASA to review the transition period and take benefit from this additional time to deepen the RIA.

2. The perimeter of application of this NPA has to be redefined and a more specific classification of the type of organisations should be achieved



EASA has recognized that the approach has to be different for complex and non-complex organisations. The FNAM welcomes this approach. Therefore, some changes may be required.

The FNAM noticed that the new requirements issued under the Implementing Rules between the non-complex organisations and the complex organisations are not so different. Too many requirements are imposed to the non-complex organisations which will be not economically affordable and where the efficiency of the flight safety in terms of costs it will require is not proven.

First of all, the FNAM is recommending to exclude the organisations belonging to General Aviation maintenance activities from the perimeter of the SMS requirements added through this NPA in the Commission Regulation (EC) No 1321/2014 (Part-M/F and Part-M/G). Indeed, it would be far too complicated for these organisations to implement the SMS requirements as requested by the NPA. It would involve heavy economic consequences without proven safety efficiency. At least, some major alleviation are requested.

Secondly, the boundaries between complex and non complex organisations are far too narrow. Only two classifications (complex and non-complex) of organisations are not enough. There is a too high gap in the organisations described as a complex organisation. It can go from an organisation having 20 FTE for Part-M Subpart F and Part-145 organisations or 10 FTE for Part-M Subpart G to 20,000 FTE or more for the major organisations.

The FNAM emphasises the importance to well proportionate the requirements of the implementation of the new management system according to various factors, such as the number of employees, number of certificates held, number of bases, different types of equipments operated as well as the operational environment, must be considered. It can not just be proportionate to the number of FTE. Thus the FNAM is asking to create three categories of organisations (small, medium and large ones) which will depend on the factors just described above and which will allow a better differentiation on the number and consistence of requirements.

3. The Human Factor principles should be reconsidered

New requirements catch the FNAM's attention. In "AMC2 145.A.47(b) Production planning", it is stating that :

"(b) Reasonable work hour limits should not be exceeded merely for management convenience even when staff is willing to work extended hours. When maximum work hours are exceeded, the organisation and the individual staff member should have a written plan on how the fatigue risk will be mitigated. This may include:

(1) additional supervision and independent inspection;

(2) limitation of tasks to non-safety critical;

(3) use of additional rest breaks; and

(4) permission to nap in accordance with guidelines approved by the organisation."

The FNAM is asking to precisely define what is "Reasonable work hour".

The FNAM reminds that the European Union has already established work and rest time limits and their minimum standard in the "Directive 2003/88/EC" and in the "Directive 2000/79/EC". It is not from the scope of the EASA to establish social requirements but it belongs to the States sovereignty. The FNAM is requesting to remove those principles from the SMS requirements.

4. The coherence with already existing SMS in other fields (Flight Operations, Approved Training Organisation...) should be made.

An organisation can hold several types of certificates. As it is stated in the following paragraph: *"(c) Where the organisation holds one or more additional organisation certificates within the scope of Regulation (EC) 216/2008, the management system may be*



combined or integrated with that required under the additional certificate(s) held" (M.A.616 Management system). The FNAM is asking to the EASA to define the words "combined" and "integrated" in order to avoid any misinterpretation. The FNAM is suggesting that each organization should have the flexibility to decide which type of organizational structure it wants to establish. In particular for the small organisations, it would be more manageable for them to have only of SMS structure which gathers the monitoring of their different types of certificates. The interfacing of the different SMS by activities within an organisation would make the system more efficient and would involve less administrative load.

The FNAM is asking for a complete interfacing and cohesion between the SMS requirements of the:

- Regulation (EU) N° 1178/2011,
- Regulation (EU) N° 965/2012,
- Regulation (EC) N° 1321/2014.

To conclude, through these different axes of enhancement, the FNAM is suggesting to:

- extend the period of transition for implementing the new requirements;
- give some flexibility for the maintenance organisations on the identification of items on which risk assessment has to be established;
- allow the organisations, which hold different types of certificates, to coordinate their SMS organizational structure as it is more convenient for them;
- remove General Aviation maintenance activities from the scope of this NPA (Part-M/F and Part-M/G);
- remove Human Factor principle from the SMS requirements;
- create three categories of organisations with higher boundaries between each of them.

response Same as comment #605 on NPA 2013-01(C).

Noted.

The transition period for the implementation of the new requirements will be defined during the adoption process of the amending regulation, and is expected to be in line with the transition periods for similar amendments applied to other areas. The EASA opinion will include a recommendation to define the transition periods in line with the need to provide sufficient time for organisations to adapt their systems.

Organisations involved in the continuing airworthiness management of CMPA or aircraft used for CAT will be required to implement a management system including safety risk management processes, as defined in the new Part-CAMO, which is aligned with the management system requirements in the area of aircrew and air operations. All other organisations, which are eligible for the new Part-CAO, will see no major changes to the existing Section A requirements.

Regarding the perimeter of SMS application, as a general principle, all organisations exposed to or possibly contributing to aviation safety risks should ideally be subject to SMS requirements, which entails that such requirements must be proportional and flexible. The management system requirements proposed in Part-CAMO only include core requirements at IR level and all the detailed means to comply are included in the AMCs. However, EASA recognises the need for possible exceptions from this general principle depending on the overall contribution of a particular activity to the safety of the total system and the relative costs and benefits of SMS implementation both for organisations and authorities. This is why at this stage only organisations involved in the continuing airworthiness management of CMPA or aircraft used for CAT will be required to



implement a management system including safety risk management.

Regarding a more specific classification of the type of organisations (complex/non-complex), the introduction of three or even more categories poses the risk of a very narrow interpretation of the different criteria by competent authorities. This would also imply that different sets of AMC are provided for each of the types (e.g. small, medium, large). This may result in organisations blindly following the AMCs that apply to them rather than analysing their systems and procedures to define what is needed to effectively manage risks.

Regarding General Aviation, please also refer to the response to comment #537.

Regarding the introduction of Human Factor principles, the comment is not accepted. Human factors are an integral part of any management system for safety. The changes introduced with Part-CAMO in relation to HF competencies and training have been agreed with the European Human Factors Advisory Group (EHFAG) and validated by the Focused Consultation Group, which was established to assist EASA with the drafting of the opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I.

Regarding the need to ensure coherence with already existing SMS in other fields (flight operations, approved training organisations, etc.), the opinion to be issued for Part-CAMO will consider alignment, as far as practicable, with the management system already applicable in the areas of air operations and aircrew.

comment 334

comment by: DGAC FRANCE

The debate on « safety sensitive maintenance tasks » is part of an already consulted NPA and is in progress. DGAC France will not comment the matter within this NPA. See comments already done. The paragraphs changes here are out of scope of the SGS implementation. (apply for instance to AMC MA708d)

response Noted.

Regarding 'critical tasks', the final text that will be included in Part-145 will be that resulting from rulemaking task MDM.020, cf. Opinion No 06/2013 'Critical maintenance tasks'. For this task, it was considered necessary to align the amended text in NPA 2013-01 with the text of Opinion No 06/2013 in order for stakeholders to be able to assess NPA 2013-01 changes in the context of the other relevant amendments proposed.

Prior to the adoption of the corresponding rule amendments for all pending tasks, EASA, in close coordination with the European Commission, will ensure that the different amendments stemming from different rulemaking tasks are properly consolidated, without omissions, overlaps or inconsistencies, and that this consolidation does not result in any other unintended effects.

Regarding the comment on items being outside the scope of SMS implementation: not accepted:

It is critical that human factors be fully integrated into SMS as humans remain at the heart of the air transportation system. Adding specific provisions for the management of safety on the basis of the new management system requirements will create an adequate framework for the effective management of human factors issues. The changes introduced with Part-CAMO in relation to HF competencies and training have been agreed



with the European Human Factors Advisory Group (EHFAG) and validated by the Focused Consultation Group, which was established to assist EASA with the drafting of the opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I.

comment	<p>358</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></p> <p><u>Scope of NPA 2013-01</u></p> <p>Annex 19 of the Chicago Convention (adopted by the ICAO Council and subject to ongoing consultation with Contracting States through the state letter 2013/30) requires, in the maintenance field, an SMS acceptable by the authority for " approved maintenance organizations providing services to operators of aeroplanes or helicopters engaged in international commercial air transport, in accordance with Annex 6, Part I or Part III, Section II, respectively". A similar provision was previously included in ICAO Annex 6, Part 1 for aircraft and Part 3, Section II for helicopters.</p> <p>This NPA however expands the scope of Annex 19 requirements by introducing mandatory SMS for all approved maintenance organisations. Thus, approved organisations under Part M Subpart F and approved organisations under Part M Subpart G involved with aircraft operated in general aviation, although they are presently excluded from the scope of ICAO Annex 19, would be affected by the future European regulation.</p> <p>In the current context of simplification wished for general aviation, adding such constraints to these organisations would be in contradiction with the conclusions of the European General Aviation Safety Strategy Group.</p> <p>Furthermore, the implementation of such provisions would encourage the use of independent Part 66 licensed staff. A paradoxical result, probable but not desirable, could be that some organisations would give up their approvals that would become too demanding. In this regard, DGAC experience in implementing SMS for operators involved in commercial air transport or for Part 145 approved maintenance organisations has showed the difficulty for these organisations to fully understand the concept of SMS. This finding would be, with no doubt, confirmed for organisations working in the field of general aviation.</p> <p>DGAC therefore demands that NPA 2013-01 regulatory proposals related to SMS be limited to organisations working on airplanes or helicopters engaged in commercial air transport (as required by the provisions of ICAO Annex 19) or complex powered aircraft operated in general aviation (as Regulation (EC) 1321/2014 requires these aircraft to be maintained by a Part 145 approved organisation and their airworthiness to be managed by a part M/G approved organisation).</p> <p>I note, in this regard, that if Regulation (EC) 1321/2014 deals with aircraft based on the "large aircraft" criterion, the NPA 2013-01 defines the requirements according to the "complex powered aircraft" criterion as it anticipates the changes in process for Regulation (EC) 1321/2014 (opinion 2012-06). It seems imperative that the next Regulation (EC) 1321/2014 does not introduce different requirements between heavy and complex motorized aircraft. The regulation, in its integrity, should apply either to heavy or to complex motorized aircraft.</p>
response	<p>Same as comment #658 on NPA 2013-01(C).</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the</p>



implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT and are not managing CMPA). Linked to that, those organisations will not have to introduce HF training nor assess HF-related competences of their staff. They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements.

On the differences in the definitions for large aircraft and CMPA: the opinion to be produced for the new Part-CAMO will consider the definition of CMPA in line with the upcoming changes to Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 by amending Regulation (EU) 2015/1536 (Opinion No 06/2012).

Nevertheless, it is proposed (cf. Article 4 of Cover Regulation) to provide an additional proportionality element by adopting the following exemption that has already been agreed in the area of Air Operations (EASA Committee of February 2016 — discussions on the latest amendments to Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 in relation to non-commercial operations of CMPA): Organisations approved in accordance with Annex I (Part-M) Subpart F shall be entitled to perform maintenance of complex motor-powered aeroplanes with a maximum certificated take-off mass at or below 5 700 kg which are equipped with turboprop engines.

Organisations approved in accordance with Annex Vd (Part-CAO) shall be entitled to manage the continuing airworthiness of complex motor-powered aeroplanes with a maximum certificated take-off mass at or below 5 700 kg which are equipped with turboprop engines.

comment

359

comment by: DGAC FRANCE

Link between the NPA 2013-01 and other NPAs:

Once an NPA is published, unless decided otherwise by stakeholders, it is desirable to carry out the work up to completion.

To illustrate this, I note the reintroduction of the "safety critical tasks" elements of task MDM.020 in NPA 2013-01, while NPA 2012-04 already addressed this matter. However, nothing indicates:

- 1) Whether the comments associated to this earlier NPA have been kept and will be analyzed in the framework of the NPA 2013-01 or;
- 2) Whether new comments related to these "safety critical tasks" items included in the NPA 2013-01 are expected or ;
- 3) Whether the NPA 2013-01 represents the final vision of the Agency on the "safety critical tasks". This approach is very confusing!

DGAC decided not to comment again on "safety critical tasks" and waits until EASA provides with answers in the CRD 2012-04

response

Same as comment #661 on NPA 2013-01(C).

Noted.

NPA 2012-03 'Control of suppliers of components and material used in maintenance' has indeed not been considered for NPA 2013-01. This is due to the fact that at the stage of an NPA the final outcome and resulting text cannot be anticipated. Therefore, each



rulemaking task is processed separately unless the issue being dealt with in a separate NPA has a direct link to the issue being addressed by the NPA under consideration.

The normal procedure is that each NPA follows its own plan and is processed without considering any other pending NPA. This normal procedure could not be fully applied in relation to NPA 2013-01 due to the nature and extent of the changes proposed: some of these changes are directly linked to specific items being the subject of distinct, pending NPAs. This concerns the rulemaking task on 'critical maintenance tasks' (RMT.0222 (MDM.020)/Opinion No 06/2013) and the rulemaking task related to changing provisions for 'large aircraft' to 'complex motor-powered aircraft' (RMT.0244 MDM.047) as proposed in Opinion No 06/2012. For these, it was necessary to align the amended text in NPA 2013-01 with the final deliverables of the corresponding rulemaking tasks in order for stakeholders to be able to assess NPA 2013-01 changes in the context of the other amendments. This, however, does not imply that comments received on NPA 2013-01 may have an impact on those separate rulemaking tasks and related deliverables. Prior to the adoption of the corresponding rule amendments, EASA, in close coordination with the European Commission, will ensure that the different amendments stemming from different rulemaking tasks are duly consolidated and that this consolidation does not result in any unintended effects.

comment

360

comment by: DGAC FRANCE

Regulatory requirements introduced by this NPA and unrelated to SGS

This NPA introduces changes other than those related to the consideration of SMS in Part M and Part 145.

Some of them that are consensual will probably not rise debate; in such cases, it is a shame to wait for the implementation of SMS to apply them even, as they would make a significant improvement. For instance, 145.B.45 § (c) will allow to suspend an approval when the inspectors can not carry out an audit for more than 24 months, in a country when the security is not ensured for example.

Others, however, are considered substantial and their development must be addressed through specific(s) NPA(s) so that detailed discussions can be conducted before considering any implementation. Without being exhaustive, I note the following examples related to organisations: the introduction of human factors concepts for the staff employed by Part M / G organisations, the requirement for all Part-145 organisations to implement a Fatigue Risk Management Scheme and for the authorities, the introduction of a new categorization of organisations (wide / not wide, complex / non-complex, very small ..) that are not necessarily well suited to the types of profile of the managed organisations.

response

Same as comment #663 on NPA 2013-01(C).

Regarding the introduction of human factors elements in Part-M, it is important that human factors concepts be understood and applied by CAMO staff as they can contribute to events through their own errors or by causing errors to be made within the contracted maintenance organisation. The management system framework, including safety risk management, safety training and safety promotion, creates the proper framework for managing HF-related issues in continuing airworthiness management.

Regarding the comment related to the requirement for all Part-145 organisations to



implement a fatigue risk management scheme, this will be assessed in Phase II of RMT.0251 (MDM.055).

Regarding the comment on the categorisation of organisations, following a recommendation made by the Focused Consultation Group, the application of complexity criteria for the determination of applicable AMCs (complex/non-complex organisations) will not be maintained for the new Part-CAMO.

comment

361

comment by: DGAC FRANCE

Too detailed organisational requirements for the Authorities:

This NPA goes way too far in terms of details applicable to the authorities' organisation. The 145.B.20 GM1 (a) (2) indicating how the Authority should compute its human resources needed to perform organisations oversight, for example, is too prescriptive and is not at all justified.

DGAC remind you the contents of letter No. 11-237 of 30 November 2011 relating to air operations, where it indicated that it belonged to Member States to define precisely how to organize themselves in order to comply with the rules contained in the part ARO and that from this point of view, the AMC and GM were written in a way that is too detailed and prescriptive.

response

Same as comment #665 on NPA 2013-01(C).

Not accepted.

Guidance material (GM) is not prescriptive.

The changes proposed with NPA 2013-01 in the area of Section B are fully aligned with the corresponding Subparts GEN of the authority requirements already adopted through Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 (aircrew) and 965/2012 (air operations). This is also in line with the Terms of Reference for task RMT.0251 (MDM.055) issued on 18 July 2011: they indicated that one element of the task would be to implement in Section B relevant provisions linked with the implementation of an SSP in the framework of the European Aviation Safety Programme (EASP), based on the proposal made with Part-AR (authority requirements) (Opinions Nos 03/2011 and 04/2011 at that time). This is intended to enable competent authorities to streamline their systems and procedures to improve efficiency in certification and oversight in the fields of aircrew, air operations, continuing airworthiness and later on in the area of initial airworthiness.

This does not only support the implementation of SSPs, it also implements some of the long-term recommendations of the 'Consistency of Organisation Approvals' (COra) report (see Advance-Notice of Proposed Amendment (A-NPA) No 15-2006¹).

comment

362

comment by: DGAC FRANCE

¹ [http://easa.europa.eu/system/files/dfu/final%20A-NPA%2015-2006%20COra%20\(26.09.06\).pdf](http://easa.europa.eu/system/files/dfu/final%20A-NPA%2015-2006%20COra%20(26.09.06).pdf)



	<p>An alternative AMC concept that modifies the existing balance:</p> <p>It should be noted that an alternative AMC shall only ensure compliance with the implementing rules (IR) and not dual compliance with the provisions contained in the implementing rules (IR) and the associated (not alternative) AMC.</p> <p>However, AMC1 MB104 (d) (3) suggests that this dual compliance is required.</p> <p>Under other regulations, synchronized drafting and review of IR and AMC could possibly justify such a wording but the 1321/2014 Regulation AMCs have not been developed for this purpose.</p> <p>It is therefore requested to either delete AMC1 MB104 (d) (3) or to amend it so that it only includes a reference to the implementing rule to which it guarantees compliance.</p> <p>Finally, it is not unreasonable to consider the revision of that similar paragraph in other texts implementing the Basic Regulation.</p>
response	<p>Same as comment #668 on NPA 2013-01(C).</p> <p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>As a result of the changes to M.B.104 (now CAMO.B.120), AMC1 to point (d)(3) is deleted. The intent is to demonstrate compliance with the safety objectives as defined at IR level.</p> <p>The new Section B requirements proposed for the processing of applications for the approval of alternative means of compliance aim to enhance transparency and support standardisation; they are not intended to change the legal status of the EASA AMCs. With the current system, any organisation intending to use an alternative means of compliance needs to demonstrate an equivalent level of safety, and this general principle remains unchanged.</p> <p>It is accepted that a further review of the existing AMCs to Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 may be required to include at AMC level only those elements that genuinely constitute means to comply. Such review would be necessary with or without Section B requirements on alternative means of compliance processing. Considering the possible impact of such review, this can only be done as part of Phase II.</p>
comment	<p>363 comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></p> <p>The requirements are to be implemented in short delays ... despite insufficient Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA):</p> <p>The RIA proposed by EASA is purely qualitative and only emphasizes the interest of SMS for safety. The Agency recognizes that the implementation of such regulation is costly, without further details.</p> <p>DGAC would strongly appreciate a real assessment of the costs incurred for organisations and authorities to be carried out; the evaluation could also reinforce the idea of delaying the implementation of the proposed new rules or even of abandoning certain requirements (general aviation).</p>
response	<p>Same as comment #670 on NPA 2013-01(C).</p> <p>Accepted.</p> <p>While promoting a proactive approach to the management of safety can be seen as a simple logical necessity not requiring empirical evidence to support its use within safety</p>



management processes, EASA acknowledges the need to further enhance the regulatory impact assessment for the related opinion, in particular to formulate detailed recommendations for specific transition measures and opt-outs. For that purpose, data and input from authorities and industry was sought through an online survey conducted in 2015/Q4.

In this context it should be noted that the EASA approach, different from the ICAO approach, is to structure the SMS framework in the form of generally applicable management system requirements that build upon existing quality systems and leave detailed means of achieving the safety objective at AMC level. This provides flexibility, as an organisation may propose means alternative to those established in the EASA AMC in order to meet or exceed the objective set at IR level.

Also, whereas determination of the direct cost impact associated with SMS implementation for a particular category of service provider may be straightforward, there is a general difficulty in quantifying the benefits of SMS in high-risk/low-probability transport domains, such as aviation.

NPA 2012-25 (B) ‘Part-M’ — Embodiment of Safety Management System (SMS) requirements into Commission Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 — RMT.0251 (MDM.055) — General remarks p. 1-11

comment 97 comment by: *Association of Dutch Aviation Technicians NVLT*

To the opinion of the NVLT this NPA will contribute in the enhancement of aviation safety.

response Noted.

comment 98 comment by: *Association of Dutch Aviation Technicians NVLT*

Clearly identify the personnel of the Part-145 and Part- M organisation who are participating or are involved or are a part of the Safety Management System.

response Partially accepted.

The provisions do not require a separate safety management system, but a management system with specific features. Ultimately, all personnel involved in the activities that are subject to an organisation certificate have a role in safety and need to be aware of the system in place in order to manage it. The main responsibilities and accountabilities with regard to the management system are clearly set out in CAMO.A.200 and CAMO.A.305 & related AMCs and GM respectively. Going beyond those provisions may have unintended effects as it may constrain organisations in relation to deciding upon their specific organisational set-up to effectively manage safety.



comment

252

comment by: *Aerospace Industries Association*

The Aerospace Industry Association (AIA) appreciates the opportunity to respond to EASA's NPAs introducing a proposed new management system and Safety Management Systems (SMS) regulations for Parts M and 145 organizations, and to provide input to the regulatory process. AIA represent manufacturers of commercial aircraft, engines, avionics and components who provide products and airworthiness and maintenance services to nearly every commercial aviation operator throughout the world.

AIA and our member companies have been working with national authorities for many years to develop safety management best practices, and welcome the broader use of structured risk management throughout the industry. Introduction of such an approach, coupled with the full recognition of existing successful practices and the practical limitations of the risk management process, should help to minimize the negative impacts on highly effective and uniquely suited processes and systems for effectively managing aviation safety in place today. These existing systems and activities have evolved along with the sophistication and efficiency of the products themselves, and largely satisfy the tenets of the ICAO SMS Framework.

The NPAs acknowledge that EASA is proposing extensive changes to Annexes I 'Part-M' and II 'Part-145' and that these changes are part of a broader restructuring of EASA requirements. It should be recognized that these changes will have a significant disruptive impact to the industry and regulatory authorities and potentially authority-to-authority working arrangements, unless the transition is well coordinated among all stakeholders. The transition must minimize the disruption to aviation, an industry with an enviable safety record.

The NPAs introduce new requirements to obtain an 'Alternative Means of Compliance' to an Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC); these new requirements essentially make the AMC material requirements. The introduction of this 'Alternative Means of Compliance' process, compounded by the numerous revisions, and in some cases prescriptive, new AMC material, will introduce significant disruption to an industry which is currently operating effectively and safely.

The process for accepting 'Alternative Means of Compliance' should also allow for the reuse of existing accepted 'Alternative Means of Compliance'. The implementation and transition to these new AMCs and process for 'Alternative Means of Compliance' needs to be well coordinated to minimize the disruption to industry and other regulatory authorities.

In addition, we are concerned about the potential complexity, cost, and resource burden associated with regulatory compliance activities for this proposed set of rules and guidance. We are also concerned that overly prescriptive policy and guidance could disrupt and diminish the effectiveness of existing safety systems, even with the proposed flexible regulatory framework. However, the multiplicity of the new AMC requirements removes most of such flexibility.

AIA is further concerned that adding detailed interpretations to the concepts expressed in the ICAO framework may lead to lack of harmony between different national versions of



response

SMS, impeding mutual acceptance among international authorities.

AIA member companies will also be submitting additional detailed comments that we encourage EASA to give full consideration. Our membership is concerned about the results of this NPA.

Again, we thank you for the opportunity to review this important proposal and trust that you will consider our comments prior to finalizing the regulations.

Noted.

On the disruptive impact on industry:

The NPA does not introduce SMS as a separate element, but proposes to upgrade the existing management system with specific features aiming for effective hazard identification and safety risk assessment. The new management system 'framework' is designed to apply to all organisations required to hold an organisational approval within the scope of Regulation (EC) No 216/2008, i.e. all those activities for which the regulator had already determined that the level of risks entailed implied the obligation for an organisation approval and requires continuing oversight. The way this management system framework for safety is being proposed is far less prescriptive than the ICAO SMS framework.

The need for specific implementation support in the area of continuing airworthiness and maintenance is acknowledged and will be the focus of safety promotion as part of established initiatives. A safety promotion task will be proposed for the EASA planning cycle for 2017–2021.

Guidance for authorities to assess SMS will be provided by the EASA Rulemaking Advisory Group (RAG) working group which is developing a cross-domain SMS assessment methodology and tool. First results should be available in June 2016.

To promote a common understanding of the SMS concepts and encourage harmonised implementation, EASA actively participates in the Safety Management International Collaboration Group (SMICG). Guidance material developed by the SMICG is available at [http://www.skybrary.aero/index.php/Safety_Management_International_Collaboration_Group_\(SM_ICG\)](http://www.skybrary.aero/index.php/Safety_Management_International_Collaboration_Group_(SM_ICG)).

Regarding the prescriptive nature of AMCs:

The status of the AMC has not been changed with the NPA; AMCs are non-binding, as regulated persons may choose to demonstrate compliance through alternative means of compliance. When they chose to do so, the demonstration of compliance is upon them. This has always been the case in the context of the EASA rules; the new elements are intended to increase transparency by requiring competent authorities to make information on AltMoC that have been accepted available and to support rulemaking and standardisation by requiring competent authorities to notify EASA of any alternative means of compliance they have accepted for their industry, have issued or are using themselves. In practice, approved organisations will continue to describe most of the means of compliance used in their exposition and related procedures, and today there is already a process in place to control changes to these documents.



comment	<p>43</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>SVFB/SAMA</i></p> <p>Section A Managment System (missing quote)</p> <p>This in itself is a sensible requirement, it will depend on how much additional administrative work is required, respectively is there a net reduction of such work</p> <p>> for SME's > for majors</p>
response	<p><i>Noted.</i></p>

comment	<p>196</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>Howard Torode</i></p> <p>Comment from European Gliding Union. EGU support the comments of Europe Air Sports (et al, specifically here comment 81). Having read the key parts of both Sections A and B of this rule it is clear that the motivation and policies of this NPA are drawn directly from the needs of Commercial Air Transport and are in no way relevant or pertinent to Sport/GA under Part M. The whole concept herein is creating considerable extra weight to the already excessive requirements of Part M rather than making it 'lighter', as demanded by the light sport aviation community for the past several years. It appears clear that this bulk transfers of SMS measures from Part 145 (for heavy CAT) have been carried out without coordination with other developments for Part M, specifically NPA2012-17 from the 'Task Force on Part M for GA'. Rationale</p> <p>Far from being concerned about large organisations workshop practices and coordination, the sport aviation sector is supported typically by small organisations amnd individuals often on a part time basis. Indeed the principle problem in this sector is access to individuals who are qualified under the continuingly complex requirements of Part M or Part 66. Gliding, and sport aviation as a whole, are in no way against the concept of SMS. In fact we believe that many of our national sporting associations operate such measures already, but in a manner that is appropriate and proportioate to our sporting needs. Assuming that it is EASA intention to apply SMS policies to Sport/GA we recommend that the whole approach be reviewed, preferably by 'Task Force on Part M for GA' which is specifically tasked for this role.</p>
response	<p><i>Noted.</i></p> <p>The Part-M General Aviation Task Force was represented by ECOGAS in the Focused Consultation Group, which was established to assist EASA with the drafting of the opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I. In addition, it was consulted on the applicability of SMS</p>



and its recommendations were considered for the related opinion.

The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in continuing airworthiness management of CAT aircraft or CMPA). Linked to that, those organisations will not have to introduce HF training nor assess HF-related competences of their staff. They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements.

Explanatory Note Part-M — SECTION A — Subpart F organisations

p. 12-13

comment 44

comment by: SVFB/SAMA

**a) good move, we support this classification of Part M/F by default as non complex.
b) to have a positive economical effect, the privileges of the M/F must be expanded in a reasonable manner as explained in 212-03a comments. 95% of organisations have an 145 certificate they are much to limited according present definition of commercial in the basic regulations.**

The evidence for this in regards to aircraft up to 5.7T is not available.

From the "Annual Safety Recommendations Review 2011" which refers to selected accidents leading to a safety recommendation between 1997 to 2011 (<https://easa.europa.eu/safety-and-research/safety-recommendations.php>) our research has shown that:

Maintenance caused fatalities out of this report have been as follows:

Maintenance driven

9 Heli 9

12 5.7 T to 30 Pax 0

13 2250 kg to 5.7 T 0

14 up to 2250 9

Total 18 fatalities compared to a total of 891 which is 2.02 %.

Most fatalities due maintenance have been caused by aircraft > 80 Pax within accident reports with safety recommendation.

The others had no safety recommendation !

Based on this risk, the privileges of the Part M/F should be expanded up to 5.7T regardless if the operation is commercial or non commercial as long it is not CAT (Airline or airline like operations)

c) M/F are not consistently classified as non complex

d) the limits should be changed regarding to the above statistics in regards to maintenance:

Definition: an organisation unit is either a Flight Operation, a ATO, part 145, a component shop, a line station , a CAMO etc.



shift-work (with a 3 shift system) 365x24 counts for **2 organisation units**, a 2 shift system for **1 orga unit**.

1) a) Organisation with only **one** organisational unit, no shift work < 200 => **not complex**

b) Organisations with **2** org units > 150 complex
(e.g : just part M/F and a day only two shift system would count for 2 orga units)

c) Organisations with **3** org units > 100 complex (e.g: Part 145 and a full shift system would count for 3 units)

d) Organisations with **4** org units > 50 complex (e.g Part 145, shift system and CAMO, 4 org units > any organisation with > 50 is complex)

e) Organisations with **5** or more org units > 20 complex
(e.g. ATO, Part 145, CAMO and 3 line stations > any orga with > 20 would be complex)

2) For part M/G there should be given a similar differentiation.

response Noted.

The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT and are not managing CMPA). Linked to that, those organisations will not have to introduce HF training nor assess HF-related competences of their staff. They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements.

Regarding the **types of operations that should be considered as commercial operations and commercial air transport**, please note that amending Regulation (EU) 2015/1536 (Opinion No 06/2012) will take due account of the latest amendments proposed to Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 for non-commercial operations and aerial work (Part-NCO (non-commercial operations with other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft) and Part-SPO (specialised operations)) and clarify the applicable requirements depending on the type of operation. As a general rule, in terms of type of operation, a Part-CAMO (continuing airworthiness management) or a Part-145 (maintenance) certificate will only be required for aircraft operated by air carriers licensed in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1008/2008.

Regarding the **definition of complex/non-complex organisation** and the issue of **proportionality**, it is important to note that, unlike the ICAO SMS framework, the EASA management system framework provides maximum flexibility to industry as all detailed provisions are included at AMC level and these can be 'deviated' from by means of alternative means of compliance. This shall ensure the provisions can be applied whatever the size, nature and complexity of the organisation. It is not advisable to define very granular degrees of complexity. The proposed degrees of complexity are in fact elements to be considered under the organisation's safety risk management (e.g. shift work, existence of multiple organisation certificates).

Specific implementation support in relation to SMS in maintenance and continuing airworthiness management will be provided in the framework of the EASA's safety promotion programme (a safety promotion task will be proposed for the planning cycle 2017–2021). This may entail templates for manuals, implementation guidelines, etc.

Finally, it is acknowledged that competent authorities need to adapt their expectations on



management system implementation in line with the size, nature and complexity of the organisation, and additional guidance will be required. The EASA Rulemaking Advisory Group (RAG) has been tasked to develop a cross-domain SMS assessment methodology and tool that will take the SMICG tool as a starting point.

comment 45

comment by: SVFB/SAMA

The proposed changes in this annex shows what we mean: if a TMG can be CAT, what is left for the Part F approved MRO?

All alleviations are useless, as practically no MRO can have an existence with a M/F certificate.

The privileges for M/F must include all aircraft up to 5.7 regardless if commercial or not, as long as it is not CAT (airlines and charter airlines).

We are not aware of any airlines operating with TMG's , defacto none which operates with aircraft below 18 PAX.

see proposed annex IV here: by subordinating aircraft below 5.7 T under CAT as proposed for TMG here, the same PART 145 structures and process as for major organisations apply

ANNEX IV

COMMERCIAL AIR TRANSPORT OPERATIONS

[PART-CAT]

(a) SUBPART A — GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

CAT.GEN.100 Competent authority

The competent authority shall be the authority designated by the Member State in which the operator has its principal place of business.

CAT.GEN.105 Touring motor gliders, powered sailplanes and mixed balloons

(a) Powered sailplanes, excluding touring motor gliders, shall be operated and equipped in compliance with the requirements applicable to sailplanes.

(b) Touring motor gliders (TMGs) shall be operated following the requirements for:

(1) aeroplanes when they are power-driven by an engine; and

(2) sailplanes when operated without using an engine.

(c) TMGs shall be equipped in compliance with the requirements applicable to aeroplanes, unless otherwise specified in CAT.IDE.A.

(d) Mixed balloons shall be operated in accordance with the requirements for hot-air balloons.

ANNEX IV

COMMERCIAL AIR TRANSPORT OPERATIONS

[PART-CAT]

(a) SUBPART A — GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

CAT.GEN.100 Competent authority

The competent authority shall be the authority designated by the Member State in which the operator has its principal place of business.

CAT.GEN.105 Touring motor gliders, powered sailplanes and mixed balloons

(a) Powered sailplanes, excluding touring motor gliders, shall be operated and equipped in compliance with the requirements applicable to sailplanes.

(b) Touring motor gliders (TMGs) shall be operated following the requirements for:



	<p>(1) aeroplanes when they are power-driven by an engine; and</p> <p>(2) sailplanes when operated without using an engine.</p> <p>(c) TMGs shall be equipped in compliance with the requirements applicable to aeroplanes, unless otherwise specified in CAT.IDE.A.</p> <p>(d) Mixed balloons shall be operated in accordance with the requirements for hot-air balloons.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Regarding the types of operations that should be considered as commercial operations and commercial air transport, please note that the only operations that are considered commercial air transport for the purpose of Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 are operations of <u>licensed air carriers</u>. Regarding the consideration of commercial operations other than CAT, amending Regulation (EU) 2015/1536 (Opinion No 06/2012) will take due account of the latest amendments proposed to Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 for non-commercial operations and aerial work (Part-NCO (non-commercial operations with other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft) and Part-SPO (specialised operations)).</p> <p>Finally, EASA issued on 6 January 2016 Opinion No 01/2016 'Revision of the European operational rules for balloons', and is currently launching a new rulemaking activity to review the operational and flight crew licensing rules applicable to sailplanes, with the objective to separate them from the existing rules.</p>

comment	<p>46 comment by: SVFB/SAMA</p> <p>Definition: an organisation unit is either a Flight Operation, a ATO, part 145, a component shop, a line station , a CAMO etc. shift-work (with a 3 shift system) 365x24 counts for 2 organisation units, a 2 shift system for 1 orga unit.</p> <p>1) a) Organisation with only one organisational unit, no shift work < 200 => not complex</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">b) Organisations with 2 org units > 150 complex (e.g : just part M/F and a day only two shift system would count for 2 orga units)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">c) Organisations with 3 org units > 100 complex (e.g: Part 145 and a full shift system would count for 3 units)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">d) Organisations with 4 org units > 50 complex (e.g Part 145, shift system and CAMO, 4 org units > any organisation with > 50 is complex)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">e) Organisations with 5 or more org units > 20 complex (e.g. ATO, Part 145, CAMO and 3 line stations > any orga with > 20 would be complex)</p> <p>2) For part M/G there should be given a similar differentiation.</p>
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>It is not advisable to define very granular degrees of complexity. The proposed degrees of complexity are in fact elements to be considered under the organisation's safety risk management (e.g. shift work, existence of multiple organisation certificates).</p>



Following a recommendation made by the Focused Consultation Group, the application of complexity criteria for the determination of applicable AMCs (**complex/non-complex organisations**) will not be maintained for the new Part-CAMO.

comment 79

comment by: *René Meier, Europe Air Sports*

Subpart F Organisations

page 12/224

General remark

6th line of the text block: There is a character or a figure missing between "(EC) No" and "/2008".

The Agency writes: "This would allow Subpart-F organisations to make use of alleviated management systems..." We ask for another formula: "Respecting these fundamental differences the Agency proposes forms of an alleviated management system based primarily on checklist adapted to the complexity of the organisation."

Rationale:

Some more pressure sometimes is required to reach to goal which is the level playing field.

page 13/218

1st line of the text block: In our view it is not the number of maintenance staff which should be considered, it is far more a question of shift-work and related hand-overs.

Rationale:

In our view it is absolutely no problem to work with many more than 10 FTE at the same time. Handovers related to working shifts might be a risk, if the processes are not well organised. This should primarily be included in the Agency's provision.

response Accepted.

The editorial error will be corrected. Regarding Subpart F organisations, EASA will consider the recommendations to be made by the Part-M General Aviation Task Force in Phase II in order to determine what type of management system should be introduced.

In relation to determining organisational complexity: it is not advisable to define very granular degrees of complexity. The proposed degrees of complexity are in fact elements to be considered under the organisation's safety risk management (e.g. shift work, existence of multiple organisation certificates).

Following a recommendation made by the Focused Consultation Group, the application of complexity criteria for the determination of applicable AMCs (**complex/non-complex organisations**) will not be maintained for the new Part-CAMO; the proposal of a criterion related to shift work will be considered.

comment 197

comment by: *Howard Torode*

Comment by the European Gliding Union

EGU considers that the Subpart F rules introduced here would place a disproportionate burden on Subpart F organisations in the Sport/GA sector, who already enjoy only limited additional privileges compared to licenced engineers as proposed in Part 66. Direct



	<p>read across from Part 145 is not appropriate. The concept proposed is undermining the lighter approach a</p> <p>Subpart F organisation and leading to a full Part 145 requirements by default.</p> <p>Rationale The widely applied metric of judging scale based on the number of FTE engineers in an organisation is basically flawed for the case of a wide, disparate network of engineers who only spend part of their time on GA, such as operates in Sport Aviation. Its not the number that matters it is the copmmunication and support provided. The sort of measures proposed here are not those that are needed in these case and would lead to great inconvenience and a less satisfactory performance in these types of organisations.</p>
<p>response</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in continuing airworthiness management of CAT aircraft or CMPA). They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements.</p> <p>The Part-M General Aviation Task Force was represented by ECOGAS in the Focused Consultation Group, which was established to assist EASA with the drafting of the opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I. In addition, it was consulted on the applicability of SMS and its recommendations were considered for the related opinion. The implementation of an SMS will not be required for General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT and are not managing CMPA). They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements.</p>

<p>comment</p>	<p>204 comment by: <i>British Gliding Association</i></p> <p>British Gliding Association SECTION A Management system, Subpart F organisations</p> <p>The concept proposed is undermining the concept of a Part M subpart F maintenance organisation and leading to Part 145 by default for any organisation with more than 10 certifying staff. This is fine in the case of commercial air transport as they are probably already Part 145 but for sporting organisations and those on the fringe this is forcing a huge change with associated financial burden that they can ill afford. Sporting Organisations that utilise a significant number of volunteer maintenance staff or maintenance staff not directly under its control as authorised individuals should be allowed to develop their own SMS as applicable to the organisation irrespective of the number of maintenance staff involved.</p>
<p>response</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the response to comment #197.</p>



comment	<p data-bbox="352 210 1449 237">231 comment by: <i>FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation</i></p> <p data-bbox="352 297 1449 465">The FNAM noticed that the new requirements issued under the Implementing Rules between the non-complex organisations and the complex organisations are not so different. Too many requirements are imposed to the non-complex organisations which will be not economically affordable and where the efficiency of the flight safety in terms of costs it will require is not proven.</p> <p data-bbox="352 477 1449 611">The boundaries between complex and non complex organisations are far too narrow. There is a too high gap in the organisations describe as a complex organisation. It can go from an organisation having 20 FTE for Part-M Subpart F to 20,000 FTE or more for the major organisations.</p> <p data-bbox="352 656 1449 936">The FNAM emphasises the importance to well proportionate the requirements of the implementation of the new management system according to various factors, such as the number of employees, number of certificates held, number of bases, different types of equipments operated as well as the operational environment, must be considered. It can not just be proportionate to the number of FTE. Thus the FNAM is asking to create three categories of organisations (small, medium and large ones) which will depend on the factors just described above and which will allow a better differentiation on the number and consistence of requirements.</p> <p data-bbox="352 981 1449 1216">Futhermore, the FNAM is recommending to exclude the organisations belonging to General Aviation maintenance activities from the perimeter of the SMS requirements added through this NPA in the Commission Regulation (EC) No 1321/2014 (Part-M/F and Part-M/G). Indeed, it would be far too complicated for these organisations to implement the SMS requirements as requested by the NPA. It would involve heavy economic consequences without proven safety efficiency. At least, some major alleviation are requested.</p>
response	<p data-bbox="352 1249 1449 1276">See also comment #605 on NPA 2013-01(C).</p> <p data-bbox="352 1299 1449 1326">Partially accepted.</p> <p data-bbox="352 1348 1449 1561">Regarding the definition of complex/non-complex organisation and the issue of proportionality, it is important to note that, unlike the ICAO SMS framework, the EASA management system framework provides maximum flexibility to industry as all detailed provisions are included at AMC level and these can be deviated from by means of alternative means of compliance. This shall ensure the provisions can be applied whatever the size, nature and complexity of the organisation.</p> <p data-bbox="352 1583 1449 1610">Regarding specific complexity criteria: accepted.</p> <p data-bbox="352 1632 1449 1774">Following a recommendation made by the Focused Consultation Group, the application of complexity criteria for the determination of applicable AMCs (complex/non-complex organisations) will not be maintained for the new Part-CAMO; the proposed criteria on organisation complexity are more relevant to the organisation's safety risk management.</p> <p data-bbox="352 1796 1449 1930">Regarding General Aviation, it was stated in NPA 2013-01(A) that all changes proposed to Part-M Subpart G for organisations not involved in the continuing airworthiness management of CMPA or aircraft used in CAT as well as to Part-M Subpart F were to be considered 'provisional'.</p> <p data-bbox="352 1953 1449 2020">The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT</p>



and are not managing CMPA). Linked to that, those organisations will not have to introduce HF training nor assess HF-related competences of their staff. They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements.

comment 302

comment by: *European Sailplane Manufacturers*

For the accountable manager of a M/F organisation or a CAMO this will simply increase his/her workload without a real safety benefit.

In reality the following will happen:

...additional workload for the accountable manager (AM)

...a change for the exposition which trigger costs, amendment of approval and even more work for the AM

...another point to be checked during an audit by the NAA and therefore even more work for the AM

...in the end the AM is the person accountable anyway - so where is the benefit??

As long as there are no clear indications of a real benefit with regard to the safety of operating sailplanes or other ELA2 aircraft and/or a economical benefit we, the sailplane manufacturers oppose this proposed change for our sector of aviation.

response

Noted.

The safety benefits of the rule changes (new Part-CAMO) will only be measurable after some time; it is widely recognised that the implementation of effective safety management needs a series of changes to occur within an organisation or an authority. This is particularly relevant in the area of safety culture, which cannot be 'engineered' through regulations.

Once organisations have demonstrated effective implementation of the new management system framework, they should see a reduction in the amount of and costs associated with competent authority oversight, i.e. by allowing the organisation to manage more changes itself, without intervention by the competent authority or by extending the audit planning cycle. Conversely, organisations which have not been able to implement robust safety management processes will be 'penalised' as the oversight burden may increase.

More importantly, effective implementation will benefit not only safety, but it is also expected to benefit productivity and efficiency through the adoption of better management strategies and building up risk management capabilities not only limited to aviation safety risks. The causes and contributing factors of incidents and accidents are very often also causing or contributing to production losses or inefficiencies (fatigue being a typical example), and the analytical approach to safety risk management will also allow identifying more opportunities to increase the overall performance.

Regarding the need for proportionality, as stated explicitly in NPA 2013-01(A), all changes proposed to Part-M Subpart G for organisations not involved in the continuing airworthiness management of complex motor-powered aircraft or aircraft used in CAT as well as to Part-M Subpart F were to be considered 'provisional' pending the outcome of the actions recommended to EASA by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy



Group, which was appointed by the EASA Management Board.

The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in continuing airworthiness management of CAT aircraft or CMPA). Linked to that, those organisations will not have to introduce HF training nor assess HF-related competences of their staff. They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements.

comment

327

comment by: GAMA

The General Aviation Manufacturers Association (GAMA) is an international trade association representing over 80 of the world's leading manufacturers of general aviation airplanes and rotorcraft, engines, avionics, components and related services. GAMA's members also operate repair stations, fixed based operations, pilot and maintenance training facilities and they manage fleets of aircraft.

GAMA appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback regarding EASA NPA 2013-01 *Embodiment of Safety Management System (SMS) requirements into Commission Regulation (EC) No 1321/2014*, and offers the following comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS

General Aviation Impact

GAMA appreciates EASA's recognition of the efforts of the European General Aviation Safety Strategy Group and the Part-M General Aviation Task Force's recommendations as stated in NPA 2013-01(B)

"when drafting rules, a clear distinction be made between organisations involved with commercial air transport and other organisations, to ensure General Aviation will be considered 'as a sector in its own right and not as a watered-down Commercial Air Transport by-product."

NPA 2013-01(B) states the Agency decided not to propose a unique maintenance organisation approval system at this stage because of the development and efforts of these groups. However NPA 2013-01(A) states,

"All changes proposed to Part-M Subpart G for organisations not involved in the continuing airworthiness management of complex motor-powered aircraft or aircraft used in commercial air transport as well as to Part-M Subpart F should be considered 'provisional' at this stage, pending the outcome of the actions recommended to the Agency by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy Group appointed to the EASA Management Board. These actions may entail a full review of existing organisation approvals for those organisations not involved in the design, production, operation, maintenance or continuing airworthiness management of complex motor-powered aircraft or aircraft used in commercial air transport."

GAMA requests clarification what the provisional status implies. If provisional status intends to implement the full effect of the requirements until the European General Aviation Safety Strategy Group's and Part-M Task Force's recommendations are identified, then GAMA would object as it would be an unnecessary burden for a temporary implementation. GAMA does support a proposal to allow the Safety Strategy Group to develop appropriate management systems which are proportional to the General Aviation segment of industry and that the recommendations are given an appropriate transition period to allow organisations to adapt their management systems to the new



requirements

“to allow any possible actions requested by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy Group or the Part-M General Aviation Task Force in this area to become effective.”

GAMA would also not support a proposal if the provisional status implies that the full effects of the requirements are imposed after three years absent any recommendations from the Safety Strategy and Part-M Taskforce. EASA has recognized that the proposed SMS requirements would not be appropriate for General Aviation and has elected to defer to the European General Aviation Safety Strategy Group and Part-M working group recommendations; therefore it would be inappropriate to place a three year time line on the recommendations. Particularly because the working groups are currently establishing proportional management systems that will unlikely be implemented before the three year deadline has expired. At that point, it would be inappropriate to impose acknowledged inappropriate requirements because of a deadline especially when EASA is aware of existing efforts to develop an appropriate system.

NPA 2013-01(B)

Explanatory Note Part M Section A

“...to ensure clarity and prevent misunderstanding on the underlying reference the former term ‘quality system’ is not used any longer.”

GAMA recognizes that EASA intends to define a consistent set of management system requirements that would be compatible with a broad range of systems however GAMA is concerned that this will be interpreted as a requirement to change existing quality systems to compliance monitoring systems. Many existing systems have defined “quality systems” that incorporate all of the proposed SMS requirements but use a different term or title. GAMA requests that EASA clarify that the intent is not to require the use specific titles or system descriptions but to provide examples and continue to allow the flexibility for a company to make the determination.

GAMA supports that AS9110 be included as acceptable AMC to SMS compliance similar to what EASA has referenced in NPA 2013-01(B) page 17 regarding industry standards.

response

See also comment #603 on NPA 2013-01(C).

Noted.

NPA 2013-01(B)

Explanatory Note — Part-M, Section A

The new Part-CAMO management system provisions build upon those elements that are already in place today in most organisations approved within the scope of Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014, i.e. the quality-system-related provisions that deliver the ‘compliance monitoring function’ of the new management system requirements. As current provisions related to ‘quality system’ deal with the monitoring of compliance, related reporting and corrective action processes, and with the advent of additional safety-management-related functions such as safety risk management, it is preferable to adopt more neutral language at IR level. This also considers that there are multiple types of quality systems defined in different international or national standards, with different meanings and scopes. It is, therefore, proposed to refer to compliance monitoring function that, together with all other required functions and processes, make up the organisation’s management system for safety.

As stated in the Explanatory Note of NPA 2013-01(B), this change to terminology at IR level is not meant to require organisations to change the designations of their quality



system personnel or department — it is left to each organisation to decide how to refer to this function and to determine the most suitable organisational set-up allowing to manage all functions required by the new Part-CAMO. This is why the opinion proposes to embed the safety-management-related functions into the general management system provisions, which provide flexibility for organisations to implement these as they see fit. This aims to ensure maximum freedom for organisations in terms of organisational aspects.

Conversely, at Part-CAMO requirements level, no reference to ‘quality system’ must remain. This is aligned with the existing provisions in the areas of aircrew and air operations.

On the disruptive impact on industry:

The related opinion does not introduce SMS as a separate element, but proposes to upgrade the existing management system with specific features aiming for effective hazard identification and safety risk assessment. The new management system ‘framework’ was originally designed to apply to all organisations required to hold an organisational approval within the scope of Regulation (EC) No 216/2008, i.e. all those activities for which the regulator had already determined that the level of risks entailed implied the obligation for an organisation approval and requires continuing oversight. The way this management system framework for safety is being proposed is far less prescriptive than the ICAO SMS framework as per Annex 19, Edition 1.

The need for specific implementation support in the area of continuing airworthiness is acknowledged. A safety promotion task will be proposed for the planning cycle 2017–2021.

Guidance for authorities to assess SMS in the particular context of the organisation and its specific activity will also need to be provided (this is also a work item on the job cards of the ICAO Safety Management Panel (SMP)).

Regarding the prescriptive nature of AMCs:

The status of the AMC has not been changed with the NPA; AMCs are non-binding, as regulated persons may choose to demonstrate compliance through alternative means. When they chose to do so, the demonstration of compliance is upon them. This has always been the case in the context of the EASA rules, the new elements are intended to increase transparency by requiring the competent authority to make available the information on alternative means of compliance that have been accepted and to support rulemaking and standardisation by requiring competent authorities to notify EASA of any alternative means of compliance they have accepted for their industry, have issued or are using themselves. In practice, approved organisations will continue to describe most of the means of compliance used in their exposition and related procedures — and today there is already a process in place to control changes to these documents.

Regarding AS9110 as acceptable AMC to SMS compliance:

AS/EN 9110 currently does not include any safety-risk-management-related provisions and, therefore, it cannot be considered as an acceptable means of compliance for SMS. EASA closely monitors the work of ASD-ICCAIA to develop a common industry standard addressing SMS in design, manufacturing and maintenance.



Explanatory Note Part-M — SECTION A — Subpart G organisations

p. 13-14

comment	<p>10 comment by: <i>Nuno Marques - OGMA</i></p> <p>The Compliance Monitoring Manager is considered the current Quality Manager, its correct?</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>In most cases it can be assumed that the current quality manager is and will remain responsible for the compliance monitoring function.</p> <p>The proposed change to terminology at IR level is not meant to require organisations to change the designations of their quality system personnel or department: it is left to each organisation to decide how to refer to this function and to determine the most suitable organisational set-up allowing to manage all functions required by the new Part-CAMO.</p> <p>Please refer also to the response to comment #327.</p>

comment	<p>47 comment by: <i>SVFB/SAMA</i></p> <p>pg 13/218 Subpart G Organisations quote:</p> <p>All the limits should be reviewed. 10 FTE's CMPA CAT Todays definition does allow may be a handful of SME's to operate under M/F. As said earlier: it can't be that the aviation world of minor organisations ends at 10(G) or 20(145) and everything from 20 to 20'000 is under the same organisational striaghtjacket.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the response to your comment #46.</p>

comment	<p>48 comment by: <i>SVFB/SAMA</i></p> <p>page 13 v 218 quote</p> <p>It does not help. The hositic approach in the NPA is not holistic.</p>
---------	--



The TMG is considered CAT: this is a total overkill.
 Na aircraft below 5.7 T and or below 18 Pax should be considered as CAT unless it operates on a regular schedule and is publicly available.

ANNEX IV

COMMERCIAL AIR TRANSPORT OPERATIONS

[PART-CAT]

(a) SUBPART A — GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

CAT.GEN.100 Competent authority

The competent authority shall be the authority designated by the Member State in which the operator has its principal place of business.

CAT.GEN.105 Touring motor gliders, powered sailplanes and mixed balloons

(a) Powered sailplanes, excluding touring motor gliders, shall be operated and equipped in compliance with the requirements applicable to sailplanes.

(b) Touring motor gliders (TMGs) shall be operated following the requirements for:

(1) aeroplanes when they are power-driven by an engine; and

(2) sailplanes when operated without using an engine.

(c) TMGs shall be equipped in compliance with the requirements applicable to aeroplanes, unless otherwise specified in CAT.IDE.A.

(d) Mixed balloons shall be operated in accordance with the requirements for hot-air balloons.

response

Noted.

Please refer to the response to your comment #45.

comment

49

comment by: SVFB/SAMA

page 14/218 on top

It would be helpful to have an example and if that example would be along the very simple guidelines given by Miss Jaqueline Booth of TCCA at the SMS Meeting in Le Hague at 18. April 2013 it would suit well.

But it cannot be, that a SME consisting of the owner, his wife, 2 freelance pilots and a secretary had to develop a 100 page manual labelled as completely useless in respect to any value added concerning safety and having a detrimental economical effect.

response

Noted.

The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT and are not managing CMPA). Linked to that, those organisations will not have to introduce HF training nor assess HF-related competences of their staff. They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements.

Implementation support material will be developed by means of a dedicated safety promotion task, proposed for the next planning cycle 2017–2021.

Promotion material may take the form of manual templates, toolkits, implementation



guidelines, etc.

SMICG material may also assist small organisations with the implementation of SMS, cf. http://www.skybrary.aero/index.php/SMS_for_Small_Organizations.

comment 80

comment by: *René Meier, Europe Air Sports*

Subpart G organisations
page 13/224

It is not the number of FTE being important. What is important is: Do all work at the same time e.g. in a morning and in an afternoon block or do working shifts exist?

Rationale:

Without any problem many more persons may work the same time, coordination is simple. With shift work, however, things change. This fact should be considered being of greater importance than the number of workers present.

response Noted.

It is not advisable to define very granular degrees of complexity. The proposed degrees of complexity are in fact elements to be considered under the organisation's safety risk management (e.g. shift work, existence of multiple organisation certificates).

Following a recommendation made by the Focused Consultation Group, the application of complexity criteria for the determination of applicable AMCs (**complex/non-complex organisations**) will not be maintained for the new Part-CAMO.

comment 161

comment by: *Baines Simmons Limited*

Subpart G Organisations – complex vs. non-complex

Under current requirements (M.A.201(h)) there cannot be Part M Subpart G approved CAMOs “under a direct contract with an operator of aircraft used in CAT” (until NPA 2010-09 is implemented).

We suggest that the implication of this paragraph could cause confusion and should be deleted.

response Accepted.

The Explanatory Note will be amended to reflect the provisions currently applicable, meaning that for CAT (licensed air carriers) the organisation must be approved as per Part-CAMO (currently Part-M Subpart G) as part of the operator's AOC.

comment 198

comment by: *Howard Torode*

Comment by European Gliding Union.

Compared to the Subpart F section above, EGU finds this section on Subpart G more



	<p>comprehensible. with a clearer strategic idea of what is expected. While the '10 X full time engineer' (FTE) criterion is still considered inappropriate, we find a clearer more acceptable reassurance of EASA's intent towards GA. The Subpart F section (above) could profit from this treatment.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NPA proposed to consider all Subpart F organisations as 'non-complex' by default. For this reason, no complexity criteria were included. As stated, all changes proposed to Subpart F were to be considered 'provisional' pending the outcome of the work of the Part-M General Aviation Task Force — Phase II.</p> <p>The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT and are not managing CMPA). Linked to that, those organisations will not have to introduce HF training nor assess HF-related competences of their staff. They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements.</p>
comment	<p>232 comment by: <i>FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation</i></p> <p>The FNAM noticed that the new requirements issued under the Implementing Rules between the non-complex organisations and the complex organisations are not so different. Too many requirements are imposed to the non-complex organisations which will be not economically affordable and where the efficiency of the flight safety in terms of costs it will require is not proven.</p> <p>The boundaries between complex and non complex organisations are far too narrow. There is a too high gap in the organisations describe as a complex organisation. It can go from an organisation having 10 FTE for Part-M Subpart G to 20,000 FTE or more for the major organisations.</p> <p>The FNAM emphasises the importance to well proportionate the requirements of the implementation of the new management system according to various factors, such as the number of employees, number of certificates held, number of bases, different types of equipments operated as well as the operational environment, must be considered. It can not just be proportionate to the number of FTE. Thus the FNAM is asking to create three categories of organisations (small, medium and large ones) which will depend on the factors just described above and which will allow a better differentiation on the number and consistence of requirements.</p> <p>Futhermore, the FNAM is recommending to exclude the organisations belonging to General Aviation maintenance activities from the perimeter of the SMS requirements added through this NPA in the Commission Regulation (EC) No 1321/2014 (Part-M/F and Part-M/G). Indeed, it would be far too complicated for these organisations to implement the SMS requirements as requested by the NPA. It would involve heavy economic consequences without proven safety efficiency. At least, some major alleviation are requested.</p>
response	<p>Duplication of comment #231 — please refer to the response to comment #231.</p>



comment	<p>303</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>European Sailplane Manufacturers</i></p> <p>For the accountable manager of a M/F organisation or a CAMO this will simply increase his/her workload without a real safety benefit.</p> <p>In reality the following will happen:</p> <p>...additional workload for the accountable manger (AM) ...a change for the exposition which trigger costs, amendment of approval and even more work for the AM ...another point to be checked during an audit by the NAA and therefore even more work for the AM ...in the end the AM is the person accountable anyway - so where is the benefit??</p> <p>As long as there are no clear indications of a real benefit with regard to the safety of operating sailplanes or other ELA2 aircraft and/or a economical benefit we, the sailplane manufacturers oppose this proposed change for our sector of aviation.</p>
response	<p>Duplication of comment #302 — please refer to the response to comment #302.</p>

Explanatory Note Part-M — SECTION A — Criteria table

p. 15-16

comment	<p>41</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>AOPA-Sweden</i></p> <p>To maintain proportionality, AOPA recommends that there be no CM-function for F-shops or G-organisations working with non-complex a/c below 2730 kg MTOW regardless of number of employees.</p> <p>It seems foolish to introduce new levels of complexity to a business sector already failing due to the introduction of pt-M and all costs and complexity brought with it.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>As indicated in NPA 2013-01(A), all changes proposed to Part-M Subpart G for organisations not involved in the continuing airworthiness management of complex motor-powered aircraft or aircraft used in CAT (licensed air carriers), as well as to Part-M Subpart F, were to be considered 'provisional' pending the outcome of the actions recommended to EASA by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy Group, which was appointed by the EASA Management Board.</p> <p>The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT and are not managing CMPA). Linked to that, those organisations will not have to introduce HF training nor assess HF-related competences of their staff. They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F</p>



and G requirements.

comment	50	comment by: SVFB/SAMA
response	<p>page 15/218 the limit of CAT should be included up to 5.7 T.</p> <p>Noted. Please refer to the response to your comment #45.</p>	

Explanatory Note Part-M — SECTION A — Changes to the Continuing Airworthiness Management Exposition - Management system documentation p. 17

comment	163	comment by: <i>Baines Simmons Limited</i>
response	<p>CAME content and layout The renaming of Section 2 from Quality System to “Management System” implies that the “Quality System” requirements have been superseded by the “Management System” requirements, when in reality the “Quality System” has only been renamed as the “Compliance Monitoring Function”, of the broader “Management System”. We feel this will cause further confusion between the various terms in use. We recommend that the new “Management System” content (sections 2.6 through 2.14) should be included in Part 0 General Organisation, to reinforce the intention that that the Management System is all encompassing, including the “Corporate Commitment by the Accountable Manager”, the “Management Personnel”, and the “Management Organisation Charts”. Furthermore the “Continuing Airworthiness Safety Policy” should be include in Part 0, whilst the remainder of the proposed Compliance Monitoring content (2.1, less the policy, through to 2.6) should be in Part 2 “Compliance Monitoring Procedures” as in the NPA.</p> <p>We consider this layout to be vital to help ensure that industry does not continue to equate “safety” with “quality”, or “safety performance” solely with regulatory compliance.</p> <p>Accepted. The CAME content and layout will be amended as proposed in this comment, and similar changes will be made to the MOE (NPA 2013-01(C)).</p>	

comment	233	comment by: <i>FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation</i>
<p>An option is presented about an separate manual called Safety Management Manual</p>		



	<p>(SMM) which explains how to implement the new management system processes. The FNAM notices that no requirement is given about its approval. The FNAM is asking if there is any reference to another regulation which explain its process of acceptance. It should be acceptable to have only one manual in case of multiple agreements.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>GM1 M.A.712(a)(5), as proposed in the NPA, clarifies the different possibilities in relation to management system documentation.</p> <p>The proposed CAMO.A.200 (NPA: M.A.712), under point (b), clarifies that where the organisation holds one or more additional certificates, the management system may be combined or integrated with that required under the other certificate(s) held. The management system documentation will need to reflect integration when this option is chosen. It is acceptable to have only one manual in case of multiple certificates as long as the organisation can demonstrate that all applicable requirements are addressed.</p> <p>Requirements for approval are those in CAMO.A.300 (NPA: M.A.704), points (b) and (c). If management system key processes are not included in the CAME, but in a separate Safety Management Manual, then the provisions defined in CAMO.A.300 (NPA: M.A.704) equally apply to such separate manual.</p>
comment	<p>304 comment by: <i>European Sailplane Manufacturers</i></p> <p>This essentially translates to:</p> <p>"Re-write your CAME."</p> <p>For small companies this often is a task which will have to be contracted to third parties but which still needs close cooperation with management of the organisation.</p> <p>Both elements (contracting and blocking of management) are rather expensive.</p> <p>Without a clear benefit, this is unacceptable for small companies. The administrative workload is already too high!</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>As indicated in NPA 2013-01(A), all changes proposed to Part-M Subpart G for organisations not involved in the continuing airworthiness management of complex motor-powered aircraft or aircraft used in CAT (licensed air carriers), as well as to Part-M Subpart F, were to be considered 'provisional' pending the outcome of the actions recommended to EASA by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy Group appointed by the EASA Management Board.</p> <p>The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT and are not managing CMPA). Linked to that, those organisations will not have to introduce HF training nor assess HF-related competences of their staff. They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F</p>



and G requirements.

Explanatory Note Part-M — SECTION A — Industry standards p. 17-18

comment	<p>94 comment by: <i>EUROPEAN AVIATION QUALITY GROUP (EAQG)</i></p> <p>Industry Standards Note 2 Comment: Aerospace and Defence Industries Association of Europe (ASD) moved to a different address. Proposed Change to Text: published by Aerospace and Defence Industries Association of Europe (ASD) - Standardisation - Rue Montoyer 10 - 1000 Brussels.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>This will be updated as indicated.</p>

comment	<p>245 comment by: <i>FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation</i></p> <p>Regarding this following statement: "Specific provisions at AMC level have been introduced in order to consider and give credit for the implementation of management systems in accordance with Industry standards (such as ISO 9001:20081 or EN 9110:2009 or later revisions) by maintenance organisations." the FNAM do not agree that less monitoring are going to be made on the organisation which will have this Industry standard. The FNAM is asking to the EASA to make a RIA on the standards in order to prove on the exactitude similarity with this regulation requirement.</p> <p>For legal certainty issues, any reference to external norms, article, and Industry standards shall explicitly precise the date and the version of these documents.</p>
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The way the AMC in Section B is worded leaves the consideration of industry standards at the sole discretion of the competent authority. Not including such provision would create a vacuum as it would remove the acceptable means with specific criteria to be applied when the decision has been made that some audit items should be credited, i.e. it would not provide for any transparency, nor standardisation, should the competent authority decide to apply different conditions for crediting audit items.</p> <p>This AMC reflects the outcome of a dedicated consultation and review process with the involvement of the competent authorities. It is already applied under Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012.</p> <p>Regarding the need to make reference to the applicable version, it is acceptable in EU</p>



legislation to include references to standards as dynamic references by not mentioning the applicable edition. This option is chosen when it is intended that the reference is to the latest applicable version.

Extract from the [Joint Practical Guide for persons involved in the drafting of European Union legislation](#) (issued by the Legal Service of the European Commission):

Static references

A static reference refers to a specific text as it stands on a specific date, by stating the title of the act and the source, and specifying, where appropriate, an amending act.

Dynamic reference

A reference is dynamic if the provision cited is always understood to be the provision as amended. References in the enacting terms of acts of Union law are, in general, dynamic references.

When no mention is made to a particular edition, then the reference is construed as a dynamic reference.

Explanatory Note Part-M — SECTION A — Human Factors

p. 18-19

comment 39

comment by: *NFLC, Cranfield University, UK*

Why does Part M HF training need to align with Part 145? There will be some overlap but I would suggest this assumption is flawed as written.

response

Not accepted.

HF concepts do need to be understood by CAMO staff as concepts that can contribute to events through their own errors or by causing errors to be made within the contracted Part-145 organisation; therefore, there are many common areas in terms of human factors in the Part-CAMO and Part-145 organisation.

comment 82

comment by: *René Meier, Europe Air Sports*

Human factors
page 18/224

Best possible training of staff at all levels is the best way to minimize human factors effects. Unfortunately this fact is, as far as we see, not dealt with here.

Additionally, even more important than best possible training is the choice of the right employees, also at all levels. It is not only "good airmanship" that counts, to exactly the same extent it is good "workmanship".

Rationale:

Enormous cultural differences exist within Europe of the 27 (or 28) plus 4: What might work in one country might simply be impossible in another. We are absolutely not fond of



	<p>endless repetition of the recognized fact that one size does not fit all, but in the area of human factors, however, this is really true, looking at the various school systems. Statements made by the Agency ask for enormous investments in human factors training staff and facilities. Actually, "Europe" does not dispose of the money, nor of the human resources required.</p> <p>And in the end, always the same question: Who do you think will be able and willing to pay the bill?</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>As indicated in NPA 2013-01(A), all changes proposed to Part-M Subpart G for organisations not involved in the continuing airworthiness management of complex motor-powered aircraft or aircraft used in CAT (licensed air carriers), as well as to Part-M Subpart F, were to be considered 'provisional' pending the outcome of the actions recommended to EASA by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy Group, which was appointed by the EASA Management Board.</p> <p>The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT and are not managing CMPA). Linked to that, those organisations will not have to introduce HF training nor assess HF-related competences of their staff. They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements.</p>
comment	<p>199 comment by: <i>Howard Torode</i></p> <p>Comment by European Gliding Union</p> <p>A two year 'Human Factors' continuation training course is too frequent to be economic for sporting organisations where certifying staff is composed of a widely spread volunteer work force. We need a different, more relevant approach to HF and training compared to large Part 145 organisations. It would be more appropriate to use a 5 years cycle for simple aircraft (ELA1&2) not used in CAT.</p> <p>For non-CAT the HF syllabus has already been set in Part 66 L licence module 2. Why are there two syllabii, and if so, how do they interact? Presumably a Part 66 engineer in a Subpart F organisation is exempt from one or the other?</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>As indicated in NPA 2013-01(A), all changes proposed to Part-M Subpart G for organisations not involved in the continuing airworthiness management of complex motor-powered aircraft or aircraft used in CAT (licensed air carriers),, as well as to Part-M Subpart F, were to be considered 'provisional'.</p> <p>The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT and are not managing CMPA). Linked to that, those organisations will not have to introduce HF training nor assess HF-related competences of their staff. They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements.</p> <p>The HF syllabus in Part-66 is applicable in the context of obtaining a Part-66 licence. The</p>



HF syllabus proposed for Part-M is applicable for personnel not having received initial HF training (for example, component maintenance staff) and for recurrent training.

comment 234 comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation*

The FNAM reminds that the European Union has already established work and rest time limits and their minimum standard in the "Directive 2003/88/EC" and in the "Directive 2000/79/EC". It is not from the scope of the EASA to establish social requirements but it belongs to the States sovereignty. The FNAM is requesting to remove those principles from the SMS requirements.

response Noted.

This comment is relevant to Part-145. See response to comment #605 on NPA 2013-01(C).

Explanatory Note Part-M — SECTION A — Indirect approval vs changes not requiring prior approval

p. 19-20

comment 40 comment by: *NFLC, Cranfield University, UK*

Human Factors, para c, page 19.

As a Part M, I use a maintenance programme supplied by the TC holder, and the maintenance instructions are also supplied by the TC holder. Therefore, I would suggest that the type certificate holder is a more significant party in the HF & HPL of maintenance programmes than the Part M organisation is, and this requirement should be addressed at the Part 21J TC holders.

All I am doing as a Part M is managing information supplied to me, and making some small additions based on national requirements. I am not the brains that specifies how things are done, that is the Part 21J. I would go back to the Part 21J with any errors, but then the Part 145 can do the same.

So even though I agree with the sentiment of this paragraph, I fail to see how I can deliver it in practice.

response Not accepted.

The maintenance programme is not the exact transcription of the applicable design approval holder data and not all maintenance instructions are necessarily included in the maintenance programme (this concerns in particular those instructions not qualifying as mandatory continuing airworthiness information). The operating environment, modifications, STCs and repairs embodied in the aircraft also need to be considered when drafting the maintenance programme. Moreover, the maintenance programme may be drafted as a stand-alone document or by making reference to other documents, i.e. the applicable design approval holder data. The way the information is presented and grouped inside the maintenance programme is also not mandated. In this respect the



CAMO developing the maintenance programme creates the link between the design approval holder and the maintenance organisation and there is significant potential for consideration of human factors issues.

Therefore, ICAO added a standard in ICAO Annex 6 (cf. Standard 8.3) with a requirement for human factor principles to be observed in the design and application of the aircraft maintenance programme, and this needs to be transposed into the EASA rules.

Explanatory Note Part-M — Editorial and consistency changes p. 21

comment 109 comment by: CAA-NL

At various points the statement is made to ensure compliance with this regulation, where as in the operational regulations a reference to regulation 216/2008 and its implementing rules would be more appropriate.

response Accepted.

The text will be changed to be fully aligned with Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012.

comment 313 comment by: European Sailplane Manufacturers

The sailplane manufacturers have here the following comments:

General:
 If all these editorial changes in the Part-M would be introduced then still an update of M/F and CAMO expositions would be needed for all organisations even if some (e.g. the very small ones) would be exempted.
 We consider it to be a bit too late to change so many expressions with fundamental meaning within the rule.

Quality system:
 It tells a whole story that we shall now monitor compliance instead of trying to produce good quality.
 In the end this even more transports the illusion that only by showing compliance with regulations good work can be done. This is rubbish.
 We all have observed an increasing divergence of the real important work (e.g. maintaining / repairing / inspecting aircraft) and all the paperwork associated with approvals, expositions, audits etc..
 EASA should start to realize, that within small companies this real important work should be supported and the main tool would be to lesson the paperwork.

Surveyor:
 The word inspector should not be used for the NAA persons doing the audits.



response

In the air sport communities the word "inspector" is still used for these persons, which have now been defined as certifying staff and airworthiness review staff. Still an inspector they are and that should not be confused with auditors from the competent authorities.

Re-numbered AMC / GM:

This is not really helpful...very confusing.

Noted.

As indicated in NPA 2013-01(A), all changes proposed to Part-M Subpart G for organisations not involved in the continuing airworthiness management of complex motor-powered aircraft or aircraft used in CAT (licensed air carriers), as well as to Part-M Subpart F, were to be considered 'provisional'.

The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT and are not managing CMPA). They will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements, meaning quality system instead of management system.

Regarding the comment on the reference to quality system:

The 'management system' provisions proposed for Part-CAMO build upon those elements that are already in place today in any organisation approved within the scope of Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014, i.e. the quality-system-related provisions. These provisions will 'deliver' the 'compliance monitoring function' of the new management system requirements. As current regulatory provisions related to 'quality system' solely deal with the monitoring of compliance, related reporting and corrective action processes, and with the advent of additional safety-management-related functions such as safety risk management, it is preferable to adopt more neutral language at IR level. This also considers that there are multiple types of quality systems defined in different international or national standards, with different meanings and scopes. It is, therefore, proposed to refer to compliance monitoring function that, together with all other required functions and processes, make up the organisation's management system for safety.

As stated in the Explanatory Note, this change to terminology at IR level is not meant to require organisations to change the designations of their quality system personnel or department — it is left to each organisation to decide how to refer to this function and to determine the most suitable organisational set-up allowing to manage all functions required by the amended rules. This is why the NPA proposes to embed the safety-management-related functions into the general management system provisions, rather than mandating SMS as a separate thing, which provides flexibility for organisations to implement these as they see fit. This aims to ensure maximum freedom for organisations in terms of organisational aspects and terminology.

Conversely, at Part-CAMO requirements level, no reference to 'quality system' must remain.

Regarding the comment on the reference to surveyor:

Terminology is proposed to be aligned with existing one in the areas of aircrew and air operations (see ORA.GEN.200 in Regulation (EU) No 290/2012 and ORO.GEN.200 in Regulation (EU) No 965/2012). Other regulators, such as the FAA and TCCA, also use the



term ‘inspector’.

Regarding renumbered AMC/GM:

The need to add an AMC number even when there is only one EASA AMC included in the text is required to allow for future addition of new EASA AMCs for the same IR, for example as an outcome of the alternative means of compliance process proposed with this NPA.

comment	<p>319 comment by: <i>Federal Office of Civil Aviation, FOCA, Switzerland</i></p> <p>The established term “indirect approval” is reworded to “changes not requiring prior approval”. In our view, this new wording is less clear than the established wording. In particular, the new wording implicates that such changes need NAA approval afterwards, but in fact, no further approval from the NAA is required.</p>
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The term ‘indirect approval’ lacks legal certainty and, therefore, it has been replaced by ‘changes not requiring prior approval’ when drafting the IRs for air operations and aircrew.</p> <p>The same approval principles should apply to all areas within the scope of Regulation (EC) No 216/2008. The purpose is to ensure a consistent approach to managing changes in order to allow competent authorities to apply the same procedures.</p>

Explanatory Note Part-M — Detailed list of changes	p. 21-49
---	----------

comment	<p>11 comment by: <i>Nuno Marques - OGMA</i></p> <p>PART-21 refer System Monitoring Management as "Quality Assurance System". In this NPA to PART-M and PART-145, Compliance Monitoring Function instead of Quality System.</p> <p>As my company is certified also PART-21, I can consider Compliance Monitoring Function also to PART-21?</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>As stated in the Explanatory Note, this change to terminology at IR level is not meant to require organisations to change the designations of their quality system personnel or department — it is left to each organisation to decide how to refer to this function and to determine the most suitable organisational set-up allowing to manage all functions required by the amended rules.</p> <p>The terminology used in Part-21 may be reviewed to determine the need for further alignment in Phase II of RMT.0251 (MDM.055).</p>



comment	12	comment by: <i>Nuno Marques - OGMA</i>
	<p>PART-21 refer System Monitoring Management as "Quality Assurance System". In this NPA to PART-M and PART-145, Compliance Monitoring Function instead of Quality System. As my company is certified also PART-21, I can consider Compliance Monitoring Function also to PART-21?</p>	
response	<p>Noted. Please refer to the response to comment #11.</p>	

comment	13	comment by: <i>Nuno Marques - OGMA</i>
	<p>PART-21 refer System Monitoring Management as "Quality Assurance System". In this NPA to PART-M and PART-145, Compliance Monitoring Function instead of Quality System. As my company is certified also PART-21, I can consider Compliance Monitoring Function also to PART-21?</p>	
response	<p>Noted. Please refer to the response to comment #11.</p>	

comment	14	comment by: <i>Nuno Marques - OGMA</i>
	<p>In third bullet in respect of "AMC and GM, numbering and format", is Implementing Rule and not Rile, right? I hope! ;)</p>	
response	<p>Accepted. This was a typo and it will be corrected.</p>	

comment	148	comment by: <i>Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)</i>
	<p>· Table last row in the description column. Editorial "Subpart F" mentioned. Should be "Subpart G".</p>	
response	<p>Accepted. This was a copy-paste error and it will be corrected to read 'Subpart G'/'Part-CAMO' as appropriate.</p>	



comment 323

comment by: *European Sailplane Manufacturers*

From here on the sailplane manufacturers have to admit, that going through the next 200 pages by far exceeds their possibilities.

We refer to the general comments given for NPA2013-01A and given here in NPA2013-01B above.

If EASA rulemaking will more and more evolve into an attrition battle where hundreds of pages of proposed amendments have to be commented, then we can only ask for a fundamental change in the rulemaking process.

The experience has shown that indeed it might be possible that in the following pages several critical details might be hidden, which will hurt small aviation. But who could claim that he can see today that there is such a hidden trap?

And even worse - who can foresee what will be happening during implementation by NAAs (who themselves are already overwhelmed by existing regulation)?

The European sailplane manufacturers sincerely hope that there might be light on the horizon in the form of a much less complicated regulation for small aviation, e.g. for all activities with aircraft falling under the ELA2 definition.

Otherwise we are lost - in the paper flood and also in this way of conducting rulemaking and finally in the attempt to prosper in a sector of aviation, which is existing much longer than EASA or the European community...

response

Same as comment #591 on NPA 2013-01(C).

Noted.

This NPA is indeed extensive, in particular because relevant provisions that are aligned with the corresponding general requirements in terms of authority and organisation requirements in Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012 had to be included three times (for Part-M Subpart F, Part-M Subpart G, and Part-145). The items that are fully aligned between those parts are identified in the Explanatory Notes (cf. detailed list of changes) with an asterisk (*) to facilitate their review by all stakeholders concerned.

The proposal to align the organisation and authority requirements between aircrew, air operations and continuing airworthiness aims to streamline the requirements and eliminate the differences that are not justified. This shall ultimately lead to the adoption of simpler common generic requirements for authorities and organisations complemented, where necessary, by area-specific requirements, to ensure the most efficient use of resources, eliminate gaps, overlapping requirements and confused responsibilities, as well as to facilitate safety promotion and training.

The need for simpler Part-M rules for General Aviation is fully acknowledged; this has been considered in Phase II of the Part-M General Aviation Task Force.



comment	202	comment by: <i>Finnish Transport Safety Agency</i>
	Finland has no comments, no objections on this document.	
response	Noted.	

SUBPART A — GENERAL — M.A.202 External occurrence reporting p. 54

comment	52	comment by: <i>SVFB/SAMA</i>
	<p>pg 54/218 M.A.202 (a)</p> <p>Here input in the system is required.</p> <p>Where do we get the output, in what form and manner ?</p> <p>This system should provide aviation with safety relevant information BEFORE the accident happens.</p> <p>The output portion of the system should be ready BEFORE the input system is set up. At present there are 450'000 reports STORED in the repository (sound like crematory)</p> <p>The accident report, well prepared as it is, comes out long after the events. From Occurrence reporting, which could be predictive, there is no value added to the public whatsoever.</p>	
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>To support the implementation of EASP and SSP, a new provision is added in Section B (refer to CAMO.B.135 (NPA: M.B.106) 'Immediate reaction to a safety problem') to require competent authorities to take adequate measures following the identification of a safety problem through occurrence reporting or any other means. This new IR also foresees that EASA shall provide, without undue delay, Member States with all the information needed for them to react in a timely manner to a safety problem involving any products, parts, appliances, persons or organisations within the scope of Regulation (EC) No 216/2008.</p> <p>All provisions on occurrence reporting will need to be reviewed to be aligned with Regulation (EU) No 376/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 3 April 2014 on the reporting, analysis and follow-up of occurrences in civil aviation. This will be done through a separate task (RMT.0681).</p>	



comment	64	comment by: <i>KLM Engineering & Maintenance</i>
	<p><i>A.202 External occurrence reporting</i></p> <p>(a) Any person or organisation responsible in accordance with point M.A.201 shall report to the competent authority designated by the State of Registry, the organisation responsible for the type design or supplemental type design and, if applicable, the Member State of operator, any identified condition of an aircraft or component which endangers flight safety.</p> <p>(b) Reports shall be made in a manner established by the competent authority as defined in M.1 Agency and contain all pertinent information about the condition known to the person or organisation.</p> <p>(c) Where the person or organisation maintaining the aircraft is contracted by an owner or an operator to carry out maintenance, the person or the organisation maintaining the aircraft shall also report to the owner, the operator or the continuing airworthiness management organisation any such condition affecting the owner's or the operator's aircraft or component.</p> <p>(d) Reports shall be made as soon as practicable, but in any case within 72 hours of the person or organisation identifying the condition to which the report relates, unless exceptional circumstances prevent this.</p> <p>(e) Where relevant, the person or organisation (Which organization? Responsible in accordance with M.A.201 –or- maintaning the aircraft?) shall produce a follow-up report to provide details of actions it intends to take to prevent similar occurrences in the future as soon as these actions have been identified. This report shall be produced in a form and manner established by the competent authority</p>	
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The text will be amended to clarify the addressee in point (e).</p>	

comment	110	comment by: <i>CAA-NL</i>
	<p>M.A.202</p> <p>Please include a reference to the proper EU legislation: 2003/42 and 996/2010.</p> <p>Please amend the text of M.A.202(e):</p> <p>‘... This report shall be produced in a form and manner established by acceptable to the competent authority’.</p> <p>To provide flexibility in allowing the organization to develop its own follow-up report which is part of the CAME approved by the competent authority.</p> <p>Also we propose to add the following AMC MA202(e)</p> <p>‘The follow-up report should detail which planned and completed actions including planned/completion dates. This follow-up report should be updated continuously. Actions should address, as applicable, amendment to working procedures, amendment to training and qualifications, maintenance standards, amendments to maintenance programs, one-time inspections, amendment to maintenance contracts, any fleet actions (modifications and one-time or recurring inspections).’</p>	



response	<p>Same as comment #227 on NPA 2013-01(C).</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The text is fully aligned with that of Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012.</p> <p>All provisions related to occurrence reporting will be reviewed to ensure consistency with Regulation (EU) No 376/2014. This will be done through a separate task (RMT.0681).</p>
comment	<p>138 comment by: <i>Federation of Aerospace Enterprises in Ireland</i></p> <p>AMC 1 M.A.202 (b)</p> <p>For most operators reportable occurrences can be extracted directly from a system database, to have to put this into a form for it later to be (presumably) put back into a database seems unnecessary and should be instead put into a database compatible file type e.g. .csv. Also the form is difficult to locate and is in fact in the IORS website within the EASA website so if it is to be retained a more specific location should be provided.</p> <p>Proposed text.</p> <p>For reports from organisations under the oversight of the Agency, the EASA technical occurrence report form spreadsheet format, available on the EASA IORS website https://easa.europa.eu/iors/, should be used</p>
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Regulation (EU) No 376/2014 imposes requirements on organisations related to reporting format and content (Article 7). This set of requirements applies to all reportable occurrences. Occurrence reports contained in an organisation's database and sent to the competent authority shall comply with the format specifications that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — compatibility with the ECCAIRS software and the ADREP taxonomy; — the use of standardised formats; and — the provision of mandatory data fields. <p>These obligations apply to occurrence reports registered in organisations' databases. For this purpose, the European Commission, with the support of EASA, has developed a European Aviation Safety Reporting portal (http://www.aviationreporting.eu/). This portal offers a single address that can be used by reporting organisations to transfer occurrences to their competent authority in a format that is compliant with Regulation (EU) No 376/2014. An electronic format (E5X) compliant with Regulation (EU) No 376/2014 is also available. It is understood that organisations and competent authorities may agree on any other method that brings equivalent level of compliance.</p> <p>For organisations under the oversight of EASA, occurrence reporting is described on the EASA website at https://www.easa.europa.eu/easa-and-you/safety-management/occurrence-reporting/report-an-occurrence.</p> <p>EASA accepts online or offline forms available on the European Aviation Safety Reporting portal. EASA also accepts reports using the electronic format (E5X). It is up to the reporting organisation to select the best suitable option. The electronic format can be interfaced with an internal database. For this purpose, the JRC portal.</p>



URL= <http://eccairsportal.jrc.ec.europa.eu> provides additional information and tools.

AMC1 M.A.202(b) will be reviewed accordingly.

Please note that the requirements on occurrence reporting may need to be further amended to be aligned with Regulation (EU) No 376/2014 through a separate rulemaking task (RMT.0681).

comment 294

comment by: AEA

M.A.202 External occurrence reporting

(a) Any person or **organisation responsible in accordance with point M.A.201** shall report to the competent authority designated by the State of Registry, the organisation responsible for the type design or supplemental type design and, if applicable, the Member State of operator, any identified condition of an aircraft or component which endangers flight safety.

(b) Reports shall be made in a manner established by the competent authority as defined in M.1 Agency and contain all pertinent information about the condition known to the person or organisation.

(c) Where the person or **organisation maintaining the aircraft** is contracted by an owner or an operator to carry out maintenance, the person or the organisation maintaining the aircraft shall also report to the owner, the operator or the continuing airworthiness management organisation any such condition affecting the owner's or the operator's aircraft or component.

(d) Reports shall be made as soon as practicable, but in any case within 72 hours of the person or organisation identifying the condition to which the report relates, unless exceptional circumstances prevent this.

(e) Where relevant, the person or **organisation (Which organization? Responsible in accordance with M.A.201 –or- maintaining the aircraft?)** shall produce a follow-up report to provide details of actions it intends to take to prevent similar occurrences in the future as soon as these actions have been identified. This report shall be produced in a form and manner established by the competent authority

~

response

Accepted.

The text will be amended to clarify the addressee in point (e).

comment 368

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 54/218, section B., point M.A.202 & point M.A.403

NPA 2013-01(C), page 88/184, section B.; point 145.A.60



NPA 2013-01(C), page 132/184, section B.; point 145.A.71

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

Point M.A.202(a) requires to report “[...] any identified condition of an aircraft or component which endangers flight safety”. It relies on the AMC M.A.202(a), which provides a list of examples to define ‘a condition which endangers flight safety’.

Point 145.A.60(a) requires to report “[...] any condition of the aircraft or component [...] that has resulted or may result in an unsafe condition that hazards seriously the flight safety”

Point 145.A.71(c) states “[...], the organisation shall establish procedures to minimise the risk of multiple errors and capture errors in flight safety sensitive maintenance tasks [...]”

The definition given in AMC M.A.202(a) does not set specific and measurable criteria to identify such conditions. Further, the list of examples is not exhaustive: for example, it does not consider unscheduled maintenance or failures of systems (other than emergency system) that could lead to a serious event.

Point M.A.403(b) states that “Only the authorised certifying staff, [...] can decide, using M.A.401 maintenance data, whether an aircraft defect hazards seriously the flight safety and therefore decide when and which rectification action shall be taken before further flight and which defect rectification can be deferred”.

This is causing concerns for the application of SMS principles within the Part-M & Part-145 environments.

Existing regulations do not require design organisations to publish the list of (and to flag) all flight safety sensitive (failure) conditions, related soft/hardware components and maintenance tasks and procedures to ensure that no omission or over conservatism happens in the reporting process required by points M.A.202/145.A.60 or assessments required by points M.A.403/145.A.71 downstream.

Design organisations should develop the (minimum) basis that identifies items for which reporting is necessary. Organisations approved under EASA Part-21, Part-M, and Part-145 would then identify strengths, weaknesses, and hazards in view of achieving continual improvement and/or adaptation of such a basis.

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

Some reports of severe occurrences will eventually turn out to be unduly alarming as further information becomes available. A successful reporting system should accept such false alarms and the wasted effort they generate in the knowledge that to discourage them might eventually lead to the suppression of a genuine report. But in order to limit the number of false alarms, which could congest organisations responsible for (or involved) in reviewing occurrences, the list of (/flagging of) all flight safety sensitive (failure) conditions, related soft/hardware components, and maintenance tasks and procedures should be published, as a basis.

It is important to note that some severe occurrences could be not reported because they have been inappropriately assessed (impact underestimated) due to the lack of enough or clear information made available to the end users evaluating the severity of events, before reporting.

A safe and efficient process addressing occurrences is tremendously affected by the accountabilities, responsibilities and authorities of the different stakeholders, and by the understanding of these aspects (refer to the paragraph 6.7 of the Chapter 6, in the ICAO



Safety Management Manual, Doc. 9859).

A. Organisations approval

Organisations having accountabilities and/or responsibilities in aviation are approved in Europe under regulations such as EASA Part-21, Part-M, Part-145 or Part-147. A segregation of aviation activities/domains is organised accordingly. The high and uniform level of protection of the European citizen (ref. Article 2 of Regulation (EC) No 216/2008) is guaranteed in civil aviation at all times by organisations specialized in one or more aviation domains: organisations managing the continuing airworthiness of Products and components are not necessarily competent to design Products/components (and vice versa).

B. Individuals

Airworthiness of Products relies (amongst others) on the expertise of the different involved individuals. This expertise is built on knowledge acquired by attending specialized training courses combined with on-job experience, and is confirmed when licenses are granted or authorized signatories are nominated. This participates in establishing and maintaining a high uniform level of civil aviation safety in Europe.

C. Who should identify flight safety sensitive conditions and related items?

The principles described here above should be kept in mind for the allocation of accountabilities, responsibilities and authorities pertinent to the subject identification in order to ensure that the high uniform level of civil aviation safety is maintained.

Not all structural failures or system malfunctions endanger the flight safety (as acknowledged in AMC 20-8): some have no safety consequences. It would be appropriate to adapt the occurrence reporting system requirements to the severity of failures identified during design phase (i.e. the category of aircraft components and maintenance that depend on the worst severity of their credible failures). It would also help in identifying which maintenance tasks and procedures should be considered as “critical” in the sense of having possibly a catastrophic, hazardous or major failure^[1] in the case of undetected maintenance errors.

The personnel and organisations in the best position to evaluate the severity of the consequences of failure conditions, aircraft item failures or maintenance inappropriately performed, with due consideration of design safety objectives, are those governed by the EASA Part-21 (cleverly suggested implicitly by the AIBN report SL RAP.: 8/2006, recommendation 12/2006). The outcomes of their studies should be published to support Part-M and Part-145 organisations (to limit omissions or over conservatism). In return, Part-M organisations, with the support of Part-145 organisations, should report their experience to the Part-21 organisation in view of achieving continual improvement.

^[1] Does the EASA Part-M or Part-145 establish the definitions for “catastrophic”, “hazardous” and “major” in the context of failures? Certification Specifications do (e.g. refer to the paragraph 8 of the Acceptable Means of Compliance – AMC – with 25.1309).

response Noted.

EASA acknowledges the importance of the issues raised in this comment related to the identification of occurrences that endanger flight safety. The responsibilities of the design approval holder to facilitate the identification of conditions endangering flight safety, as well as related accountabilities and responsibilities in the reporting organisations will need



to be assessed and possibly clarified. It is proposed to address this comment in Phase II of RMT.0251 (MDM.055), which will cover changes to Part-21 and Part-145 and will also require adjustments to Part-M.

comment 369

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 54/218, section B., point M.A.202 & point M.A.403

NPA 2013-01(C), page 88/184, section B.; point 145.A.60

NPA 2013-01(C), page 132/184, section B.; point 145.A.71

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

Point M.A.202(a) requires to report “[...] any identified condition of an aircraft or component which endangers flight safety”.

Point M.A.403(b) refers to decisions “[...] whether an aircraft defect hazards seriously the flight safety [...]”.

Point 145.A.60(a) requires to report “[...] any condition of the aircraft or component [...] that has resulted or may result in an unsafe condition that hazards seriously the flight safety”

Point 145.A.71(c) states “[...], the organisation shall establish procedures to minimise the risk of multiple errors and capture errors in flight safety sensitive maintenance tasks [...]”

It is proposed to use the term ‘critical’ in the Regulation (EC) 1321/2014, the Part 145, and the Part M regulatory material, and to replace the other terms as necessary. Further harmonisation within the various Certification Specifications and Part 21 subpart Q would be advisable. This adjective could be associated with terms such as:

- ‘failure condition’ (ref. points M.A.202 & M.A.403),
- ‘maintenance’ (ref. NPA 2012-04 & paragraph (b) of point M.A.607), ‘task’ (ref. point M.A.402),
- ‘part’ or ‘component’ (ref. point M.A.202 & Part 21.A.805).

In addition, there should be a correlation between the term ‘critical’ with the failure severities (and associated airworthiness requirements) to be taken into account.

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

Reference to flight safety is ambiguous. Safety cannot be fully described and covered by the activities related to continuing airworthiness management and maintenance. While the term ‘Safety’ is globally recognized and understood by the aviation community as the objective to reach, it shall not be mistaken for the term ‘Airworthiness’ that only entails a series of activities necessary, but not sufficient, to reach this objective. Although the failure of one of these activities is likely to impact the full safety chain, the selection of the term ‘Safety’ in a very specific context should be avoided.

The term ‘critical’ is preferred to ‘flight safety’, including for consistency with the various Certification Specifications (CS-27, CS-29, CS-E, CS-P): It is a practice to refer to terms such as Critical Design Configuration Control Limitations (CDCCL), critical components, critical tasks, etc... For instance, the term ‘critical tasks’, which has been used since 2004 in procedures, training material, work cards and tools, is part of the culture of the maintenance personnel. In addition, it is not shown that replacing a powerful and striking language such as ‘critical task’ by a long term such as ‘flight safety sensitive maintenance task’, would be effective for the safety improvement, for example. It may even be considered that such a change could create confusion on a safety-related topic.

The use of the term ‘critical’ will participate in the global harmonisation of the



terminology applicable to the EASA Part 21 through the Part 147, and therefore in preventing misunderstanding.

The severities of failure conditions are defined in the applicable Certification Basis (ref. Part 21.A.17 and Part 21.A.101). The Certification Basis includes airworthiness requirements of the Certification Specifications (CS) that require, for example, for large aeroplanes (ref. CS-25):

- The prevention of catastrophic failures of the aeroplane structure, and
- Aeroplane systems be designed so that catastrophic, hazardous, or major failure conditions do not occur more than a given rate.

Some, but not all, Certification Specifications correlate the term ‘critical’ with some of the failure severities and associated airworthiness requirements (ref. CS-27/-29.602, CS-E 15, ref. also to the ED Decision 2007/003/C). It appears that there is no CS definition using generic terms for the term ‘critical’ that is common to all kinds of aircraft and related Products, parts and appliances, and the implications of such a definition are not systematically specified.

The correlation between the term ‘critical’ with the failure severities (and associated airworthiness requirements) will minimize the possibilities of errors, or extensive judgment, in the risk assessments required by SMS principles.

response

Noted.

The term ‘flight safety’ is already used in Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012.

EASA acknowledges the importance of clearly defining essential terms, such as flight safety and airworthiness, and to use them consistently throughout the EASA IRs. It is proposed to address this comment in Phase II of RMT.0251 (MDM.055), which will cover changes to Part-21 and Part-145 and will also require adjustments to Part-M.

Note that the term ‘critical maintenance task’ will prevail following the adoption of Opinion No 06/2013 ‘Critical maintenance tasks’, amending Regulation (EU) 2015/1536.

‘Critical maintenance task’ means a maintenance task that involves the assembly or any disturbance of a system or any part on an aircraft, engine or propeller that, if an error occurred during its performance, could directly endanger the flight safety.

comment

370 comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 54/218, section B., point M.A.202
 NPA 2013-01(C), page 88/184, section B.; point 145.A.60

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

– It is proposed to modify point M.A.202 to read:

“(a) Any person or organisation responsible for the management of aircraft continuing airworthiness in accordance with point M.A.201 shall report to the competent authority designated by the State of Registry, the organisation responsible for the type design or supplemental type design and, if applicable, the Member State of operator, any identified condition of an aircraft or component which endangers flight safety that has resulted or may result in a condition that hazards the aircraft continuing airworthiness or the



serviceability of both operational and emergency equipment.

(b) Reports shall be made in a form and manner established by either the Agency or the competent authority as defined in M.1, and contain all pertinent information about the condition and evaluation results known to the person or organisation.

(c) Where the person or organisation maintaining the aircraft is contracted by an owner or an operator to carry out maintenance, the person or the organisation maintaining the aircraft shall also report to the competent authority for the oversight of a maintenance organisation as defined in M.1 and to the owner, the operator or the continuing airworthiness management organisation any such condition affecting the owner's or the operator's aircraft or component.

(d) Reports shall be made submitted as soon as practicable, but in any case within 72 hours of the person or organisation identifying the condition to which the report relates, unless exceptional circumstances prevent this.

[...]"

An AMC should explicitly define what qualifies as "exceptional circumstances" in paragraph (d).

– It is proposed to modify point 145.A.60 to read:

~~"(a) The organisation shall report to the competent authority as defined in 145.1, the state of registry and the organisation responsible for the design of the aircraft or component and to the owner, the operator or the continuing airworthiness management organisation any condition of the aircraft or component identified by the organisation that has resulted or may result in an unsafe condition that hazards seriously the flight safety aircraft continuing airworthiness or the serviceability of both operational and emergency equipment.~~

~~(b) The organisation Reports shall make such reports be made in a form and manner established by either the Agency or the competent authority, and ensure that they contain all pertinent information about the condition and evaluation results known to the organisation.~~

~~(c) Where the organisation is contracted by a commercial operator to carry out maintenance, the organisation shall also report to the operator any such condition affecting the operator's aircraft or component.~~

~~(d) The organisation shall produce and submit such r~~ Reports shall be submitted as soon as practicable but in any case within 72 hours of the organisation identifying the condition to which the report relates unless exceptional circumstances prevent this.

[...]"

An AMC should explicitly define what qualifies as "exceptional circumstances" in paragraph (c).

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The current scheme for reporting occurrences has the merit, at first glance, to have a built-in redundant feature. This feature may later prove to be a way to congest or complicate the work of organisations responsible for (or involved in) reviewing occurrences. It may ultimately have detrimental consequences on the initial objective: i.e. to process occurrences on-time and on-quality. For example, for a given occurrence, additional work is generated by two reports (one report issued by the person or organisation responsible for the aircraft continuing airworthiness management, and the



other by the maintenance organisation):

- not having the same contents, or
- not submitted simultaneously.

Experience shows another drawback: It happened that the CAMO and the contracted maintenance organisation relied on each other to report occurrences. How many occurrences have not been reported because each party believed the other one already did it?

Again, a safe and efficient process addressing occurrences is tremendously affected by the accountabilities, responsibilities and authorities of the different stakeholders.

Therefore, it is proposed to allocate the central accountability, responsibilities and authorities pertinent to reporting to the person or organisation responsible for the aircraft continuing airworthiness management and to require the maintenance organisation to provide support (and report only to its competent authority). Refer to points M.A.721(d) and 145.A.62(d).

It is to be noted that the proposal takes into account the objective set by point M.A.301, as it refers to “[...] any identified condition of an aircraft or component that has resulted or may result in a condition that hazards the aircraft continuing airworthiness or the serviceability of both operational and emergency equipment”.

When the changes introduced by the Comments No. 1 and No. 2 are adopted, this wording should be replaced by “... that has resulted or may result in a critical failure or unsafe condition” (the definition of “unsafe condition” is already given in the AMC 21.A.3B(b)).

Point M.A.202(b) (and point 145.A.60(b) as well) does not address the case when an occurrence should be reported to different competent authorities: e.g. to the authority for the oversight of the continuing airworthiness of individual aircraft and the issue of airworthiness review certificates, to the authority for the oversight of a maintenance organisation, and/or to the authority for the approval of maintenance programmes.

The proposal is to accept the Technical Occurrence Report form ref. FO.IORS.00044-004, on the EASA website <http://www.easa.europa.eu/iors/>, as an acceptable template to report occurrence whatever the Member State authority. This change aims at reducing the duplication of efforts to report on different forms the same occurrence. Only the distribution list would need to be adjusted to the case.

Note: it is surprising to carry out “external occurrence reporting” (title of points M.A.202/145.A.60) on the EASA website “Internal Occurrence Reporting System”.

response

Partially accepted.

The reference to ‘which endangers flight safety’ is maintained and AMCs will clarify that this refers to events or circumstances that resulted or may result in a condition that hazards the aircraft continuing airworthiness or the serviceability of both operational and emergency equipment.

To address possible omissions in reporting between CAMOs and Part-145 organisations, it is proposed to amend Annex I to Part-M ‘Continuing airworthiness arrangement’ by adding provisions to clarify obligations in relation to occurrence reporting obligations as part of the arrangement.

Regarding the comment on point (b), all competent authorities will need to adapt the



formats of the occurrence reports to comply with Annex I to Regulation (EU) No 376/2014. This should eliminate the need to use different reporting formats for different authorities.

The text of M.A.202 may need to be further amended by RMT.0681 to be aligned with Regulation (EU) No 376/2014.

Regarding the proposal to accept the Technical Occurrence Report form (ref.: FO.IORS.00044-004) on the EASA website, please note that this has been designed for reporting from organisations whose competent authority is EASA. The form may need to be reviewed to align it with Annex I to Regulation (EU) No 376/2014.

Regarding the note: The title of M.A.202 is changed back to read 'occurrence reporting' to avoid confusion. Regarding IORS, the reference to 'Internal' is to mean this is the system implemented by EASA.

comment

371

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 54/218, section B., point M.A.202

NPA 2013-01(C), page 88/184, section B.; point 145.A.60

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

– It is proposed to modify the sub-paragraph (e) of point M.A.202 to read:

“(e) Where relevant, the person or organisation responsible for the management of aircraft continuing airworthiness shall produce a follow-up report to provide details of actions it intends to take to prevent similar occurrences in the future as soon as these actions have been identified. This report shall be produced in a form and manner established by the competent authority as defined in M.1.”

In addition, what is meant by “where relevant”?

– It is proposed to modify the sub-paragraph (e) of point 145.A.60 to read:

“(ed) Where relevant, the organisation shall produce a follow-up report to provide the person or organisation responsible for the management of aircraft continuing airworthiness with details of possible actions it intends to take to prevent similar occurrences in the future, as soon as these actions have been identified. This report shall be produced in a form and manner established by the competent authority.”

In addition, what is meant by “where relevant”?

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The term “Where relevant” is found ambiguous in accordance with practices recommended in the paragraph 4.1.5 of the EASA Proposed CM-21A-J-001 Issue 01.

response

Partially accepted.

The text now refers to ‘the person or organisation responsible in accordance with M.A.201’.

The text may need to be further amended by RMT.0681 to fit Regulation (EU) No 376/2014.

comment

227

comment by: LHT



response	<p>M.A.202 External occurrence reporting (e): "Where relevant" needs to be specified.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The text in Part-M is aligned with that already published in Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 (a significant portion of CAMOs are also AOC holders). The text will be further amended by RMT.0681 to fit Article 13 of Regulation (EU) No 376/2014.</p>
----------	---

comment	<p>307 comment by: AEA</p> <p>M.A.202 External occurrence reporting (e): "Where relevant" needs to be specified.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The text in Part-M is aligned with that already published in Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 (a significant portion of CAMOs are also AOC holders). The text will be further amended by RMT.0681 to fit Article 13 of Regulation (EU) No 376/2014.</p>

comment	<p>33 comment by: NFLC, Cranfield University, UK</p> <p>AMC 1 M.A.202(a)3 It may not be possible to provide this information within 72 hours for small organisations without disruption to leave etc. So this statement is OK for significant failures / incidents / accidents but too restrictive for minor occurrences.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The 72-hour limit is now mandated by Regulation (EU) No 376/2014 and the list of reportable occurrences subject to mandatory reporting is defined in Regulation (EU) 2015/1018.</p>

comment	<p>372 comment by: Airbus</p> <p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: NPA 2013-01(B), page 54/218, section B., AMC 1 M.A.202 [NPA 2013-01(C), pages 88-89, section B., AMC1 & 2 145.A.60]</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: This AMC is new in accordance with the table page 22/218. Why has AMC M.A.202(b) not been revised instead? It is proposed to modify the AMC M.A.202(b), re-identified AMC1 M.A.202, to read: "External Occurrence reporting (a) The reports may be transmitted by any method, i.e. electronically, by post or by facsimile. Each report should contain, at least, the following information, as applicable: (1) Reporter/ or Organisation's name and approval reference if applicable,</p>
---------	--



	<p>(2) Information necessary to identify the subject aircraft and/or component;</p> <p>(3) Date and time relative to any life or overhaul limitation relevant instruction of the Aircraft Maintenance Programme approved under M.A.302, in terms of flight hours and/or flight cycles and/or landings, and/or any other applicable parameter etc., as appropriate;</p> <p>(4) Details of the occurrence, condition as required by M.A.202(b); and</p> <p>(5) Any other relevant information found during the evaluation or rectification of the condition.</p> <p>AMC 20-8 General Acceptable Means of Compliance for Airworthiness of Products, Parts and Appliances provides further guidance on occurrence reporting.</p> <p>(b) For reports from organisations under the oversight of the Agency, the EASA technical occurrence report form, available on the EASA website, should be used.”</p> <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:</p> <p>No reason has been found to restrict AMP-related data to be provided to those relative to the life or overhaul limitations.</p> <p>Reference to AMC 20-8 is kept for consistency with AMC1 145.A.60.</p>
response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>The new AMC1 M.A.202 supersedes the existing AMC M.A.202(b). This has not been correctly identified in the amended text and in the detailed list of changes.</p> <p>The text may need to be further amended to be aligned with Regulation (EU) No 376/2014.</p>

comment	<p>53 comment by: SVFB/SAMA</p> <p>page 54/218 (e)</p> <p>the value of a functioning reporting system is in the valuation of a high number of data (as opposed to the individual organisation) Therefore, the organisation shall of course forward any findings , however the agency should be in a much better position due to a huge database> the output here is what we are looking for and which is not available nor defined.</p> <p>Priorities in doing so should be given to airlines, then other CAT (charter) then major organisations, . Where the common database input remains under a number of statistical relevance, the regulation shall allow organisations to be exempt from reporting eventually unless its a vital occurrence.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Compliance with Regulation (EU) No 376/2014 needs to be ensured. The statistical relevance of occurrences cannot be determined at the level of an individual organisation.</p>

Comment	<p>96 comment by: Association of Dutch Aviation Technicians NVLT</p>
---------	---



	<p>Due the fact that Directive 2003/42/EC concerning ‘occurrence reporting in civil aviation’ will be revised see Regulation (EC) No 996/2010. The NVLT has the opinion that there should be a form of synchronisation between a large number of ‘occurrence’ related aspects mentioned in this NPA Regulation (EC) No 1321/2014 and in Regulation (EC) No 996/2010.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Following the publication of Regulation (EU) No 376/2014, all relevant occurrence reporting provisions will be reviewed by RMT.0681 to ensure consistency and align with that Regulation.</p>

<p>SUBPART A — GENERAL — AMC1 M.A.202 External occurrence reporting</p>	<p>p. 54</p>
--	--------------

comment	<p>3 comment by: <i>Stefan Stroeker</i></p> <p>Ladies and Gentlemen, in the light of updating AMC 1 M.A.202 - External occurrence reporting, it should be added in (a) (2) behind "... component;" e.g. Part- and Serial- Number. This information is elementary for further investigations. With kind regards Stefan Ströker - STROEK AIR -</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The AMC will be amended as proposed in your comment.</p>

comment	<p>4 comment by: <i>Stefan Stroeker</i></p> <p>Ladies and Gentlemen, in the light of updating AMC 1 M.A.202 - External occurrence reporting, it should be added in (a) (2) behind "... component;" e.g. Part- and Serial- Number. This information is elementary for further investigations. With kind regards Stefan Ströker - STROEK AIR</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Please see response to comment #4 above.</p>



comment	83	comment by: <i>René Meier, Europe Air Sports</i>
	<p>Subpart A - General M.A.202 External occurrence reporting page 54/224</p> <p>On the one hand, thinking of "commercial air transport" or of "commercial operations" (which is not the same...), if safety of flight is endangered, it is not the preparation of a report which comes first, other actions are much more important. 72 hours may be appropriate.</p> <p>On the other hand, for our community, we ask for a time limit of five working days.</p> <p>Rationale: Looking at all the holidays indicated on European calendars 72 hours cannot be respected several times a year.</p>	
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The limit of 72 hours is defined in Regulation (EU) No 376/2014, and in the area of General Aviation the Regulation assigns responsibility for reporting mostly to the pilot-in-command. Moreover, the Regulation requires competent authorities to implement systems for mandatory and voluntary reporting that are easily accessible and facilitate reporting.</p>	
comment	295	comment by: <i>AEA</i>
	<p><i>AMC 1 M.A.202 External occurrence reporting</i> <i>(this AMC is very similar to the existing AMC M.A.202(b) – so; not completely NEW. It is rather confusing to indicate this AMC is completely new.)</i></p> <p>(a) Each report should contain, at least, the following information, as applicable:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Reporter/Organisation name and approval reference; (2) Information necessary to identify the subject aircraft and/or component; (3) Date and time relative to any life or overhaul limitation in terms of flying hours/cycles/landings etc., as appropriate; (4) Details of the condition as required by M.A.202(b) <i>known to the person or organization</i>; and (5) Any other relevant information found during the evaluation or rectification of the condition. <p>(b) For reports from organisations under the oversight of the Agency, the EASA technical occurrence report form, available on the EASA website, should be used.</p>	
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The new AMC1 M.A.202 supersedes the existing AMC M.A.202(b). This has not been correctly identified in the amended text and in the detailed list of changes. See also the response to comment #372.</p>	
comment	65	comment by: <i>KLM Engineering & Maintenance</i>



	<p>AMC 1 M.A.202 External occurrence reporting (this AMC is very similar to the existing AMC M.A.202(b) – so; not completely NEW. It is rather confusing to indicate this AMC is completely new.)</p> <p>(a) Each report should contain, at least, the following information, as applicable:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Reporter/Organisation name and approval reference; (2) Information necessary to identify the subject aircraft and/or component; (3) Date and time relative to any life or overhaul limitation in terms of flying hours/cycles/landings etc., as appropriate; (4) Details of the condition as required by M.A.202(b) known to the person or organization; and (5) Any other relevant information found during the evaluation or rectification of the condition. <p>(b) For reports from organisations under the oversight of the Agency, the EASA technical occurrence report form, available on the EASA website, should be used.</p>
response	Please refer to the response to comment #295 above.
comment	<p>235 comment by: <i>FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation</i></p> <p>Attachment #3</p> <p>Regarding the article “M.A.202 External occurrence reporting”, these requirements are showing similarities with the project of regulation on occurrence reporting in civil aviation in the perimeter of the European Council and Parliament. For example, in both case the occurrences have to be reported within 72 hours (in regard to paragraph (c)). Overlapping of regulation is not an option.</p> <p>The FNAM is asking to the EASA to clarify which entity has to cope with this subject. Only one person within the organisation should report the occurrence reporting either through the EASA, or through the NAA. It can not be through both. This would appear, as inefficient, as a possible source of misreporting and as not economically affordable. An issue is raised regarding the perimeter between these two regulations.</p> <p>Furthermore, the FNAM is asking for a definition of "exceptional circumstances" in paragraph (d).</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The text will be further amended to be aligned with Regulation (EU) No 376/2014. This Regulation aims to ensure reporting through a unique channel depending on who is the competent authority (EASA or national aviation authority) for a particular area. Individuals normally report through the organisation that employs them.</p> <p>Clarification on the reference to ‘exceptional circumstances’ will be provided by RMT.0681. This will build upon the guidance material (Guidance Material — Regulation (EU) No 376/2014 and its IRs — Version 1, December 2015, p. 25) issued by the European Commission, which states:</p> <p><i>‘The circumstances allowing a reporting of the occurrences after the 72 hours deadline shall be exceptional. This may for example include situations in which the reporter is</i></p>



unable to access a mean to report the occurrence.

In some cases an individual may be made aware of an occurrence through the automatic reporting systems of his/her organisation (e.g. Flight Data Monitoring programme, post processing of radar tracks etc) and not during the actual operation. In those cases, the 72 hours period starts when the potential reporter is made aware of this occurrence.'

SUBPART A — GENERAL — M.A.203 Means of compliance p. 54-55

comment	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 246 comment by: <i>Luftsport Verband Bayern / Germany</i> </div> <p>M.A.203 (b) Who is checking, that this requirement is fulfilled in case of staff according M.A.801 (b)(2)? It may not be obvious at the time the AR is processed that the AMC was not followed.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The possibility for persons to apply for an alternative means of compliance is not maintained for the proposed rule changes based on RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I. Therefore, M.A.203 is not maintained.</p> <p>The issue will be reassessed in Phase II.</p>

comment	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 267 comment by: <i>RECCHIA Giuseppe Guido</i> </div> <p>M.A.203 point (a) should be removed since the principle addressed in there is already contained in Article 8 of cover regulation. See also other comments on M.B.104, M.A.620 and M.A.720.</p> <p>It could be added in the point (b), which will become point (a), the following statement "<i>Without prejudice to the content of Article 8 of Regulation (EC) no. 1321/2014, when</i>"</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The possibility for persons to apply for an alternative means of compliance is not maintained for the proposed rule changes based on RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I. Therefore, M.A.203 is not maintained.</p> <p>The issue will be reassessed in Phase II.</p>

comment	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 373 comment by: <i>Airbus</i> </div>
---------	---



1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), pages 54 & 55/218, section B., point M.A.203

NPA 2013-01(B), page 81/218, section B., point M.A.620

NPA 2013-01(B), page 121/218, section B., point M.A.720

NPA 2013-01(C), pages 136-137/184, section B., point 145.A.82

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

– It is proposed to modify point M.A.203 to read:

“M.A.203 Means of compliance

(a) Alternative means of compliance to the AMC adopted by the Agency may be used to establish compliance with this Regulation and its Implementing Rules.

(b) When a person or organisation responsible for continuing airworthiness in accordance with M.A.201(a), or independent certifying staff preparing the aircraft certificate of release to service in accordance with M.A.801(b)(2) wishes to use an alternative means of compliance, he or she shall, prior to implementing it, provide the competent authority as defined in M.1 point 1 with a full description of the alternative means of compliance shall be provided to the competent authority as defined in M.1 point 1 prior to implementing it.

The description shall include any revisions to manuals or procedures that may be relevant, as well as an assessment demonstrating that this Regulation is met.

(c) The person or organisation referred to in (b) may implement these alternative means of compliance subject to prior approval by the competent authority, and upon receipt of the notification as prescribed in M.B.104.

(d) The approval of alternative means of compliance referred to in (c) is only valid for the individual person or organisation and aircraft concerned. Other persons or organisations wishing to use the same alternative means of compliance will need to apply for a new approval in accordance with (b).”

– It is proposed to delete points M.A.620 and M.A.720.

– It is proposed to modify point 145.A.82 to read:

“145.A.82 Means of compliance

(a) Alternative means of compliance to the AMC adopted by the Agency may be used by an organisation to establish compliance with this Regulation and its Implementing Rules.

(b) When an maintenance organisation wishes to use an alternative means of compliance, it shall, prior to implementing it, provide the competent authority with a full description of the alternative means of compliance shall be provided to the competent authority as defined in 145.1 prior to implementing it. The description shall include any revisions to manuals or procedures that may be relevant, as well as an assessment demonstrating that compliance with this Regulation is met.

(c) The organisation referred to in (b) may implement these alternative means of compliance subject to prior approval by the competent authority, and upon receipt of the notification as prescribed in 145.B.12(d).

(d) The approval of alternative means of compliance referred to in (c) is only valid for the organisation and aircraft concerned. Other organisations wishing to use the same alternative means of compliance will need to apply for a new approval in accordance with (b).”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

Relying only on specific persons will create problems within CAMO, particularly with subparagraph (d).

The harmonisation will bring consistency and will benefit from the strengths of the other AMC.

It seems that points M.A.620 and M.A.720 are a (approximate) duplication of point M.A.203.



response

Not accepted.

This point only addresses persons that are not employed by an approved organisation. The equivalent provisions for Part-M Subpart G organisations are included in M.A.720.

The possibility for persons to apply for an alternative means of compliance is not maintained for the proposed rule changes based on RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I. Therefore, M.A.203 is not maintained. The issue will be reassessed in Phase II.

comment

374

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 55/218, section B., AMC 1 M.A.203

NPA 2013-01(B), page 121/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.720

NPA 2013-01(C), page 137/184, section B., AMC1 145.A.82

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

The AMC1 M.A.203/AMC1 145.A.82 should clarify the acceptable method(s) to document alternative means of compliance and associated risk assessments.

Further, it is proposed to modify the AMC 1 M.A.203/AMC1 145.A.82 to read:

“DEMONSTRATION OF COMPLIANCE

In order to demonstrate that the Implementing Rules are met, a risk assessment should be completed and documented. The result of this risk assessment should demonstrate that the alternative means of compliance reaches an equivalent level of safety to that established by the Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC) adopted by the Agency—is reached.”

It is proposed to delete the AMC1 M.A.720.

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The AMC1 M.A.203/AMC1 145.A.82 do not indicate where the alternative means of compliance and the related risk assessments have to be documented as a result of the demonstration of compliance required by points M.A.203(b)/145.A.82(b): Should it be in the CAME/MOE or somewhere else? This should be clarified.

It seems that the AMC1 M.A.720 is a duplication of the AMC1 M.A.203.

response

Accepted.

AMC1 M.A.203 is not maintained.

The AMC text related to demonstration of compliance will be amended in Part-CAMO as proposed (cf. AMC1 CAMO.A.120). The results of the risk assessment are not meant to be part of the CAME. They shall form part of the management system records to be kept by the organisation. This will be clarified in the AMC. The changes will be proposed for adoption in the other domains (aircrew, air operations, aerodromes etc.).



comment	<p>208</p> <p>AMC1 M.A.301-1 Continuing airworthiness tasks Point 3: Where is the added value to replace the term "quality system" by the term "management system"?</p>	comment by: <i>LHT</i>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>See NPA 2013-01(A):</p> <p>The new management system provisions build upon those elements that are already in place today in an organisation, i.e. the quality-system-related provisions. These provisions will deliver the 'compliance monitoring function' of the new management system requirements. As current Part-M provisions related to 'quality system' deal with the monitoring of compliance, related reporting and corrective action processes, and with the advent of additional safety-management-related functions such as safety risk management, it is preferable to adopt more neutral language at IR level. This also considers that there are multiple types of quality systems defined in different international or national industry standards, with different meanings and scopes. It is, therefore, proposed for the new Part-CAMO, to refer to compliance monitoring function that, together with the other required functions and processes, make up the organisation's management system for safety.</p> <p>The change to terminology at IR level is not meant to require organisations to change the designations of their quality system personnel or department — it is left to each organisation to decide how to refer to this function and to determine the most suitable organisational set-up allowing to manage all functions required by the new Part-CAMO. This is why the opinion proposes to embed the safety-management-related functions into the general management system provisions, which provide flexibility for organisations to implement these as they see fit. This aims to ensure maximum freedom for organisations in terms of organisational aspects.</p> <p>Conversely, at Part-CAMO requirements level, no reference to 'quality system' will remain. This is aligned with the existing provisions in the areas of aircrew and air operations (see ORA.GEN.200 in Regulation (EU) No 290/2012 and ORO.GEN.200 in Regulation (EU) No 965/2012).</p>	
comment	<p>211</p> <p>M.A.302 (c): Why to replace the term "indirect approval procedure"?</p>	comment by: <i>LHT</i>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The reference to 'indirect approval' is maintained in M.A.302.</p>	
comment	<p>239</p> <p>Why has the term 'Indirect approval' been removed, this is widely used across industry and in place for many organisations within the organisation maintenance programme and</p>	comment by: <i>Thomson Airways</i>



response	the CAME.
	Noted. The reference to 'indirect approval' is maintained in M.A.302.

comment	305 comment by: AEA
	AMC1 M.A.301-1 Continuing airworthiness tasks Point 3: Where is the added value to replace the term "quality system" by the term "management system"?
response	Please refer to the response to comment #208.

comment	306 comment by: AEA
	M.A.302 (c): Why to replace the term "indirect approval procedure"?
response	Noted. The reference to 'indirect approval' is maintained in M.A.302.

comment	375 comment by: Airbus
	<p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: NPA 2013-01(B), page 55/218, section B., point M.A.302</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: It is proposed to modify the sub-paragraph (d) of the point M.A.302 "Aircraft Maintenance Programme" to read: “(d) The aircraft maintenance programme must establish compliance with: (i) instructions issued by the competent authority; (ii) instructions for continuing airworthiness and airworthiness limitations that have been specified as mandatory for the aircraft, the engine(s), the propeller(s), and their components, as appropriate, in: – the approval of the type design or restricted type design, – the approval of a change to type design or supplemental type design that is embodied, – the approval of a major repair design that is embodied, or – an airworthiness directive applicable to the type design or restricted type design. They must be identified as mandatory. – issued by the holders of the type certificate, restricted type certificate, supplemental type certificate, major repair design approval, ETSO authorisation or any other relevant approval issued under Regulation (EC) No 1702/2003 and its Annex (Part 21), and – included in the certification specifications referred to in point 21A.90B or 21A.431B of the Annex (Part 21) to Regulation (EC) No 1702/2003, if applicable;</p>



(iii) recommended instructions for continued airworthiness issued under Regulation (EU) No 748/2012 and its Annex (Part-21), that are selected in accordance with criteria:

- proposed by the owner or the continuing airworthiness management organisation, and
- approved in accordance point M.A.302(b) or (c), as appropriate.

(iv) additional or alternative instructions proposed by the owner or the continuing airworthiness management organisation once approved in accordance with point M.A.302(b) or (c), except for instructions and/or accomplishment plan intervals of safety related critical maintenance tasks and procedures referred in paragraph (e), which may be changed/escalated, subject to sufficient reviews carried out in accordance with paragraph (g) and only when subject to direct approval in accordance with point M.A.302(b)."

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

To prevent overburden and its adverse consequences in applying SMS principles, emphasis should be put on activities that affect critical failure conditions, and related maintenance tasks and procedures of the AMP (including those related to critical soft/hardware components). This implies an adjustment of point M.A.302.

Point M.A.201 states "The owner is responsible for the continuing airworthiness of an aircraft and shall ensure that no flight takes place unless [...] the maintenance of the aircraft is performed in accordance with the approved maintenance programme as specified in M.A.302". The Aircraft Maintenance Programme (AMP) is therefore at the origin of all maintenance performed on the aircraft and components thereof, and consequently a key component of the continuing airworthiness management system. It will be a major contributor feeding the Safety Management System.

Experience shows that a recommendation from an aircraft manufacturer to lubricate the door seals every 30 days has become a mandatory requirement for continuing airworthiness (ref. to CRD 2011-19). One may ask how the lubrication of a door-seal every 30 days can be of such importance for the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft. The proposal for point M.A.302(d) will participate in ensuring that no over conservatism (and consequential overburden) happens in:

- The establishment of an AMP, and
- The risk assessments required by SMS to address some AMP-related activity hazards.

The categorization of instructions will contribute to the correct assessment of risks and to the definition of appropriate mitigation strategies. Our proposal considers the following categories:

- Mandatory/Recommended maintenance,
- Scheduled/Unscheduled maintenance (not explicit, but imposed by point M.A.201),
- Critical/Non-critical maintenance (ref. NPA 2012-04),
- On/Off-wing maintenance (not explicit, but imposed by point M.A.201).

The following illustration and explanations describe our understanding of the main categories of maintenance instructions and their interrelationships.



- **Mandatory** maintenance instructions are necessary to show and maintain compliance with the design airworthiness objectives specified in the Certification Basis, in order to prevent severe failures. They exist purely for airworthiness reasons.

- **Recommended** maintenance instructions are intended for:

- Operational and/or economic reasons, but which accomplishment helps in showing compliance with a mandatory instruction: e.g. the scope of the recommended instruction

covers the intent of the equivalent mandatory instruction, but its schedule results from an analysis that also takes into account economical considerations; or

- Operational and/or economic reasons only.
- **Scheduled** maintenance instructions are intended to be complied with in accordance with a planned date/time/deadline (one-time or periodic/repetitive).
- **Unscheduled** maintenance instructions are intended to be complied with following failures, malfunction, or defect, special or abnormal conditions or events.
- **Critical** maintenance instructions (including use of correct components/materials), if improperly complied with (or not complied with at all, a fortiori), may generate failures, which effect(s) upon the Product could exceed the qualitative or quantitative airworthiness objectives prescribed in the Certification Basis.
- **Off-wing** maintenance instructions are performed in workshop (not performed directly on aircraft).

The way the paragraph (d) of the point M.A.302 is currently worded gives the impression that the AMP must establish compliance with all instructions issued by the Design Approval Holders (DAH). The Part-M should allow the person or organisation responsible for the continuing airworthiness of aircraft to assess DAH recommendations for inclusion in the AMP (i.e. some recommendations, i.e. not mandatory, may neither be introduced nor substituted by any alternative instruction in the AMP) in accordance with criteria agreed with the competent authority (risk-based approach for recommendations).

Note: It is to be noted that neither the critical maintenance instructions (includes the accomplishment plan) nor the critical maintenance procedures should be changed by the owner or the continuing airworthiness management organisation without the approval of the competent authority: interval escalations are only one example of changes requiring approval.

Our proposal will prevent an overburden in the AMP-related activities and consequently will ease the application of SMS principles within the Part-M & Part-145 environments (e.g. refer to our Comment No. 4).

response

Noted.

These changes cannot be implemented with this opinion based on the current terms of reference. The issues raised and proposals made in this comment will be reassessed in Phase II of RMT.0251 (MDM.055).

comment

376 comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:
 NPA 2013-01(B), page 55/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.302(d)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:
 It is proposed to modify the AMC M.A.302(d), re-identified AMC1 M.A.302(d), to read:
 "Aircraft Maintenance Programme compliance
 1. An owner or operator's **aircraft** maintenance programme should ~~normally~~ be based upon the ~~maintenance review board (MRB) report where applicable, the maintenance planning document (MPD), the relevant chapters of the maintenance manual or any other maintenance data published under Regulation (EU) No 748/2012 and its Annex (Part-21) that are applicable to the Products, and components thereof, for which continuing airworthiness must be ensured, containing information on scheduling. Furthermore, an owner or operator's maintenance programme should also take into account any~~



~~maintenance data containing information on scheduling for components.~~

The aircraft maintenance programme includes a maintenance schedule that should be based on maintenance data containing information on maintenance requirement scheduling, like in the Maintenance Review Board (MRB) report and the Airworthiness Limitations Section (ALS) of the Instructions for Continued Airworthiness (ICA).

The aircraft maintenance programme also governs some unscheduled maintenance requirements that should be based on maintenance data containing information on that kind of directives, like in the Aircraft Maintenance Manual (AMM). It includes maintenance requirements to be performed after the Products and their components, as appropriate, have gone through special or abnormal conditions or events such as, but not limited to: hard/overweight landing, flap/slat limit speed exceeded, bird or hail strike, brake emergency application or overheat, flight in excessive turbulence, lightning strike or static discharge, engine bird strike or slush ingestion, tail runway impact, departure from runway or taxiway, flight through dust storm or dust contamination on ground, flight through volcanic ash or volcanic ash contamination on ground, mercury spillage.

It also embraces the non revenue flight requirements following maintenance actions: Non-revenue flight following maintenance actions may be required for maintenance actions involving items that cannot be properly ground tested to verify that the aircraft's operational characteristics have not been adversely affected.

The aircraft maintenance programme should indicate amongst the maintenance tasks and procedures it covers those that are mandatory and those that are critical.

An independent inspection may be necessary for critical maintenance tasks and procedures. An independent inspection should consist of the verification on aircraft, engine(s), propeller(s), or component(s) thereof, as appropriate, of the work recorded by a person not issuing the maintenance release. The ICA published under Regulation (EU) No 748/2012 and its Annex (Part-21) should be followed when determining the need for an independent inspection. In the absence of independent inspection requirements published by organisations holding a design approval, the person or organisation managing the continuing airworthiness management should revert to the competent authority, to obtain the list of required independent inspections.

2. Instructions issued by the competent authority can encompass all types of instructions from a specific task for a particular aircraft to complete recommended aircraft maintenance schedules programmes for certain aircraft types that can be used by the owner/operator directly. These instructions may be issued by the competent authority in the following cases:

- in the absence of specific recommendations instructions published under Regulation (EU) No 748/2012 and its Annex (Part-21) of the Type Certificate Holder.
- to provide alternative instructions to those described in the subparagraph 1 above, with the objective of providing flexibility to the operator.

3. Where an aircraft type has been subjected to the MRB report process, an operator the MRB report should normally be one of the source documents for the development of the initial maintenance schedule of the operator's aircraft maintenance programme based upon the MRB report.

4. Where an aircraft is maintained in accordance with an aircraft maintenance programme based upon the MRB report process, any associated programme for the continuous surveillance of the reliability, or health monitoring of the aircraft should be considered as part of the aircraft maintenance programme. [should be addressed by AMC M.A.302(f)]

45. Aircraft maintenance programmes for aircraft types subjected to the MRB report process should contain identification cross reference to the MRB report source document tasks such that it is always possible to relate such tasks to the current approved aircraft maintenance programme. This does not prevent the approved aircraft maintenance



programme from being developed in the light of service experience to beyond the MRB report source document recommendations but will show the relationship to such recommendations. [should be moved to the paragraph 1.1.17. of the Appendix I to AMC M.A.302 and AMC M.A.301-3(b). Note that point M.A.301(b) does not exist]

The aircraft operating environment or in-service experience are some examples of reasons supporting the rejection from the approved aircraft maintenance programme of recommendations published under Regulation (EU) No 748/2012 and its Annex (Part-21). A selection policy for these recommendations should be established and proposed to the competent authority in order to ease the approval process of the aircraft maintenance programme.

~~6. Some approved aircraft maintenance programmes, not developed from the MRB process, utilise reliability programmes. Such reliability programmes should be considered as a part of the approved maintenance programme. [should be addressed by AMC M.A.302(f)]~~

75. Alternative and/or additional instructions to those defined in paragraphs M.A.302(d)(i), (ii) and (iii), proposed by the owner or the operator, may include but are not limited to the following:

- ~~Escalation of the interval for~~ Changes to certain tasks or procedures based on reliability data or other supporting information. Appendix I recommends that the aircraft maintenance programme contains the corresponding escalation change procedures. The escalation of changes to these tasks is are directly approved by the competent authority, except in the case of critical maintenance tasks or procedures ALS and their accomplishment plan (Airworthiness Limitations such as the instructions and associated airworthiness limitations specified as mandatory in the approval of any design activity or in airworthiness directives), which are approved by the Agency.
- Accomplishment plan ~~At~~ more restrictive intervals than those proposed by the TC holder of a design approval as a result of the reliability data or because of a more stringent severe operational environment.
- Additional tasks at the discretion of the operator.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

Following Comment No. 8, AMC M.A.302(d) is adapted.

On the basis of point M.A.201(a)(4) requirements, the AMC M.A.302(d) should stress that the maintenance schedule is not the only constituent of the AMP.

Further, the Annex 6 to the Convention on International Civil Aviation, Part I, Chap. 11, para. 11.3.2 requires that mandatory instructions be flagged: “Maintenance tasks and intervals that have been specified as mandatory in approval of the type design shall be identified as such.”. It is advisable to do the same for critical maintenance tasks and procedures.

Taking into account the paragraph (b) of the new point 145.A.48, the AMC is modified to implement the control of independent inspections. Refer also to the Comment No. 58 and the Comment No. 60.

The MRB report is not the unique source to develop the maintenance schedule (initial issue and revisions), which should be based on different source documents like the MRB report and the ALS.

To support the point M.A.302(d)(iii), details should be given on the need for a policy to evaluate whether recommendations issued under Part-21 should be included or not in the AMP.

Changes to critical maintenance tasks or procedures may adversely impact Product airworthiness. All changes (e.g. to task/procedure contents or to accomplishment plans) should be taken into account. The Agency should approve any change to any airworthiness-related maintenance task/procedure, unless approved variation procedures



	in design approval holder’s documentation allow the aircraft operator to vary such tasks/procedures (ref. ICAO Airworthiness Manual, Doc. 9760, Vol. II, Part A, Chap. 3, paragraph 3.5.).
response	Noted. These changes cannot be implemented with this opinion based on the current terms of reference. The issues raised and proposals made in this comment will be reassessed in Phase II of RMT.0251 (MDM.055).

SUBPART D — MAINTENANCE STANDARDS — GM1 M.A.401(d) Continuing airworthiness management	p. 56
---	-------

comment	139	comment by: <i>Federation of Aerospace Enterprises in Ireland</i>
	There does not seem to be an associated M.A. 401(d) rule and there is no reference in the existing AMCs 401 (a) to (c) that refers to the use of simplified English.	
response	Accepted. This is an editorial mistake; the GM should have read ‘GM1 M.A.401(c) Maintenance data’. The GM will be further amended to take account of the fact that not all maintenance procedures will be provided in English.	

comment	149	comment by: <i>Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)</i>
	Editorial GM1 M.A. 401(d) Continuing airworthiness management Refer to “d”? The rule has no point “d”. Refer to “Continuing airworthiness management”, M.A.401 is “Maintenance Data”.	
response	Accepted. This is an editorial mistake; the GM should have read ‘GM1 M.A.401(c) Maintenance data’. The GM will be further amended to take account of the fact that not all maintenance procedures will be provided in English.	

comment	167	comment by: <i>Baines Simmons Limited</i>
---------	-----	---



	<p>GM1 M.A. 401(d) Continuing airworthiness management There is no M.A.401 (d) currently, or proposed through this NPA. and The title of M.A.401 is “Maintenance Data” and not “Continuing airworthiness Management”. We consider there to be one or more typographical errors with this segment.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>This is an editorial mistake; the GM should have read ‘GM1 M.A.401(c) Maintenance data’.</p> <p>The GM will be further amended to take account of the fact that not all maintenance procedures will be provided in English.</p>
comment	<p>329 comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></p> <p>Regarding j) point: rewrite as "Use a language understandable by the workers" Of course simplified english is better than oxford english for such technical documents, but there is no reason to "mandate english as the language, so suppress the English requirement.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The GM will be amended to take account of the fact that not all maintenance procedures will be provided in English.</p>
comment	<p>215 comment by: <i>LHT</i></p> <p>GM1 M.A. 401 (d) Continuing airworthiness management: Not understandable, reference to regulation is missing, M.A.401 (d) doesn't exist.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>This is an editorial mistake; the GM should have read ‘GM1 M.A.401(c) Maintenance data’.</p> <p>The GM will be further amended to take account of the fact that not all maintenance procedures will be provided in English.</p>
comment	<p>308 comment by: <i>AEA</i></p> <p>GM1 M.A. 401 (d) Continuing airworthiness management: Not understandable, reference to regulation is missing, M.A.401 (d) doesn't exist.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>This is an editorial mistake; the GM should have read ‘GM1 M.A.401(c) Maintenance data’.</p>



The GM will be further amended to take account of the fact that not all maintenance procedures will be provided in English.

comment 377

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

Point M.A.401

NPA 2013-01(B), page 56/218, section B., GM1 M.A.401(d)

Point 145.A.45

NPA 2013-01(C), page 77/184, section B., AMC1 145.A.45(d)

AMC 145.A.45(g)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

The reference of GM1 M.A.401(d) seems to imply that there is a paragraph (d) in point M.A.401.

With regard to the point M.A.401 (refer also to point 145.A.45(b)3.), the paragraph (b) introduces confusion: the Part 21 imposes on Design Approval Holders the publication of “Instructions for Continued Airworthiness” (ICA), but not “instructions for continuing airworthiness”.

Point M.A.401 and point 145.A.45 refer to terms (or a combination thereof) associated or not to the term ‘maintenance’, such as ‘requirement’, ‘information’, ‘standard’, ‘practice’, ‘procedure’, ‘instruction’, or ‘task’. Some common definitions should be established for such terms in order to prevent confusion, ambiguities and/or extensive interpretations.

– It is proposed to modify point M.A.401 to read:

“(a) The person or organisation maintaining an aircraft or managing the aircraft continuing airworthiness shall:

1. ensure that all applicable maintenance data is current and readily available for use when required; and
2. have access to and use only applicable current maintenance data in the performance of maintenance including modifications and repairs, or in the management of aircraft continuing airworthiness.

(b) For the purposes of this Part Regulation, applicable maintenance data is:

1. any applicable requirement, procedure, standard or information issued by the competent authority or the Agency,
2. any applicable airworthiness directive,
3. applicable instructions for continuing/continued airworthiness, issued under Regulation (EU) No 748/2012 and its Annex (Part-21) by type certificate holders, supplementary type certificate holders and any other organisation that publishes such data in accordance with Part 21.
4. any applicable data issued in accordance with 145.A.45(d).

(c) ~~The person or organisation maintaining an aircraft shall ensure that all applicable maintenance data is current and readily available for use when required.~~ The person or organisation maintaining an aircraft or managing the aircraft continuing airworthiness shall establish a work card or worksheet system to be used and shall either transcribe accurately the maintenance data onto such work cards or worksheets or make precise reference to the particular maintenance task or tasks contained in such maintenance data. Work cards and worksheets may be computer generated and held on an electronic



database subject to both adequate safeguards against unauthorised alteration and a back-up electronic database which shall be updated within 24 hours of any entry made to the main electronic database. Complex maintenance tasks shall be transcribed onto the work cards or worksheets and subdivided into clear stages to ensure a record of the accomplishment of the complete maintenance task.

Where a maintenance organisation provides a service to an aircraft operator who requires their work card or worksheet system to be used then such work card or worksheet system may be used. In this case, the maintenance organisation shall establish a procedure to ensure correct completion of the aircraft operators' work cards or worksheets.

(d) The person or organisation maintaining an aircraft or managing the aircraft continuing airworthiness shall establish procedures to ensure that if found, any inaccurate, incomplete or ambiguous procedure, practice, information or maintenance instruction contained in the maintenance data used by any personnel is recorded and notified to the author of the maintenance data.

(e) The person or organisation managing the aircraft continuing airworthiness may only modify maintenance instructions in accordance with a procedure specified in the continuing airworthiness management exposition. With respect to those changes, the person or organisation shall demonstrate that they result in equivalent or improved maintenance standards and shall inform the appropriate holder(s) of a design approval of such changes. For the purposes of this paragraph, 'maintenance instructions' means instructions on how to carry out a particular maintenance task, excluding those described in the instructions for continued airworthiness issued under Regulation (EU) No 748/2012 and its Annex (Part-21), and those resulting from the engineering design of repairs and modifications."

– It is proposed to modify point 145.A.45 to read:

"[...]

(b) For the purposes of this Part Regulation, applicable maintenance data shall be any of the following:

1. Any applicable requirement, procedure, operational directive or information issued by the authority responsible for the oversight of the aircraft or component;
2. Any applicable airworthiness directive issued by the authority responsible for the oversight of the aircraft or component;
3. Instructions for ~~continuing~~ continued airworthiness, issued under Regulation (EU) No 748/2012 and its Annex (Part-21) ~~by type certificate holders, supplementary type certificate holders, any other organisation required to publish such data by Part-21 and~~, in the case of aircraft or components from third countries, the airworthiness data mandated by the authority responsible for the oversight of the aircraft or component;
4. Any applicable standard, such as but not limited to, maintenance standard practices recognised by the Agency as a good standard for maintenance;
5. Any applicable data issued in accordance with paragraph (d).

(c) The organisation shall establish procedures to ensure that if found, any inaccurate, incomplete or ambiguous procedure, practice, information or maintenance instruction contained in the maintenance data used by maintenance personnel is recorded and notified to the author of the maintenance data.

(d) The organisation may only modify maintenance instructions in accordance with a procedure specified in the maintenance organisation's exposition that requires the agreement of the person or organisation managing the aircraft continuing airworthiness. With respect to those changes, the organisation shall demonstrate that they result in equivalent or improved maintenance standards and shall inform the appropriate ~~type certificate~~ holder(s) of a design approval of such changes. For the purposes of this paragraph, ~~'maintenance instructions'~~ for the purposes of this paragraph means



instructions on how to carry out the particular maintenance task; excluding those described in the instructions for continued airworthiness issued under Regulation (EU) No 748/2012 and its Annex (Part-21), and those resulting from ~~they exclude~~ the engineering design of repairs and modifications.

[...]"

– It is proposed to modify AMC1 145.A.45(d) to read:

"The referenced procedure should address the need for a practical demonstration by the mechanic to the compliance monitoring manager of the proposed modified maintenance instruction. Depending on the nature of the modification the safety manager should perform a safety risk assessment. When satisfied, the compliance monitoring manager should ~~approve~~ ~~endorse~~ the modified maintenance instruction and ensure that the type/restricted type certificate or supplementary type certificate holder is informed of the modified maintenance instruction. The modified maintenance instruction should not be applied without the agreement of the person or organisation managing the aircraft continuing airworthiness. The procedure should include a paper/electronic traceability of the complete process from start to finish and ensure that the relevant maintenance instruction clearly identifies the modification. Modified maintenance instructions should only be used in the following circumstances;

(a) Where the type/restricted type certificate/supplementary type certificate holders original intent can be carried out in a more practical or more efficient manner.

(b) Where the type/restricted type certificate/supplementary type certificate holders original intent cannot be achieved by following the maintenance instructions. For example, where a component cannot be replaced following the original maintenance instructions.

(c) For the use of alternative tools/equipment.

Important Note: ~~Critical Design Configuration Control Limitations (CDCCL) are airworthiness limitations. Any modification of the maintenance instructions linked to CDCCL specified in the following approvals constitutes an aircraft modification that should be approved in accordance with Part-21:~~

– the approval of the type design or restricted type design,

– the approval of a change to type design or supplemental type design that is embodied,

– the approval of a repair design that is embodied, or

– an airworthiness directive applicable to the type design or restricted type design."

– It is proposed to re-identify AMC 145.A.45(g) into AMC1 145.A.45(g) and to modify it to read:

"1. To keep data up-to-date, a procedure should be set up to monitor the amendment status of all data and maintain a check that all amendments are being received by being a subscriber to any document amendment scheme. Special attention should be given to ~~TC related data~~ the instructions and associated airworthiness limitations specified as mandatory in the approval of any design activity or in airworthiness directives ~~such as certification life limited parts, airworthiness limitations and Airworthiness Limitation Items (ALI), etc."~~

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

Currently, there is no paragraph (d) in point M.A.401.

The term "Instructions for Continued Airworthiness" is used in Part 21.A.31(a)3. and 21.A.61 (Subpart B for Type Certificate/Restricted Type Certificate), 21.A.107 (Subpart D for changes to Type Certificates and Restricted Type Certificates), 21.A.120 (Subpart E for Supplemental Type Certificates), and 21.A.449 (Subpart M for repairs).

Not only maintenance organisations, but the person or organisation managing the aircraft continuing airworthiness also should use applicable current maintenance data: e.g. for the development of the aircraft maintenance programme. In addition, the person or



organisation managing the aircraft continuing airworthiness may also (and should sometimes) establish a work card or worksheet system (ref. 145.A.45(e)), particularly when aircraft operations require the development of specific work cards that may require specific knowledge and experience (e.g. operation in an environment with sand storms, etc...) not gained by the maintenance organisation.

Although some difficulties will probably appear, some definitions common to the different Implementing Rules and Certification Specifications are necessary: for example, the term ‘maintenance instructions’ in point 145.A.45(d) has a different meaning in CS-25, Appendix H25, paragraph H25.3(b). Point 145.A.45(d) defines (for the purposes of this paragraph) maintenance instructions as “[...] instructions on how to carry out the particular maintenance task: they exclude the engineering design of repairs and modifications”. Maintenance instructions under CS-25, Appendix H25, paragraph H25.3(b), include amongst others, scheduling information that provides the recommended periods at which recommended work should be performed.

The FAA KSI Team defined in its final report, dated 12-Mar-2007, the following terms (refer to <http://www.skybrary.aero/bookshelf/books/1436.pdf>):

Task: Short description (e.g. a descriptive title) of what is to be accomplished by a procedure. Example: “Operational check of static inverter.”

Procedure: Instructions for how a task is to be accomplished. A procedure consists of one or more sequential steps. Procedures are shown in maintenance, operation, or training manuals.

This definition of the term ‘procedure’ will probably not fit point 145.A.71.

With regard to the modification of maintenance instructions, how a maintenance organisation can modify them (ref. point 145.A.45(d)) without the agreement of the person or organisation managing the aircraft continuing airworthiness? The Part-M confirms in point M.A.301 that the aircraft continuing airworthiness and the serviceability of both operational and emergency equipment shall be ensured (amongst others) by the accomplishment of **all** maintenance, in accordance with the M.A.302 approved aircraft maintenance programme. The AMC M.A.302 indicates that the term “maintenance programme” is intended to include maintenance tasks, the associated procedures and standard maintenance practices.

With regard to the important note of AMC1 145.A.45(d), we failed at finding a reason to restrict it to CDCCL (also applicable to AMC 145.A.45(b)1.).

An harmonisation of AMC for points M.A.401 and 145.A.45 is recommended.

response

Noted.

The GM should have read ‘GM1 M.A.401(c) Maintenance data’. The GM will be further amended to take account of the fact that not all maintenance procedures will be provided in English.

Regarding the other elements of the comment proposing extensive changes to M.A.401, these would require a new rulemaking task, as these issues are not covered under the ToRs for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I. The issues raised and proposals made in this comment may be reassessed in Phase II of RMT.0251 (MDM.055).

comment

413

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:
AMC M.A.504(a)



AMC M.A.504(b)
2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:
 It is proposed to re-identify AMC M.A.504(a) into AMC1 M.A.504(a) and to modify it to read:
 “A component continues to be unserviceable until a decision is taken pursuant to AMC M.A.605(c) 6. in accordance with procedures described in the continuing airworthiness management organisation.
 Procedures should be defined by the organisation describing the decision process for the status of unserviceable components. This procedure should identify at least the following:
 – role and responsibilities of the persons managing the decision process;
 – description of the decision process to chose between maintaining, storing or mutilating a component;
 – traceability of decision.”
 It is proposed to delete AMC M.A.504(b).
3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:
 The decisions on component serviceability should be under the responsibility of the person or organisation managing the aircraft airworthiness. Nevertheless, the maintenance organisation should report any evidence of defects or malfunctions to the person or organisation managing the aircraft airworthiness.

response

Not accepted.
 Proposing extensive changes to the AMCs to M.A.504 would require a new rulemaking task, as these issues are not covered under the ToRs for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I. In addition, these changes would need to consider the case of aircraft not managed by a CAMO and components maintained for the sole purpose of placing them in an inventory/component pool.
 The issues raised and proposals made in this comment may be reassessed in Phase II of RMT.0251 (MDM.055).

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — M.A.602 Application for an organisation certificate p. 56

comment

378

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:
 NPA 2013-01(B), pages 56 & 57/218, section B., point M.A.602 and its AMC1
 NPA 2013-01(B), page 83/218, section B., point M.A.702 and its AMC
 NPA 2013-01(C), page 47/184, section B., point 145.A.15
 AMC 145.A.15
2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:
 Can the Agency clarify if the wording “taking into account the applicable requirements of this Regulation” in the point M.A.702(a) is associated to “form and manner established by the competent authority”? In such a case, the requirement should be transferred into Part-M Section B (i.e. requirement for competent authorities). In any case, this has been found confusing particularly when the first sentence of AMC1 M.A.702 is considered.
 The paragraph (b) of points M.A.602/M.A.702/145.A.15 refers to “an initial certificate”. It is believed that this term may introduce confusion. In addition, it is proposed to modify



this paragraph to read:
 “M.A.602 Application for an organisation certificate
 [...] (b) [...]. Such documentation shall include, as prescribed in M.A.604, a procedure describing how changes not requiring prior approval will be managed and notified to the competent authority.
 [...] M.A.702 Application for an organisation certificate
 [...] (b) [...]. Such documentation shall include, as prescribed in M.A.704, a procedure describing how changes not requiring prior approval will be managed and notified to the competent authority.”
 “145.A.15 Application for an organisation certificate
 [...] (b) [...]. Such documentation shall include, as prescribed in 145.A.70, a procedure describing how changes not requiring prior approval will be managed and notified to the competent authority.”
 Can the Agency clarify what “this information” refers to in the paragraph (b) of the AMC2 M.A.702?
3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:
 The AMC1 M.A.602/M.A.702 allow organisations to apply for several certificates. In this context, does the paragraph (b) of points M.A.602/M.A.702/145.A.15 refer to:
 – The application for the first certificate?
 or
 – The first application for each certificate?
 Should the AMC 145.A.15 be aligned on AMC1 M.A.602/M.A.702?

response

Partially accepted.

The wording ‘taking into account the applicable requirements of this Regulation’ is included to specify that all applicable requirements will need to be considered for the application, i.e. additional documentation may be required, for example to provide evidence of qualification for airworthiness review personnel, if the organisation applies for this privilege. This general statement will also ensure that any additional requirement that may be introduced through successive amendments will need to be considered for the application.

The text is fully aligned with that already applicable in the area of aircrew (Regulation (EU) No 290/2012) and air operations (Regulation (EU) No 965/2012). Any change here would create a mismatch with the requirements already published. Therefore, it is proposed not to include any cross reference as proposed in this comment.

For the other points to be clarified:

- The application for an organisation certificate refers to the initial certificate for the Part under consideration, i.e. the organisation never held such certificate for the Part under consideration.
- ‘This information’ in AMC2 M.A.702 refers to the documentation required by M.A.602/702 point (b).

Regarding the question ‘Should the AMC 145.A.15 be aligned on AMC1 M.A.602/M.A.702?’, this is accepted: a new AMC will be added for 145.A.15 to align with Part-M (Phase II).



SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.A.602 Application for an organisation certificate

p. 57

comment

15

comment by: *Austro Control Ltd.*

Comment: M.A.203, lit. (d)

The complete repetitive Processing of an alternative means of compliance (Alt.MC) approved, published and already used by Competent authority shall be revised. The Alt.MC shall be available for immediate use to all Organisations under the oversight of the publishing Competent authority if they met the conditions described in the Alt.MC.

Justification:

When an Alt.MC has been approved, published and already used by approved organisation under the oversight of a competent authority, the equivalent level of safety to reach the intent of the Basic Regulation and its Implementing Rules has been established. The conditions under which such an Alt.MC can be used have to be specified in the Alt.MC itself. If another approved organisation intends to use such an Alt.MC and there are no differences found to the conditions described in the Alt.MC by the intended users of such an Alt.MC they should be allowed to use it directly without an additional application to and approval by the competent authority. The proper validation of the conditions described in the Alt.MC by the organization will be anyway subject to audits and/or inspections by the competent authority.

Proposal:

Revise point (d) in M.A.203 in such a way that each organisation and/or person who intends to use an already approved, published and used Alt.MC has to validate the conditions described in the Alt.MC and provide the result to the Competent Authority without an additional application to and approval by the Competent Authority. The competent authority has to verify the proper internal evaluation for such an usage of an Alt.MC during their standard oversight activities.

response

Not accepted.

The text, as proposed with NPA 2013-01(B), is fully aligned with that already applicable under Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012; consistency must be ensured with the procedures already being implemented at Member State level.

An alternative means of compliance from an organisation is approved for the individual case and considering the specifics of that organisation. There are two possibilities to provide a general presumption of compliance:

- EASA, based on the information provided by the competent authority, concludes that the alternative is of general interest and subsequently covers it through the issuing of AMC;
- the competent authority considers the alternative of general interest for organisations under its oversight and decides to issue AMC as national AMC in line with the new CAMO.B.120 point (e).



SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — Appendix IX to AMC1 M.A.602 and AMC M.A.702 EASA Form 2 p. 58-59

comment	54	<p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>SVFB/SAMA</i></p> <p>pg 56/218 M.A.601 Scope not listed in point M.A. 201g write instead less then 5.7T and or CAT and component of those.</p> <p>This cross referencing violates the request for "smart regulation" according EU communication</p> <p>compet 83 Draft Council Conclusions on a future smart regulation agenda with a strong end-user focus</p>
response		<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft.</p>

comment	205	<p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>British Gliding Association</i></p> <p>British Gliding Association Appendix IX to AMC1 M.A.602 and AMC M.A.702 EASA Form 2. The BGA supports the change to aircraft class group 4 by allowing simple aircraft and sailplanes to be classified as a group on the approval certificate.</p>
response		<p>Noted.</p>

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — M.A.603 Extent of approval p. 59-60

comment	379	<p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>Airbus</i></p> <p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: NPA 2013-01(B), pages 59 & 60/218, section B., point M.A.603</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: It is proposed to modify the paragraph (a) of point M.A.603 to read:</p>
---------	-----	--



	“(a) Appendix V to Annex I (Part-M) provides the template of certificate for this approval.”.
	3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION: Editorial.
response	Not accepted. For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft.

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.A.603(c) Terms Extent of approval p. 61

comment	380	comment by: Airbus
	1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: NPA 2013-01(B), page 61/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.603(c) 2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: It is proposed to modify the paragraph 1. of AMC1 M.A.603(c) to read: “1. This AMC contains principles and conditions to be taken into account for the preparation of an acceptable procedure about the fabrication of parts.”. 3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION: For clarity.	
response	Not accepted. For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft.	

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — M.A.604 Maintenance organisation manual p. 61

comment	130	comment by: René Meier, Europe Air Sports
	M.A. 604 Maintenance Organisation Manual p 63/224 (a)1., last word: Some caracters are missing, we believe.	
response	Noted. For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to	



the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft.

comment 268 comment by: *RECCHIA Giuseppe Guido*

For consistency with M.A.704.5 as renumbered in this NPA, in the end of the point M.A.604.5 as renumbered in this NPA the following should be added

"and related to M.A.616(a)(1);"

response Not accepted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft.

comment 381 comment by: *Airbus*

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 61/218, section B., point M.A.604

NPA 2013-01(B), page 84/218, section B., point M.A.704

NPA 2013-01(C), page 126/184, section B., point 145.A.70

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

It is proposed to harmonise the points M.A.604, M.A.704 and 145.A.70:

"M.A.604 Maintenance organisation ~~exposition~~ manual

(a) The ~~maintenance~~ organisation shall provide the competent authority with a maintenance organisation ~~exposition~~ manual, and where applicable any referenced associated manuals, containing all of the following information:

1. a statement signed by the accountable manager to confirm that the organisation will continuously work in accordance with ~~Part M~~ this Regulation and the ~~manual~~ ~~exposition~~ at all times;

2. the organisation's scope of work ~~relevant to the extent of approval~~;

3. the organisation's management system and safety policy as specified in M.A.616;

4. the title(s) and name(s) of person(s) referred to in M.A.606(b);

5. the duties and responsibilities of the persons nominated under M.A.606(b), including matters on which they may deal directly with the competent authority on behalf of the organisation;

6. an organisation chart showing associated chains of responsibility between the person(s) referred to in M.A.606(b);

7. a list of certifying staff with their scope of approval, ~~and~~;

8. a general description of manpower resources;

9. a list of locations where maintenance is carried out, together with a general description of the facilities;

10. the notification procedure of M.A.617 for organisation changes;

11. the maintenance organisation ~~manual~~ ~~exposition~~ amendment procedure(s); and



~~812.~~ procedures specifying how the maintenance organisation manages safety and ensures compliance with this Regulation, ~~and;~~

(b) The maintenance organisation exposition shall be amended as necessary to remain an up-to-date description of the organisation. The maintenance organisation ~~manual exposition~~ and its amendments shall be approved by the competent authority.

(c) Notwithstanding paragraph (b), minor amendments to the ~~manual exposition~~ may be managed in accordance with the procedure established as provided in M.A.602(b) (hereinafter referred to as amendments not requiring prior approval).

[...]

M.A.704 Continuing airworthiness management exposition

(a) The organisation shall provide the competent authority with a continuing airworthiness management exposition, and where applicable any referenced associated manuals, containing all of the following information:

1. a statement signed by the accountable manager to confirm that the organisation will continuously work in accordance with this Regulation ~~Part~~ and the exposition at all times. When the accountable manager is not the chief executive officer of the organisation then such chief executive officer shall countersign the statement;

~~2~~ 3. the organisation's scope of work relevant to the extent of approval;

~~3~~ 23. the organisation's safety policy as defined in M.A.712(a)(1);

4. the title(s) and name(s) of person(s) referred to in points M.A.706(a), M.A.706(eb), M.A.706(ec) and M.A.706(id);

5. the duties, accountabilities, responsibilities and authorities of the persons nominated under M.A.706(b), including matters on which they may deal directly with the competent authority on behalf of the organisation;

~~5~~ 6. an organisation chart showing associated chains of accountability and responsibility between all the person(s) referred to in points M.A.706(a), M.A.706(eb), M.A.706(cd) M.A.706(id) and related to M.A.712(a)(1);

~~6~~ 7. a list of the airworthiness staff referred to in point M.A.707, specifying, where applicable, the staff authorised to issue permits to fly in accordance with point M.A.711(c);

8. a general description of manpower resources;

~~7~~ 9. a general description and location of the facilities;

10. the notification procedure of M.A.713 for organisation changes;

~~9~~ 11. the continuing airworthiness management exposition amendment procedure(s); ~~and~~

~~8~~ 12. procedures specifying how the continuing airworthiness management organisation manages safety and ensures compliance with this Regulation ~~and manages safety;~~

~~10~~ 3. the documentation of management system key processes as required by M.A.712(a)(5) and procedures established to comply with M.A.708(e);

~~10~~ 4. the list of approved aircraft maintenance programmes, or, for aircraft not involved in commercial air transport, the list of "generic" and "baseline" maintenance programmes;

(b) The continuing airworthiness management exposition shall be amended as necessary to remain an up-to-date description of the organisation. The continuing airworthiness management exposition and any subsequent amendment shall be approved by the competent authority.

(c) Notwithstanding paragraph (b), minor amendments to the exposition may not require prior approval and may be managed in accordance with the procedure referred to in M.A.702(b) approved in accordance with M.B.702(h).

"

"145.A.70 Maintenance organisation exposition

(a) '~~Maintenance organisation exposition~~' means the document or documents that contain the material specifying the scope of work deemed to constitute approval and



~~showing how the organisation intends to comply with this Regulation.~~ The organisation shall provide the competent authority with a maintenance organisation exposition, and where applicable any referenced associated manuals, containing all of the following information:

~~1. A statement signed by the accountable manager to confirming that the maintenance organisation exposition and any referenced associated manuals define the organisation's compliance will continuously work in accordance with this Regulation and the exposition will be complied with at all times. When the accountable manager is not the chief executive officer of the organisation then such chief executive officer shall countersign the statement;~~

92. a specification of the organisation's scope of work relevant to the extent of approval;

23. the organisation's safety policy as specified by 145.A.65;

34. the title(s) and name(s) of the persons nominated under 145.A.30(b);

45. the duties ~~and~~, accountabilities, responsibilities and authorities of the persons nominated under 145.A.30(b), including matters on which they may deal directly with the competent authority on behalf of the organisation;

56. an organisation chart showing associated chains of accountability and responsibility between the persons referred to in ~~nominated under~~ 145.A.30 and related to 145.A.65(a)(1);

67. a list of certifying staff and support staff;

78. a general description of manpower resources;

89. a general description of the facilities located at each address specified in the organisation's certificate;

10. the notification procedure of 145.A.85 for organisation changes;

11. the maintenance organisation exposition amendment procedure(s);

12. procedures specifying how the maintenance organisation manages safety and ensures compliance with this Regulation;

123. the documentation of management system key processes as required by 145.A.65(a)(5) and maintenance procedures established in accordance with 145.A.71;

134. a list of commercial operators, where applicable, to which the organisation provides an aircraft maintenance service;

145. a list of subcontracted organisations, where applicable, as specified in 145.A.75(b);

156. a list of all approved locations, including line stations, where applicable, as specified in 145.A.75(d);

167. a list of contracted organisations, where applicable.

(b) The exposition shall be amended as necessary to remain an up-to-date description of the organisation. The exposition and any subsequent amendment shall be approved by the competent authority.

(c) Notwithstanding paragraph (b) minor amendments to the exposition may not require prior approval and may be managed in accordance with the procedure referred to in 145.A.85(c) approved in accordance with 145.B.32."

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

This NPA promotes consistency: "the existence of multiple safety/quality management system frameworks with differing, duplicated or inconsistent requirements can have not just negative economic but possibly adverse safety impacts caused by confusions, in particular if implemented within a single organisation".

The strengths of points M.A.604, M.A.704 and 145.A.70 have been homogeneously applied to these points. For example, the wording "[...] and where applicable any referenced associated manuals" included in point 145.A.70 has been added to the introductory statement of points M.A.604 and 704 to take into account the possibility to



the document the management system key processes in a separate organisation’s Safety Management Manual.

response Partially accepted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft.

The changes proposed to M.A.704 have been considered for the new CAMO.A.300.

The proposal to align the Part-CAMO and Part-145 exposition contents will be considered in Phase II of RMT.0251 (MDM.055) to the extent that no additional requirements are introduced and no unintended effects generated.

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.A.604 Maintenance organisation manual p. 62

comment 84 comment by: René Meier, Europe Air Sports

AMC1 M.A.604 Maintenance organisation manual
page 64/224

We would like to repeat that the fact of existing shift work is in our view much more important than the number of FTE.

Rationale:
Handovers might provoke interruptions in an on-going process, briefings might be incomplete.

response Noted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft.

comment 111 comment by: CAA-NL

AMC1 M.A.604, Appendix IV to this AMC

There should be reference to non-complex or complex organisation instead of small and large organisations.

response Noted.

As indicated in the Explanatory Note of the NPA, all Subpart F organisations were proposed to be considered ‘non-complex’ by default for the purpose of determining the



set of AMCs related to the management system.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft.

comment 382

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

Appendix IV to AMC1 M.A.604

NPA 2013-01(B), page 85/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.704

NPA 2013-01(B), page 177/218, section B., Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704

NPA 2013-01(C), page 130/184, section B., GM1 145.A.70(a)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

It is proposed to introduce harmonised text in the Appendix IV to AMC1 M.A.604, AMC1 M.A.704 and GM1 145.A.70(a):

“Appendix IV to AMC1 M.A.604 Maintenance Organisation Manual Exposition

1. Purpose

‘Maintenance organisation exposition’ (MOE) means the document or documents that contain the material specifying the scope of work deemed to constitute approval and showing how the organisation intends to comply with this Regulation. The purpose of the ~~maintenance organisation manual~~ MOE is to set forth the procedures, means and methods of the reference for all the work carried out by the approved maintenance organisation approved under Subpart F of Part-M. Compliance with its contents will assure it should contain all the means established by the organisation to ensure compliance with Part-M according to the extent of approval and the privileges granted to the organisation. This is a prerequisite to obtaining and retaining a maintenance organisation approval certificate.

The ~~maintenance organisation manual~~ MOE should define precisely the work that the approved maintenance organisation is authorised to carry out and the subcontracted work. It should detail the resources used by the organisation, its structure and its procedures.

[...]

AMC1 M.A.704 Continuing airworthiness management exposition (see Appendices to Part M – Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704)

(a) ‘Continuing airworthiness management organisation’ (CAME) means the document or documents that contain the material specifying the scope of work deemed to constitute approval and showing how the organisation intends to comply with this Regulation. The purpose of the ~~continuing airworthiness management exposition~~ CAME is to set forth the procedures, means and methods of the ~~M.A. Subpart G~~ organisation approved under M.A. Subpart G.

(b) Compliance with its contents will assure compliance with Part-M requirements according to the extent of approval and the privileges granted to the organisation. This is a prerequisite to obtaining and retaining a Continuing Airworthiness Management Organisation (CAMO) approval certificate.

[...]

Part 4 Airworthiness review and permit to fly procedures (if applicable)

[...]



(f) Unless otherwise agreed by the competent authority, the ~~person responsible for the management system~~ compliance monitoring manager should be responsible for monitoring and amending the exposition, including associated procedures manuals, and the submission of proposed amendments to the ~~approving~~ competent authority.”

“Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704

Continuing airworthiness management exposition

TABLE OF CONTENT

[...]

2.4 Monitoring that all maintenance is carried out by an appropriate maintenance organisation, taking into account pilot-owner maintenance, as appropriate.

2.5 Monitoring that all contracted maintenance is carried out in accordance with the contract or work order, including subcontractors used by the maintenance contractor.

[...]

3.2 Audit of aircraft documentation, including possible verifications on aircraft.

PART 0 [...]

0.1 Corporate commitment by the accountable manager

(The accountable manager's exposition statement should embrace the intent of the ~~AMC1 M.A.704 following paragraph~~ and in fact this statement may be used without amendment. Any modification to the statement should not alter the intent.)

~~This exposition defines the organisation and procedures upon which the M.A. Subpart G approval of Joe Bloggs under Part M is based.~~

~~These procedures are approved by the undersigned and must be complied with, as applicable; in order to ensure that all the continuing airworthiness activities including maintenance for aircraft managed by Joe Bloggs is carried out on time to an approved standard.~~

~~It is accepted that these procedures do not override the necessity of complying with any new or amended regulation published by the Agency or the competent authority from time to time where these new or amended regulations are in conflict with these procedures.~~

~~The competent authority will approve this organisation when satisfied that the procedures are in compliance with Part M. The approval remains valid subject to compliance with Part M and the organisation's procedures. It is understood that the competent authority reserves the right to limit, suspend, or revoke the approval of the organisation, as applicable, if the competent authority has evidence that the procedures are not followed and compliance with Part M is not demonstrated.~~

~~In the case of commercial air transport, suspension or revocation of the approval of the Part M Subpart G continuing airworthiness management approval will invalidate the AOC.~~

[...]

0.3 Management personnel

a) Accountable manager

[...]

d) Duties, and responsibilities, accountabilities, and authorities

(This paragraph should further develop the duties, and responsibilities, accountabilities, and authorities of:

- the personnel listed in paragraphs c): “Continuing airworthiness coordination”,
- the safety manager, as regards safety management related processes and tasks,
- the compliance monitoring manager, as regards the compliance monitoring of the ~~maintenance continuing airworthiness management~~ system [which includes the ~~contracted~~ approved maintenance organisation(s)]

e) Manpower resources and training policy



(1) Manpower resources

(This paragraph should give broad figures to show that the number of staff dedicated to the performance of the approved continuing airworthiness activities, including subcontracted tasks, is adequate. It is not necessary to give the detailed number of employees of the whole company but only the number of those involved in continuing airworthiness. This could be presented as follows:)

[...]

0.5 Notification procedure to the competent authority regarding changes to the organisation's activities / approval / location / personnel

(This paragraph should explain in which occasion the company should inform the competent authority prior to incorporating proposed changes; for instance, refer to M.A.713 and its AMC & GM):

~~The accountable manager (or any delegated person such as the engineering director or the quality compliance monitoring) will notify to the competent authority any change concerning:~~

~~(1) the company's name and location(s)~~

~~(2) the group of person as specified in paragraph 0.3.c)~~

~~(3) operations, procedures and technical arrangements, as far as they may affect the approval.~~

~~Joe Bloggs will not incorporate such change until the change have been assessed and approved by the competent authority.)~~

PART 1 [...]

1.1 [...]

(4) Acceptance by the flight crew pilot in command (For commercial air transport)

(This paragraph should explain how the crew pilot in command notifies their acceptance or non-acceptance of the MEL deferment in the technical log)

[...]

1.8 [...]

c) Deferred defect policy

(Defects such as cracks and structural defect are not addressed in the MEL and CDL. However, it may be necessary in certain cases to defer the rectification of a defect. This paragraph should establish the procedure to be followed in order to be sure that the deferment of any defect will not lead to any safety concern. This will include appropriate liaison with the appropriate type certificate holder of a design approval.)

PART 2 [...]

2.1 [...]

[Incorrect subparagraph bullet numbers]

[...]

2.9 [...]

[Incorrect reference to AMC1 M.A.712(a)? Note: points 2.7 to 2.14 are new, even if they are not highlighted in grey]

Part 3 [...]

3.1 [...]

– is signed by the owner/lessee of the aircraft in the case of operations other than non-commercial air transport.

In the case of operations other than commercial air transport, this activity should be carried in agreement with the owner.)

3.2 [Refer to Comment No. 74. In addition, an aircraft is a product in accordance with the definition given in the Article 3 of Regulation (EC) 216/2008. The paragraph is confusing.]

PART 4 AIRWORTHINESS REVIEW PRIVILEGES PROCEDURES

PART 4A AIRWORTHINESS REVIEW PROCEDURES”



“GM1 145.A.70(a) Maintenance organisation exposition

(a) ‘Maintenance organisation exposition’ (MOE) means the document or documents that contain the material specifying the scope of work deemed to constitute approval and showing how the organisation intends to comply with this Regulation. The purpose of the maintenance organisation exposition (MOE) is to set forth the procedures, means and methods of the organisation approved under Part-145.

(b) Compliance with its contents will assure compliance with the Part-145 requirements of Part-145, according to the extent of approval and the privileges granted to the organisation. ~~which~~ This is a prerequisite to obtaining and retaining a maintenance organisation approval certificate.

[...]

(g) ~~Unless otherwise agreed by the competent authority, The organisation should define responsibilities~~ the compliance monitoring manager should be responsible for monitoring the amendment of and amending the MOE, including associated procedures manuals, and the submission of the proposed amendments to the competent authority.”

The term ‘publication’ has been replaced by ‘distribution’ in the paragraph (g) of the AMC1 M.A.704. However, the CAME “should be made available to the competent authority [...]”. This creates confusion.

The template of the accountable manager’s statement given in the paragraph 2. Part A of the Appendix IV to AMC1 M.A.604, the paragraph (i) of the AMC1 M.A.704, and the paragraph (i) of the GM1 145.A.70(a) has not been amended following the change of principle (i.e. introduction of the SMS) and is found too general. It should be developed on the basis of the ICAO SMM example (refer to figure 8-1 page 8-5) that is more detailed. The contents of paragraph 0.1 of the Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704 should be deleted (as highlighted here above) and this paragraph should refer to the AMC1 M.A.704.

Can the Agency explain why the paragraph (j) of the AMC1 M.A.704 put specific emphasis on CDCCL? The following is proposed:

“(k) The exposition should contain information as applicable, on how the continuing airworthiness management organisation complies with CDCCL instructions and airworthiness limitations that have been specified as mandatory for the aircraft, the engine(s), the propeller(s), and their components, as appropriate, in:

- the approval of the type design or restricted type design,
- the approval of a change to type design or supplemental type design that is embodied,
- the approval of a major repair design that is embodied, or
- an airworthiness directive applicable to the type design or restricted type design.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

A homogeneous description of the purpose of the MOE and CAME is added for clarity. This NPA promotes consistency: “the existence of multiple safety/quality management system frameworks with differing, duplicated or inconsistent requirements can have not just negative economic but possibly adverse safety impacts caused by confusions, in particular if implemented within a single organisation”.

The contents of the Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704 should be reviewed with extreme care to make sure that they are not a duplication of the Part-M requirements: reference to AMC or points of Part-M can be added instead. The term ‘audit’ is used in the title and the contents of the paragraph 3.2. In this context, it may not fit the definition given in the Comment No. 74.

Great emphasis is put on accountabilities, responsibilities, authorities, and duties in the frame of the SMS. The pilot in command is accountable for accepting the aircraft. Reference to flight crew introduces vagueness. Similarly, referring to the type certificate holder is not precise enough as liaison with one or more supplemental type certificate holders may be necessary, for example. The term ‘holder of a design approval’



	<p>encompasses all design organisations.</p> <p>It is advisable to use the same wording ('operations other than commercial air transport' or 'non-commercial air transport') in two consecutive sentences to prevent confusion.</p> <p>A clarification on the responsibility for the CAME/MOE creation/amendment (taking into account contents of <u>AMC2 M.A.706(a)2.</u> and <u>AMC2 145.A.30(a)2.</u>) is added to define the basic acceptable solution. Alternatives should be accepted by the competent authority before implementation to prevent inadequate proposals.</p> <p>With regard to the distribution/publication issue, it is to be noted that distribution implies a distribution list, i.e. the information is pushed to the subscribers, while information made available implies that the information is pulled by the end user.</p> <p>The emphasis put on CDCCL may give the impression to readers that the other mandatory instructions and airworthiness limitations are less important. The proposal is to restore the balance.</p>
response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft.</p> <p>The proposals made in this comment will be considered for the AMCs to the new Part-CAMO.A.300 'Continuing airworthiness management exposition'. In line with the recommendations made by the Focused Consultation Group, Appendix V to the CAME AMC will not be maintained and the contents will be considered to issue CAME guidance as part of the EASA safety promotion material. The comment made will be considered for creating such material.</p> <p>Further alignment between the CAME and the MOE contents and structure will be addressed as part of RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase II.</p>
comment	<p>383 comment by: Airbus</p> <p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: NPA 2013-01(B), page 62/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.604</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: It is proposed to modify the paragraph 2. of AMC1 M.A.604 to read: "2. The maintenance organisation exposition as specified in Part-145 provides an outline of the format of an acceptable maintenance organisation manual for larger organisations with more than 10 maintenance staff. 3. Unless otherwise agreed by the competent authority, the compliance monitoring function should be responsible for monitoring and amending the maintenance organisation exposition, including associated procedures manuals, and the submission of the proposed amendments to the competent authority."</p> <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION: For consistency with paragraph 1. of AMC1 M.A.604 and with <u>Comment No. 15.</u></p>
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO</p>



applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft.

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — M.A.606 Personnel requirements

p. 62

comment 384

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 62/218, section B., point M.A.606

NPA 2013-01(B), page 87/218, section B., point M.A.706

NPA 2013-01(C), pages 48 & 49/184, section B., point 145.A.30

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

It is proposed to harmonise as much as possible points M.A.606, M.A.706 and 145.A.30. Therefore:

– It is proposed to modify the point **M.A.606** to read:

“(a) The organisation shall appoint an accountable manager, who has corporate authority for ensuring that all maintenance required by the customer can be financed and carried out in accordance with ~~to the standard required by this Regulation.~~

(b) The organisation shall nominate ~~a~~ A person or group of persons ~~shall be nominated with the responsibility of,~~ whose responsibilities include ensuring that the organisation is always in compliance with this Subpart. Such person(s) shall be ultimately responsible to the accountable manager.

[...]”

– It is proposed to modify the point **M.A.706** to read:

“(a) The organisation shall appoint an accountable manager, who has corporate authority for ensuring that all continuing airworthiness management activities can be financed and carried out in accordance with this ~~Regulation~~Part.

The accountable manager shall:

1. ensure that all necessary resources are available to manage continuing airworthiness in accordance with M.A.708 to support the organisation approval;

2. establish and promote the safety policy specified in M.A.712(a)(2);

3. nominate a person with responsibility for compliance monitoring, including the associated feedback system as required by in accordance with M.A.712(a)(6). The nominated person shall have direct access to the accountable manager to ensure that the accountable manager is kept properly informed on compliance matters; and

4. demonstrate a basic understanding of this Regulation.

For commercial air transport, the accountable manager shall in addition:

1. ~~(b) For commercial air transport the paragraph (a) accountable manager shall~~ be the person who also has corporate authority for ensuring that all the operations of the operator can be financed and carried out to the standard required for the issue of an air operator’s certificate.;

2. nominate a post holder who shall not be employed by a Part-145 approved organisation under contract to the operator, unless specifically agreed by the competent authority.

(~~eb~~) The organisation shall nominate ~~a~~ A person or group of persons ~~shall be nominated with the responsibility of,~~ whose responsibilities include ensuring that the organisation is always in compliance with this Subpart. Such person(s) shall be ultimately responsible to



the accountable manager.

1. The person or persons nominated shall represent the continuing airworthiness management structure of the organisation and be responsible for all continuing airworthiness functions specified in this Regulation.

2. The person or persons nominated shall be identified and their credentials submitted in a form and manner established by the competent authority.

The person or persons nominated shall be able to demonstrate relevant knowledge, background and satisfactory experience related to aircraft continuing airworthiness management and demonstrate a working knowledge of this Regulation.

~~(dc) For commercial air transport, the accountable manager shall designate a~~ The nominated post holder. This person shall be responsible for the management and supervision of continuing airworthiness activities, and of the other persons pursuant to paragraph (eb).

~~(ed) For organisations extending airworthiness review certificates in accordance with points M.A.711(a)4 and M.A.901(f), the organisation shall nominate persons authorised to do so, subject to approval by the competent authority. The nominated post holder referred to in paragraph (d) shall not be employed by a Part 145 approved organisation under contract to the operator, unless specifically agreed by the competent authority.~~

~~(f) The organisation shall have sufficient appropriately qualified staff for the expected work.~~

(e) The organisation shall have a continuing airworthiness man-hour plan showing that the organisation has sufficient staff to plan, perform, supervise, inspect and monitor the organisation activities in accordance with the approval. In addition, the organisation shall have a procedure to reassess work intended to be carried out when actual staff availability is less than the planned staffing level for any particular work shift or period.

~~(g) All paragraph (c) and (d) persons shall be able to show relevant knowledge, background and appropriate experience related to aircraft continuing airworthiness.~~

~~(hf)~~ The qualification of all personnel involved in continuing airworthiness management shall be recorded.

~~(i) For organisations extending airworthiness review certificates in accordance with points M.A.711(a)4 and M.A.901(f), the organisation shall nominate persons authorised to do so, subject to approval by the competent authority.~~

~~(jg)~~ For all complex motor-powered aircraft and for aircraft used for commercial air transport, the organisation shall establish and control the competence of personnel involved in the any continuing airworthiness management, airworthiness review and/or audits compliance monitoring in accordance with a procedure and to a standard agreed by the competent authority. In addition to the necessary expertise related to the job function, competence must include an understanding of the application of safety management principles and, human factors and human performance issues appropriate to that person's function in the organisation".

– It is proposed to modify the point 145.A.30 to read:

“(a) The organisation shall appoint an accountable manager who has corporate authority for ensuring that all maintenance required by the customer can be financed and carried out to the standard required by in accordance with this Regulation.

The accountable manager shall:

(1) ensure that all necessary resources are available to accomplish maintenance in accordance with 145.A.65(c) to support the organisation approval;

(2) establish and promote the safety policy specified in 145.A.65(a)(2); and

(3) nominate a person with responsibility for compliance monitoring, including the associated feedback system as required by 145.A.65(a)(6). The nominated person shall have direct access to the accountable manager to ensure that the accountable manager is



kept properly informed on compliance matters; and

(4) demonstrate a basic understanding of this Regulation Part.

(b) The organisation shall nominate a person or group of persons, whose responsibilities include ensuring that the organisation is always in compliance with this Regulation Part. Such person(s) shall be ultimately be responsible to the accountable manager.

(1) The person or persons nominated shall represent the maintenance management structure of the organisation and be responsible for all maintenance functions specified in this Regulation Part.

(2) The person or persons nominated shall be identified and their credentials submitted in a form and manner established by the competent authority.

The person or persons nominated shall be able to demonstrate relevant knowledge, background and satisfactory experience related to aircraft maintenance and demonstrate a working knowledge of this Regulation.

~~(c) The accountable manager under paragraph (a) shall appoint a person with responsibility for compliance monitoring, including the associated feedback system as required by 145.A.65(a)(6). The appointed person shall have direct access to the accountable manager to ensure that the accountable manager is kept properly informed on compliance matters.~~

(d) The organisation shall have a maintenance man-hour plan showing that the organisation has sufficient staff to plan, perform, supervise, inspect and monitor the organisation in accordance with the approval. In addition the organisation shall have a procedure to reassess work intended to be carried out when actual staff availability is less than the planned staffing level for any particular work shift or period.

(e) The organisation shall establish and control the competence of personnel involved in any maintenance, management and/or audits compliance monitoring in accordance with a procedure and to a standard agreed by the competent authority. In addition to the necessary expertise related to the job function, competence must include an understanding of the application of safety management principles and, human factors and human performance issues appropriate to that person's function in the organisation.

~~“Human factors” means principles which apply to aeronautical design, certification, training, operations and maintenance and which seek safe interface between the human and other system components by proper consideration of human performance. “Human performance” means human capabilities and limitations which have an impact on the safety and efficiency of aeronautical operations.~~

[...]

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

Alignment, when possible, with point 145.A.30 structure, e.g. for the clear segregation of accountabilities and responsibilities of the accountable manager.

The term “nominate” is used to mean “to propose (someone) for appointment to a position, an office”. The term “appoint” is used to mean “to name or assign to a position, an office, or the like; designate”.

With regard to the establishment and control of the competence of personnel, the term “audits” has been replaced by “compliance monitoring” to cover personnel involved in such activities other than audits.

The definitions of “human factors” and “human performance” are already included into re-identified GM3 145.A.30(ed).

response

Partially accepted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-



powered aircraft.

The changes proposed to M.A.706 have been mostly accepted for the new CAMO.A.305 'Personnel requirements'.

Further alignment between the Part-CAMO and Part-145 personnel requirements will be addressed in Phase II of RMT.0251 (MDM.055).

comment 385

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

AMC M.A.606(a)

AMC M.A.706(a)

NPA 2013-01(C), page 51/184, section B., AMC1 145.A.30(a)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

It is proposed to (re-identify when necessary and) harmonise as much as possible AMC M.A.606(a), AMC M.A.706(a) and AMC1 145.A.30(a). Therefore:

– It is proposed to amend the AMC1 M.A.606(a) to read:

~~“With regard to the a~~Accountable manager, it is normally intended to mean the chief executive officer of the maintenance organisation approved under M.A. Subpart F, who by virtue of position has overall (including in particular financial) responsibility for running the organisation. The accountable manager may be the accountable manager for more than one organisation and is not required to be necessarily knowledgeable on technical matters. When the accountable manager is not the chief executive officer, the competent authority will need to be assured that such an accountable manager has direct access to chief executive officer and has a sufficiency of 'maintenance funding' allocation.”

– It is proposed to amend the AMC1 M.A.706(a) to read:

“Accountable manager is normally intended to mean the chief executive officer of the continuing airworthiness management organisation approved under M.A. Subpart G, who by virtue of position has overall (including in particular financial) responsibility for running the organisation. The accountable manager may be the accountable manager for more than one organisation and is not required to be knowledgeable on technical matters as the continuing airworthiness management exposition defines the continuing airworthiness standards. When the accountable manager is not the chief executive officer, the competent authority will need to be assured that such an accountable manager has direct access to the chief executive officer and has a sufficiency of 'continuing airworthiness funding' allocation.”

– It is proposed to amend the AMC1 145.A.30(a) to read:

~~“With regard to the a~~Accountable manager, it is normally intended to mean the chief executive officer of the approved maintenance organisation, who by virtue of position has overall (including in particular financial) responsibility for running the organisation. The accountable manager may be the accountable manager for more than one organisation and is not required to be necessarily knowledgeable on technical matters as the maintenance organisation exposition defines the maintenance standards. When the accountable manager is not the chief executive officer the competent authority will need to be assured that such an accountable manager has direct access to the chief executive officer and has a sufficiency of 'maintenance funding' allocation.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:



	<p>This NPA promotes consistency: “the existence of multiple safety/quality management system frameworks with differing, duplicated or inconsistent requirements can have not just negative economic but possibly adverse safety impacts caused by confusions, in particular if implemented within a single organisation”.</p> <p>To prevent possible confusion, errors, or extensive judgment.</p>
response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>Regarding AMC1 M.A.606(a): for the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.</p> <p>The proposed change to AMC1 M.A.706(a) is accepted.</p> <p>The proposed change to AMC1 145.A.30(a) will be considered in Phase II.</p>

comment	392	comment by: <i>Airbus</i>
<p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: NPA 2013-01(B), page 63/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.606(e) NPA 2013-01(B), page 89/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.706(j) NPA 2013-01(C), page 53/184, section B., AMC1 145.A.30(e)</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: It is proposed to harmonise as much as possible the text of AMC1 M.A.606(e), AMC1 M.A.706(j) and AMC1 145.A.30(e). Therefore: – It is proposed to modify the AMC1 M.A.606(e) to read: “1. Personnel involved in maintenance should be assessed for competence by ‘on the job’ evaluation and/or by examination relevant to their particular job role within the organisation before unsupervised work is permitted. 2. Adequate initial and recurrent training should be provided and recorded to ensure continued competence.” – It is proposed to re-identify AMC1 M.A.706(j) into AMC1 M.A.706(g) (reference left available, refer to Comment No. 22) and to modify paragraph (a) to read: “(a) Adequate initial and recurrent training should be provided and recorded to ensure continued competence. Competence should be defined as a measurable skill or standard of performance, knowledge and understanding, taking into consideration attitude and behaviour. The referenced procedure should require amongst others that technical support personnel such as, planners, engineers, and technical record staff, supervisors, post-holder, airworthiness review staff, whether employed or contracted, are assessed for competence before unsupervised work commences and competence is controlled on a continuous basis. Competence should be assessed by evaluation of: – on-the-job performance and/or testing of knowledge by appropriately qualified personnel, and – records for basic, organisational, and/or product type and differences training, and – experience records. Validation of the above could include a confirmation check with the organisation(s) that issued such document(s). For that purpose, experience/training may be recorded in a document such as a log book or based on the suggested template in GM [to be developed</p>		



on the basis of the re-identified GM6 to 145.A.30(d)].

As a result of this assessment, an individual's qualification should determine:

– which level of on-going supervision would be required or whether unsupervised work could be permitted.

– whether there is a need for additional training.

A record of such qualification and competence assessment should be kept.

This should include copies of all documents that attest to qualification, such as the authorisation held, as applicable.

For a proper competence assessment of its personnel, the organisation should consider that:

1. In accordance with the job function, adequate initial and recurrent training should be provided and recorded to ensure continued competence so that it is maintained throughout the duration of employment/contract.

2. All staff should be able to demonstrate knowledge of and compliance with the continuing airworthiness management organisation procedures, as applicable to their duties.

3. All staff should be able to demonstrate an understanding of safety management principles, human factors and human performance issues in relation with their job function and be trained as per AMC5 M.A.706(g).

4. To assist in the assessment of competence and to establish the training needs analysis, job descriptions are recommended for each job function in the organisation. Job descriptions should contain sufficient criteria to enable the required competence assessment.

5. Criteria should allow the assessment to establish that, among others (titles might be different in each organisation):

(a) Managers are able to properly manage processes, resources and priorities described in their assigned duties and responsibilities in accordance with the safety policy and objectives and in compliance with the applicable requirements and organisation procedures.

(b) Aircraft maintenance programme engineers are able to interpret source data (norms, data issued by the holder of a design approval or by the competent authority, etc.) and use them to develop the aircraft maintenance programme.

(c) Engineering staff are able to interpret source data (norms, data issued by the holder of a design approval or by the competent authority, etc.) and use them to make work cards.

(d) Operations staff are able to interpret aircraft continuing airworthiness tasks to ensure the maintenance is done in an effective and timely manner.

(e) Planners are able to organise maintenance activities in an effective and timely manner.

(f) Compliance monitoring staff are able to monitor compliance with this Regulation identifying non-compliance in an effective and timely manner so that the organisation may remain in compliance with this Regulation.

(g) Staff having designated safety management responsibilities are familiar with the relevant processes in terms of hazard identification, risk management, and monitoring of safety performance.

(h) All staff are familiar with the safety policy and the procedures and tools that can be used for internal safety reporting. Competence assessment should be based upon the procedure specified in GM5 to M.A.706(g).

– It is proposed to rename AMC1 145.A.30(e) into AMC1 145.A.30(d) modify it to read:

“Adequate initial and recurrent training should be provided and recorded to ensure continued competence.

Competence should be defined as a measurable skill or standard of performance, knowledge and understanding, taking into consideration attitude and behaviour.



The referenced procedure requires amongst others that planners, mechanics, specialised services staff, supervisors, certifying staff and support staff, whether employed or contracted, are assessed for competence before unsupervised work commences and competence is controlled on a continuous basis.

Competence should be assessed by evaluation of:

- on-the-job performance and/or testing of knowledge by appropriately qualified personnel, and
- records for basic, organisational, and/or product type and differences training, and
- experience records.

Validation of the above could include a confirmation check with the organisation(s) that issued such document(s). For that purpose, experience/training may be recorded in a document such as a log book or based on the suggested template in GM36 to 145.A.30(ed).

As a result of this assessment, an individual's qualification should determine:

- which level of on-going supervision would be required or whether unsupervised work could be permitted.
- whether there is a need for additional training.

A record of such qualification and competence assessment should be kept.

This should include copies of all documents that attest to qualification, such as the licence and/or any authorisation held, as applicable.

For a proper competence assessment of its personnel, the organisation should consider that:

1. In accordance with the job function, adequate initial and recurrent training should be provided and recorded to ensure continued competence so that it is maintained throughout the duration of employment/contract.
2. All staff should be able to demonstrate knowledge of and compliance with the maintenance organisation procedures, as applicable to their duties.
3. All staff should be able to demonstrate an understanding of safety management principles, human factors and human performance issues in relation with their job function and be trained as per AMC25 145.A.30(de).
4. To assist in the assessment of competence and to establish the training needs analysis, job descriptions are recommended for each job function in the organisation. Job descriptions should contain sufficient criteria to enable the required competence assessment.
5. Criteria should allow the assessment to establish that, among others (titles might be different in each organisation):
 - (a) Managers are able to properly manage processes, resources and priorities described in their assigned duties and responsibilities in accordance with the safety policy and objectives and in compliance with the applicable requirements and organisation procedures.
 - (b) Planners are able to interpret maintenance requirements into maintenance tasks, and have an understanding that they have no authority to deviate from the maintenance data.
 - (c) Supervisors are able to ensure that all required maintenance tasks are carried out and, where not completed or where it is evident that a particular maintenance task cannot be carried out to the maintenance data, then such problems will be reported to the compliance monitoring manager for appropriate action. In addition, for those supervisors who also carry out maintenance tasks, that they understand such tasks should not be undertaken when incompatible with their management responsibilities.
 - (d) Mechanics are able to carry out maintenance tasks to any standard specified in the maintenance data and will notify supervisors of defects or mistakes requiring rectification to re-establish required maintenance standards.



(e) Specialised services staff are able to carry out specialised maintenance tasks to the standard specified in the maintenance data. They should be able to communicate with supervisors and report accurately when necessary.

(f) Support staff are able to determine that relevant tasks or inspections have been carried out to the required standard.

(g) Certifying staff are able to determine when the aircraft or aircraft component is ready for to release to service and when it should not be released to service.

(h) Compliance monitoring staff are able to monitor compliance with ~~Part-145~~**this Regulation** identifying non-compliance in an effective and timely manner so that the organisation may remain in compliance with ~~Part-145~~**this Regulation**.

(i) Staff having designated safety management responsibilities are familiar with the relevant processes in terms of hazard identification, risk management, and monitoring of safety performance.

(j) All staff are familiar with the safety policy and the procedures and tools that can be used for internal safety reporting. Competence assessment should be based upon the procedure specified in GM5 to 145.A.30(ed).”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

This NPA promotes consistency: “the existence of multiple safety/quality management system frameworks with differing, duplicated or inconsistent requirements can have not just negative economic but possibly adverse safety impacts caused by confusions, in particular if implemented within a single organisation”.

To prevent possible confusion, errors, or extensive judgment.

response

Partially accepted.

Regarding AMC1 M.A.606(a): for the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.

The proposed changes to the AMCs to M.A.706 related to competence assessment are accepted and they will be considered for the AMCs to new Part-CAMO.A.305.

The proposed change to the corresponding Part-145 AMCs will be considered in Phase II.

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.A.606(b) Personnel requirements

p. 62

comment

388

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 63/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.606(b)
AMC1 145.A.30(b)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

It is proposed to harmonise as much as possible AMC1 M.A.606(b) and AMC1 145.A.30(b) and to create a new AMC1 M.A.706(b). Therefore:

– It is proposed to modify the paragraphs 3. and 4. of AMC1 M.A.606(b) to read:

“1. Dependent upon the size of the organisation, the functions may be subdivided under individual managers or combined in **nearly** any number of ways.

2. The maintenance organisation should have, dependent upon the extent of approval, an



aircraft maintenance manager, a workshop manager all of whom should report to the accountable manager. In small maintenance organisations any manager may also be the accountable manager, and may also be the aircraft maintenance manager or the workshop manager.

3. The aircraft maintenance manager is responsible for ensuring that all maintenance required to be carried out, plus any defect rectification carried out during aircraft maintenance, is carried out to the ~~design and standards~~ requirements specified in this Regulation. [...].

4. The workshop manager is responsible for ensuring that all work on aircraft components is carried out to the standards requirements specified in this Regulation [...].”.

– It is proposed to create the AMC1 M.A.706(b) to read:

“1. Dependent upon the size of the organisation, the continuing airworthiness management functions may be divided under individual managers or combined in nearly any number of ways.

2. The organisation should have, dependent upon the extent of approval, an aircraft manager, an engineering manager, an aircraft maintenance program manager, an operational manager, a compliance monitoring manager and a safety manager, all of whom should report to the accountable manager except in a small continuing airworthiness management organisation where any manager may also be the accountable manager, as determined by the competent authority, he/she may also hold all the other aforementioned manager positions.

3. The aircraft manager is responsible for ensuring that compliance with M.A.301 is demonstrated, in particular:

- the maintenance is carried out in accordance with the aircraft maintenance programme and managed as per regulation;
- the aircraft configuration is managed; and
- the continuing airworthiness records system is managed in accordance with the M.A.305, and M.A.306 when necessary.

The aircraft manager is also responsible for any corrective action resulting from compliance monitoring of M.A.712(a)(6).

4. The engineering manager is responsible for ensuring that:

- the up-to-date maintenance data specified in M.A.401 are available;
- the data for modifications and repairs specified in M.A.304 are available;
- the airworthiness directives necessary for the demonstration of compliance with M.A.303 are available; and
- the resulting work cards (task cards, job cards, engineering orders, etc.) issued as specified in 145.A.45(e), where appropriate.

The engineering manager role may be subdivided under an engineering manager, an airworthiness directives manager, a type design change manager or other positions depending on the organisation complexity. The engineering manager is also responsible for any corrective action resulting from compliance monitoring of M.A.712(a)(6).

5. The aircraft maintenance programme manager is responsible for ensuring that the issuance and approval of the aircraft maintenance programmes are done in accordance with M.A.302. He/she assesses the aircraft maintenance programme approvers, who are independent from both the aircraft maintenance programme creation process and the aircraft maintenance programme manager. The aircraft maintenance programme manager is also responsible for any corrective action resulting from compliance monitoring of M.A.712(a)(6).

6. The operations manager is responsible for ensuring the aircraft continuing airworthiness management around the clock. He/she is responsible for ensuring the daily management of the operator’s tech log system, as specified in M.A.306, the line



maintenance and the deferred defects management. The operational manager is also responsible for any corrective action resulting from compliance monitoring of M.A.712(a)(6).

7. Notwithstanding the example sub-paragraph 2 - 6 titles, the organisation may adopt any title for foregoing managerial positions but should identify to the competent authority the titles and persons chosen to carry out these functions.

8. When an organisation chooses to nominate any manager to all or any combination of the identified continuing airworthiness management organisation functions because of the size of the undertaking, it is necessary that these managers report ultimately through either the fleet manager or the engineering manager or aircraft maintenance programme manager or the operational manager or the compliance monitoring manager, as appropriate to the accountable manager.

NOTE: The airworthiness review staff may report to any of the managers specified depending upon which type of control the approved continuing airworthiness management organisation uses (for example: independent inspection/regulation advisor/certification advisor, etc.) so long as the independence of the compliance monitoring function can be guaranteed.”

– It is proposed to modify the AMC1 145.A.30(b) to read:

“1. Dependent upon the size of the organisation, the ~~Part-145~~ maintenance organisation functions may be subdivided under individual managers or combined in nearly any number of ways.

2. The organisation should have, dependent upon the extent of approval, a base maintenance manager, a line maintenance manager, a workshop manager, a compliance monitoring manager, and a safety manager, all of whom should report to the accountable manager except in small Part-145 organisation where any ~~one~~ manager may also be the accountable manager, as determined by the competent authority, he/she may also be the line maintenance manager or the workshop manager.

3. The base maintenance manager is responsible for ensuring that all maintenance required to be carried out in the hangar, plus any defect rectification carried out during base maintenance, is carried out to the ~~design and safety standards~~ requirements specified in 145.A.65(c). The base maintenance manager is also responsible for any corrective action resulting from the compliance monitoring of 145.A.65(a)(6).

4. The line maintenance manager is responsible for ensuring that all maintenance required to be carried out on the line including line defect rectification is carried out to the ~~standards~~ requirements specified in 145.A.71 and also responsible for any corrective action resulting from the compliance monitoring of 145.A.65(a)(6).

5. The workshop manager is responsible for ensuring that all work on aircraft components is carried out to the ~~standards~~ requirements specified in 145.A.71 and also responsible for any corrective action resulting from the compliance monitoring of 145.A.65(a)(6).

6. Notwithstanding the example sub-paragraphs 2 - 5 titles, the organisation may adopt any title for the foregoing managerial positions but should identify to the competent authority the titles and persons chosen to carry out these functions.

7. Where an organisation chooses to ~~appoint~~ nominate managers for all or any combination of the identified ~~Part-145~~ maintenance functions because of the size of the undertaking, it is necessary that these managers report ultimately through either the base maintenance manager or line maintenance manager or workshop manager or compliance monitoring manager, as appropriate, to the accountable manager.

NOTE: Certifying staff may report to any of the managers specified depending upon which type of control the approved maintenance organisation uses (for example licensed engineers/independent inspection/dual function supervisors, etc.) so long as the independence of the compliance monitoring function can be guaranteed.



3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

Design is rather addressed by Part 21 than by Part M. Regulations specify rather requirements than standards (e.g. industrial standards/norms like ATA breakdown). To prevent possible confusion, errors, or extensive judgment.

response

Partially accepted.

The AMC proposed is more suitable for very large CAMOs, but may not provide enough flexibility for organisations to adapt the organisational structure and assignment of accountabilities and responsibilities (e.g. not all CAMOs may have nominated a dedicated manager for aircraft maintenance programmes). It is feared that with such detailed AMCs many organisations would need to apply for an alternative means of compliance. The text is, therefore, proposed to be included as GM.

The issue will be reassessed in Phase II.

comment

389

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 63/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.606(c)

NPA 2013-01(B), pages 88-89/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.706(g)

AMC 145.A.30

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

It is proposed to harmonise as much as possible the AMC1 M.A.606(c) with the AMC of M.A.706(b) and 145.A.30(b). Therefore:

– It is proposed to modify the paragraph 1. of AMC1 M.A.606(c) to read:

~~“1. All nominated persons should possess the appropriate experience and qualifications which are listed in paragraphs 2.1 to 2.5 below.~~

~~2.~~ All nominated persons should have the appropriate experience and qualifications as follows:

~~2.1.~~ practical experience and expertise in the application of aviation safety standards and safe maintenance practices;

~~2.2.~~ comprehensive knowledge of:

(a) ~~Part M~~ This Regulation and any associated requirements and procedures;

(b) the maintenance organisation manual;

~~2.3.~~ five years aviation experience of which at least three years should be practical maintenance experience;

~~2.4.~~ knowledge of the relevant type(s) of aircraft or components maintained. This knowledge may be demonstrated by documented evidence or by an assessment performed by the competent authority. This assessment should be recorded.

Training courses should be as a minimum at a level equivalent to Part-66 Appendix III Level 1 General Familiarisation, and could be imparted by a Part-147 organisation, by the manufacturer, or by any other organisation accepted by the competent authority.

~~2.5.~~ knowledge of maintenance standards.”

– It is proposed to re-identify AMC1 M.A.706(g) into **AMC2 M.A.706(g)** and to modify it to



read:

KNOWLEDGE, BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE

(a) Nominated person or group of persons should have:

(1) practical experience and expertise in the application of aviation safety standards and safe operating practices;

(2) a comprehensive knowledge of:

(i) relevant parts of operational requirements and procedures;

(ii) the AOC holder's Operations Specifications when applicable;

(iii) the need for, and content of, the relevant parts of the AOC holder's Operations Manual when applicable;

(3) knowledge of safety management systems and **quality compliance monitoring** systems;

(4) five years relevant work experience of which at least two years should be from the aeronautical industry in an appropriate position;

(5) a relevant engineering degree or an aircraft maintenance technician qualification with additional education acceptable to the approving competent authority. 'relevant engineering degree' means an engineering degree from aeronautical, mechanical, electrical, electronic, avionic or other studies relevant to the maintenance and continuing airworthiness of aircraft/aircraft components;

The above recommendation may be replaced by 5 years of experience additional to those already recommended by paragraph (a)(4) above. These 5 years should cover an appropriate combination of experience in tasks related to aircraft maintenance and/or continuing airworthiness management (engineering) and/or surveillance of such tasks;

(6) thorough knowledge with the organisation's continuing airworthiness management exposition;

(7) knowledge of a relevant sample of the type(s) of aircraft gained through a formalised training course. These courses should be at least at a level equivalent to Part-66 Appendix III Level 1 General Familiarisation and could be imparted by a Part-147 organisation, by the manufacturer, or by any other organisation accepted by the competent authority.

"Relevant sample" means that these courses should cover typical systems embodied in those aircraft being within the scope of approval.

For all balloons and any other aircraft of 2730 Kg MTOM **and below or less**, the formalised training courses may be replaced by demonstration of knowledge. This knowledge may be demonstrated by documented evidence or by an assessment performed by the competent authority. This assessment should be recorded.

(8) knowledge of maintenance methods.

(9) knowledge of applicable regulations.

– It is proposed to create a new AMC identified under the AMC1 145.A.30(d) (reference left available, refer to [Comment No. 24](#)) to read:

KNOWLEDGE, BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE

(a) Nominated person or group of persons should have:

(1) practical experience and expertise in the application of aviation safety standards and safe operating practices;

(2) a comprehensive knowledge of:

(i) relevant parts of operational requirements and procedures;

(ii) the need for, and content of, the relevant parts of the AOC holder's Operations Manual when applicable;

(3) knowledge of safety management systems and compliance monitoring systems;

(4) five years relevant work experience of which at least two years should be from the aeronautical industry in an appropriate position;

(5) a relevant engineering degree or an aircraft maintenance technician qualification with additional education acceptable to the approving competent authority. 'relevant



engineering degree’ means an engineering degree from aeronautical, mechanical, electrical, electronic, avionic or other studies relevant to the maintenance and continuing airworthiness of aircraft/aircraft components;

The above recommendation may be replaced by 5 years of experience additional to those already recommended by paragraph (a)(4) above. These 5 years should cover an appropriate combination of experience in tasks related to aircraft maintenance and/or continuing airworthiness management (engineering) and/or surveillance of such tasks;

(6) thorough knowledge with the maintenance organisation exposition;

(7) knowledge of a relevant sample of the type(s) of aircraft gained through a formalised training course. These courses should be at least at a level equivalent to Part-66 Appendix III Level 1 General Familiarisation and could be imparted by a Part-147 organisation, by the manufacturer, or by any other organisation accepted by the competent authority. “Relevant sample” means that these courses should cover typical systems embodied in those aircraft being within the scope of approval.

For all balloons and any other aircraft of 2730 Kg MTOM or less, the formalised training courses may be replaced by demonstration of knowledge. This knowledge may be demonstrated by documented evidence or by an assessment performed by the competent authority. This assessment should be recorded.

(8) knowledge of maintenance methods.

(9) knowledge of applicable regulations.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The proposal simplifies the AMC1 M.A.606(c) by eliminating an unnecessary reference to another paragraph.

This NPA promotes consistency: “the existence of multiple safety/quality management system frameworks with differing, duplicated or inconsistent requirements can have not just negative economic but possibly adverse safety impacts caused by confusions, in particular if implemented within a single organisation”.

To prevent possible confusion, errors, or extensive judgment.

response

Noted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.

The changes proposed to M.A.706 and Part-145 will be considered in Phase II.

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.A.606(d) Personnel requirements p. 63

comment

391 comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:
 NPA 2013-01(B), page 63/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.606(d)
 NPA 2013-01(B), page 88/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.706(f)
 NPA 2013-01(C), page 53/184, section B., AMC1 145.A.30(d)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:
 It is proposed to harmonise as much as possible the AMC1 M.A.606(d), AMC1 of M.A.706(f) and AMC1 145.A.30(d). Therefore:



– It is proposed to modify the paragraph 1. of AMC1 M.A.606(d) to read:

“1. All ~~contracted~~ staff, including contracted staff, are subjected to compliance with the organisation’s procedures specified in the maintenance organisation manual relevant to their duties.

2. To have sufficient staff means that the approved maintenance organisation employs or contracts staff directly, even on a volunteer basis, for the anticipated maintenance workload.

3. Temporarily subcontracted means the person is employed by another organisation and contracted by that organisation to the approved maintenance organisation.”

– It is proposed to move the last two paragraphs of AMC1 M.A.706(f) into a new AMC1 M.A.706(e) to read:

“SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF STAFF

1. The actual number of persons to be employed and their necessary qualifications is dependent upon the tasks to be performed and thus dependent on the size and complexity of the organisation (general aviation aircraft, corporate aircraft, number of aircraft and the aircraft types, complexity of the aircraft and their age and for commercial air transport, route network, line or charter, ETOPS) and the amount and complexity of maintenance contracting. Consequently, the number of persons needed, and their qualifications may differ greatly from one organisation to another and a simple formula covering the whole range of possibilities is not feasible.

2. To enable the approving competent authority to accept the number of persons and their qualifications, an organisation should make an analysis of the tasks to be performed, the way in which it intends to divide and/or combine these tasks, indicate how it intends to assign responsibilities and establish the number of man/hours and the qualifications needed to perform the tasks. With significant changes in the aspects relevant to the number and qualifications of persons needed, this analysis should be updated.

3. Has sufficient staff means that the organisation employs or contracts competent staff, as detailed in the man-hour plan, of which at least half the staff that perform continuing airworthiness management tasks on any shift should be employed to ensure organisational stability. For the purpose of meeting a specific operational necessity, a temporary increase of the proportion of contracted staff may be permitted to the organisation by the competent authority, in accordance with an approved procedure which should describe the extent, specific duties, and responsibilities for ensuring adequate organisation stability. For the purpose of this subparagraph, employed means the person is directly employed as an individual by the continuing airworthiness management organisation approved under this Regulation, whereas contracted means the person is employed by another organisation and contracted by that organisation to the continuing airworthiness management organisation approved under this Regulation.

4. The planned absence (for training, vacations, etc.) should be considered when developing the man-hour plan.

5. The continuing airworthiness management man-hour plan should relate to the anticipated continuing airworthiness management work load except that when the organisation cannot predict such workload, due to the short term nature of its contracts, then such plan should be based upon the minimum continuing airworthiness management workload needed for commercial viability. Continuing airworthiness management work load includes all necessary work such as, but not limited to, aircraft maintenance programme creation/amendment, aircraft continuing airworthiness status analyses/checks, planning, production of work orders in paper or electronic form, completion and retention of aircraft continuing airworthiness records.

6. The compliance monitoring function man-hours should be sufficient to meet the requirement of M.A.712(a)(6) which means taking into account AMC2 and AMC3



M.A.712(a)(6). Where compliance monitoring staff perform other functions, the time allocated to such functions needs to be taken into account in determining compliance monitoring staff numbers.

9. The continuing airworthiness management man-hour plan should be reviewed at least every 3 months and updated when necessary.

10. Significant deviation from the continuing airworthiness management man-hour plan should be reported to the compliance monitoring manager, the safety manager and the accountable manager for review. Significant deviation means more than a 25% shortfall in available man-hours during a calendar month for any one of the functions specified in 145.A.30(d).”

– It is proposed to re-identify AMC1 145.A.30(d) into AMC1 145.A.30(c) to read:

“1. The actual number of persons to be employed and their necessary qualifications is dependent upon the tasks to be performed and thus dependent on the size and complexity of the organisation (corporate aircraft, number of aircraft and the aircraft types, complexity of the aircraft and their age) and the amount and complexity of maintenance contracting. Consequently, the number of persons needed, and their qualifications may differ greatly from one organisation to another and a simple formula covering the whole range of possibilities is not feasible.

2. To enable the approving competent authority to accept the number of persons and their qualifications, an organisation should make an analysis of the tasks to be performed, the way in which it intends to divide and/or combine these tasks, indicate how it intends to assign responsibilities and establish the number of man/hours and the qualifications needed to perform the tasks. With significant changes in the aspects relevant to the number and qualifications of persons needed, this analysis should be updated.

13. Has sufficient staff means that the organisation employs or contracts competent staff, as detailed in the man-hour plan, of which at least half the staff that perform maintenance in each workshop, hangar or flight line on any shift should be employed to ensure organisational stability. For the purpose of meeting a specific operational necessity, a temporary increase of the proportion of contracted staff may be permitted to the organisation by the competent authority, in accordance with an approved procedure which should describe the extent, specific duties, and responsibilities for ensuring adequate organisation stability. For the purpose of this subparagraph, employed means the person is directly employed as an individual by the maintenance organisation approved under ~~Part 145~~ this Regulation, whereas contracted means the person is employed by another organisation and contracted by that organisation to the maintenance organisation approved under ~~Part 145~~ this Regulation.

24. The maintenance man-hour plan should take into account all maintenance activities carried out outside the scope of the ~~Part 145~~ approval.

The planned absence (for training, vacations, etc.) should be considered when developing the man-hour plan.

35. The maintenance man-hour plan should relate to the anticipated maintenance work load except that when the organisation cannot predict such workload, due to the short term nature of its contracts, then such plan should be based upon the minimum maintenance workload needed for commercial viability. Maintenance work load includes all necessary work such as, but not limited to, planning, maintenance record checks, production of worksheets/cards in paper or electronic form, accomplishment of maintenance, inspection and the completion of maintenance records.

46. In the case of aircraft base maintenance, the maintenance man-hour plan should relate to the aircraft hangar visit plan as specified in AMC 145.A.25(a).

57. In the case of aircraft component maintenance, the maintenance man-hour plan should relate to the aircraft component planned maintenance as specified in



	<p>145.A.25(a)(2).</p> <p>68. The compliance monitoring function man-hours should be sufficient to meet the requirement of 145.A.65(a)(6) which means taking into account <u>AMC2</u> and AMC3 145.A.65(a)(6). Where compliance monitoring staff perform other functions, the time allocated to such functions needs to be taken into account in determining compliance monitoring staff numbers.</p> <p>79. The maintenance man-hour plan should be reviewed at least every 3 months and updated when necessary.</p> <p>810. Significant deviation from the maintenance man-hour plan should be reported to the compliance monitoring manager, the safety manager and the accountable manager for review. Significant deviation means more than a 25% shortfall in available man-hours during a calendar month for any one of the functions specified in 145.A.30(d).”</p> <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:</p> <p>This NPA promotes consistency: “the existence of multiple safety/quality management system frameworks with differing, duplicated or inconsistent requirements can have not just negative economic but possibly adverse safety impacts caused by confusions, in particular if implemented within a single organisation”.</p> <p>To prevent possible confusion, errors, or extensive judgment.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft.</p> <p>The proposed change to the M.A.706 AMC will be considered for the AMCs to the new Part-CAMO.A.305.</p> <p>Further alignment between the new Part-CAMO and Part-145 will be addressed in Phase II.</p>

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — M.A.607 Certifying staff	p. 63-64
--	----------

comment	<p>55 comment by: SVFB/SAMA</p> <p>page 61 of 218 (c) good progressiv intention</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p>
comment	<p>85 comment by: René Meier, Europe Air Sports</p> <p>M.A.607 Certifying staff</p>



new (c)
 page 66/224
 "unforseen" may be deleted, in our view. Please only write "(c) In the following cases..."
 Rationale:
 This is clear enough.

response Not accepted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.

If it is a foreseeable case, then the organisation should use regular certifying staff, therefore this possibility should only be allowed for cases that cannot be realistically anticipated.

comment 396 comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:
 NPA 2013-01(B), pages 63 & 64/218, section B., point M.A.607

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:
 It is proposed to modify the paragraph (c) of point M.A.607 to read:
 "2. to any person with not less than three years maintenance experience and holding a valid ICAO aircraft maintenance licence rated for the aircraft type requiring certification provided there is no organisation appropriately approved under this Regulation at that location and the contracted organisation obtains and holds on file evidence of the experience and the licence of that person.
 All such cases must be reported to the competent authority within seven days of the issuance of such certification authorisation. The approved maintenance organisation issuing the one-off certification authorisation shall ensure that any such critical maintenance that could affect flight safety is re-checked."

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:
 Refer to Comment No. 2.

response Not accepted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.

Your comment will be addressed when reviewing Subpart F.

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.A.606(h)2 607(d)(2) Personnel requirements p. 65-66

comment 398 comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:



NPA 2013-01(B), page 65/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.607(d)(2)

NPA 2013-01(C), page 57/184, section B., AMC1 145.A.30(j)(4)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

The sub-paragraphs a. & b. of paragraph 1. use the term “adequate” without defining what an adequate training is.

In addition, what is the meaning of “maintenance airworthiness regulation training”?

– It is proposed to modify the paragraph 1. of point AMC1 M.A.607(d)(2) to read:

“1. For the issue of a limited certification authorisation the commander should hold either a valid air transport pilot license (ATPL), or commercial pilots license (CPL). In addition, the limited certification authorisation is subject to the maintenance organisation manual containing procedures to address the following:

a. Completion of ~~adequate maintenance airworthiness regulation~~ [to be defined] ? training.

b. Completion of ~~adequate~~-task training for the specific task on the aircraft. The task training should be of sufficient duration to ensure that the individual has a thorough understanding of the task to be completed and should involve training in the use of associated maintenance data.

c. Completion of the ~~maintenance organisation~~ procedural training.

The above procedures should be specified in the maintenance organisation manual and be accepted by the competent authority”.

– It is proposed to re-identify AMC1 145.A.30(j)(4) into AMC1 145.A.30(i)(4) and to modify the paragraph 1. to read:

“1. For the issue of a limited certification authorisation the commander or flight engineer should hold either a valid air transport pilots license (ATPL), commercial pilots license (CPL) in accordance with Part-FCL, or authorisation as Technical Crew in accordance with Part-ORO Subpart TC. In addition, the limited certification authorisation is subject to the maintenance organisation exposition containing procedures to address the personnel requirements of 145.A.30(ed) and associated AMC and guidance material.

Such procedures should include as a minimum:

(a) Completion of ~~adequate continuing airworthiness regulation~~[to be defined] ? training as related to maintenance.

(b) Completion of ~~adequate~~-task training for the specific task on the aircraft. The task training should be of sufficient duration to ensure that the individual has a thorough understanding of the task to be completed and will involve training in the use of associated maintenance data.

(c) Completion of the ~~maintenance organisation~~ procedural training as specified in ~~Part-145~~ this Regulation.

The above procedures should be specified in the maintenance organisation exposition and be accepted by the competent authority.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The term “adequate” is ambiguous and may lead to confusion, errors, or extensive judgment.

With regard to “maintenance airworthiness regulation training” or “continuing airworthiness regulation training as related to maintenance”, it appears that it may be interpreted differently from a person to another (after an opinion poll).

Some of these interpretations are:

- A training about maintenance-related regulation (subpart F of Part M or Part 145),
- A training about continuing airworthiness-related regulation (remainder of Part M)
- A training about regulations related to maintenance and continuing airworthiness.

Further, consideration should be given to the development of guidance material for point



response	<p>M.A.607 on the basis of the re-identified GM1 145.A.30(i)(4).</p> <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.</p> <p>It is not planned, as part of Phase II, to align Part-CAO and Part-145.</p>
comment	<p>399 comment by: Airbus</p> <p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: NPA 2013-01(B), page 65/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.607(d)(2) NPA 2013-01(C), page 57/184, section B., AMC1 145.A.30(j)(4)</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:</p> <p>The paragraph 2. defines the scope of tasks that may be certified and/or carried out by the commander holding an ATPL or CPL. It uses terms such as “minor maintenance” and “simple checks” without defining selection criteria for “minor” and “simple”. A list of examples is given instead.</p> <p>– It is proposed to modify the paragraph 2. of point AMC1 M.A.607(d)(2) to read: “2. Typical tasks that may be certified and/or carried out by the commander holding an ATPL or CPL are minor simple maintenance or simple checks. Simple maintenance means a repair, inspection/check/test, replacement, modification or defect rectification described in approved maintenance data and meeting all the following criteria:</p> <p>(i) To configure the aircraft prior to the task (e.g. opening of access panels), or to return the aircraft to its initial configuration, does not involve:</p> <p>a. A sequence of more than 10 actions as described in the approved maintenance data, or b. Equipment necessitating special training.</p> <p>(ii) The task does not involve more than 10 actions as described in the approved maintenance data (not including those required to configure the aircraft prior to the task, i.e. flaps down, etc, or to return the aircraft to its initial configuration). Pushing a control, switch or button, and reading the corresponding outcome may be considered as a single step even if the maintenance data shows them separated.</p> <p>(iii) The serviceability of the aircraft can be verified using aircraft controls, switches, Built-in Test Equipment (BITE), Central Maintenance Computer (CMC) or external test equipment not involving special training.</p> <p>(iv) The outcome of the test is a unique go – no go indication or parameter, which can be a single value or a value within an interval tolerance. No interpretation of the test result or interdependence of different values is allowed.</p> <p>Some examples of tasks are included in the following list:</p> <p>a. Replacement of internal lights, filaments and flash tubes. b. Closing of cowlings and refitment of quick access inspection panels. c. Role changes, e.g., stretcher fit, dual controls, FLIR, doors, photographic equipment etc. d. Inspection for and removal of de-icing/anti-icing fluid residues, including removal/closure of panels, cowls or covers that are easily accessible but not requiring the use of special tools. e. Any check/replacement maintenance for a particular aircraft type involving simple techniques consistent with this AMC and as agreed by the competent authority.”</p> <p>– It was already proposed to re-identify AMC1 145.A.30(j)(4) into AMC1 145.A.30(i)(4) and it is proposed to modify the paragraph 2. to read:</p>



“2. Typical tasks that may be certified and/or carried out by the commander holding an ATPL or CPL are minor simple maintenance or simple checks. Simple maintenance means a repair, inspection/check/test, replacement, modification or defect rectification described in approved maintenance data and meeting all the following criteria:

(i) To configure the aircraft prior to the task (e.g. opening of access panels), or to return the aircraft to its initial configuration, does not involve:

- a. A sequence of more than 10 actions as described in the approved maintenance data, or
- b. Equipment necessitating special training.

(ii) The task does not involve more than 10 actions as described in the approved maintenance data (not including those required to configure the aircraft prior to the task, i.e. flaps down, etc, or to return the aircraft to its initial configuration). Pushing a control, switch or button, and reading the corresponding outcome may be considered as a single step even if the maintenance data shows them separated.

(iii) The serviceability of the aircraft can be verified using aircraft controls, switches, Built-in Test Equipment (BITE), Central Maintenance Computer (CMC) or external test equipment not involving special training.

(iv) The outcome of the test is a unique go – no go indication or parameter, which can be a single value or a value within an interval tolerance. No interpretation of the test result or interdependence of different values is allowed.

Some examples of tasks are included in the following list:

- (a) Replacement of internal lights, filaments and flash tubes.
- (b) Closing of cowlings and refitment of quick access inspection panels.
- (c) Role changes e.g. stretcher fit, dual controls, FLIR, doors, photographic equipment, etc.
- (d) Inspection for and removal of de-icing/anti-icing fluid residues, including removal/closure of panels, cowls or covers that are easily accessible but not requiring the use of special tools.
- ~~(e) Any check/replacement involving simple techniques consistent with this AMC and as agreed by the competent authority.~~

~~In addition to paragraph 2(a) to (e) other typical minor maintenance or simple defect rectification tasks that may be carried out are included in the following list:~~

- ~~(ae) Replacement of wheel assemblies.~~
- ~~(bf) Replacement of simple emergency equipment that is easily accessible.~~
- ~~(eg) Replacement of ovens, boilers and beverage makers.~~
- ~~(eh) Replacement of external lights.~~
- ~~(ei) Replacement of passenger and cabin crew seats, seat belts and harnesses.~~
- ~~(fj) Simple replacement of overhead storage compartment doors and cabin furnishing items.~~
- ~~(gk) Replacement of static wicks.~~
- ~~(hl) Replacement of aircraft main and APU aircraft batteries.~~
- ~~(im) Replacement of in-flight entertainment system components other than public address.~~
- ~~(jn) The de-activation only of sub-systems and aircraft components as permitted by the operator's minimum equipment list where such de-activation is agreed by the competent authority as a simple task.~~
- ~~(ko) Re-setting of tripped circuit breakers under the guidance of maintenance control.~~
- ~~(p) Any maintenance for a particular aircraft type involving simple techniques consistent with this AMC and as agreed by the competent authority.~~

~~(l) Any other task agreed by the competent authority as a simple task for a particular aircraft type.”~~

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The Article 2 defines maintenance. “Maintenance” means any one or combination of



overhaul, repair, inspection, replacement, modification or defect rectification of an aircraft or component, with the exception of pre-flight inspection. So, what is “minor maintenance”? For example, could it mean “minor repair”? A minor repair is defined in Part-21 as one that has no appreciable effect on the mass, balance, structural strength, reliability, operational characteristics, noise, fuel venting, exhaust emission, or other characteristics affecting the airworthiness of the product. It is to be noted that the category of a repair (minor/major) may be indicated on the repair design approval documentation issued by the design approval holder.

Therefore, it is believed that there is currently an incompatibility between the definition found in Part-21 and the intent of AMC1 M.A.607(d)(2). (holistic approach)

This may lead to confusion, errors, or extensive judgment.

Would not it be appropriate to adopt an approach similar to the GM 66.A.20(a) (for the category A aircraft maintenance license)? It refers to the term “simple test” and defines its meaning.

Note: No need has been found for minor overhaul. “Defect rectification” is covered by the term “repair” in Part M Appendix II “Authorised Release Certificate EASA Form 1”, paragraph 5., Block 11 Status/Work, item (ii). It is believed that this is inappropriate (found in contradiction with Article 2).

response Not accepted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, no changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO. It is not planned, as part of Phase II, to align Part-CAO and Part-145.

Creating a new categorisation of tasks and a new definition of simple maintenance tasks for the purpose of issuing a limited certifying staff authorisation would require a dedicated rulemaking task, as this is outside the scope of the ToR of RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I and II. A rulemaking proposal should be submitted to EASA.

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — AMC M.A.607 (c) AMC1 M.A.607(e) Certifying staff p. 66

comment 397

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

AMC M.A.607

NPA 2013-01(C), page 58/184, section B., AMC1 145.A.30(j)(5)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

– It is proposed to introduce the new AMC1 M.A.607(c) to read:

“1. For the purposes of this sub-paragraph ‘unforeseen’ means that the aircraft grounding could not reasonably have been predicted by the operator because the defect was unexpected due to being part of a hitherto reliable system.

2. A one-off authorisation should only be considered for issue under the responsibility of the accountable manager of the contracted organisation after it has made a reasoned judgement that such a requirement is appropriate under the circumstances and at the same time maintaining the required airworthiness standards. The organisation’s



accountable manager will need to assess each situation individually prior to the issuance of a one-off authorisation.

3. A one-off authorisation should not be issued where the level of certification required could exceed the knowledge and experience level of the person it is issued to. In all cases, due consideration should be given to the complexity of the work involved and the availability of required tooling and/or test equipment needed to complete the work.”

– It is proposed to re-identify AMC1 145.A.30(j)(5) into AMC1 145.A.30(i)(5) and to modify it to read:

“1. For the purposes of this sub-paragraph ‘unforeseen’ means that the aircraft grounding could not reasonably have been predicted by the operator because the defect was unexpected due to being part of a hitherto reliable system.

2. A one-off authorisation should only be considered for issue under the responsibility of the compliance monitoring manager of the contracted organisation after it has made a reasoned judgement that such a requirement is appropriate under the circumstances and at the same time maintaining the required airworthiness standards. The organisation’s compliance monitoring manager will need to assess each situation individually prior to the issuance of a one-off authorisation and may request the safety manager to perform a safety risk assessment.

3. A one-off authorisation should not be issued where the level of certification required could exceed the knowledge and experience level of the person it is issued to. In all cases, due consideration should be given to the complexity of the work involved and the availability of required tooling and/or test equipment needed to complete the work.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:
To achieve a uniform level of requirements.

response

Not accepted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, no changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO. It is not planned, as part of Phase II, to align Part-CAO and Part-145.

The proposal to change AMC1 145.A.30 will be addressed in Phase II.

comment

411 comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:
NPA 2013-01(B), page 66/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.607(e)
AMC M.A.707
NPA 2013-01(C), page 70/184, section B., AMC1 145.A.35(j)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:
– It is proposed to modify the AMC1 M.A.607(e) to read:
“1. The following minimum information as applicable should be kept on record in respect of each certifying person:
(a) Family name and first name;
(b) ~~d~~Date of birth;
(c) Basic education,
(d) Part-66 qualification and/or nationally-recognised maintenance personnel qualification, and any Aeronautical degree,
(~~ee~~) ~~h~~Basic training;
(~~ef~~) ~~†~~Type training;



(eg) recurrent Continuation training;
 (fh) specialised training;
 (gi) Experience;
 (j) Experience in maintenance and within the organisation,
 (k) Responsibilities of current role in the organisation,
 (hl) Qualifications relevant to the approval;
 (im) Scope of the authorisation and personal authorisation reference;
 (jn) Date of first issue of the authorisation; and
 (ko) if appropriate – expiry date of the authorisation; and
 (p) Copy of the authorization.

2. The record may be kept in any format but should be controlled by the organisation's compliance monitoring function. This does not mean that the compliance monitoring manager should run the record system.

23. Persons authorised to access the system should be maintained at a minimum to ensure that records cannot be altered in an unauthorised manner or that such confidential records become accessible to unauthorised persons.

34. The competent authority should be granted access to the records upon request.”
 – It is proposed to re-identify the AMC M.A.707(e) into AMC1 M.A.707(j) and to modify it to read:
 “1. The following minimum content information as applicable should be kept on the record in respect of each airworthiness review staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation record should be:
 - (a) Family Name and first name,
 - (b) Date of Birth,
 - (c) Basic Education,
 - Experience,
 - (d) Aeronautical Degree and/or Part-66 qualification and/or nationally-recognised maintenance personnel qualification,
 (e) Basic training,
 (f) Continuation training,
 - Initial Training received,
 - (g) Type(s) of Training received,
 - Continuation Training received,
 (h) Experience,
 - (i) Experience in continuing airworthiness and within the organisation,
 - (j) Responsibilities of current role in the organisation,
 (k) Qualifications relevant to the authorization,
 (l) Scope of the authorization,
 (m) Date of first issue of the authorization,
 (n) If appropriate — expiry date of the authorization,
 (o) Identification Number of the authorization,
 - (p) Copy of the authorisation.

2. The record may be kept in any format but should be controlled by the organisation's compliance monitoring function. This does not mean that the compliance monitoring manager should run the record system.

3. Persons authorised to access the system should be maintained at a minimum to ensure that records cannot be altered in an unauthorised manner or that such confidential records become accessible to unauthorised persons.

4. The officials of the competent authorities, the Agency and the Member State, who have responsibility for the oversight of the maintained aircraft and component thereof are authorised persons when investigating the records system for initial and continued



approval or when they have cause to doubt the competence of a particular person.”

– It is proposed to modify the AMC1 145.A.35(j) to read:

“1. The following minimum information as applicable should be kept on record in respect of each certifying staff and support staff:

- (a) Family Name and first name,
- (b) Date of Birth,
- (c) Basic education,
- (d) Part-66 qualification and/or nationally-recognised maintenance personnel qualification, and any Aeronautical degree,
- (e) Basic Training,
- (f) Type Training,
- (g) Continuation Training,
- (h) Type(s) of training received,
- (i) Experience,
- (j) Experience in maintenance and within the organisation,
- (k) Responsibilities of current role in the organisation,
- (l) Qualifications relevant to the authorization,
- (m) Scope of the authorization,
- (n) Date of first issue of the authorization,
- (o) If appropriate — expiry date of the authorization,
- (p) Identification Number of the authorization,
- (q) Copy of the authorization.

2. The record may be kept in any format but should be controlled by the organisation's compliance monitoring function. This does not mean that the compliance monitoring manager should run the record system.

3. Persons authorised to access the system should be maintained at a minimum to ensure that records cannot be altered in an unauthorised manner or that such confidential records become accessible to unauthorised persons.

4. The officials of the competent authorities, the Agency and the Member State, who have responsibility for the oversight of the maintained aircraft and component thereof are authorised persons when investigating the records system for initial and continued approval or when they have cause to doubt the competence of a particular person.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

For consistency between Part-M and Part-145. This NPA promotes consistency: “the existence of multiple safety/quality management system frameworks with differing, duplicated or inconsistent requirements can have not just negative economic but possibly adverse safety impacts caused by confusions, in particular if implemented within a single organisation”.

response

Partially accepted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, no changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO. It is not planned, as part of Phase II, to align Part-CAO and Part-145.

The proposal to change AMC M.A.707(e) will be considered when finalising the AMCs to Part-CAMO.

The proposal to change AMC1 145.A.35 will be addressed in Phase II.



SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.A.610 Maintenance work orders p. 66

comment 412 comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 66/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.610

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

It is proposed to modify the point M.A.610 to read:

“Before the commencement of maintenance a written work order shall be agreed between the organisation and the person or organisation requesting maintenance to clearly establish the maintenance to be carried out.”.

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

For clarity (to take into account that maintenance may be ordered by a person, e.g. the pilot-owner).

response Not accepted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, no changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO. It is not planned, as part of Phase II, to align Part-CAO and Part-145.

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.A.613 (a) Component certificate of release to service p. 66-68

comment 56 comment by: SVFB/SAMA

AMC1 M.A.607
(a)

.. several weeks:

and this in a part M/F LOL

response Noted.

comment 274 comment by: UK CAA

Page No: 66

Paragraph No: AMC1 M.A.607 (b) (1) (a)

Comment: This paragraph refers to the need to do competence assessments on prospective certifying staff. The last sentence in the paragraph reads as follows: “When



the person has been recruited from another approved maintenance organisation and was a certifying person in that organisation, then it is reasonable to accept a written confirmation from the previous organisation.” It is possible that the previous organisation might have been significantly different in activity and scope to the new organisation, and that the person’s certifying experience would therefore not be so relevant. UK CAA believes that this sentence should be clarified by adding a comment that the previous organisation should have been approved with a similar scope or activity as the new organisation.

Justification: UK CAA believes that clarity is required in making the rule easier to use, and to give clear understanding of the intent and correct application of the paragraph.

Proposed Text: Amend the last sentence as follows:
 “When the person has been recruited from another approved maintenance organisation **with a similar scope and activity**, and was a certifying person in that organisation, then it is reasonable to accept a written confirmation from the previous organisation.”

response Noted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, no changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.

Your comment will be considered for the AMCs to be issued for Part-CAO.

comment 454 comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:
 NPA 2013-01(B), page 67/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.613(a)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:
 It is proposed to modify the sub-paragraph (c) to read:
 “2.6.2 Serviceable aircraft components removed from a non-Member State registered aircraft may only be issued with an EASA Form 1 under the following conditions:
 (a) [...];
 (b) [...];
 (c) [...].
 An EASA Form 1 may be issued and should contain the information as specified in paragraph 2.4, including the aircraft from which the aircraft component was removed.”.

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:
 For clarity. The last sentence should not be included in sub-paragraph (c).

response Noted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, no changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.

Your comment will be considered for the AMCs to be issued for Part-CAO.

comment 455 comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:
 Point M.A.614



<p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: It is proposed to modify the sub-paragraph (a) to read: “(a) The approved maintenance organisation shall record all details of work carried out. Records necessary to prove all requirements have been met for issuance of the certificate of release to service including the sub-subcontractor’s release documents shall be retained.”.</p> <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION: NPA 2013-01(B), page 21/218, paragraph “Editorial and consistency changes”.</p>
<p>response Noted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, no changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.</p> <p>Your comment will be considered for the AMCs to be issued for Part-CAO.</p>

<p>SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.A.615(b) Privileges of the organisation p. 68</p>
--

<p>comment 456 comment by: Airbus</p>
<p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: NPA 2013-01(B), page 68/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.615(b)</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: It is proposed to modify the sub-paragraph (c) to read: “(c) ‘Under the control of the Subpart F maintenance organisation’ means that the Subpart F organisation should investigate the capability of the subcontracted organisation (including qualifications, facilities, equipment, and materials) and ensure that such organisation: (1) receives appropriate maintenance instructions and maintenance data for the task to be performed; (2) properly records the maintenance performed in the Subpart F airworthiness records; and (3) notifies the Subpart F organisation for any deviation or non-conformity, which has arisen during such maintenance.”.</p> <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION: For consistency with the text of point M.A.615(b).</p>
<p>response Noted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, no changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.</p> <p>Your comment will be considered for the AMCs to be issued for Part-CAO.</p>



SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — M.A.616 Management system

p. 69

comment 86 comment by: René Meier, Europe Air Sports

M.A.616 Organisational review Management system
page 71/224
(d) We repeat our comment as regards the 10 FTE.
Rationale:
If hand-overs exist things might be different.

response Noted.
Please refer to the response to comment #79.

comment 112 comment by: CAA-NL

M.A.616(a)(4)
Personal should be maintained trained and competent for ‘all their tasks’ not only for their safety management related tasks.
M.A.616(d)
Please amend the limit to 20 staff in line with AMC1 ORO.GEN.200(b).

response Not accepted.
For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, no changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.

comment 420 comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:
NPA 2013-01(B), page 69/218, section B., point M.A.616
NPA 2013-01(B), pages 98-99/218, section B., point M.A.712
NPA 2013-01(C), page 93/184, section B., point 145.A.65
2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:
It is proposed to create the GM1 M.A.616(a), GM1 M.A.712(a) and GM1 145.A.65(a) to read:
“SAFETY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
(a) The management of safety should be organised according to four overarching processes that underlie the actual safety management system:
(1) safety policy and objectives;
(2) safety risk management;
(3) safety assurance; and
(4) safety promotion: i.e. training and communication on safety.
(b) The two core operational activities are safety risk management and safety assurance.



Safety risk management must be considered as an early safety management system design activity, aimed at initial identification of hazards in the context in which operations of the organisation related to the delivery of [continuing airworthiness management/maintenance] services will take place.

Safety assurance must be considered as a continuous, on-going activity aimed at:

- (1) ensuring that the initial identification of hazards and assumptions in relation to the assessment of the consequences of safety risks, and the defences that exist in the safety management system as a means of control, remain valid and applicable as the safety management system evolves over time; and/or
- (2) introducing changes in the defences as necessary.

Thus, hazard identification can be considered as a one-stop or one-shot activity that is conducted either during safety management system design or when facing significant changes to the original system. Safety assurance, on the other hand, is a daily activity that is conducted non-stop to ensure that the operations of the organisation that support the delivery of [continuing airworthiness management/maintenance] services are properly protected against hazards. Simply put, hazard identification provides the initial frame of reference against which assurance of safety is conducted on a daily basis.

Additional explanations may be found in the ICAO Doc 9859 ‘Safety Management Manual’.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

A basic explanation of the SMS framework is found necessary. Further, a (bottom-up) reference to the ICAO SMM is a means to limit the extent of this explanation.

response

Noted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.

Your comment will be considered for the AMCs to be issued for Part-CAO.

The opinion does not propose the implementation of an SMS with four components; it proposes an integrated management system framework that is functionally equivalent to the ICAO framework, while building upon the existing quality system: the proposed management system requirements, which are aligned with those already adopted for aircrew (Regulation (EU) No 290/2012) and air operations (Regulation (EU) No 965/2012) combine safety management and compliance monitoring provisions into a single set of requirements. The proposed management system framework promotes an integrated approach to the management of an organisation by including the additional safety management components into the existing organisation requirements, rather than adding them as a separate framework. This aims to encourage organisations to embed safety management into all safety-relevant activities, instead of (super)imposing another system onto their existing management systems.

The Focused Consultation Group recommended the inclusion of a GM to clarify the intent of the management system for safety, and some of the elements proposed in this comment may be considered.

comment

421

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:
 NPA 2013-01(B), page 69/218, section B., point M.A.616



	<p>NPA 2013-01(B), pages 98-99/218, section B., point M.A.712 NPA 2013-01(C), page 93/184, section B., point 145.A.65 2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: Point 145.A.65(a)(5) refers to “documentation of all management system key processes <u>and procedures</u>”, while paragraphs M.A.616(a)(5) and M.A.712(a)(5) refer to “documentation of all management system key processes”. It is proposed to add a reference to ‘procedures’ to the points M.A.616(a)(5) and M.A.712(a)(5). 3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION: No reason has been found to justify the difference between these paragraphs. This NPA promotes consistency: “the existence of multiple safety/quality management system frameworks with differing, duplicated or inconsistent requirements can have not just negative economic but possibly adverse safety impacts caused by confusions, in particular if implemented within a single organisation”. Reference to ‘procedures’, in addition to ‘processes’, indicates the possibility of various levels of organisational instructions.</p>
<p>response</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.</p> <p>The text in M.A.712(a)(5) is aligned with aircrew and air operations. Procedures are the result of documenting processes, therefore reference is made to processes only.</p>

<p>comment</p>	<p>422 comment by: Airbus</p> <p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: NPA 2013-01(B), page 69/218, section B., point M.A.616 NPA 2013-01(B), pages 98-99/218, section B., point M.A.712 NPA 2013-01(C), page 93/184, section B., point 145.A.65 2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: Point 145.A.65(a)(6) refers to “Compliance monitoring shall include a feedback system of findings to <u>the person or group of persons specified in 145.A.30(b), and ultimately to the accountable manager</u> to ensure effective implementation of corrective actions as necessary”, while the paragraphs M.A.616(a)(6) and M.A.712(a)(6) refer to “Compliance monitoring shall include a feedback system of findings to <u>the accountable manager</u> to ensure effective implementation of corrective actions as necessary”. It is proposed to add a reference to ‘the person or group of persons specified in <u>M.A.606(b)/M.A.706(b)</u> and <u>M.A.706(c)</u>’ to the paragraphs M.A.616(a)(6) and M.A.712(a)(6). 3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION: No reason has been found to justify the difference between these paragraphs. This NPA promotes consistency: “the existence of multiple safety/quality management system frameworks with differing, duplicated or inconsistent requirements can have not just negative economic but possibly adverse safety impacts caused by confusions, in particular if implemented within a single organisation”. Reference to ‘the person or group of persons specified in M.A.606(b)/M.A.706(b)’ ensures the whole maintenance/continuing airworthiness management structure of the organisation is informed on findings (not relying <u>only</u> on a unique and very busy person,</p>
----------------	---



response	<p>i.e. the accountable manager).</p> <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.</p> <p>The text in M.A.712(a)(6), now CAMO.A.200(a)(6), aligned with the aircrew and air operations regulations, refers to the accountable manager as they are ultimately responsible for safety and compliance. Additional reporting lines can be implemented and must be clearly defined in accordance with point (a)(1) of CAMO.A.200(a)(6). Imposing specific reporting lines at IR level would remove flexibility.</p>
comment	<p>423 comment by: Airbus</p> <p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: NPA 2013-01(B), page 69/218, section B., point M.A.616 NPA 2013-01(B), pages 98-99/218, section B., point M.A.712 NPA 2013-01(C), page 93/184, section B., point 145.A.65 NPA 2013-01(B), pages 69-70/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.616(a) NPA 2013-01(B), pages 99-100/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.712(a)(1);(2);(3);(5) and AMC1 M.A.712(a)(1) NPA 2013-01(C), pages 94-95/184, section B., AMC1 145.A.65(a)(1)</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:</p> <p>– It is proposed to modify the paragraph (a)(1) of the points M.A.616, M.A.712 and 145.A.65 to read: “(a) The organisation shall establish, implement, and maintain a management system that includes: (1) clearly defined lines of authority, responsibility and accountability throughout the organisation, including a direct safety accountability of the accountable manager;”</p> <p>– It is proposed to create a new AMC1 M.A.616(a)(1), a new AMC2 M.A.712(a)(1) and a new AMC2 145.A.65(a)(1) to read: “ACCOUNTABILITIES, RESPONSIBILITIES AND AUTHORITIES In the English language, the notion of accountability is different from the notion of responsibility. Responsibility refers to the situation where a person must execute specific actions, while accountability extends this to the obligation or willingness to assume responsibility for the execution of such actions. To express it in safety management terms, safety responsibilities describe the safety purpose of the duties an individual is required to deliver. Safety accountabilities are statements of what (from a safety standpoint) the individual is required to deliver, either directly, or through supervision and management of others, including those to whom the individual has delegated responsibility. There is clearly a significant difference between both terms. However, this is a difference that exists only in the English language. In the context of safety accountabilities, responsibilities and authorities, the term ‘authority’ refers to the power or right to settle or decide by an authoritative or conclusive decision. It also refers to the right to act in a specified way, when the authority is delegated from one person or organisation to another. The organisation should define, document and communicate safety accountabilities, responsibilities and authorities (refer to [points M.A.604/M.A.704/145.A.70]).</p>



Every departmental head or person responsible for a functional unit will have a degree of involvement in the operation of the safety management system and its safety performance. This involvement will certainly be deeper for those responsible for operational departments or functional units directly involved in the delivery of the basic [continuing airworthiness management/maintenance] services of the organisation (refer to [points M.A.606(b)/M.A.706(b) & (c)/145.A.30(b)]: operations, maintenance, engineering, training and dispatch, usually referred to by the generic term “line managers”) than for those responsible for supporting functions (human resources, administration, legal and financial).

The job description (or any equivalent document) of all employees, regardless the employee position level in the organisation hierarchy, should describe the safety accountabilities, responsibilities and authorities.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The paragraph (i)(5)(iii) of both GM3 M.A.712(a)(3) and GM4 145.A.65(a)(3) indicates that in the management of changes, the larger/complex organisations should demonstrate that safety accountabilities, authorities and responsibilities are reviewed. However, there is no explanation of what is expected for the initial determination of these safety accountabilities, authorities and responsibilities.

Proposal based mainly on the paragraphs 6.7 and 8.5 of the ICAO Doc 9859 ‘Safety Management Manual’

response

Partially accepted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.

For Part-CAMO, the proposal has been retained to create GM ‘ACCOUNTABILITIES, RESPONSIBILITIES AND AUTHORITIES’

For Part-145, the proposal will be considered in Phase II.

comment

427

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 69, section B., point M.A.616

NPA 2013-01(B), pages 101-102, section B., AMC1 M.A.712(a)(2)

NPA 2013-01(C), pages 96-97, section B., AMC1 145.A.65(a)(2)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

– The AMC1 M.A.712(a)(2) and AMC1 145.A.65(a)(2) refer to a “proactive and systematic management” of safety.

Does EASA consider that proactive safety management includes predictive schemes or can the EASA confirm that no predictive scheme is required?

– It is proposed to create a new AMC1 M.A.616(a)(2) to read:

“SAFETY POLICY

(a) The safety policy should:

(1) be endorsed by the accountable manager;

(2) reflect organisational commitments regarding safety, and its proactive and systematic management;

(3) be communicated, with visible endorsement, throughout the organisation;

(4) include internal reporting principles, and encourage personnel to report maintenance



related errors, incidents and hazards; and
 (5) recognise the need for all personnel to cooperate for compliance monitoring and safety investigations.
 (b) The safety policy should include a commitment:
 (1) to improve towards the highest safety standards;
 (2) to comply with all applicable legislation, meet all applicable standards, and consider best practices;
 (3) to provide appropriate resources;
 (4) to enforce safety as one primary responsibility of all managers; and
 (5) to ensure that personnel are not inappropriately punished for reporting or cooperating with occurrence investigations.
 (c) Management should:
 (1) continually promote the safety policy to all personnel, and demonstrate their commitment to it;
 (2) provide necessary human and financial resources for its implementation; and
 (3) establish safety objectives and performance standards.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The ICAO refers to predictive, proactive and reactive hazard identification as part of safety management. With the help of the ICAO Doc. 9859 Safety Management Manual, these terms can be defined as:

– Reactive schemes: require a very serious triggering event, with oftentimes considerable damaging consequences, to take place in order to launch the safety data capture process. Reactive schemes are based upon the notion of waiting until “something breaks to fix it”. They are most appropriate for situations involving failures in technology and/or unusual events. Reactive schemes are an integral part of mature safety management. The contribution of reactive schemes to safety management nevertheless depends on the extent to which the information they generate goes beyond the triggering cause(s) of the event, and the allocation of blame, and includes contributory factors and findings as to safety risks.

Examples: The investigation of accidents and serious incidents.

– Proactive schemes: require a less serious triggering event, probably with little or no damaging consequences, to take place in order to launch the safety data capture process. Proactive schemes are based upon the notion that aviation system failures can be minimized by identifying safety risks within the system before it fails, and taking the necessary actions to mitigate such safety risks.

Examples: Mandatory and voluntary reporting systems, safety audits and safety surveys.

– Predictive schemes: do not require a triggering event to take place in order to launch the safety data capture process. Routine operational data are continually captured, in real time. Predictive schemes are based upon the notion that safety management is best accomplished by trying to find trouble, not just waiting for it to show up. Therefore, predictive safety data capture systems aggressively seek safety information that may be indicative of emerging safety risks from a variety of sources.

GM7 145.A.65(a)(3) paragraph D. states: “[...] Proactive data collection is often the product of ongoing safety programmes and not necessarily triggered by an event.”. This seems to imply that predictive schemes are included in proactive ones, but this needs to be confirmed.

The creation of AMC1 M.A.616(a)(2) brings consistency with Part-M subpart G and Part-145. Human factors and human performance and limitations have not been taken into account for this AMC as no requirement on human factors training are applied to Part-M subpart F organisations (refer to page 18/218 of the NPA 2013-01(B)). Refer to Comment



response	<p>No. 73.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.</p> <p>Regarding the reference to the types of methods to identify hazards, EASA chose not to use the term 'predictive' in relation to hazard identification; this should prevent misunderstandings that are frequently encountered when discussing the differences between predictive and proactive (e.g. in the explanation provided referring to 'Proactive schemes that require a less serious triggering event', some would claim that as soon as you react to an event, this is a reactive action).</p> <p>This approach also considers that depending on the type of organisation and nature of the activities, it cannot be assumed there is always a continual collection of real-time 'operational data'. Whereas an operator can rely on its flight data monitoring and other sources of operational data, for a maintenance organisation or a continuing airworthiness management organisation there is no such continual flow of routine operational data, which does not imply these organisations should not be actively involved in identifying hazards from a variety of sources.</p> <p>Amendment 1 to Annex 19 will also reconsider the use of the term 'predictive' in relation to hazard identification. The following change has been agreed:</p> <p>2. Safety risk management</p> <p><i>2.1 Hazard identification</i></p> <p><i>2.1.1 The service provider shall develop and maintain a process that to identify ensures that hazards associated with its aviation products or services are identified.</i></p> <p><i>2.1.2 Hazard identification shall be based on a combination of reactive, and proactive and predictive methods of safety data collection.</i></p> <p><i>2.2 Safety risk assessment and mitigation</i></p> <p><i>The service provider shall develop and maintain a process that ensures analysis, assessment and control of the safety risks associated with identified hazards.</i></p> <p><i>Note. — The process may include predictive methods of safety data analysis.</i></p>
----------	---

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — GM1 M.A.616(a)(1) Management system	p. 70
---	-------

comment

425

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 70, section B., GM1 M.A.616(a)(1)

NPA 2013-01(B), page 101, section B., GM1 M.A.712(a)(1)

NPA 2013-01(C), page 96, section B., GM1 145.A.65(a)(1)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

– It is proposed to modify the paragraph (a) of the GM1 M.A.712(a)(1) to read:



“SAFETY MANAGER
 (a) Depending on the size of the organisation and the nature and complexity of its activities, the safety manager may be assisted by additional safety personnel for the performance of all allocated safety management tasks as defined in AMC1 M.A.712(a)(1) point 2(b).”
 – It is proposed to modify the paragraph (b) of the GM1 M.A.616(a)(1), GM1 M.A.712(a)(1), and GM1 145.A.65(a)(1) to read:
 “(b) Regardless of the organisational set-up, it is important that the safety manager remains the unique focal point as regards the development, administration, and maintenance evolution of the organisation’s management system as related to safety.”
3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:
 Editorial.
 The use of the term “maintenance” is potentially confusing in this context due to the definition of maintenance given in the article 2 of Regulation (EC) 1321/2014.

response

Not accepted.
 For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.
 The GM text is fully aligned with that adopted for aircrew and air operations. As reference is being made to ‘management system’, there should be no confusion. Moreover, introducing the notion of evolution would require further clarification on the intent and this may duplicate the provisions on continual improvement as defined for example in point (f) of AMC1 M.A.712(a)(3), now AMC1 CAMO.A.200(a)(3).

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — GM1 M.A.616(a)(2) Management system p. 70

comment

428 comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:
 NPA 2013-01(B), page 70, section B., GM1 M.A.616(a)(2)
 NPA 2013-01(B), page 102, section B., GM1 M.A.712(a)(2)
 NPA 2013-01(C), page 97, section B., GM1 145.A.65(a)(2)
2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:
 It is proposed to harmonise the GM1 M.A.616(a)(2) with the GM1 M.A.712(a)(2) and the GM1 145.A.65(a)(2). Therefore:
 – It is proposed to modify the GM1 M.A.616 (a)(2) to read:
 “SAFETY POLICY
 The safety policy is the means whereby the organisation states its intention to maintain and, where practicable, improve safety levels in all its activities, and to minimise its contribution to the consequences of hazards risk of an aircraft accident as far as it is reasonably practicable.
 It reflects the management’s commitment to safety, and should reflect the organisation’s philosophy of safety management, and become the foundation on which the organisation’s management system is built. It serves as a reminder as to ‘how we do business here’. The creation of a positive safety culture begins with the issuance of a clear,



unequivocal direction.

The safety policy should state that the purpose of internal safety reporting and internal safety investigations is to improve safety, not to apportion blame to individuals.”

– It is proposed to modify the GM1 M.A.712(a)(2) to read:

“SAFETY POLICY

The safety policy is the means whereby the organisation states its intention to maintain and, where practicable, improve safety levels in all its activities and to minimise its contribution to the consequences of hazards risk of an aircraft accident or serious incident as far as it is reasonably practicable.

It reflects the management’s commitment to safety, and should reflect the organisation’s philosophy of safety management, and become the foundation on which the organisation’s management system is built. It serves as a reminder as to ‘how we do business here’. The creation of a positive safety culture begins with the issuance of a clear, unequivocal direction.

The safety policy should state that the purpose of internal safety reporting, and internal safety investigations is to improve safety, not to apportion blame to individuals.”

– It is proposed to modify the GM1 145.A.65(a)(2) to read:

“SAFETY POLICY

The safety policy is the means whereby the organisation states its intention to maintain and, where practicable, improve safety levels in all its activities, and to minimise its contribution to the consequences of hazards risk of an aircraft accident or serious incident as far as it is reasonably practicable.

It reflects the management’s commitment to safety, and should reflect the organisation’s philosophy of safety management, and become the foundation on which the organisation’s management system is built. It serves as a reminder as to ‘how we do business here’. The creation of a positive safety culture begins with the issuance of a clear, unequivocal direction.

The safety policy should state that the purpose of internal safety reporting and internal safety investigations is to improve safety, not to apportion blame to individuals.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The harmonisation will bring consistency and will benefit from the strengths of the other AMC.

The organisation should state that it intends to implement mitigation strategies against the safety risks of the consequences of hazards, not limited to aircraft accidents or serious incidents (refer to [Comment No. 97](#)).

response Not accepted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.

The GM text is fully aligned with that adopted for aircrew and air operations. The text refers to maintaining and, where practicable, improving safety levels in organisation activities in addition to minimising its contributions to the risk of an aircraft accident or serious incident. It is important to keep some focus on the worst possible outcome of a hazard. This is also necessary to not confuse aviation-safety-related safety management with occupational health and safety management.



SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.A.616(a)(3) Management system p. 70-71

comment 57 comment by: SVFB/SAMA

M.A.616

templates or example manual for
 micro <6
 very small <10
 small<50
 medium < 200
 significant <500
 major > 500
 WOULD BE MORE THAN WELCOME.

response Noted

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.

It is considered that the number of Subpart F organisations with more than 200 staff members is very limited. Providing manual templates for Part-CAO organisations may be evaluated on the basis of the recommendations of the Part-M General Aviation Task Force.

comment 88 comment by: EUROPEAN AVIATION QUALITY GROUP (EAQG)

Comment:
 It should be considered that the EN 9110 certification works strictly in conjunction with the relevant IAQG Industry Controlled Other Party (ICOP) Scheme.
 Note: IAQG is the International Aerospace Quality Group comprising about 67 Members which developed and promote the use of common standards, internally e with suppliers, to achieve performance improvement and avoiding audit duplication.
 Proposed Change to Text:
 For subcontracted organisations, certified in accordance with industry management system standards, such as ISO 9001 or EN 9110 and the associated IAQG Industry Controlled Other Party (ICOP) scheme, the Subpart F organisation should specify if, and how, it intends to consider this certification in its subcontractor control procedures

response Noted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.

EASA considers that within the range of a typical Subpart F organisation the number of EN9110-certified subcontractors is rather limited. The comment will be reassessed when drafting the AMCs for the new Part-CAO.



comment	<p data-bbox="352 210 1447 237">261 comment by: <i>FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation</i></p> <p data-bbox="352 297 1447 719">An organisation can hold several types of certificates. As it is stated in the following paragraph: “(c) Where the organisation holds one or more additional organisation certificates within the scope of Regulation (EC) 216/2008, the management system may be combined or integrated with that required under the additional certificate(s) held” (M.A.616 Management system). The FNAM is asking to the EASA to define the words “combined” and “integrated” in order to avoid any misinterpretation. The FNAM is suggesting that each organization should have the flexibility to decide which type of organizational structure it wants to establish. In particular for the small organisations, it would be more manageable for them to have only of SMS structure which gathers the monitoring of their different types of certificates. The interfacing of the different SMS by activities within an organisation would make the system more efficient and would involve less administrative load.</p> <p data-bbox="352 725 1447 790">The FNAM is asking for a complete interfacing and cohesion between the SMS requirements of the:</p> <ul data-bbox="352 797 742 898" style="list-style-type: none"> - Regulation (EU) N° 1178/2011, - Regulation (EU) N° 965/2012, - Regulation (EC) N° 1321/2014.
response	<p data-bbox="352 965 1447 992">Noted.</p> <p data-bbox="352 1016 1447 1081">For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO.</p> <p data-bbox="352 1106 1447 1664">For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, maximum alignment has been sought with Subpart GEN of the authority and organisation requirements defined in Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011, as amended by Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012. Moreover, as stated in NPA 2013-01(A), the opinion does promote an integrated approach to the management of an organisation by including the additional safety management components into the existing organisation requirements, rather than adding them as a separate framework. This aims to encourage organisations to embed safety management into all safety-relevant activities, instead of (super)imposing another system onto their existing management systems. The way the management provisions have been defined shall enable organisations to meet the requirements as they see fit in line with the business model they have adopted. Organisations holding more than one certificate may adopt common policies and procedures for some of the required processes (‘combined management system’) or adopt an overall strategy with management system key processes that are common for all areas under the different certificates, thus creating a single management system (‘integrated management system’). Combination may also be seen as an intermediate step towards full integration.</p> <p data-bbox="352 1688 1447 1933">Through the adoption of a common management system framework for all approved organisations in the area of airworthiness, air operations and aircrew, the implementation of safety management processes and related oversight will be facilitated for those organisations holding more than one certificate. From a systems’ safety perspective, this approach is intended to encourage the adoption and promotion of common procedures, principles and semantics in the area of safety management and will result in more efficient hazard identification and risk management.</p> <p data-bbox="352 1957 1447 1984">GM will be provided to clarify the practical aspects of management system integration.</p>



comment

429

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), pages 70-71/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.616(a)(3)

NPA 2013-01(B), page 122/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.721

NPA 2013-01(C), pages 89-90/184, section B., AMC1 145.A.62

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

It is proposed to harmonise as much as possible the AMC1 M.A.616(a)(3), the AMC1 M.A.721 and the AMC1 145.A.62. Therefore:

– It is proposed to modify the AMC1 M.A.616(a)(3)

“INTERNAL SAFETY REPORTING SCHEME

(a) As part of its management system, the organisation should establish an internal safety reporting scheme to enable the collection and evaluation of such occurrences to be reported under M.A.202.

(b) The scheme shall also enable the collection and evaluation of those errors, near-misses, and hazards reported internally that do not fall under point (a) above.

(c) Through this scheme the organisation should:

(1) identify and address the factors contributing to occurrences in order to reduce the likelihood of reoccurrence;

(2) identify adverse trends, corrective actions taken or to be taken by the organisation to address deficiencies; ~~and~~

(3) ensure evaluation of all known relevant information relating to errors, near-misses and hazards, and a method to circulate the information as necessary; ~~and~~

(4) ensure immediate action may be taken in case of occurrences that have an impact on the airworthiness of products or their components on which maintenance is performed, or which have already been released.

(d) The organisation shall cooperate on occurrence investigations with the person or organisation responsible for the continuing airworthiness management of an aircraft.

(~~e~~) The internal safety reporting scheme should be confidential and enable and encourage free and frank reporting of any potentially safety related occurrence, including ~~incidents~~ occurrences such as errors or near-misses, safety issues, and hazards identified. This will be facilitated by the establishment of a just culture. An organisation should ensure that personnel are not inappropriately punished for reporting or cooperating with occurrence investigations. The internal safety reporting scheme should contain the following elements:

(1) clearly identified aims and objectives with demonstrable corporate commitment;

(2) a just culture policy and process identified and published;

(3) an investigation process to:

(i) identify those reports which require further investigation; and

(ii) establish all root causes, including any technical, organisational, ~~or~~ managerial, ~~or~~ human factors issues, and any other contributing factors relating to the event; and

(4) appropriate corrective actions based on investigation findings.

(~~e~~) The internal reporting scheme should:

(1) assure confidentiality to the reporter;

(2) be closed-loop, to ensure that actions are taken internally to address any safety issues and hazards; and

(3) feed into the organisation's safety training, whilst maintaining appropriate confidentiality;



(eg) Feedback should be given to reportees both on an individual and more general basis to ensure their continued support of the occurrence reporting scheme.

– It is proposed to modify the AMC1 M.A.721

“(a) The internal safety reporting scheme should be confidential and enable and encourage free and frank reporting of any potentially safety related occurrence, including incidents/occurrences such as errors or near-misses, safety issues and hazards identified. This will be facilitated by the establishment of a just culture. An organisation should ensure that personnel are not inappropriately punished for reporting or cooperating with occurrence investigations. The internal safety reporting scheme should contain the following elements:

(1) clearly identified aims and objectives with demonstrable corporate commitment;

(2) a just culture policy and process identified and published;

(3) an investigation process to:

i. identify those reports which require further investigation; and

ii. establish all root causes, including any technical, organisational, managerial, or human factors issues, and any other contributing factors relating to the event;

(4) appropriate corrective actions based on investigation findings;

(5) for complex organisations:

i. investigators selected and trained on a recurrent basis; and

ii. analysis of the collective data showing contributing factor trends and frequencies; and

(6) where relevant, the operator and the organisation should cooperate on occurrence investigations by exchanging relevant information for improved aviation safety.

(b) The internal safety reporting scheme should:

(1) assure confidentiality to the reporter;

(2) be closed-loop, to ensure that actions are taken internally to address any safety issues and hazards; and

(3) feed into the continuation’s safety training as defined in the AMC to M.A.706(k), whilst maintaining appropriate confidentiality.

(c) Feedback should be given to reportees both on an individual and a more general basis to ensure their continued support of the safety reporting scheme.”

– It is proposed to modify the AMC1 145.A.62

“(a) The internal safety reporting scheme should be confidential and enable and encourage free and frank reporting of any potentially safety related occurrence, including incidents/occurrences such as errors or near-misses, safety issues, and hazards identified. This will be facilitated by the establishment of a just culture. An organisation should ensure that personnel are not inappropriately punished for reporting or cooperating with occurrence investigations. The internal safety reporting scheme should contain the following elements:

(1) clearly identified aims and objectives with demonstrable corporate commitment;

(2) a just culture policy and process identified and published;

(3) an investigation process to:

(i) identify those reports which require further investigation; and

(ii) establish all root causes, including any technical, organisational, managerial, or human factors issues, and any other contributing factors relating to the event;

(4) appropriate corrective actions based on investigation findings;

(5) for complex organisations:

(i) investigators selected and trained on a recurrent basis; and

(ii) analysis of the collective data showing contributing factor trends and frequencies; and

(6) where relevant, the operator and the organisation should cooperate on occurrence investigations by exchanging relevant information for improved aviation safety.

(b) The internal safety reporting scheme should:



(1) assure confidentiality to the reporter;
 (2) be closed-loop, to ensure that actions are taken internally to address any safety issues and hazards; and
 (3) feed into the continuation's safety training as defined in the 145.A.30, whilst maintaining appropriate confidentiality;
 (c) Feedback should be given to reportees both on an individual and a more general basis to ensure their continued support of the safety reporting scheme."

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

Page 18/218 of the NPA 2013-01(B) indicates implicitly that no human factors training requirements are applied to organisations managing aircraft (and components thereof) other than complex motor-powered aircraft or aircraft used for commercial air transport. How can it be required that the organisations approved under Part-M subpart F address such issues if their personnel have not been trained?

Refer to [Comment No. 71](#).

Refer to [Comment No. 97](#).

response

Partially accepted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO. It is not foreseen to include internal safety reporting provisions in Part-CAO.

Following the consultation with the European Human Factors Advisory Group (EHFAG), some of the proposed changes to AMC1 M.A.721 will be retained for the AMC to the new Part-CAMO.A.210.

comment

451

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), pages 70-71/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.616(a)(3) – Refer to [Comment No. 73](#).

NPA 2013-01(B), pages 121-122/218, section B., M.A.721

NPA 2013-01(C), pages 89/184, section B., point 145.A.62

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

Could the EASA clarify the reasons why the internal safety reporting scheme for organisations approved under Part-M subpart F is introduced at AMC level, unlike points 145.A.62 and M.A.721?

It is proposed to harmonise points 145.A.62 and M.A.721. Therefore:

– it is proposed to modify point M.A.721 to read:

“(a) As part of its management system, the organisation shall establish an internal safety reporting scheme, as detailed in the exposition, to enable the collection and evaluation of such occurrences to be reported under M.A.202.

(b) The scheme shall also enable the collection and evaluation of those errors, near-misses, and hazards reported internally that do not fall under point (a) above.

(c) Through this scheme, the organisation shall:

(1) identify and address the factors contributing to occurrences in order to reduce the likelihood of reoccurrence;

(2) identify adverse trends, corrective actions taken, or to be taken by the organisation to address deficiencies; ~~and~~

(3) ensure evaluation of all known relevant information relating to errors, near-misses,



and hazards, and a method to circulate the information as necessary; and

(4) ensure immediate action may be taken in case of occurrences that have an impact on the airworthiness of products or their components on which maintenance is performed, or which have already been released.

(ed) ~~For all complex motor powered aircraft and for aircraft used for commercial air transport, t~~The organisation shall cooperate on occurrence investigations with ~~the owner/operator and the relevant maintenance organisation(s).~~”

– it is proposed to modify point 145.A.62 to read:

“(a) As part of its management system, the organisation shall establish an internal safety reporting scheme as detailed in the exposition, to enable the collection and evaluation of such occurrences to be reported under 145.A.60.

(b) The scheme shall also enable the collection and evaluation of those errors, near-misses, and hazards reported internally that do not fall under point (a).

(c) Through this scheme the organisation shall:

(1) identify and address the factors contributing to ~~incidents~~ occurrences in order to reduce the likelihood of ~~such incidents~~ reoccurrence;g;

(2) identify adverse trends, corrective actions taken or to be taken by the organisation to address deficiencies;

(3) ensure evaluation of all known relevant information relating to errors, near-misses and hazards, and a method to circulate the information as necessary; and

(4) ensure immediate action may be taken in case of occurrences that have an impact on the ~~safety~~airworthiness of aircraft, products or ~~their~~ components on which maintenance is performed, or which have already been released.

(d) ~~When a Part-M Subpart G organisation is responsible for the continuing airworthiness management of an aircraft, t~~The organisation shall cooperate with ~~that Part-M Subpart G organisation~~ on occurrence investigations with the person or organisation responsible for the continuing airworthiness management of an aircraft.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

To take immediate action in case of occurrences having an impact on the airworthiness of products or their components is one of the aviation basics. Therefore, it should be reminded to all.

The term ‘occurrences’ has been found more neutral and is preferred to ‘incidents’ to prevent confusion with the activities related to the ICAO Annex 13 (aircraft accident and incident investigation).

In this context, the term ‘airworthiness’ is preferred to the term ‘safety’ as the main and direct impact of activities carried out by organisations approved under Part-M/Part-145 is on airworthiness. Refer to [Comment No. 2](#).

The harmonisation will bring consistency and will benefit from the strengths of the other AMC.

response

Not accepted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO. As Part-CAO will not include requirements for safety management, no internal safety reporting scheme will be mandated.

The changes proposed to M.A.721 are not accepted for Phase I. They will be reassessed in Phase II together with the changes proposed to Part-145, to ensure consistency between the related Part-CAMO and Part-145 requirements.



SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — GM1 M.A.616(a)(3) Management system

p. 71-72

comment 58 comment by: SVFB/SAMA

AMC1 M.A.616
Where are the checklists coming from ?

response Noted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, no changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft. Part-CAO will not include requirements for safety management.

For information, such checklists may be developed by the organisation as simple tools to detect hazards in systems and in operational processes.

comment 59 comment by: SVFB/SAMA

highest means: grounding.

The standard should be the **required** standard
it may be high for high risks but considerably lower for less significant risks

response Noted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, no changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft. Part-CAO will not include requirements for safety management.

For information: At the level of safety policy, there needs to be a clear commitment to improve towards the highest safety standards. Safety management is typically about having a sound approach to risks entailed by the activities. Referring to highest standards is in line with the principles set out in Regulation (EC) No 216/2008.

comment 452 comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), pages 71-72/218, section B., GM1 M.A.616(a)(3)

NPA 2013-01(B), page 123/218, section B., GM1 M.A.721

NPA 2013-01(C), pages 91-92/184, section B., GM2 145.A.62

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

Is the EASA's intent really to restrict the scope of safety risk assessments (and consequently, of the mitigation strategies) to hazards, which consequences are or



contribute to an aircraft incident or accident?

– It is proposed to harmonise GM1 M.A.616(a)(3) with GM1 M.A.721 and GM2 145.A.62, and to modify it to read:

“DEFINITIONS - INTERNAL OCCURRENCE REPORTING SCHEME

1. Near-miss: An occurrence which under slightly different circumstances could have led to ~~an aircraft incident or accident~~ serious or fatal injuries to people, damage to equipment or structures, loss of material, or reduction of ability to perform a prescribed function, during or after the delivery of the continuing airworthiness management services of the organisation.

An example is when a mechanic on rechecking his/her work at the end of a task realises that a pipe was only connected hand tight.

2. Error: Non-intentional action or inaction by a person that may lead to deviations from accepted procedures or regulations.

Errors are often associated with occasions where a planned sequence of mental or physical activities either fails to achieve its intended outcome, or is not appropriate with regard to the intended outcome, and when results cannot be attributed to the intervention of some chance agency. The mechanic forgetting to tighten the pipe was an error.

Note: The basic difference between errors and violation is intent. A person who willingly deviates from rules, procedures or training received while accomplishing a task commits a violation.

3. Hazard: A condition ~~that could cause or contribute to an aircraft incident or accident~~ or an object with the potential to cause serious or fatal injuries to people, damage to equipment or structures, loss of material, or reduction of ability to perform a prescribed function, during or after the delivery of the continuing airworthiness management services of the organisation.

Hazards can be related to human performance and limitations, the environment, organisational factors (commercial pressure, resource constraints, and culture) or technical factors (design of aircraft, systems, tooling, and equipment).

An example related to human performance and limitations is that of complex maintenance performed at time of night with circadian low.

Examples related to the environment are: line maintenance at night, excessive noise, and maintenance outside of hangar with very low temperatures.

Examples of organisational factors are: maintenance work involving multiple contractors/subcontractors, and significant turnover rate regarding maintenance and supervisory staff.

Examples related to technical factors are: ambiguous maintenance data, use of alternative tooling different from that recommended in maintenance data, and use of modified maintenance instructions.

4. Safety Culture: An enduring set of values, norms, attitudes, and practices within an organisation concerned with minimising exposure of the workforce and the general public to dangerous or hazardous conditions. In a positive safety culture, a shared concern for, commitment to, and accountability for safety is promoted.

5. Just Culture: A culture in which front line operators or others are not punished for actions, omissions or decisions taken by them that are commensurate with their experience and training, but where gross negligence, wilful violations and destructive acts are not tolerated.”

– It is proposed to harmonise GM1 M.A.721 with GM2 145.A.62 and to modify it to read:

“DEFINITIONS

1. Near-miss: An occurrence which under slightly different circumstances could have led to ~~an aircraft incident or accident~~ serious or fatal injuries to people, damage to equipment



or structures, loss of material, or reduction of ability to perform a prescribed function, during or after the delivery of the continuing airworthiness management services of the organisation.

An example is when an engineer on rechecking his/her work at the end of a work package preparation realises that a maintenance instruction for non-destructive testing refers to a maintenance procedure that would not allow detection of a failure (e.g. wrong non-destructive testing method).

2. Error: Non-intentional action or inaction by a person that may lead to deviations from accepted procedures or regulations.

Errors are often associated with occasions where a planned sequence of mental or physical activities either fails to achieve its intended outcome, or is not appropriate with regard to the intended outcome, and when results cannot be attributed to the intervention of some chance agency. The engineer introducing a typo in the maintenance procedure reference was an error.

Note: The basic difference between errors and violation is intent. A person who willingly deviates from rules, procedures or training received while accomplishing a task commits a violation.

3. Hazard: A condition that could cause or contribute to an aircraft incident or accident or an object with the potential to cause serious or fatal injuries to people, damage to equipment or structures, loss of material, or reduction of ability to perform a prescribed function, during or after the delivery of the continuing airworthiness management services of the organisation.

Hazards can be related to human performance and limitations, the environment, organisational factors (commercial pressure, resource constraints, and culture) or technical factors (design of aircraft, systems, tooling, and equipment).

An example related to human performance and limitations is that of complex revisions of the aircraft maintenance programme performed at the same time as another continuing airworthiness management task.

An example related to the environment is the continuing airworthiness management tasks performed in an excessive noisy environment (open space offices).

Examples of organisational factors are: maintenance work involving multiple contractors/subcontractors, and significant turnover rate regarding continuing airworthiness management and supervisory staff.

Examples related to technical factors are: ambiguous maintenance data, use of new information tool system, and use of modified maintenance instructions.

4. Safety risk: The assessment, expressed in terms of predicted probability and severity, of the consequences of a hazard, taking as reference the worst foreseeable situation.

45. Safety Culture: An enduring set of values, norms, attitudes, and practices within an organisation concerned with minimising exposure of the workforce and the general public to dangerous or hazardous conditions. In a positive safety culture, a shared concern for, commitment to, and accountability for safety is promoted.

56. Just Culture: A culture in which front line operators/personnel or others are not punished for actions, omissions or decisions taken by them that are commensurate with their experience and training, but where gross negligence, wilful violations and destructive acts are not tolerated.”

– It is proposed to re-identify GM2 145.A.62 into GM1 145.A.62 and to modify it to read:

“DEFINITIONS

(ea) Near-miss: An occurrence which under slightly different circumstances could have led to an aircraft incident or accident serious or fatal injuries to people, damage to equipment or structures, loss of material, or reduction of ability to perform a prescribed function, during or after the delivery of the continuing airworthiness management services of the



organisation.

An example is when a mechanic on rechecking his/her work at the end of a task realises that a pipe was only connected hand tight.

(db) Error: Non-intentional action or inaction by a person that may lead to deviations from accepted procedures or regulations.

Errors are often associated with occasions where a planned sequence of mental or physical activities either fails to achieve its intended outcome, or is not appropriate with regard to the intended outcome, and when results cannot be attributed to the intervention of some chance agency. The mechanic forgetting to tighten the pipe was an error.

Note: The basic difference between errors and violation is intent. A person who willingly deviates from rules, procedures or training received while accomplishing a task commits a violation.

(ec) Hazard: A condition that could cause or contribute to an aircraft incident or accident or an object with the potential to cause serious or fatal injuries to people, damage to equipment or structures, loss of material, or reduction of ability to perform a prescribed function, during or after the delivery of the maintenance services of the organisation.

Hazards can be related to human performance and limitations, the environment, organisational factors (commercial pressure, resource constraints, and culture) or technical factors (design of aircraft, systems, tooling, and equipment).

An example related to human performance and limitations is that of complex maintenance performed at time of night with circadian low.

Examples related to the environment are: line maintenance at night, excessive noise, and maintenance outside of hangar with very low temperatures.

Examples of organisational factors are: maintenance work involving multiple contractors/subcontractors, and significant turnover rate regarding maintenance and supervisory staff.

Examples related to technical factors are: ambiguous maintenance data, use of alternative tooling different from that recommended in maintenance data, and use of modified maintenance instructions.

(d) Safety risk: The assessment, expressed in terms of predicted probability and severity, of the consequences of a hazard, taking as reference the worst foreseeable situation.

(fe) Safety Culture: An enduring set of values, norms, attitudes, and practices within an organisation concerned with minimising exposure of the workforce and the general public to dangerous or hazardous conditions. In a positive safety culture, a shared concern for, commitment to, and accountability for safety is promoted.

(gf) Just Culture: A culture in which front line operators/personnel or others are not punished for actions, omissions or decisions taken by them that are commensurate with their experience and training, but where gross negligence, wilful violations and destructive acts are not tolerated."

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

Some examples have been added to GM1 M.A.721 in order to give the same level of information as for GM1 M.A.616(a)(3)/GM2 145.A.62.

There is an inconsistency between definitions given for "near-miss" and "hazard" on one hand, and for example, the definitions of "safety culture" and the severities of failure conditions taken into account for the Product certification (refer to Comment No. 2), on the other hand. Therefore, a definition of "hazard" has been developed on the basis of the one found in the ICAO Doc 9859 Safety Management Manual. Then, the definition for "near-miss" has been adapted.

It has been found necessary to introduce the notion of "safety risk" and of "violation". Finally, the term "operators" in the definition of "Just culture" has been found as



	<p>potentially confusing. The harmonisation will bring consistency and will benefit from the strengths of the other AMC.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, no changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft. Part-CAO will not include requirements for safety management.</p> <p>Regarding the comments on definitions:</p> <p>The term 'hazard' is defined in Regulation (EU) No 376/2014 as follows: "‘hazard’ means a situation or an object with the potential to cause death or injury to a person, damage to equipment or a structure, loss of material, or a reduction of ability to perform a prescribed function;’</p> <p>Introducing a different term for Part-CAMO would cause confusion.</p> <p>The comments on the other definitions will be discussed with the EHFAG to see which changes should be made to the AMCs and GM to Part-CAMO in Phase I.</p> <p>The examples provided are welcome and will be used to create additional guidance or safety promotion material (Phase I and II).</p>

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.A.616(a)(4) Management system

p. 72

comment 439

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 72/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.616(a)(4) and GM1 M.A.616(a)(4)

NPA 2013-01(B), pages 107-108/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.712(a)(4) and GM1 M.A.712(a)(4)

NPA 2013-01(C), pages 114-115/184, section B., AMC1 145.A.65(a)(4)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

It is proposed to cancel the GM1 M.A.616(a)(4) and GM1 M.A.712(a)(4) and to transfer their contents in the AMC1 M.A.616(a)(4) and AMC1 M.A.712(a)(4), and the AMC1 145.A.65(a)(4). The aim is also to harmonise these AMC. Therefore:

– It is proposed to modify the AMC1 M.A.616(a)(4) to read:

“TRAINING AND COMMUNICATION ON SAFETY

(a) Training

(1) The safety training programme may consist of self-instruction via a media (newsletters, flight safety magazines), classroom training, e-learning, and/or similar training provided by training service providers.

(12) Safety training should be delivered by the safety manager or a competent trainer and may be conducted by the maintenance organisation itself, independent trainers, or any training organisations acceptable to the competent authority.

(3) All personnel should receive safety training as appropriate for their safety



responsibilities.

(24) Adequate – Records of all safety training provided should be kept. These records should include, at least, the date of training completion, the safety training level related to safety responsibilities, and the name of the trainer, the training organisation and the attendees.

(b) Communication

(1) The organisation should establish communication about safety matters that:

(i) ensures that all personnel are aware of the safety management activities as appropriate for their safety responsibilities;

(ii) conveys safety critical information, especially relating to assessed risks and analysed hazards;

(iii) explains why particular actions are taken; and

(iv) explains why safety procedures are introduced or changed.

(2) Regular meetings with personnel where information, actions, and procedures are discussed, may be used to communicate safety matters.

– It is proposed to modify the [AMC1 M.A.712\(a\)\(4\)](#) to read:

“TRAINING AND COMMUNICATION ON SAFETY

(a) Training

(1) The safety training programme may consist of self-instruction via a media (newsletters, flight safety magazines), classroom training, e-learning, and/or similar training provided by training service providers.

(2) Safety training should be delivered by the safety manager or a competent trainer and may be conducted by the continuing airworthiness management organisation itself, independent trainers, or any training organisations acceptable to the competent authority. ~~All personnel should receive safety training as appropriate for their safety responsibilities.~~

(23) Adequate – Records of all safety training provided should be kept. These records should include, at least, the date of training completion, the safety training level related to safety responsibilities, and the name of the trainer, the training organisation and the attendees.

(b) Communication

(1) The organisation should establish communication about safety matters that:

(i) ensures that all personnel are aware of the safety management activities, as appropriate, for their safety responsibilities;

(ii) conveys safety critical information, especially relating to assessed risks and analysed hazards;

(iii) explains why particular actions are taken; and

(iv) explains why safety procedures are introduced or changed.

(2) Regular meetings with personnel where information, actions, and procedures are discussed, may be used to communicate safety matters.”

– It is proposed to modify the [AMC1 145.A.65\(a\)\(4\)](#) to read:

“TRAINING AND COMMUNICATION ON SAFETY

(a) Training

(1) The safety training programme may consist of self-instruction via a media (newsletters, flight safety magazines), classroom training, e-learning, and/or similar training provided by training service providers.

(2) Safety training should be delivered by the safety manager or a competent trainer and may be conducted by the maintenance organisation itself, independent trainers, or any training organisations acceptable to the competent authority.

(3) Records of all safety training provided should be kept. These records should include, at least, the date of training completion, the safety training level related to safety



responsibilities, and the name of the trainer, the training organisation and the attendees.

(b) Communication

(a1) The organisation should establish communication about safety matters that:

(1i) ensures that all personnel are aware of the safety management activities as appropriate for their safety responsibilities;

(2ii) conveys safety critical information, especially relating to assessed risks and analysed hazards;

(3iii); and

(4iv) explains why safety procedures are introduced or changed.

(b2) Regular meetings with personnel where information, actions and procedures are discussed may be used to communicate safety matters.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The harmonisation will bring consistency and will benefit from the strengths of the other AMC.

The elements related to the person receiving safety training are transferred in the AMC6 M.A.706(g) and the AMC6 145.A.30(d), except for the AMC1 M.A.616(a)(4). The elements pertaining to the safety training organisation are kept into the AMC1 M.A.712(a)(4) and the AMC1 145.A.65(a)(4).

response

Not accepted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, no changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft.

Record-keeping in relation to training is already covered through the general provisions on record-keeping in relation to management system key processes.

Following the recommendations made by the Focused Consultation Group, the elements pertaining to safety communication will remain under ‘management system’, while the elements pertaining to safety training will be moved to CAMO.A.305 ‘Personnel requirements’, also to group these with the human-factors-related training elements.

The need to align Part-CAMO with Part-145 as regards related training requirements will be assessed in Phase II.

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — GM1 M.A.616(a)(4) Management system p. 72

comment

60 comment by: SVFB/SAMA

near miss ? is this a good term?

response

Noted.

The term is commonly used in training material in the area of human factors.

Refer also to the response to comment #117.



comment	<p>237</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation</i></p> <p>Attachment #4</p> <p>Regarding the requirements in the paragraph in "AMC1 M.A.616 (a)(3) Management system", they are showing similarities with the project of regulation on occurrence reporting in civil aviation in the perimeter of the European Council and Parliament. The FNAM is asking to the EASA to clarify which entity has to cope with this subject. Only one person within the organisation should report the occurrence reporting either through the EASA, or through the NAA. It can not be through both. This would appear, as inefficient, as a possible source of misreporting and as not economically affordable. An issue is raised regarding the perimeter between these two regulations.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to the existing Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft. Part-CAO will not include occurrence reporting requirements.</p> <p>For information: Alignment with Regulation (EU) No 376/2014 will be ensured through a separate rulemaking task, that is RMT.0681. Regulation (EU) No 376/2014 aims to ensure effective reporting to the competent authority (EASA or Member State, depending on the case) through a unique channel.</p>

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — GM1 M.A.616(a)(5) Management system

p. 73

comment	<p>441</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>Airbus</i></p> <p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: AMC M.A.616(a)(5) NPA 2013-01(B), page 108/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.712(a)(5) NPA 2013-01(C), page 125/184, section B., AMC 145.A.65(b) NPA 2013-01(C), pages 132-133/184, section B., AMC & GM for 145.A.71</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: Could the EASA indicate the reasons why the AMC M.A.712(a)(5) (amended) has been processed differently from AMC 145.A.65(b) (cancelled)? Has consideration been given to create paragraphs equivalent to point 145.A.71 in Part-M? – It is proposed to create the AMC1 M.A.616(a)(5) on the basis of the AMC1 145.A.71</p> <p>“PROCEDURES (a) Procedures should be held current such that they reflect best practice within the organisation. It is the responsibility of all employees to report any differences or difficulties with the procedures via the organisation’s internal occurrence reporting scheme. (b) All procedures, and changes to the procedures, should be verified and validated before</p>
---------	--



use where practicable.”

– It is proposed to modify the AMC1 M.A.712(a)(5) to read:

“PROCEDURES

(a) Procedures should be held current such that they reflect best practice within the organisation. It is the responsibility of all employees to report any differences or difficulties with the procedures via their organisation’s internal safety occurrence reporting scheme.

(b) All procedures, and changes to the procedures, should be verified and validated before use where practicable.

(c) All technical procedures should be designed and presented in accordance with good human factors principles.”

– It is proposed to modify the AMC1 145.A.71 to read:

“PROCEDURES – GENERAL

(a) Maintenance procedures should be held current such that they reflect best practice within the organisation. It is the responsibility of all personnel to report any differences or difficulties via the organisation’s internal safety occurrence reporting scheme.

(b) All procedures, and changes to those procedures, should be verified and validated before use where practicable.

(c) All technical procedures should be designed and presented in accordance with good human factors principles.”

– It is proposed to modify the GM1 145.A.71 to read:

“HUMAN FACTORS PRINCIPLES

~~CAA UK CAP 716 chapter 6~~ The following key points provides guidance on designing and presenting technical procedures in accordance with good human factors principles and includes the following key points:

(a) Procedure design and changes should involve maintenance personnel who have a good working knowledge of the tasks;

(b) All procedures, and changes to those procedures, should be verified and validated before use where practicable;

(c) Ensure procedures are accurate, appropriate and usable, and reflect best practice;

(d) Take account of the level of expertise and experience of the user; where appropriate, provide an abbreviated version of the procedure for use by experienced technicians;

(e) Take account of the environment in which they are to be used;

(f) Ensure that all key information is included without the procedure being unnecessarily complex;

(g) Where appropriate, explain the reason for the procedure;

(h) The order of tasks and steps should reflect best practice, with the procedure clearly stating where the order of steps is critical, and where the order is optional;

(i) Ensure consistency in the design of procedures and use of terminology, abbreviations, references, etc.; and

(j) Use ‘Simplified English’; ASD Simplified Technical English for Aerospace and Defence (ASD-STE100¹³).”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The harmonisation will bring consistency and will prevent possible confusion, errors, or extensive judgment.

In this context, the reference to ‘internal occurrence reporting scheme’ is preferred to cover all procedures: the point M.A.712 addresses only management system key processes. Procedures describing processes other than key ones needs also to be



reviewed in case of difficulties.

It is not clear when reference is made to organisational procedures or to maintenance/technical procedures (i.e. contained in maintenance data such as the Aircraft Maintenance Manual or Trouble Shooting Manual): for example, refer to the paragraph (a) of both AMC1 145.A.71 and AMC1 M.A.712(a)(5). Definitions of terms should be provided and strictly applied. Refer to [Comment No. 10](#).

It is to be noted that although some national regulation materials may help in defining those of the EASA, it is found inappropriate (e.g. in case of contents evolutions) to include references to national guidance materials: the contents that are retained should be restated instead.

response Noted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft.

The change to M.A.712(a)(5) is accepted with the exception to the reference to internal occurrence reporting scheme. Part-CAMO will use the term 'internal safety reporting scheme'. The term 'occurrence' would suggest that the scheme is solely intended for reporting events, while it should serve to report any actual or potential safety issue.

The changes proposed to Part-145 will be assessed in Phase II.

Regarding the reference to UK CAA CAP 716, note this is done at GM level, therefore no obligation is imposed on the regulated person, and those wishing to use other sources may do so. Note that the GM highlights some items that are independent from the type of guidance or drafting standard applied, such as the need to take account of the level of expertise of the user, consistent use of terminology, etc.

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.A.616(a)(6) Management system

p. 73-74

comment 275

comment by: UK CAA

Page No: 73

Paragraph No: GM1 M.A.616 (a) (3) – See also UK CAA comment on page 113, paragraph GM1 M.A.712 (a) (6)

Comment: In some places in the document, the word “Definitions” is used to explain words or phrases used. In other places, the word “Terminology” is used. UK CAA recommends that a single common word be used throughout the document in order to minimise the possibility of confusion. UK CAA also recommends the use of a separate “Definitions’ or “Glossary of Terms” section in order to make such definitions easier to find once the rule is in use.

Justification: UK CAA believes that clarity is required, and common wording, in order to make the rule easier to use. This is particularly required for those whose first language is not English. The use of a common “Definitions” section at the beginning of the document would make the rule easier to use, and give users a single place to refer to for



	<p>explanations of terminology used throughout the rule.</p> <p>Proposed Text: Use the word “Definitions” throughout the document, and provide a separate “Definitions” section at the beginning of the document.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>All definitions will be grouped by creating a GM1 ‘Definitions’ to Part-CAMO (new Annex VII to Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014). In Phase II, it will be assessed how this GM could be made applicable to all annexes to Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014.</p>

comment	442	comment by: Airbus
	<p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: [NPA 2013-01(B), pages 73-74/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.616(a)(6)] NPA 2013-01(B), pages 109-110/218, section B., AMC & GM for point M.A.712(a)(6) NPA 2013-01(C), pages 116-121/184, section B., AMC & GM for point 145.A.65(a)(6)</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: – It is proposed to amend the AMC for M.A.712(a)(6) to read: “AMC1 M.A.712(a)(6) Management System COMPLIANCE MONITORING — GENERAL (a) Compliance monitoring (1) The primary objectives of the compliance monitoring function are to enable the organisation to ensure airworthy aircraft and to remain in compliance with the Part-Applicable requirements. (2) Compliance monitoring through independent audits is an essential element of the management system. (b) An essential element of the compliance monitoring function is the independent audit.The independence of the compliance monitoring function should be established by ensuring that audits, inspections and product sampling are carried out by personnel not responsible for the function, procedure or products being audited, inspected or sampled. (c) The implementation and use of a compliance monitoring function should enable the organisation to monitor compliance with the relevant requirements of this Part and other applicable Parts. (1) The organisation should specify the basic structure of the compliance monitoring function applicable to the activities conducted. (2) The compliance monitoring function should be structured according to the size of the organisation and the complexity of the activities to be monitored. (d) Organisations should monitor compliance with the procedures they have designed to ensure safe activities. In doing so, they should as a minimum, and where appropriate, monitor compliance with: (1) privileges of the organisation; (2) continuing airworthiness management procedures; (3) training standards specified in this Regulation; and (4) management system procedures and manuals.</p> <p>AMC2 M.A.712(a)(6) Management System COMPLIANCE MONITORING — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES (ea) The independent audit should be an objective process include inspections in the form</p>	



of routine sample checks of all aspects of the organisation's ability to carry out continuing airworthiness management to the ~~required standards~~ required by this Regulation. It should include some product sampling as this is the end result of the process.

(db) The independent audit should ~~represent~~ provide an objective overview of the complete continuing airworthiness management related activities. It is intended to complement the M.A.902 requirement for an airworthiness review to be satisfied that all aircraft managed by the organisation remain airworthy. Independent audits should include a percentage of random inspections carried out on a sample basis when continuing airworthiness management is being carried out.

(e) ~~An organisation should establish an audit plan to show when and how often the activities as required by M.A. Subpart G will be audited.~~

(fc) As a demonstration of the effectiveness of continuing airworthiness management procedures compliance, ~~the independent audit should ensure that all aspects of M.A. Subpart G compliance with this Regulation are checked during the applicable audit planning cycle every 12 months, including all the subcontracted activities, and may be carried out as a complete single exercise or subdivided over the applicable 12-month audit planning cycle in accordance with an audit scheduled plan. The independent audit does not require each procedure to be checked against each product line when it can be shown that the particular procedure is common to more than one product line and the procedure has been checked at least once during the applicable audit planning cycle every 12 months without resultant findings. Where findings have been identified, the particular procedure should be rechecked against other product lines until the findings have been rectified closed after which the independent audit procedure may revert back to the 12-month agreed audit planning cycle for the particular procedure. Provided that there are no safety related findings, the audit planning cycle specified in this AMC may be increased by up to 100% subject to an appropriate risk assessment and agreement by the competent authority.~~

(d) It is recommended that procedures and product audits be combined by selecting a specific product example, such as an aircraft, engine or propeller (and components thereof) and sample checking all the procedures and requirements associated with the specific product example to ensure that the end result should be an airworthy product.

For the purpose of conducting:

- procedures audits, the audit scope should not be limited to the procedure only but should also cover the related continuing airworthiness management process deliverables, such as an aircraft maintenance programme, work order, airworthiness directive status, or other aircraft continuing airworthiness records.

- product audits, a product line (for the considered organisation) is defined by the aircraft type, the information system tool used to manage the aircraft continuing airworthiness, and the aircraft operational condition (operated/not operated).

(e) It therefore follows for example that a continuing airworthiness management organisation approved under Part-M with a capability of two different information system tools would need to carry out two complete product audit sample checks at least once during the applicable audit planning cycle.

(f) The product sampling means to check the physical status of the product against the associated procedures, documentation (such as an aircraft maintenance programme, work order, status or other aircraft continuing airworthiness records), and referenced maintenance data. The sample check should not involve repeat disassembly or testing unless the sample check identifies findings requiring such action.

(g) Where the organisation has more than one location approved, the compliance monitoring ~~function~~ documentation should include a description describe of how these are integrated into the system and include a plan to audit each location every 12 months



at least once during the applicable audit planning cycle or on a risk based programme as agreed by the competent authority.

(h) A report should be raised each time an audit or inspection is performed ~~carried out~~ describing what was checked and the resulting findings against applicable requirements and procedures.

AMC3 M.A.712(a)(6) Management System

COMPLIANCE MONITORING — AUDIT PLANNING CYCLES

(a) The organisation should implement an audit planning cycle not exceeding 12 months, during which all management system key processes, continuing airworthiness management procedures, and products should be completely audited against the applicable requirements. When determining the audit planning cycle, the organisation should consider the results of its safety risk assessment and of past compliance monitoring in order to adapt the audit planning to the level of risk identified.

(b) Notwithstanding point (a), the competent authority may agree to increase the audit planning cycle by up to 100 % provided that there are no safety related findings, and subject to being satisfied that the organisation has a good record of rectifying findings in a timely manner.

AMC4 M.A.712(a)(6) Management system

COMPLIANCE MONITORING — INDEPENDENCE OF THE AUDIT

(a) The AMC1 M.A.712(a)(6) indicates that the independence of the audit should be established by always ensuring that audits, inspections and product sampling are carried out by personnel not responsible for the function, procedure, or products being audited, inspected or sampled. It, therefore, follows that a large continuing airworthiness management organisation approved under Part-M, being an organisation with more than about [number to be defined] continuing airworthiness management staff (FTEs) should have a dedicated group of auditors whose sole function is to conduct audits, inspections, and product sampling, issue finding reports, and follow-up to check that findings are being acted upon. For the medium sized continuing airworthiness management organisation approved under Part-M, being an organisation with no more than [number to be defined] continuing airworthiness management staff, it is acceptable to use competent personnel from one section/department, not responsible for the production, function, procedure, or product, to audit the section/department that is responsible subject to the overall planning and implementation being under the control of the compliance monitoring manager.

(b) The compliance monitoring manager of a non-complex organisation may perform all audits, inspections, and product sampling himself/herself or appoint one or more auditors. He/she may also elect to contract the independent audit element of the compliance monitoring function to another organisation, or a qualified and competent person approved by the competent authority.

A complex organisation may elect to contract the independent audit element of the compliance monitoring function to another organisation, or a qualified and competent person approved by the competent authority.

(c) In case external personnel are used to perform compliance audits, inspections or product sampling:

(1) any such audits, inspections or product sampling are performed under the responsibility of the compliance monitoring manager; and

(2) the organisation remains responsible to ensure that the external personnel has relevant knowledge, background, and experience as appropriate to the activities being audited or inspected, or to the product sampled, including knowledge and experience in



compliance monitoring.

(d) The organisation retains the ultimate responsibility for the effectiveness of the compliance monitoring function, in particular for the effective implementation and follow-up of all corrective actions.

AMC5 M.A.712(a)(6) Management system

FEEDBACK SYSTEM OF FINDINGS

(a) An essential element of the compliance monitoring function is the feedback system of findings.

(b) The feedback system of findings should not be contracted to outside persons. The principal function of such feedback system is to ensure that all findings resulting from the independent audits and inspections of the organisation are properly investigated and corrected in a timely manner, and to enable the accountable manager to be kept informed of any safety issues, and of the extent of compliance with Part-M.

(c) The feedback part of the system of findings should address who is required to rectify any non-compliance in each particular case, and the procedure to be followed if rectification is not completed within appropriate timescales. The procedure should lead to the accountable manager specified in M.A.706.

(d) The independent audit reports referred to in AMC2 M.A.712(a)(6) point (h) should be sent to the relevant department(s) for correction and corrective action giving target dates for these actions. Such target dates should be discussed with such the relevant department(s) before the compliance monitoring function manager or nominated auditor confirms such dates in the report. The relevant department(s) is required to correct non-compliances should act on findings and inform the compliance monitoring function manager or nominated auditor(s) of such correction action.

(e) The accountable manager should hold regular meetings with staff the compliance monitoring manager to check progress on correction and corrective actions.

(f) By derogation from point (e), in the large organisations, being an organisation with more than X continuing airworthiness management staff (FTEs), such meetings may be delegated on a day-to-day basis to the compliance monitoring manager subject to provided that:

(1) the accountable manager meeting the overall safety performance, and compliance record are reviewed at least twice per year by the safety review board with the senior staff involved to review the overall performance; and

(2) the accountable manager receives receiving at least twice a year a half-yearly summary report on findings of non-compliance findings.

(g) All records pertaining to the independent audit and the feedback system of findings should be retained for at least 5 years after the date of closure of the finding to which they refer to, or for such periods as to support changes to the audit planning cycle in accordance with AMC2 M.A.712(a)(6), whichever is the longer.

(h) The independence of the audit should be established by always ensuring that audits are carried out by personnel not responsible for the function, procedure or products being checked.

AMC6 M.A.712(a)(6) Management system

CONCESSION CONTROL FOR DEVIATIONS FROM ORGANISATION'S PROCEDURES

(a) In exceptional circumstances, it may temporarily be impossible for the organisation to comply with specific conditions stipulated in the procedures set forth in its management system documentation. For any deviation from those conditions a concession request should be submitted to the compliance monitoring manager. Such request should specify the reason for the request, and provide a justification, the condition/event concerned and



its duration, as well as any compensatory measures that may be applied.

(b) The compliance monitoring manager, in consultation with the safety manager or person having designated safety management responsibilities, should assess the deviation envisaged and compensatory measures proposed to ensure they do not affect compliance with the applicable Part-M requirements. If required he/she should define additional compensatory measures to be applied.

(c) The deviation and compensatory measures should only be implemented upon formal acceptance by the compliance monitoring manager. Depending on the case, the deviation envisaged and compensatory measures may need to be agreed with the competent authority prior implementation.

(d) It falls within the remit of the compliance monitoring function to ensure:

(1) follow-up of all concessions granted until the organisation reverts back to the conditions stipulated in the procedures set forth in its management system documentation; and

(2) that records are kept of all concessions granted and compensatory measures implemented, in accordance with M.A.717.”

– It is proposed to amend the GM1 M.A.712(a)(6) to read:

“TERMINOLOGY

(a) ‘Audit’ means a systematic, independent and documented process for obtaining evidence and evaluating it objectively to determine the extent to which requirements are complied with.

(b) ‘Inspection’ means an independent documented conformity evaluation by observation and judgement accompanied as appropriate by measurement, testing or gauging in order to verify compliance with applicable requirements.

(c) ‘Survey’ means [to be defined].”

– It is proposed to amend the AMC for point 145.A.65(a)(6) to read:

“AMC1 145.A.65(a)(6) Management system

COMPLIANCE MONITORING — GENERAL

[...]

(b) The independence of the compliance monitoring function should be established by ensuring that audits, inspections and product sampling inspections are carried out by personnel not responsible for the function, procedure or products being audited, inspected or sampled.

[...]

(d) Organisations should monitor compliance with the procedures they have designed to ensure safe activities. In doing so, they should as a minimum, and where appropriate, monitor compliance with:

(1) privileges of the organisation;

(2) maintenance procedures;

(3) training standards specified in this Regulation; and

(4) management system procedures and manuals.

AMC2 145.A.65(a)(6) Management System

COMPLIANCE MONITORING — MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES

(a) The independent audit should include inspections in the form of routine sample checks of all aspects of the organisation’s ability to carry out all maintenance to the required standards required by this Regulation and some product sampling as this is the end result of the maintenance process. It should provide an objective overview of the complete maintenance related activities and is intended to complement the 145.A.50(a) requirement for certifying staff to be satisfied that all required maintenance has been



properly carried out before issue of the certificate of release to service. Independent audits should include a percentage of random inspections carried out on a sample basis when maintenance is being carried out. This means some inspections during the night for those organisations that work at night.

(b) The independent audit should ensure that all aspects of Part-145 compliance with this Regulation are checked during the applicable audit planning cycle, including all the subcontracted activities, and may be carried out as a complete single exercise or subdivided over the applicable audit planning cycle in accordance with an audit schedule. The independent audit does not require each procedure to be checked against each product line when it can be shown that the particular procedure is common to more than one product line and the procedure has been checked at least once during the applicable audit planning cycle without resultant findings. Where findings have been identified, the particular procedure should be rechecked against other product lines until the findings have been closed after which the independent audit procedure may revert back to the agreed audit planning cycle for the particular procedure.

(c) The independent audit should sample one product on each product line at least once during the applicable audit planning cycle as a demonstration of the effectiveness of maintenance procedures compliance. It is recommended that procedures and product audits be combined by selecting a specific product example, such as an aircraft, engine or engine propeller (and components thereof) and sample checking all the procedures and requirements associated with the specific product example to ensure that the end result should be an airworthy product.

For the purpose of conducting:

- procedures audits, the audit scope should not be limited to the procedure only but should also cover the related maintenance process deliverables, such as work cards or maintenance records.

- product audits, a product line includes any product under an approval class rating as specified in the approval schedule issued to the particular organisation.

It therefore follows for example that a maintenance organisation approved under Part-145 with a capability to maintain aircraft, repair engines, brakes and autopilots would need to carry out four complete product audit sample checks at least once during the applicable audit planning cycle.

(d) The ~~sample check of a product~~ sampling means to witness any relevant testing and visually inspect the product against the associated documentation and procedures. The ~~sample check~~ product sampling should not involve repeat disassembly or testing unless the sample check identifies findings requiring such action.

[...]

AMC4 145.A.65(a)(6) Management system

COMPLIANCE MONITORING — INDEPENDENCE OF THE AUDIT

(a) The AMC1 145.A.65(a)(6) indicates that the independence of the audit should be established by always ensuring that audits, and inspections and product sampling are carried out by personnel not responsible for the function, procedure, or products being audited, or inspected or sampled. It, therefore, follows that a large maintenance organisation approved under Part-145, being an organisation with more than about 200 maintenance staff (FTEs) should have a dedicated group of auditors whose sole function is to conduct audits and inspections, raise issue finding reports, and follow-up to check that findings are being acted upon. For the medium sized maintenance organisation approved under Part-145, being an organisation with no more than 200 maintenance staff, it is acceptable to use competent personnel from one section/department, not responsible for the production, function, procedure, or product, to audit the section/department that is



responsible subject to the overall planning and implementation being under the control of the compliance monitoring manager.

(b) The compliance monitoring manager of a non-complex organisation may perform all audits, ~~and inspections,~~ and product sampling himself/herself or appoint one or more auditors. He/she may also elect to contract the independent audit element of the compliance monitoring function to another organisation, or a qualified and competent person approved by the competent authority.

A complex organisation may elect to contract the independent audit element of the compliance monitoring function to another organisation, or a qualified and competent person approved by the competent authority.

(c) In case external personnel are used to perform compliance audits, ~~or inspections~~ or product sampling:

(1) any such audits, ~~or inspections,~~ or product sampling are performed under the responsibility of the compliance monitoring manager; and

(2) the organisation remains responsible to ensure that the external personnel has relevant knowledge, background, and experience as appropriate to the activities being audited or inspected, or to the product sampled, including knowledge and experience in compliance monitoring.

[...]

AMC5 145.A.65(a)(6) Management system

FEEDBACK SYSTEM OF FINDINGS

[...]

(c) The feedback system of findings should address who is required to rectify any non-compliance in each particular case, and the procedure to be followed if rectification is not completed within appropriate timescales. The procedure should lead to the accountable manager specified in 145.A.30.

(~~e~~) The independent audit reports referred to in AMC2 145.A.65(a)(6) point ~~6~~(f) should be sent to the relevant department(s) for correction and corrective action giving target dates for these actions. Such target dates should be discussed with the relevant department(s) before the compliance monitoring manager or nominated auditor confirms such dates in the report. The relevant department(s) should act on findings and inform the compliance monitoring manager or nominated auditor(s) of such action.

(~~e~~) The accountable manager should hold regular meetings with ~~personnel~~the compliance monitoring manager to check progress on correction and corrective actions.

(~~e~~f) By derogation from point (~~e~~), in a large organisation, being an organisation with more than 200 maintenance staff (FTEs), such meetings may be delegated on a day-to-day basis to the compliance monitoring manager provided that:

(1) the overall safety performance, and compliance record are reviewed at least twice a year by the safety review board; and

(2) the accountable manager receives at least twice a year a summary report on non-compliance findings.

(~~f~~g) All records pertaining to the independent audit and the feedback system of findings should be retained for at least ~~25~~ years after the date of closure of the finding to which they refer to, or for such periods as to support changes to the audit planning cycle in accordance with AMC2 145.A.65(a)(6), whichever is the longer.

AMC6 145.A.65(a)(6) Management system

CONCESSION CONTROL FOR DEVIATIONS FROM ORGANISATION'S PROCEDURES

(a) In exceptional ~~situations~~circumstances, it may temporarily be impossible for the organisation to comply with specific conditions stipulated in the procedures set forth in its management system documentation. For any deviation from those conditions a concession request should be submitted to the compliance monitoring manager. Such



request should specify the reason for the request, and provide a justification, the condition/event concerned and its duration, as well as any compensatory measures that may be applied.

[...]

(c) The deviation and compensatory measures should only be implemented upon formal acceptance by the compliance monitoring manager. Depending on the case, the deviation envisaged and compensatory measures may need to be agreed with the competent authority prior implementation.”

– It is proposed to amend the GM2 145.A.65(a)(6) to read:

“TERMINOLOGY

(a) ‘Audit’ means a systematic, independent and documented process for obtaining evidence and evaluating it objectively to determine the extent to which requirements are complied with.

(b) ‘Inspection’ means an independent documented conformity evaluation by observation and judgement accompanied as appropriate by measurement, testing or gauging in order to verify compliance with applicable requirements.

(c) ‘Survey’ means [to be defined].”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The structure of AMC for point 145.A.65(a)(6) has been found clearer. The harmonisation of AMC 145.A.65(b) and AMC M.A.712(a), as far as possible, will bring consistency and will prevent possible confusion, errors, or extensive judgment.

With regard to the retention period (5 years) refer also to [Comment No. 96](#).

Concerning the terminology, it is found necessary to add the definition of the term ‘survey’ in this context. Further, the definitions for ‘audit’ and ‘inspection’ are so similar that it introduces a hazard: confusion, errors, extensive interpretations, etc. are not prevented.

It is to be noted that the extent of modifications that will/will not be done to the definitions has a significant impact on the contents of the AMC discussed under this Comment.

The size of organisations approved under Part-145 is the criterion to have or not a dedicated group of auditors. As a result of the harmonisation objective, some criteria need to be developed for the CAMO.

response

Noted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft.

The changes proposed to the AMCs to M.A.712(a)(6) will be considered for the AMCs and GM to the new PART-CAMO (Phase I) to the extent they do not introduce any new provisions.

The changes proposed to Part-145 and further alignment between Part-CAMO and Part-145 will be ensured in Phase II.

Regarding the change to terminology, adding a definition for ‘survey’ is not supported; however, the terminology used will be reviewed to ensure consistency and align it with quality-management-related terminology as defined in ISO 9000:2005 (which defines ‘audit’ and ‘inspection’, but not ‘survey’).



SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.A.616(d) Management system p. 74
Organisational review

comment	147	comment by: <i>EUROPEAN AVIATION QUALITY GROUP (EAQG)</i>
		<p>Comment: In the title the Appendix VIII to AMC1 M.A.616(d) "Organisational Review" has been changed to "Management system" but the text under this Appendix still refers to the Organisational Review. Proposed change to text: Depending on the complexity of the small organisation (number and type of aircraft, number of different fleets, subcontracting of specialised services, etc.), the management system may vary from a system using the principles and practices of a compliance monitoring.....</p>
response		<p>Noted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft. The organisational review option will be maintained for Part-CAO.</p>

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — Appendix VIII to AMC1 M.A.616(d) p. 74-78
Management system

comment	61	comment by: <i>SVFB/SAMA</i>
		<p>several examples should be given here</p>
response		<p>Noted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft. There will be no safety management requirements in Part-CAO.</p>
comment	89	comment by: <i>EUROPEAN AVIATION QUALITY GROUP (EAQG)</i>
		<p>Comment: In the title the AMC1 M.A.616(d) "Organisational Review" has been changed to "Management system" but under point (a) of this AMC1 the text still refers to the</p>



response	<p>Organisational Review. Proposed Change to text: (a) The primary objectives of the management system are to enable the approved maintenance organisation to ensure that it can deliver a safe product and that approved maintenance organisation remains in compliance with the requirements.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft. There will be no safety management requirements in Part-CAO and the organisational review option will be maintained.</p>

comment	150	<p>comment by: <i>Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)</i></p> <p>·Appendix VIII to AMC1 M.A.616(d)(e) Editorial? Bullet 4 & 5. Are the word corrective action and preventive action used as the definition in GM1 M.A.619?</p>
response		<p>Noted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft.</p>

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — AMC2 M.A.616(d) Management system p. 78

comment	131	<p>comment by: <i>EUROPEAN AVIATION QUALITY GROUP (EAQG)</i></p> <p>Comments: 1.This new AMC2 should be related preferably to M.A.616(a) Management system and moved to page 74 as the promotion of Industry standards such as EN9110 is not relevant for small organisations not having an independent compliance monitoring function 2. It should be considered that the EN 9110 certification works strictly in conjunction with the relevant IAQG Industry Controlled Other Party (ICOP) scheme. 3. The audit programme could be extended from 12 to 24 months for maintenance organisations being EN9110 certified Proposed Change to Text: AMC2 M.A.616(a) Management system INDUSTRY STANDARDS A Management system certified in accordance with an industry standard as the EN 9110</p>
---------	-----	--



	<p>and the associated IAQG Industry Controlled Other Party (ICOP), is deemed to meet the intent of M.A.616 (a), providing the frequency of audit programme under EN 9110 does not exceed 24 months</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft. There will be no safety management requirements in Part-CAO.</p> <p>Your comment will be assessed when finalising the AMCs to Part-CAO.</p> <p>It is assumed that the number of EN9110-certified Subpart F maintenance organisations is rather limited.</p>
comment	<p>5 comment by: <i>Stefan Stroeker</i></p> <p>Ladies and Gentlemen, regarding the per AMC2 M.A.616(d) explained Industry Standards, it should be added the ISO 9004.</p> <p>It is similar to the AMC's and gives guidance on a wider range of objectives of quality management system than does ISO 9001. ISO 9004 is recommended as a guide for organizations whose top management wishes to move beyond the requirements of ISO 9001.</p> <p>With kind regards Stefan Ströker - STROEK AIR -</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft. There will be no safety management requirements in Part-CAO.</p> <p>As an organisation may not be ISO 9004-certified, this standard has not been considered here. The absence of a certification scheme would leave it up to the competent authority to assess to what extent the organisation fulfils ISO 9004 in order to determine if this may be recognised as fulfilling organisational reviews and, therefore, this would not provide any alleviation.</p>

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — GM1 M.A.617(a) Changes to the organisation p. 79-80



comment

151

comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department
(Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)***AMC1 M.A.617(b)**

We propose the organization should inform the competent authority within reasonable time, for example at least 20 days before the date of the proposed change of nominated persons.

This because of the need of time for the authority to plan and perform the assessment/meeting with the proposed person.

See also page 117 AMC1 M.A.713(b) and page 138 AMC1 145.A.85(b).

response

Noted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft. There will be no safety management requirements in Part-CAO.

Your comment will be assessed when finalising the AMCs to Part-CAO.

comment

445

comment by: *Airbus***1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:**

NPA 2013-01(B), pages 79-80/218, section B., GM1 M.A.617(a)

NPA 2013-01(B), page 118/218, section B., GM1 M.A.713(a)

NPA 2013-01(C), page 138/184, section B., GM1 145.A.85(a)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

– It is proposed to modify the GM1 M.A.617(a) to read:

“GENERAL

(a) Typical examples of changes that may affect the certificate or the terms of approval are listed below:

(1) the name of the organisation;

(2) a change of legal entity;

(3) the organisation’s principal place of business;

(4) the organisation’s scope of approval;

(5) additional locations of the organisation;

(6) the accountable manager;

(7) any of the persons referred to in M.A.606(b);

(8) the organisation’s documentation as required by this Regulation, safety policy, and procedures; ~~and~~

(9) the facilities, equipment, tools, material, procedures, ~~or~~ work scope or certifying staff; and

(10) the detailed procedures for the fabrication of parts in accordance with AMC1 M.A.603(c).

(b) Prior approval by the competent authority is required for any changes to the organisation’s procedure describing how changes not requiring prior approval will be managed, and notified to the competent authority.

(c) Changes requiring prior approval may only be implemented upon receipt of formal approval by the competent authority.”



– It is proposed to modify the GM1 M.A.713(a) to read:

“GENERAL

(a) Typical examples of changes that may affect the certificate, or the terms of approval are listed below:

- (1) the name of the organisation;
- (2) a change of legal entity;
- (3) the organisation’s principal place of business;
- (4) the organisation’s scope of approval;
- (5) additional locations of the organisation;
- (6) the accountable manager;
- (7) any of the persons referred to in M.A.706(b) or M.A.706(c);
- (8) the organisation’s documentation as required by this Regulation, safety policy and procedures; and
- (9) the facilities, equipment, tools, material, procedures, work scope, or airworthiness review staff; and
- (10) the scheme to manage human factors and human performance and limitations.

(b) Prior approval by the competent authority is required for any changes to the organisation’s procedure describing how changes not requiring prior approval will be managed, and notified to the competent authority.

(c) Changes requiring prior approval may only be implemented upon receipt of formal approval by the competent authority.”

– It is proposed to modify the GM1 145.A.85(a) to read:

“GENERAL

(a) Typical examples of changes that may affect the certificate, or the terms of approval are listed below:

- (1) the name of the organisation;
- (2) a change of legal entity;
- (3) the organisation’s principal place of business;
- (4) the organisation’s scope of work approval;
- (5) additional locations of the organisation;
- (6) the accountable manager;
- (7) any of the persons referred to in 145.A.30(b) or 145.A.30(c);
- (8) the organisation’s documentation as required by this Regulation, safety policy and procedures;
- (9) the facilities, equipment, tools, material, procedures, work scope or certifying staff;
- (10) the scheme ~~fatigue risk management scheme established in accordance with AMC2 145.A.47(b)~~ to manage human factors and human performance and limitations; and
- (11) the detailed procedures for the fabrication of parts in accordance with AMC1 145.A.42(c).

(b) Prior approval by the competent authority is required for any changes to the organisation’s procedure describing how changes not requiring prior approval will be managed and notified to the competent authority.

(c) Changes requiring prior approval may only be implemented upon receipt of formal approval by the competent authority.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

Human factors and human performance and limitations are not taken into account in the GM1 M.A.617(a). Refer to Comment No. 71.

The paragraph (a)(10) of the GM1 145.A.85(a) is proposed for amendment as there is no reason to focus on only one matter involving human factors and human performance and limitations. Refer also to Comment No. 83.



response	The harmonisation will bring consistency and will benefit from the strengths of the other AMC.
	Noted.
	Your comment on GM1 M.A.713 will be assessed when finalising the AMCs and GM to Part-CAMO (Phase I).
	The changes proposed to Part-145 and further streamlining of the relevant Part-CAMO and Part-145 provisions will be assessed in Phase II.

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — M.A.618 Continued validity of approval

p. 80

comment	1	comment by: <i>Stefan Stroeker</i>
	Ladies and Gentlemen, regarding the per AMC2 M.A.616(d) explained Industry Standards, it should be added the ISO 9004. It is similar to the AMC's and gives guidance on a wider range of objectives of quality management system than does ISO 9001. ISO 9004 is recommended as a guide for organizations whose top management wishes to move beyond the requirements of ISO 9001. With kind regards Stefan Ströker - STROEK AIR -	
response	Noted. Please refer to the response to comment #5.	

comment	62	comment by: <i>SVFB/SAMA</i>
	excellent, we support this	
response	Noted.	

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — M.A.619 Findings

p. 80-81



comment 449

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

Point M.A.619

[NPA 2013-01(B), pages 120/218, section B., GM2 M.A.716]

[NPA 2013-01(C), page 140/184, section B., GM2 145.A.95]

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

It is proposed to develop the GM2 M.A.619 on the basis of the GM2 M.A.716 and GM2 145.A.95 to read:

“ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS

(a) It is important that the analysis does not primarily focus on establishing who or what caused the non-compliance but why it was caused. Establishing the root cause or causes of a non-compliance often requires an overarching view of the events and circumstances that lead to it, to identify all possible systemic and contributing factors (regulatory, organisational, managerial, cultural, technical, etc.) in addition to the direct factors. A narrow focus on single events or failures, or the use of a simple, linear model, such as fault tree, to identify the chain of events that lead to the non-compliance may not properly reflect the complexity of the issue, and, therefore, bears the risk that important factors required to be addressed in order to prevent reoccurrence will be ignored.

(b) Such inappropriate or partial root cause analysis often leads to defining ‘quick fixes’ addressing the symptoms of the nonconformity only. A peer review of the results of the root cause analysis may increase its reliability and objectivity.

(c) A system description of the organisation considering organisational structures, processes and their interfaces, procedures, staff, equipment, facilities, and the environment in which the organisation operates will support both effective root cause (reactive) and hazard (proactive) analysis.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The harmonisation will bring consistency and will benefit from the strengths of the other AMC.

Human factors and human performance and limitations are not taken into account in the GM2 M.A.619. Refer to [Comment No. 71](#).

response Noted.

For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft.

The comment may be considered when finalising the AMCs and GM to Part-CAO.

comment 448

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

[NPA 2013-01(B), page 81/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.619]



	<p>NPA 2013-01(B), pages 119/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.716 [NPA 2013-01(C), page 140/184, section B., AMC1 145.A.95]</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: It is proposed to harmonise AMC1 M.A.716 with AMC1 M.A.619 and AMC1 145.A.95 to read: “GENERAL The corrective action plan defined by the organisation should address the effects of the non-compliance, as well as its root cause(s) and contributing factors.</p> <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION: The harmonisation will bring consistency and will benefit from the strengths of the other AMC.</p>
response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered aircraft.</p> <p>The comment on AMC M.A.716 is accepted.</p> <p>The changes to Part-145 will be addressed in Phase II.</p>

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — M.A.620 Means of compliance	p. 81
---	-------

comment	<p>247 comment by: <i>Luftsport Verband Bayern / Germany</i></p> <p>We appreciate that the agency tries to level out the playing field within Europe by putting stronger rules on the application of the AMC material. But we think the new rules applied to the AMC deviations are too strict and too bureaucratic so that it will be practically impossible to use alternative means. First of all it will take a lot of effort for an organization to apply for an alternative because a lot of documentation has to be provided (description, risk analysis etc.). For the authority the effort will be high too to check and approve the alternative and report it to the agency and all member states. Because personnel capacity is always low at the authorities the authority will try to deny such proposals to keep the work load low. Small organisations will have a high demand for such alternatives. The above mentioned bureaucratic effort will be a big burden for them. An additional burden is that they can't use the deviations already being approved for other organisations because the full process has to be passed again for each organization. Proposal: For small organisations (< 5 FTE) it should be possible to grant other means of compliance at the time the authority audit is done.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>For the RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I opinion, only minimal changes have been made to Subpart F as it will be phased out after the transition to the new Part-CAO applicable to aircraft not used by licensed air carriers and to other-than-complex motor-powered</p>



aircraft. The new Part-CAO will not include any provisions on the acceptance of AltMoC.

It should be considered that the proposal made in this comment would mean that if the AltMoC is not acceptable, the organisation would be issued a finding as it has not complied with the rules. Also, there may be a tendency that competent authorities use such a provision as a means to increase oversight hours for smaller organisations. In any case, the AltMoC approval requires some formal confirmation by the competent authority. Approval during an audit may not provide the same level of transparency as the process that is already in place under Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012.

comment 269

comment by: RECCHIA Giuseppe Guido

M.A.620 point (a) should be removed since the principle addressed in there is already contained in Article 8 of cover regulation. See also other comments on M.B.104, M.A.203 and M.A.720.

It could be added in the point (b), which will become point (a), the following statement "Without prejudice to the content of Article 8 of Regulation (EC) no. 1321/2014, when" "

response

Please refer to the response to comment #267.

SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — M.A.621 Management system record keeping

p. 82

comment 450

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

Point M.A.305

Point M.A.306

Point M.A.614

NPA 2013-01(B), page 82/218, section B., M.A.621, its AMC and GM

NPA 2013-01(B), pages 120-121/218, section B., M.A.717, its AMC and GM

Point 145.A.55

NPA 2013-01(C), page 87/184, section B., AMC1 145.A.55 and GM1 145.A.55

NPA 2013-01(C), pages 125-126/184, section B., point 145.A.68, its AMC and GM

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

A consolidation of requirements about the way records should be kept seems necessary. Some requirements or acceptable means of compliance are located in different points (e.g. points M.A.305, M.A.306, M.A.714, M.A.717 and their AMC and GM). For example, AMC M.A.305(h) contains some pieces of information similar to the contents of the AMC/GM of points M.A.621 or M.A.717.

It is proposed that points M.A.305, M.A.306, M.A.614, M.A.714 and M.A.717 describe



	<p>which records have to be kept and provide the retention periods. Then, a new point (common to all) should be created to describe the way records should be kept. Same for Part-145.</p> <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:</p> <p>The duplication of regulation requirements creates hazards (potential future contradictions, confusion, etc.) and makes the compliance demonstration more complex than necessary: e.g. paragraph (e) of the AMC2 145.A.65(a)(3) states “Records of all FRM output, including findings from collected data, recommendations, and actions taken, should be maintained in accordance with <u>the organisation’s general record keeping procedures</u>”. Which procedure: The one for “product” record keeping (point 145.A.55) or the one for “organisation” record keeping (point 145.A.68)?</p> <p>The retention period for management system records is ambiguous: is it 2 years like currently (3 years for records of certifying staff and support staff), or 5 years as stated in the paragraph (d) of the AMC1 M.A.717 and AMC1 145.A.68? Is this 5-year retention period applicable only to computerized records?</p> <p>Refer also to EASA RMT.0276 (MDM.076).</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>In order not to interfere with RMT.0276 (MDM.076) ‘Technical records’, it is suggested that the streamlining of record-keeping requirements for Part-M, Part-ML, Part-CAMO, Part-CAO and Part-145 be reassessed in Phase II.</p>

<p>SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — M.A.622 Immediate reaction to a safety problem</p>	<p>p. 82</p>
---	--------------

comment	<p>453 comment by: Airbus</p> <p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: NPA 2013-01(B), page 82/218, section B., point M.A.622 NPA 2013-01(B), page 123/218, section B., point M.A.722 NPA 2013-01(C), page 140/184, section B., point 145.A.97</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – It is proposed to modify the title of points M.A.622, M.A.722 and 145.A.97 to read: “Immediate reaction to a safety problem measure mandated by Authorities” – It is proposed to modify point M.A.622 to read: “The organisation shall implement: (a) any safety measures mandated by the competent authority in accordance with M.B.106; and (b) any relevant mandatory safety information issued by the Agency.” <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:</p> <p>It is proposed to modify the title to prevent possible confusion with the Emergency Response Plan. To prevent contradiction with the paragraph 5. of point M.A.301 (subparagraph (iii)).</p>
response	<p>Not accepted.</p>



The text is aligned with the corresponding rules in aircrew, air operations and aerodromes, therefore no changes should be made to Part-CAMO in Phase I.

Only minimal changes have been made to Part-M Subpart F. Part-CAO will not include any requirements on 'immediate reaction to a safety problem'.



SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — M.A.702

p. 83

Application for an organisation certificate

comment

240

comment by: Thomson Airways

This change replaces the 'Approval' with 'Certificate'. Surely the 'Approval' is the authority, the certificate is just a piece of paper. Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704, section 0.1 however states - 'The Approval remains valid'.
For consistency the Approval should be stated in all cases (instead of Certificate).

response

Noted.

In line with the recommendations made by the Focused Consultation Group, Appendix V to the CAME AMC will not be maintained and the contents will be considered to issue CAME guidance as part of the EASA safety promotion material. The comment made will be considered to create such material.

For information: Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 in Chapter I Article 3 'Definitions' states: "‘certificate’ shall mean any approval, licence or other document issued as the result of certification." In line with this definition, 'certificate' is the correct term and this allows making a distinction between approval processes that affect the certificate and other approval items that may not affect the certificate (such as approving a fatigue risk management scheme).

This terminology change has been adopted already with Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012.

comment

330

comment by: DGAC FRANCE

MA702 :

This comment deals with the request for a procedure defining the process of « minor » changes to the certificate. It is similar to the question raised on Part 145, although different paragraphs concerned.

It is talking about "changes not requiring prior approval". But it is unclear to the DGAC if those changes will nevertheless get an authority approval or not after they are notified to the authority. As an example, the wording in Part 21.A.95 is clearer. DGAC recommends EASA to amend the wording similarly to the Part 21 one.

MA702, MA704 are concerned.

basically to document that :

"changes not requiring prior approval shall be approved by an appropriately approved organisation under a procedure agreed with the authority."



response

Not accepted.

These provisions reflect the elements that are currently applicable for aircrew and air operations. A change here would create inconsistencies in the way changes are managed by organisations and competent authorities.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — M.A.704
Continuing airworthiness management exposition

p. 84

comment

152

comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

· **M.A.704(a) 10**

Editorial.

There are two item 10.

response

Accepted.

This editorial mistake will be corrected.

comment

241

comment by: *Thomson Airways*

why remove the term '*Indirect Approval*'?. This term is used and recognised widely across industry.

response

Noted.

To align with Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012, all CAMO provisions dealing with 'indirect approval' or 'changes acceptable to the authority' have been reviewed. This aims for improved clarity by distinguishing between changes requiring prior approval and changes not requiring prior approval. The amended provisions fully meet the intent of 'indirect approval' or 'changes acceptable to the authority', while providing better legal certainty both to organisations and authorities.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1
M.A.704 Continuing airworthiness management exposition

p. 85-87



comment	<p>129</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: CAA-NL</p> <p>Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704 Please add in Part 5: '5.7 List of approved maintenance programs as per M.A.704(a)9'; also add this section to the EASA Form 13 Part 3. The content of the CAME has not been updated after EC 1056/2008 to include the list of maintenance programs as per M.A.704(a)9</p>
response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>The text in Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704 'Joe Bloggs CAME' will not be maintained as part of the regulatory material. It will be used to produce CAME guidance and possibly produce a sample Part-CAMO exposition, and this will be done as part of the EASA's safety promotion programme (a safety promotion task will be proposed for the planning cycle 2017–2021).</p> <p>The comment will be considered when producing such material.</p> <p>EASA Form 13 Part 3 will be amended to include the list of approved maintenance programmes, as indicated.</p>

comment	<p>170</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: Baines Simmons Limited</p> <p>CAME content and layout The renaming of Section 2 from Quality System to "Management System" implies that the "Quality System" requirements have been superseded by the "Management System" requirements, when in reality the "Quality System" has only been renamed as the "Compliance Monitoring Function", of the broader "Management System". We feel this will cause further confusion between the various terms in use. We recommend that the new "Management System" content (sections 2.6 through 2.14) should be included in Part 0 General Organisation, to reinforce the intention that that the Management System is all encompassing, including the "Corporate Commitment by the Accountable Manager", the "Management Personnel", and the "Management Organisation Charts". Furthermore the "Continuing Airworthiness Safety Policy" should be included in Part 0, whilst the remainder of the proposed Compliance Monitoring content (2.1, less the policy, through to 2.6) should be in Part 2 "Compliance Monitoring Procedures" as in the NPA. We consider this layout to be vital to help ensure that industry does not continue to equate "safety" with "quality", or "safety performance" solely with regulatory compliance.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Please refer to the response to comment #163.</p>

comment	<p>172</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: Baines Simmons Limited</p> <p>AMC1 M.A.704 Continuing airworthiness management exposition</p>
---------	---



Paragraph f) states “the person responsible for the management system should be responsible for monitoring and amending the exposition, including associated procedures manuals, and the submission of proposed amendments to the approving competent authority.” There is no clarification of the phrase “responsible for the management system” and this is considered ambiguous.

Formerly this was considered the M.A.712 Quality Manager (although we have never considered this an appropriate responsibility of that person), but now matters are even less clear. Does EASA intend to mean the “Safety Manager”, or the “Compliance Monitoring Manager”, or some other person?

Regardless of that differentiation, neither of these should perform this function as this should be the responsibility of one of the M.A.706(a), (b), or (c) personnel, forming the “management team”.

We do not understand why a similar philosophy has not been adopted here towards the CAME, as taken in GM1 145.A.70(a) Maintenance Organisation Exposition, whereby the organisation should be left to organise this responsibility.

Furthermore, why is such a statement considered AMC in Part-M and GM in Part-145?

response Accepted.

More flexibility will be provided with regard to assigning responsibilities for the CAME and the provisions proposed for Part-145 will be used for redrafting the AMC to M.A.704 (now CAMO.A.300).

Also in Phase II, GM1 145.A.70(a) will be included as AMC to ensure consistency with Part-M.

The text in AMC1 M.A.704 (now AMC 1 CAMO.A.300) will be reviewed to align it with that of GM1 145.A.70(a).

comment 220 comment by: LHT

AMC 2 M.A.702 Application for an organisation certificate:
 1. A certificate is the output of the approval
 2. Confusion in comparison to the Certificate of release to service. The word "certificate" is already "reserved" for the certificate of release to service. Common use in aviation industry.

response Noted.

Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 in Chapter I Article 3 ‘Definitions’ states: “‘certificate’ shall mean any approval, licence or other document issued as the result of certification.’

In line with this definition, ‘certificate’ is the correct term and this allows making a distinction between approval processes that affect the certificate and other approval items that may not affect the certificate (such as approving a fatigue risk management scheme).

This terminology change has been adopted already with Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012.



comment	222	comment by: LHT
	<p>M.A.704 Continuing airworthiness management exposition: replacement of several terms, but no alignment between terms and numbering within different expositions (e.g. CAME Part 0 "General organisation" and MOE Part 1 "General") -> terms and numbering of expositions should be aligned</p>	
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The Part numbering for CAME and MOE will be aligned as far as reasonably practicable.</p> <p>The need to further align the standards, contents and layouts of the expositions required by the new Part-CAMO and Part-145 will be assessed in Phase II.</p>	

comment	309	comment by: AEA
	<p>AMC 2 M.A.702 Application for an organisation certificate: 1. A certificate is the output of the approval 2. Confusion in comparison to the Certificate of release to service. The word "certificate" is already "reserved" for the certificate of release to service. Common use in aviation industry.</p>	
response	<p>Please refer to the response to comment #220.</p>	

comment	310	comment by: AEA
	<p>M.A.704 Continuing airworthiness management exposition: replacement of several terms, but no alignment between terms and numbering within different expositions (e.g. CAME Part 0 "General organisation" and MOE Part 1 "General") -> terms and numbering of expositions should be aligned</p>	
response	<p>Please refer to the response to comment #220.</p>	

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — M.A.706 p. 87-88
Personnel requirements

comment	113	comment by: CAA-NL
	<p>M.A.706(c) We think it is currently unclear whether the safety manager should be considered as a</p>	



	<p>nominated person under M.A.706(c) that needs to be accepted via EASA Form 4 by the competent authority. The safety manager is introduced in GM1 M.A.712(a)(1). In M.B.702(e)(2) there is only a reference to the acceptance of personnel under M.A.706(a) to (d).</p> <p>Some clarification that the safety manager are to be considered personnel meant under M.A.706(c) would help clarifying this issue.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Following the recommendations of the Focused Consultation Group, the text was amended to include at IR level the nomination of a person or group of persons to fulfil the role of safety manager. At the same time, the group recommended that the acceptance of nominated persons should be through the CAME including the list of nominated persons, and that EASA Form 4 should no longer be used for that purpose.</p>
comment	<p>114 comment by: CAA-NL</p>
	<p>We propose a New AMC1 M.A.706(j)</p> <p>(a) All prospective CAM staff are required to be assessed for competence, qualification, and capability related to intended duties. Competence and capability can be assessed by having the person work under the supervision of another qualified person for sufficient time to arrive at a conclusion. Sufficient time could be as little as a few weeks if the person is fully exposed to relevant work. The person need not be assessed against the complete spectrum of intended duties. When the person has been recruited from another approved organisation, then it is reasonable to accept a written confirmation from the previous organisation.</p> <p>(b) The organisation should hold copies of all documents that attest qualification, and recent experience.</p> <p>Explanation: To provide an AMC and to align with M.A.607 and 145.A.30(e).</p>
response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>Point (a) will be included in existing AMC M.A.706(k) (now AMC4 CAMO.A.305(a); (f);(g)).</p> <p>Point (b) is already addressed at IR level (cf. M.A.706(h)).</p>
comment	<p>153 comment by: Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)</p>
	<p>· M.A.706</p> <p>Editorial?</p> <p>Point (a)3. Is it right to use the wording “safety management systems and quality systems”?</p> <p>Shouldn’t it be management system and compliance monitoring in order to be consistent?</p>

response

Noted.

This refers to knowledge requirements in general. As current industry practice and related industry standards concern quality systems or quality management systems, it is correct to refer to these. Compliance monitoring is only one element of such systems and what is addressed here goes beyond pure compliance monitoring — it is more related to different types of management system standards, not directly related to the new management system framework proposed with the opinion.

comment

178

comment by: *Baines Simmons Limited***M.A.706 (j) Personnel Requirements**

We support the inclusion of minimum competence requirements in human factors and human performance limitations within the Regulation (as opposed to the AMC) as a significant (and long overdue) step forward. We also feel the amount of detail in the AMC is appropriate.

However, we feel there should be more specific Regulation (and AMC/GM) relating to “the necessary expertise related to the job function” to support the M.A.706 (f) requirements. At very least this material should refer to the existing AMC 20-22 EWIS training Programme, the AMC 20-20 Continuing Structural Integrity Programme (and its implied competence standards), and the AMC M.A.706 (f) CDCCL training to help illustrate the kinds of competence required by CAM staff.

response

Accepted.

The text has been amended in line with the proposal made (cf. AMCs to CAMO.A.305).

comment

386

comment by: *Airbus***1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:**

AMC M.A.706(a)

NPA 2013-01(C), page 52/184, section B., AMC1 145.A.30(c)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

It is proposed to harmonise as much as possible AMC M.A.706(a) with AMC1 145.A.30(c). Therefore:

– It is proposed to create a new **AMC2 M.A.706(a)** to read:

“1. Compliance monitoring includes requesting correction and corrective action as necessary by the accountable manager and the nominated persons referred to in M.A.706(b).

2. The role of the compliance monitoring manager is to ensure that the activities of the organisation are monitored independently from the showing of compliance with the applicable regulatory requirements, and any additional requirements as established by the organisation, and that these activities are being carried out properly under the supervision of the nominated persons referred to in M.A.706(b).

3. The compliance monitoring manager should be responsible for ensuring that the



compliance monitoring programme is properly implemented, maintained, and continually reviewed and improved.

The compliance monitoring manager should:

- (a) have direct access to the accountable manager;
- (b) not be one of the nominated persons referred to in M.A.706(b);
- (c) be able to demonstrate relevant knowledge, background and appropriate experience related to the activities of the organisation, including knowledge and experience in compliance monitoring; and
- (d) have access to all parts of the organisation, and as necessary, any subcontracted organisation.

4. In the case of a non-complex organisation, this task may be exercised by the accountable manager provided he/she has demonstrated having the related competence as defined in point 3(c).

5. The safety manager is responsible for the development, administration, and maintenance of effective safety management processes as part of the management system in accordance with M.A.712.

6. In the case the same person acts as compliance monitoring manager and as safety manager, the accountable manager, with regard to his/her direct accountability for safety, should ensure that sufficient resources are allocated to both functions, taking into account the size of the organisation, and the nature and complexity of its activities.”

– It is proposed to re-identify AMC1 145.A.30(c) into **AMC2 145.A.30(a)** to read:

“1. Compliance monitoring includes requesting correction and corrective action as necessary by the accountable manager and the nominated persons referred to in 145.A.30(b).

2. The role of the compliance monitoring manager is to ensure that the activities of the organisation are monitored independently from the showing of compliance with the applicable regulatory requirements, and any additional requirements as established by the organisation, and that these activities are being carried out properly under the supervision of the nominated persons referred to in 145.A.30(b).

3. The compliance monitoring manager should be responsible for ensuring that the compliance monitoring programme is properly implemented, maintained, and continually reviewed and improved.

The compliance monitoring manager should:

- (b) have direct access to the accountable manager;
- (b) not be one of the nominated persons referred to in 145.A.30(b);
- (c) be able to demonstrate relevant knowledge, background and appropriate experience related to the activities of the organisation, including knowledge and experience in compliance monitoring; and
- (d) have access to all parts of the organisation, and as necessary, any subcontracted organisation.

4. In the case of a non-complex organisation, this task may be exercised by the accountable manager provided he/she has demonstrated having the related competence as defined in point 3(c).

5. The safety manager is responsible for the development, administration, and maintenance of effective safety management processes as part of the management system in accordance with 145.A.65.

6. In the case the same person acts as compliance monitoring manager and as safety manager, the accountable manager, with regard to his/her direct accountability for safety, should ensure that sufficient resources are allocated to both functions, taking into account the size of the organisation, and the nature and complexity of its activities.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:



	To prevent possible confusion, errors, or extensive judgment within CAMO and consistency between Part-M and Part-145.
response	Accepted. The comment will be considered for the AMCs and GM to the new Part-CAMO (Phase I). In Phase II, the Part-CAMO and Part-145 provisions may be further aligned.

comment	387 comment by: Airbus
	<p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: AMC M.A.706(a)</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: It is proposed to move the contents of the AMC M.A.706(e) into a new AMC2 M.A.706(a) to read: “AMC 2 M.A.706(a) Personnel requirements POST HOLDER 1. The competent authority of the operator should only accept that the nominated post holder be employed by the organisation approved under Part-145 when it is manifest that he/she is the only available competent person in a position to exercise this function, within a practical working distance from the operator’s offices. 2. This paragraph only applies to contracted maintenance and therefore does not affect situations where the organisation approved under Part-145 and the operator are the same organisation.”</p> <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION: For clarity.</p>
response	Not accepted. This AMC relates to point (e) of the IR, meaning the nominated post holder for CAT. Point (a) relates to the appointment of the accountable manager.

comment	390 comment by: Airbus
	<p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: AMC M.A.706(i)</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: It is proposed to re-identify AMC M.A.706(i) into a new AMC1 M.A.706(d) to read: “AMC1 M.A.706(d) Personnel requirements AIRWORTHINESS REVIEW STAFF The approval by the competent authority of the exposition, containing in M.A.704(a)3 the list of M.A.706(d) personnel, constitutes their formal acceptance by the competent authority and also their formal authorisation by the organisation. Airworthiness review staff are automatically recognised as persons with authority to extend an airworthiness review certificate in accordance with M.A.711(a)4 and M.A.901(f).”</p> <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:</p>



response	<p>For consistency with modified M.A.706.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The comment will be assessed when providing the full set of AMCs and GM to Part-CAMO (Phase I).</p>
----------	--

comment 405 comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

Point M.A.707

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

It is proposed to modify point M.A.707 to take into account:

- the approval of the aircraft maintenance programme by the CAMO, and
- the similarities of point 145.A.35.

Point M.A.707 would state:

~~“M.A.707 Airworthiness review – Staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation~~

(a) ~~Airworthiness reviews and permits to fly~~

To be approved to carry out airworthiness reviews and, if applicable, to issue permits to fly, an approved continuing airworthiness management organisation shall have appropriate airworthiness review staff to issue airworthiness review certificates or recommendations referred to in Section A of Subpart I and, if applicable, to issue a permit to fly in accordance with point M.A.711(c):

~~(1)- For complex motor-powered aircraft or all aircraft used/operated in commercial air transport, and aircraft above 2730 kg MTOM, except balloons, these staff shall have acquired:~~

- ~~(a) at least five years' experience in continuing airworthiness; and;~~
- ~~(b) an appropriate license in compliance with Annex III (Part-66) or an aeronautical degree or a national equivalent; and~~
- ~~(c) formal aeronautical maintenance training; and~~
- ~~(d) a position within the approved organisation with appropriate responsibilities.~~
- ~~(e) Notwithstanding points (a) to (d), the requirement laid down in point M.A.707(a)(1)(b) may be replaced by five years of experience in continuing airworthiness additional to those already required by point M.A.707(a)(1)(a).~~

~~(2)- For aircraft that are not classified as complex motor-powered aircraft or aircraft not used in commercial air transport of 2730 kg MTOM and below, and balloons, these staff shall have acquired:~~

- ~~(a) at least three years' experience in continuing airworthiness; and~~
- ~~(b) an appropriate license in compliance with Annex III (Part-66) or an aeronautical degree or a national equivalent; and~~
- ~~(c) appropriate aeronautical maintenance training; and~~
- ~~(d) a position within the approved organisation with appropriate responsibilities;~~
- ~~(e) Notwithstanding points (a) to (d), the requirement laid down in point M.A.707(a)(2)(b) may be replaced by four years of experience in continuing airworthiness additional to those already required by point M.A.707(a)(2)(a).~~

(b) ~~Aircraft Maintenance Programme~~

To be authorised to approve an Aircraft Maintenance Programme or its amendments in accordance with point M.A.302(c), an approved continuing airworthiness management organisation shall have appropriate Aircraft Maintenance Programme approvers to carry



out the review and approval of an Aircraft Maintenance Programme or its amendments. These staff shall have acquired:

- (1) an aeronautical degree;
- (2) at least five years' experience in continuing airworthiness;
- (3) at least two years' experience in maintenance programme development for the aircraft in the scope and limits of the contemplated authorization;
- (4) formal aeronautical maintenance training; and
- (5) a position within the approved organisation with appropriate responsibilities.

(c) The organisation shall ensure that all staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation receive sufficient continuation training in each three year period to ensure that such staff have up-to-date knowledge of relevant technology, organisation procedures and human factor issues.

(d) The organisation shall establish a programme for continuation training for staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation, including a procedure to ensure compliance with the relevant paragraphs of M.A.707 as the basis for issuing authorisations under this Regulation to staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation.

(e) The organisation shall issue an authorization that clearly specifies the scope and limits of such authorization, when:

- (i) the conditions of paragraphs (a) and/or (b) and (c) have been fulfilled by the staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation; and
- (ii) ~~Airworthiness review staff nominated by the approved continuing airworthiness organisation can only be issued an authorisation by the approved continuing airworthiness organisation when formally accepted by the competent authority after satisfactory completion under supervision of an airworthiness review or an Aircraft Maintenance Programme review, as appropriate under supervision.~~

(f) The authorisation must be in a style that makes its scope clear to the staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation and any authorised person who may require to examine the authorisation. Where codes are used to define scope, the organisation shall make a code translation readily available.

“Authorised person” means the officials of the competent authorities, the Agency and the Member State who have responsibility for the oversight of the maintained aircraft and component thereof.

(g) The person responsible for the compliance monitoring system shall also remain responsible on behalf of the organisation for issuing authorisations to staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation. Such person may nominate other persons to actually issue or revoke the authorisations in accordance with a procedure as specified in the exposition.

(h) Continued validity of the authorisation is dependent upon:

- (i) continued compliance with paragraphs (a) and/or (b) and (c);
- (ii) ~~The organisation shall ensure that aircraft airworthiness review staff can demonstrate of appropriate recent continuing airworthiness management airworthiness review experience; and~~
- (iii) The successful assessment of the airworthiness review staff every 5 years by currently valid authorised senior airworthiness review staff.

(d) ~~Airworthiness review s~~Staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation shall be identified by listing each person in the continuing airworthiness management exposition together with their ~~airworthiness review~~ authorisation reference.

(e) The organisation shall maintain a record of all ~~airworthiness review~~ staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation, which shall include that includes the scope of the authorisation, details of any appropriate pertinent qualification held together with a summary of relevant continuing airworthiness management experience and training, and a copy of the



authorisation. This record shall be retained until two years after the ~~airworthiness review~~ staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation have left the organisation or the authorization has been withdrawn.

The staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation shall be given access on request to their personal records as detailed above.

(k) The organisation shall provide staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation with a copy of their authorisation in either a documented or electronic format.

(l) Staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation shall produce their authorisation to any authorised person within 24 hours.

(m) The minimum age for staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation is 21 years.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

For consistency with Part-145 (adapted from point 145.A.35). This NPA promotes consistency: “the existence of multiple safety/quality management system frameworks with differing, duplicated or inconsistent requirements can have not just negative economic but possibly adverse safety impacts caused by confusions, in particular if implemented within a single organisation”.

The application of requirements depending on the aircraft category has been modified with the introduction of the notion of complex motor-powered aircraft. The proposal aligns requirements on this new classification.

The approval privilege for the Aircraft Maintenance Programme has been added for completeness. Some AMC should be developed on this matter.

The airworthiness review staff are currently authorised to perform airworthiness reviews without a periodic assessment by a competent assessor (his/her peers) of their competence on this matter. The proposal introduces this assessment. Refer also to AMC1 M.A.707(c).

response

Not accepted.

M.A.707 and the related AMCs have not been changed with the NPA. The changes proposed are not covered by the ToR of RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I. Creating new privileges, additional personnel requirements and related qualification criteria would require a new rulemaking task and a dedicated regulatory impact assessment. This would in particular need to consider that not all CAMOs will be involved in the continuing airworthiness management of complex motor-powered aircraft or aircraft used in CAT.

A separate rulemaking proposal should be submitted to EASA.

This rulemaking task in Phase II will aim to further streamline the management systems, but this does not mean that in the end the exact same management system provisions should apply to CAMOs and maintenance organisations. The objective is to ensure consistency of all generally applicable elements, complemented with area-specific elements where justified.

Continuing airworthiness management is different in nature from performing maintenance, therefore the possibility to transpose the relevant personnel requirements from Part-145 should be assessed with caution.

comment

406

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:
AMC M.A.707(a)



2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

It is proposed to re-identify the AMC M.A.707(a) into AMC1 M.A.707(a) and to modify it to read:

“AMC1 M.A.707(a) ~~Airworthiness review~~ Staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation

1. Airworthiness review staff are only required if the M.A. Subpart G organisation wants to be granted M.A.711(b) airworthiness review and, if applicable, M.A.711(c) permit to fly privileges.

Aircraft Maintenance Programme approvers are only required if the M.A. Subpart G organisation wants to be granted M.A.302(c) Aircraft Maintenance Programme privilege.

2. “experience in continuing airworthiness” means any appropriate [What is appropriate? Ambiguous] combination of experience in tasks related to aircraft maintenance and/or continuing airworthiness management (engineering) and/or surveillance of such tasks.

3. A person qualified to the ~~AMC2~~ M.A.706(g) subparagraph (a)4-5 should be considered as holding the equivalent to an aeronautical degree.

4. An appropriate licence in compliance with Annex III (Part-66) is any one of the following:

- a category B1 licence in the subcategory of the aircraft reviewed, or
- a category B2 or C licence, or
- in the case of piston-engine non-pressurised aeroplanes of 2 000 kg MTOM and below, a category B3 licence.

It is not necessary to satisfy the experience requirements of Part-66 at the time of the review.

5. To hold a position with appropriate responsibilities means the ~~airworthiness review~~ staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation should have a position in the organisation independent from the airworthiness management process or with overall accountability and authority on the airworthiness management process of complete aircraft.

Independence from the airworthiness management process may be achieved, among other ways, by:

- Being authorised to perform airworthiness reviews only on aircraft for which the person has not participated in their management. For example, performing airworthiness reviews on a specific model line, while being involved in the airworthiness management of a different model line.
- M.A. Subpart G organisations with Part-145/M.A. Subpart F approval, may nominate maintenance personnel from their Part-145/M.A. Subpart F organisation as airworthiness review staff, as long as they are not involved in the airworthiness management of the aircraft. These personnel should not have been involved in the release to service of ~~base~~ maintenance for that particular aircraft (other than maintenance tasks performed during the physical ~~survey~~ inspection of the aircraft or performed as a result of findings discovered during such physical ~~survey~~ inspection) to avoid possible conflict of interests.

• Nominating as airworthiness review staff or Aircraft Maintenance Programme approvers personnel from the ~~Quality Department~~ compliance monitoring function of the continuing airworthiness management organisation.

Overall accountability and authority on the airworthiness management process of complete aircraft may be achieved, among other ways, by:

- Nominating as airworthiness review staff or Aircraft Maintenance Programme approvers the Accountable Manager or the Maintenance Post-holder.
- Being authorised to perform airworthiness reviews only on those particular aircraft for which the person is responsible for the complete continuing airworthiness management process.



—In the case of one-man organisations, this person has always overall authority. This means that this person cannot be nominated as airworthiness review staff or Aircraft Maintenance Programme approver, as no independence is possible.

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

For consistency with amendments introduced in point M.A.707.

The term “appropriate” is found ambiguous in accordance with practices recommended in the paragraph 4.1.5 of the EASA Proposed CM-21A-J-001 Issue 01.

The extent of line maintenance should not be considered as a possible source of significant conflicts of interests for maintenance personnel involved for the same aircraft in the accomplishment of an airworthiness review and the release to service of line maintenance.

response

Not accepted.

Please see response to comment #405.

The changes proposed are not covered by the ToR of RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I.

However, the reference to ‘quality department’ in point (5) of AMC M.A.707(a) will be corrected.

comment

407

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

AMC M.A.707

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

– It is proposed to re-identify AMC M.A.707(a)(1) and AMC M.A.707(a)(2) into AMC1 M.A.707(a)(1) and AMC1 M.A.707(a)(2), respectively.

– It is proposed to modify the AMC1 M.A.707(a)(1) to read:

“For ~~complex motor-powered aircraft and all aircraft used in for~~ commercial air transport ~~and any other aircraft, other than balloons, above 2730 kg MTOM,~~ formal aeronautical maintenance training means training (internal or external) supported by evidence on the following subjects:

– Relevant parts of initial and continuing airworthiness regulations.

– Relevant parts of operational requirements and procedures, ~~if applicable.~~

– [...]”

– It is proposed to modify the AMC1 M.A.707(a)(2) to read:

“For ~~non-complex motor-powered aircraft, all balloons and any other aircraft of 2730 Kg MTOM and below,~~ aircraft not used in commercial air transport, and all balloons:

[...]

This knowledge may be demonstrated by documented evidence or by an assessment performed by the competent authority or by ~~other~~ a senior airworthiness review staff already authorised within the organisation in accordance with approved procedures. This assessment should be recorded.”

– It is also proposed to re-identify AMC M.A.707(b) into AMC1 M.A.707(e) and to modify it to read:

“The formal acceptance by the competent authority of the ~~airworthiness review staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation~~ is granted through the corresponding EASA Form 4.

An airworthiness review ~~or an Aircraft Maintenance Programme review~~ “under



supervision” means under the supervision of the competent authority. If the organisation has already properly authorised airworthiness review staff exercising the privilege held by the organisation, the competent authority may accept that the supervision be performed by this the appropriate senior existing airworthiness review staff in accordance with an approved procedure. In such case, evidence of the airworthiness review or the Aircraft Maintenance Programme review performed under supervision should be provided to the competent authority together with the EASA Form 4. If satisfied, the competent authority will issue the formal acceptance through the EASA Form 4.

Once the airworthiness review staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation has been accepted by the competent authority, the inclusion of their name in the exposition (refer to M.A.704(a)57.) constitutes the formal authorisation by the organisation.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

For consistency with amendments introduced in points M.A.704 and M.A.707.

The proposal introduces also consistency with AMC1 M.A.707(c) for the airworthiness review staff assessment. Nevertheless, it is found acceptable for the initial assessment of airworthiness review staff to proceed with a senior airworthiness review staff of the concerned organisation.

response

Noted.

On Aircraft Maintenance Programme review, please see response to comment #405.

The other comments may be considered to produce the AMC for the new Part-CAMO (Phase I).

comment

408

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

AMC M.A.707

NPA 2013-01(C), page 69/184, section B., AMC1 145.A.35(d)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

– It is proposed to re-identify AMC M.A.707(c) into **AMC1 M.A.707(c)** and to modify it to read:

“In order to keep the validity of the airworthiness review staff authorisation, the airworthiness review staff should have either:

1. For complex motor-powered aircraft or aircraft operated in commercial air transport:

– conducted at least one airworthiness review in the last six month period.

2. For aircraft that are not classified as complex motor-powered aircraft or not operated in commercial air transport:

– been involved in continuing airworthiness management activities for at least six months in every two year period, or

– conducted at least one airworthiness review in the last twelve month period.

In order to restore the validity of the authorisation, the airworthiness review staff should conduct at a satisfactory level an airworthiness review under the supervision of the competent authority or, if accepted by the competent authority, under the supervision of another currently valid authorised senior airworthiness review staff, of the concerned. The senior airworthiness review staff should pertain to a continuing airworthiness management organisation other than the concerned one and should process in accordance with an approved procedure.”

– It is proposed to introduce a new AMC2 M.A.707(c) harmonised with AMC1 145.A.35(d):



“1. Continuation training is a two way process to ensure that staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation remain current in terms of procedures, human factors and technical knowledge and that the organisation receives feedback on the adequacy of its procedures and continuing airworthiness management instructions. Due to the interactive nature of this training, consideration should be given to the possibility that such training has the involvement of the compliance monitoring function and safety management key personnel to ensure that feedback is collected and disseminated. Alternatively, there should be a procedure to ensure that feedback is formally passed from the training department to the compliance monitoring function and safety management key personnel to initiate action.

2. Continuation training should cover changes in relevant requirements such as in this Regulation, changes in organisation procedures and the modification standard of the products being maintained plus human factor issues identified from any internal or external analysis of occurrences. It should also address instances where staff failed to follow procedures and the reasons why particular procedures are not always followed. In many cases the continuation training will reinforce the need to follow procedures and ensure that incomplete or incorrect procedures are identified to the company in order that they can be corrected. This does not preclude the possible need to carry out an audit of such procedures.

3. Continuation training should be of sufficient duration in each 3 year period to meet the intent of M.A.707(c) and may be split into a number of separate elements. M.A.707(c) requires such training to keep staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation updated in terms of relevant technology, procedures and human factors issues which means this training is one part of ensuring compliance. Therefore sufficient duration should be related to relevant audit findings and other internal/external sources of information available to the organisation on human errors in continuing airworthiness management and/or maintenance. This means that in the case of an organisation that manages the continuing airworthiness of aircraft with few relevant audit findings, continuation training could be limited to hours rather than days, whereas a similar organisation with a number of relevant audit findings, such training may take several days. The content of continuation training should be related to relevant audit findings, hazards and related safety risks identified. It is recommended that such training is reviewed at least once in every 36 month period.

4. The method of training is intended to be a flexible process and could, for example, include a Part-147 continuation training course, aeronautical college courses, internal short duration courses, seminars, etc. The elements, general content and length of such training should be specified in the continuing airworthiness management organisation's exposition unless such training is undertaken by an organisation approved under Part-147 when such details may be specified under the approval and cross referenced in the continuing airworthiness management organisation's exposition.”

– It is proposed to modify AMC1 145.A.35(d) to read:

“1. Continuation training is a two way process to ensure that certifying staff remain current in terms of procedures, human factors and technical knowledge and that the organisation receives feedback on the adequacy of its procedures and maintenance instructions. Due to the interactive nature of this training, consideration should be given to the possibility that such training has the involvement of the compliance monitoring function and safety management key personnel to ensure that feedback is actioned/collected and disseminated. Alternatively, there should be a procedure to ensure that feedback is formally passed from the training department to the compliance monitoring function and safety management key personnel to initiate action.

2. Continuation training should cover changes in relevant requirements such as Part 145 in



this Regulation, changes in organisation procedures and the modification standard of the products being maintained plus human factor issues identified from any internal or external analysis of incidents/occurrences. It should also address instances where staff failed to follow procedures and the reasons why particular procedures are not always followed. In many cases the continuation training will reinforce the need to follow procedures and ensure that incomplete or incorrect procedures are identified to the company in order that they can be corrected. This does not preclude the possible need to carry out an audit of such procedures.

3. Continuation training should be of sufficient duration in each 2 year period to meet the intent of 145.A.35(d) and may be split into a number of separate elements. 145.A.35(d) requires such training to keep certifying staff updated in terms of relevant technology, procedures and human factors issues which means that this training is one part of ensuring compliance. Therefore sufficient duration should be related to relevant audit findings and other internal/external sources of information available to the organisation on human errors in maintenance. This means that in the case of an organisation that maintains aircraft with few relevant audit findings, continuation training could be limited to days rather than weeks, whereas a similar organisation with a number of relevant audit findings, such training may take several weeks. For an organisation that maintains aircraft components, the duration of continuation training would follow the same philosophy but should be scaled down to reflect the more limited nature of the activity. For example certifying staff who release hydraulic pumps may only require a few hours of continuation training whereas those who release turbine engine may only require a few days of such training. The content of continuation training should be related to relevant audit findings, hazards and related safety risks identified. It is recommended that such training is reviewed at least once in every 24 month period.

4. The method of training is intended to be a flexible process and could, for example, include a Part-147 continuation training course, aeronautical college courses, internal short duration courses, seminars, etc. The elements, general content and length of such training should be specified in the maintenance organisation exposition unless such training is undertaken by an organisation approved under Part-147 when such details may be specified under the approval and cross referenced in the maintenance organisation exposition.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

For consistency with point M.A.707 and Part-145 (adapted from AMC1 145.A.35(d)). This NPA promotes consistency: “the existence of multiple safety/quality management system frameworks with differing, duplicated or inconsistent requirements can have not just negative economic but possibly adverse safety impacts caused by confusions, in particular if implemented within a single organisation”.

The proposal introduces also consistency with M.A.707(h)(iii) for the airworthiness review staff assessment.

response

Partially accepted.

Editorial changes to AMC1 145.A.35(d) will be assessed when making changes to Part-145 (Phase II).

Regarding the changes to AMC M.A.707(c): not accepted.

Amending the training requirements for AR staff as per M.A.707 and the related AMCs is not covered by the ToR of RMT.0251 (MDM.055).



comment 409

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

AMC M.A.707

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

It is proposed to introduce a new AMC1 M.A.707(d) harmonised with AMC 145.A.35(e):

“The programme for continuation training should list all staff exercising a privilege and when training will take place, the elements of such training and an indication that it was carried out reasonably on time as planned. Such information should subsequently be transferred to the record for staff exercising a privilege, as required by M.A.707(j).”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

For consistency with point M.A.707 and Part-145 (adapted from AMC 145.A.35(e)). This NPA promotes consistency: “the existence of multiple safety/quality management system frameworks with differing, duplicated or inconsistent requirements can have not just negative economic but possibly adverse safety impacts caused by confusions, in particular if implemented within a single organisation”.

response

Not accepted.

M.A.707 and the related AMCs are not affected by this NPA/opinion. The changes proposed are not covered by the ToR of RMT.0251 (MDM.055). The proposed changes may be reassessed in Phase II, which will be the subject of new ToR.

comment 410

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

AMC M.A.707

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

It is proposed to re-identify the AMC M.A.707(c) into AMC1 M.A.707(h) and to modify it to read:

“In order to keep the validity of their ~~airworthiness review~~ staff authorization, the ~~airworthiness review~~ staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation should have either:

- been involved in continuing airworthiness management activities for at least ~~six~~ twelve months in ~~any~~ every consecutive ~~two~~ three-year period, or
- conducted at least one airworthiness review or an Aircraft Maintenance Programme review, as appropriate, in the last twelve month period.

In order to restore the validity of their ~~airworthiness review~~ staff exercising a privilege held by the organisation should conduct at a satisfactory level an airworthiness review or an Aircraft Maintenance Programme review, as appropriate, under the supervision of the competent authority or, if accepted by the competent authority, under the supervision of another currently valid authorised airworthiness review staff or Aircraft Maintenance Programme approver, as appropriate, of the concerned continuing airworthiness management organisation in accordance with an approved procedure.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

For consistency with amendments introduced in point M.A.707.



response Not accepted.

M.A.707 and the related AMCs are not affected by this NPA/opinion. The changes proposed are not covered by the ToR of RMT.0251 (MDM.055). The proposed changes may be reassessed in Phase II, which will be the subject of a new ToR.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1
M.A.706(f) Personnel requirements

p. 88

comment 393 comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

AMC M.A.706(f)

AMC3 & 4 145.A.30(e)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

– It is proposed to re-identify the AMC M.A.706(f) into AMC3 M.A.706(g) and to modify it to read:

“TRAINING – FTS/EWIS

Additional training in fuel tank safety as well as associated inspection standards and maintenance procedures should be required of continuing airworthiness management organisations’ technical personnel, especially the staff involved with the management of CDCCL, Service Bulletin assessment, work planning and maintenance programme management. EASA guidance is provided for training to Continuing Airworthiness Management Organisations’ continuing airworthiness personnel in Appendix XII to AMC to M.A.706(fe) and M.B.102(c).

Competence assessment should include the verification for the need for additional EWIS training when relevant.

EASA guidance is provided for EWIS training programme to continuing airworthiness management organisation personnel in AMC 20-22.”

– It is proposed to re-identify AMC3 145.A.30(e) into AMC3 145.A.30(d) and to merge it with AMC 4 145.A.30(e) to read:

“TRAINING – FTS/EWIS

Additional training in fuel tank safety as well as associated inspection standards and maintenance procedures should be required for maintenance organisations’ technical personnel, especially technical personnel involved in the compliance of CDCCL tasks.

EASA guidance is provided for training to maintenance organisation personnel in Appendix IV to AMC to 145.A.30(ed) and 145.B.10(3).

Competence assessment should include the verification for the need for additional EWIS training when relevant.

EASA guidance is provided for EWIS training programme to maintenance organisation personnel in AMC 20-22.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

Fuel Tank Safety requirements are deeply connected with EWIS.

response Partially accepted.

The proposed changes have been addressed in the existing AMC M.A.706, now AMC2



CAMO.A.305(g) 'Additional qualification requirements'.

The changes proposed to Part-145 will be assessed in Phase II.

comment

223

comment by: *LHT*

AMC1 M.A.706 (f) Personnel requirements:
replacement of term "quality system" by "compliance monitoring function" -> Where is the added value?

response

Noted.

See NPA 2013-01(A).

The new management system provisions build upon those elements that are already in place today in any Part-M organisation, i.e. the quality-system-related provisions. These will deliver the 'compliance monitoring function' of the new management system requirements. As current Part-M provisions related to 'quality system' deal with the monitoring of compliance, related reporting and corrective action processes, and with the advent of additional safety-management-related functions such as safety risk management, it is preferable to adopt more neutral language at IR level. This also considers that there are multiple types of quality systems defined in different international or national standards, with different meanings and scopes. It is, therefore, proposed to refer to compliance monitoring function that, together with all other required functions and processes, make up the organisation's management system for safety.

comment

311

comment by: *AEA*

AMC1 M.A.706 (f) Personnel requirements:
replacement of term "quality system" by "compliance monitoring function" -> Where is the added value?

response

Please refer to the response to comment #223 above.

**SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1
M.A.706(g) Personnel requirements**

p. 88-89

comment

9

comment by: *Diana Roele-Klijn Martinair Flight Academy*

In the explanatory Note Part-M Section A Management System on page 12 it is stated:
'The former term 'quality system' is not used any longer.
Therefore the text on page 90 **AMC1 M.A. 706(g)**



Par. 3 ; *knowledge of safety management systems and **quality systems***.
 should refer to "compliance monitoring systems" instead of "quality systems".

response Noted.

This refers to knowledge requirements in general. As current industry practice and related industry standards concern quality systems or quality management systems, it is correct to refer to these. Compliance monitoring is only one element of such systems and what is addressed here goes beyond compliance monitoring — it is more related to different types of management system standards, not directly related to the new management system framework proposed with the NPA/opinion.

comment 8 comment by: *Andreas Keiser*

AMC1 M.A.706(g) point (a)(3)
 Should the term "Quality system" be replaced by "compliance monitoring systems" or "just culture"?

response Noted.

Regarding 'quality system', please refer to the response to comment #223.

Regarding 'just culture', this is not a typical 'knowledge' or 'experience' item, but an item related to management commitment, behaviours and attitudes, and it may be difficult to provide evidence of knowledge in relation to 'just culture' if it is listed as a stand-alone item.

However, personnel should indeed be knowledgeable of just culture principles, and this is normally achieved by including such principles in the safety policy.

comment 179 comment by: *Baines Simmons Limited*

AMC1 M.A.706 (g) Personnel Requirements
 Paragraph (a)(3) should read "... and compliance monitoring systems;". The term quality system is no longer relevant except to those organisations retaining, for example ISO 9000 Quality Systems, which by implication are not relevant to this Regulatory change.

response Noted.

This refers to knowledge requirements in general. As current industry practice and related industry standards concern quality systems or quality management systems, it is correct to refer to these. Compliance monitoring is only one element of such systems and what is addressed here goes beyond compliance monitoring — it is more related to different types of management system standards, not directly related to the new management system framework proposed with the NPA.

This would allow, e.g., to accept the qualifications of a person who has worked as quality manager or auditor in an organisation certified to EN9110 (= quality system).



comment	<p>280</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: AIR FRANCE</p> <p>AFR Comment : (3) "Quality system" term is kept in this paragraph, we suggest to replace it by "Compliance monitoring system or function" to be in compliance with the fact that "Quality system" term will be not used any longer.</p>
response	<p>Please refer to the response to comment #179 above.</p>

comment	<p>395</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: Airbus</p> <p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: AMC M.A.706 NPA 2013-01(C), page 56/184, section B., AMC6 145.A.30(e)</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: – It is proposed to create a new AMC6 M.A.706(g) to read: “SAFETY TRAINING All personnel should receive safety training as appropriate for their safety management related responsibilities.” – It is proposed to re-identify AMC6 145.A.30(e) into AMC6 145.A.30(d) and to modify it to read: “SAFETY TRAINING (a) All personnel should receive safety training as appropriate for their safety management related responsibilities. Such training could be classroom based or computer based training. Adequate records of all safety training provided should be kept. (b) Safety training should be delivered by the safety manager or a competent trainer and may be conducted by the maintenance organisation itself, or independent trainers, or any training organisations acceptable to the competent authority.”</p> <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION: The elements related to the person receiving safety training are kept in the AMC6 M.A.706(g) and the AMC6 145.A.30(d). The elements pertaining to the safety training organisation are transferred into the <u>AMC1 M.A.712(a)(4)</u> and the <u>AMC1 145.A.65(a)(4)</u>.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The AMCs will be amended to reflect the structure and contents as in Part-145.</p>

comment	<p>402</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: Airbus</p> <p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: GM M.A.706(g)</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: It is proposed to introduce a new GM4 M.A.706(g) to read: “SAFETY TRAINING 1. The scope of safety training and related training programme will differ significantly</p>
---------	--



depending on the size and complexity of the organisation. Safety training should reflect the evolving management system, and the changing roles of the personnel who make it work.

2. In recognition of this, training should be provided to management and staff at least:

- (a) during the initial implementation of safety management processes;
- (b) for all new staff or personnel recently appointed for any safety management related task;
- (c) on a regular basis to refresh their knowledge and to understand changes to the management system;
- (d) when changing roles which affects their safety management roles and responsibilities; and
- (e) when performing specialist safety roles, such as: safety manager, safety investigator, focal point for Emergency Response Planning, and Safety Auditor.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

For consistency with Part-145. This NPA promotes consistency: “the existence of multiple safety/quality management system frameworks with differing, duplicated or inconsistent requirements can have not just negative economic but possibly adverse safety impacts caused by confusions, in particular if implemented within a single organisation”.

response

Accepted.

A new GM will be added based on GM1 145.A.30(e), and to ensure consistency.

Cf. GM1 CAMO.A.305(a);(f);(g) ‘Personnel requirements’ — SAFETY MANAGEMENT & HUMAN FACTORS TRAINING

comment

403

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

GM M.A.706(g)
 NPA 2013-01(C), pages 59-61/218, section B., GM1 145.A.30(e)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

– It is proposed to introduce a new GM1 M.A.706(g) based on GM1 145.A.30(e) to read: “TRAINING SYLLABUS FOR INITIAL HUMAN FACTORS TRAINING

The training syllabus below identifies the topics and subtopics to be addressed during the human factors training.

The continuing airworthiness management organisation may combine, divide, change the order of any subject of the syllabus to suit its own needs, as long as all subjects are covered to a level of detail appropriate to the organisation and its personnel.

Some of the topics may be covered in separate training (health and safety, management, supervisory skills, etc.) in which case duplication of training is not necessary.

Where possible, practical illustrations and examples should be used, especially accident and incident reports.

Topics should be related to existing legislation, where relevant. Topics should be related to existing guidance/advisory material, where relevant (e.g. ICAO HF Digests and Training Manual).

Topics should be related to continuing airworthiness management and maintenance engineering where possible; too much unrelated theory should be avoided.

1 General/Introduction to human factors

1.1 Need to address human factors



- 1.2 Statistics
- 1.3 Incidents
- 2 Safety Culture/Organisational factors
 - 2.1 Just Culture
 - 2.2 Reporting culture
 - 2.3 Informed culture
 - 2.4 Flexible culture/learning culture
 - 2.5 Safety Risk Management
- 3 Human error
 - 3.1 Error models and theories
 - 3.2 Types of errors in continuing airworthiness management and maintenance tasks
 - 3.3 Violations
 - 3.4 Implications of errors
 - 3.5 Avoiding and managing errors
 - 3.6 Human reliability
- 4 Human performance & limitations
 - 4.1 Vision
 - 4.2 Hearing
 - 4.3 Information-processing
 - 4.4 Attention and perception
 - 4.5 Situational awareness
 - 4.6 Memory
 - 4.7 Claustrophobia and physical access
 - 4.8 Motivation
 - 4.9 Fitness/Health
 - 4.10 Stress
 - 4.11 Workload management
 - 4.12 Fatigue and fatigue management
 - 4.13 Alcohol, medication, drugs
 - 4.14 Physical work
 - 4.15 Repetitive tasks/complacency
- 5 Environment
 - 5.1 Peer pressure
 - 5.2 Stressors
 - 5.3 Time pressure and deadlines
 - 5.4 Workload
 - 5.5 Shift Work
 - 5.6 Noise and fumes
 - 5.7 Illumination
 - 5.8 Climate and temperature
 - 5.9 Motion and vibration
 - 5.10 Complex systems
 - 5.11 Hazards in the workplace
 - 5.12 Lack of manpower
 - 5.13 Distractions and interruptions
- 6 Procedures, information, tools and practices
 - 6.1 Visual Inspection
 - 6.2 Work logging and recording
 - 6.3 Procedure - practice/mismatch/norms
 - 6.4 Technical documentation - access and quality
- 7 Communication



	<p>7.1 Shift/Task handover 7.2 Dissemination of information 7.3 Cultural differences 8 Teamwork 8.1 Responsibility 8.2 Management, supervision and leadership 8.3 Decision making 9 Professionalism and integrity 9.1 Keeping up to date; currency 9.2 Error provoking behaviour 9.3 Assertiveness 10 Organisation’s HF program 10.1 Safety risk assessment 10.2 Confidential internal reporting scheme 10.3 Reporting errors and hazards 10.4 Safety policy as related to non-punitive reporting and just culture 10.5 Occurrence investigation process 10.6 Action to address problems 10.7 Feedback” – It is proposed to re-identify GM1 145.A.30(e) into GM1 145.A.30(d). 3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION: For consistency with Part-145 (adapted from the re-identified GM1 145.A.30(d)). This NPA promotes consistency: “the existence of multiple safety/quality management system frameworks with differing, duplicated or inconsistent requirements can have not just negative economic but possibly adverse safety impacts caused by confusions, in particular if implemented within a single organisation”.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>For consistency, the GM will also be included in Part-CAMO. It states that the organisation may combine, divide, or change the order of any subject of the syllabus to suit its own needs.</p>

comment	<p>404 comment by: Airbus</p> <p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: GM M.A.706(g) [NPA 2013-01(C), pages 62-65/218, section B., GM5 145.A.30(e)]</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: It is proposed to introduce a new GM5 M.A.706(g) to read: “COMPETENCE ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE The organisation should develop a procedure describing the process of competence assessment of personnel. The procedure should specify: (a) persons responsible for this process; (b) when the assessment should take place; (c) credits from previous assessments; (d) validation of qualification records; (e) means and methods for the initial assessment; (f) means and methods for the continuous control of competence including feedback on</p>
---------	---



personnel performance;

(g) competences to be observed during the assessment in relation with each job function;

(h) actions to be taken when assessment is not satisfactory; and

(i) recording of assessment results.

For example, according to the job functions and the scope, size, and complexity of the organisation, the assessment may consider the following (list not exhaustive):

- Knowledge of applicable officially recognised standards;
- Knowledge of auditing techniques: planning, conducting and reporting;
- Knowledge of human factors, human performance and limitations;
- Knowledge of organisation capabilities, privileges and limitations;
- Knowledge of Part-M, Part-145 and any other relevant regulations;
- Knowledge of relevant parts of the continuing airworthiness management exposition and procedures;
- Knowledge of occurrence reporting systems (mandatory and internal) and understanding of the importance of reporting occurrences, incorrect continuing airworthiness instructions, maintenance data and existing or potential defects;
- Knowledge of safety risks linked to the working environment;
- Knowledge of Safety Management Systems and Just Culture;
- Knowledge on CDCCL when relevant;
- Knowledge on EWIS when relevant;
- Understanding of professional integrity, behaviour and attitude towards safety;
- Understanding of conditions for ensuring continuing airworthiness of aircraft and components;
- Understanding of his/her own human performance and limitations;
- Understanding of personnel authorisations and limitations;
- Understanding critical maintenance task and procedures;
- Ability to compile and control completed work cards;
- Ability to consider human performance and limitations;
- Ability to determine required qualifications for task performance;
- Ability to identify and rectify existing and potential unsafe conditions;
- Ability to manage third parties involved in continuing airworthiness activity;
- Ability to confirm proper accomplishment of maintenance tasks on the basis of maintenance records;
- Ability to identify and properly plan performance of critical maintenance tasks and procedures;
- Ability to prioritise tasks and report discrepancies;
- Ability to process the work requested by the operator;
- Ability to promote the safety and quality policy;
- Ability to properly process removed, uninstalled, rejected and suspected unapproved parts;
- Ability to recognise the acceptability of parts to be installed prior to fitment;
- Ability to split complex maintenance procedures into clear stages;
- Ability to understand work orders, work cards and refer to and use applicable maintenance data;
- Ability to use information systems;
- Adequate communication and literacy skills;
- Analytical and proven auditing skills (for example, objectivity, fairness, open-mindedness, determination, ...);
- Continuing airworthiness error investigation skills;
- Resources management and production planning skills;
- Teamwork, decision-making and leadership skills;



	<p>– Ability to encourage a positive safety culture and apply a just culture.”</p> <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION: For consistency with Part-145 (adapted from re-identified GM5 145.A.30(d)). This NPA promotes consistency: “the existence of multiple safety/quality management system frameworks with differing, duplicated or inconsistent requirements can have not just negative economic but possibly adverse safety impacts caused by confusions, in particular if implemented within a single organisation”.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>For consistency, the GM will be included in Part-CAMO.</p> <p>Reference: AMC1 CAMO.A.305(g) and related GM1.</p>

<p>SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.A.706 (j) Personnel requirements</p>	<p>p. 89-90</p>
--	-----------------

comment	<p>276</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: UK CAA</p> <p>Page No: 92 Paragraph No: AMC1 M.A.706 (j) point (e) Comment: This paragraph refers to human factors training, and includes the possibility that this training can be delivered by a competent trainer, and “may be conducted by the organisation itself, or independent trainers, or any training organisations acceptable to the competent authority.” This implies that the independent trainers or training organisation would be sub-contracted to provide this training. UK CAA therefore believes that the organisation which sub-contracts this service should show a formal audit or assessment of the sub-contracted organisation, as the training that they provide falls under their responsibility. Justification: UK CAA believes that the provision of required human factors training is the responsibility of the approved organisation, and that therefore that organisation should show that it has assessed the training and training organisation as suitable for its needs, and that the training being provided is of an acceptable standard. Proposed Text: Add a sentence to the end of AMC1 M.A.706 (j) (e) as follows: “... The organisation requiring the training should satisfy itself that the training provider is suitably qualified, and that the training delivery meets the needs of the organisation.”</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The change will be made as suggested and an equivalent provision will be added to Part 145.A.30(e) when Part-145 will be reviewed (Phase II).</p>

comment	<p>238</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation</p> <p>Regarding the paragraph (a) of the "AMC1 M.A.706 (j) Personnel requirements", the</p>
---------	--



response	<p>FNAM is asking to the EASA if it is possible to combine the training on human factors and the SMS training for pragmatical reason.</p> <p>Accepted.</p> <p>The change will be made as suggested.</p>
comment	<p>331 comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></p> <p>AMC1 M.A.706 (j) Personnel requirements The CAMO activities are really different from those of the 145 organisation. There should not be a reference to the GM1 dealing with 145 organisation. There should be a dedicated one, or no need for the AMC and leave the organisation decide how to comply to the MA706 directly.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>A GM with the HF training syllabus will be included in Part-CAMO for consistency. The organisation may adapt this to its specific needs, e.g. a stand-alone CAMO not involved in CAM of large aircraft may select only those items relevant to its activity and to the interfaces it may have with different maintenance organisations.</p> <p>See also the response to comment #403.</p>
comment	<p>7 comment by: <i>Andreas Keiser</i></p> <p>AMC1 M.A.706(j) point (b) Shouldn't the line "- Post-holders, managers, supervisors;" under AMC1 M.A.706 (j) be changed to "Nominated persons (M.A.606 (b)), managers, supervisors;"?</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The text will be amended as proposed to ensure consistency.</p>
comment	<p>38 comment by: <i>NFLC, Cranfield University, UK</i></p> <p>AMC1 MA706(j) I understand the benefit of human factors training, but this needs to be appropriate to the organisation. So any specified training syllabus needs to be in Part M guidance material to give Part M organisations the ability to modify it as they see fit. For example, aircrew Crew Resource Management training may be sufficient in some cases, depending on the Part M / Part 145 / aircraft combination. The Part 145 HF training content seems to be specified in guidance material, looking at the Part 145 GM reference in this paragraph. It would also seem excessive for Part M staff who carry out limited data entry and have no contact with</p>



the Part 145 organisation to have to complete the Part 145 human factors training. As written, the effort required to comply with this paragraph is excessive compared to the benefit it brings, and the effort it would take to justify why specific items from the Part 145 HF syllabus are not required for a Part M is potentially significant when working with AMC material / soft law.

This will not stop planners coming up with overly optimistic maintenance schedules; it will just increase the regulatory burden. Organisations who do not want to perform responsibly will still perform badly, irrespective of whether they have received human factors training or not. The more inflexible the regulation becomes, the less people are able to use their judgement, all they think about are complying with procedures as opposed to whether the procedures are correct or not, hence the more difficult it is for them to use best practice human factors and the more likely they are to make errors.

The volume of regulation and AMC material is becoming an issue as it does not differentiate between what gives an organisation a large safety / risk improvement and what gives no tangible benefit. So best practice human factors for the Part M regulation design would give some flexibility to the individual Part M organisations to prioritise what they need to do in order to concentrate on their most significant risks and some flexibility in how they deal with minor / low risks, in accordance with best SMS practices. This can't happen when the volume of regulation and AMC material is increasing like it is. Being able to request an alternate AMC is not as helpful as perhaps perceived as it still takes significant effort to do request this.

response

Not accepted.

HF concepts do need to be understood by the CAMO staff as they can contribute to events through their own errors or by causing errors to be made within the contracted Part-145 organisation, therefore there are many common areas in terms of human factors in CAMOs and Part-145 organisations.

comment

102 comment by: Rega/Swiss Air-Ambulance

AMC1 M.A. 706(j) Personnel requirements:
 The human factors requirements are defined in too much detail. It should be much more open to the operator to define the training (persons to be trained, time, refresher, etc.). Experience shows that an initial training is important. However a human factors training every two years is too much and reducing the awareness, which is counterproductive for this important subject.

response

Not accepted.

HF training can be done as part of safety management training, it does not need to be a stand-alone training item. Note that the AMC applies only to CAMOs involved in continuing airworthiness management of complex motor-powered aircraft and aircraft used in CAT.

If there is an acceptance that such training is needed, then the periodicity of refresher training is the same, no matter what the size or complexity of the organisation is, as the objective of continued competence remains the same.



comment	<p>206 comment by: <i>British Gliding Association</i></p>
	<p>British Gliding Association AMC1 M.A.706(k) (j) Personnel requirements (c) For non commercial air transport the human factors is already defined in Part 66 L license module 2. Having two syllabus is not appropriate, and requiring HF training within 6 months is probably not achievable with limited resources. A part 66 engineer should be exempted from foundation HF training if this was received as part of the license and only require continuation training. Volunteer maintenance staff not involved on CAM who have not received human factors training should receive human factors training within a reasonable time reflecting the scope of work they are undertaking but not to exceed 5 years from joining the organisation.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The AMC to point (j) of M.A.706, now AMC to Part-CAMO, will only apply to CAMOs involved in the continuing airworthiness management of complex motor-powered aircraft and aircraft used in CAT.</p> <p>There will be no human factors training requirements in Part-CAO.</p> <p>Regarding the L licence HF training syllabus, this is primarily relevant for obtaining the licence; it could also be used for recurrent training.</p> <p>There will be no human factors training requirements in Part-CAO.</p>
comment	<p>207 comment by: <i>British Gliding Association</i></p>
	<p>British Gliding Association AMC1 M.A.706 (j) Personnel requirements point (d) A two year human factors continuation training period is too short for sporting organisations where the certifying staff is made up primarily of a volunteer workforce. It would be more appropriate to say that where only ELA 1 and 2 aircraft are concerned not used for commercial air transport, a 5 year Human Factors continuation training is appropriate.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The AMC to point (j) of M.A.706 only applies to CAMOs involved in the continuing airworthiness management of complex motor-powered aircraft and aircraft used in CAT.</p> <p>There will be no human factors training requirements in Part-CAO.</p>
comment	<p>394 comment by: <i>Airbus</i></p>
	<p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: NPA 2013-01(B), page 89/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.706(j) NPA 2013-01(C), page 55/184, section B., AMC2 145.A.30(e) 2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:</p>



It is proposed to create a new AMC5 M.A.706(g) on the basis of AMC1 M.A.706(j) and harmonised with AMC4 145.A.30(d). Therefore:

– It is proposed to relocate the paragraphs (b) to (f) of AMC1 M.A.706(j) into **AMC5 M.A.706(g)**, and to modify it to read:

“HUMAN FACTORS

(a) ~~Initial~~ With respect to the understanding of the application of human factors and human performance issues, continuing airworthiness, management, and compliance monitoring personnel should be assessed for the need to receive ~~initial~~ human factors **initial** training, but, in any case, all ~~continuing airworthiness, management, and compliance monitoring~~ personnel directly involved in the delivery of the basic continuing airworthiness management services of the organisation should receive human factors continuation training. This should concern to a minimum:

- Post-holders, line managers, ~~supervisors~~;
- Human factors specialist staff including investigators and trainers;
- Airworthiness Review ~~C~~sStaff;
- Technical support personnel such as, planners, engineers, and technical record staff;
- ~~Compliance monitoring staff~~Staff involved in compliance monitoring and having designated safety management responsibilities; and
- Contract staff in the above categories.

The generic term “line managers” refers to departmental head or person responsible for operational departments or functional units directly involved in the delivery of the basic continuing airworthiness management services of the organisation.

(b) ~~Initial~~ Human factors **initial** training should cover all the topics of the training syllabus specified in ~~GM1 145.A.30(e)~~GM1 M.A.706(g) either as a dedicated course or else integrated within other training, such as safety management training. The syllabus may be adjusted to reflect the particular nature of the organisation. The syllabus may also be adjusted to meet the particular nature of work for each function within the organisation. For example:

- small organisations may cover in less depth subjects related to teamwork and communication, and
 - planners may cover in more depth the scheduling and planning objective of the syllabus.
- Initial training **compliant with the organisation’s training standards** should be provided to personnel within 6 months of joining the continuing airworthiness organisation, but temporary staff may need to be trained shortly after joining the organisation to cope with the duration of employment. Personnel being recruited from another organisation, and temporary staff should be assessed for the need to receive any additional human factors training.

(c) The purpose of human factors continuation training is primarily to ensure that staff remain current in terms of human factors, and also to collect feedback on human factors issues. Consideration should be given to the possibility that such training has the involvement of the safety manager, and compliance monitoring manager. There should be a procedure to ensure that feedback is formally passed from the trainers to the safety manager, and compliance monitoring manager to initiate action where necessary.

Human factors continuation training should be **delivered either as a dedicated course or else integrated within other training, such as safety management training.** It should be of an appropriate duration in each two-year period, in relation to relevant **quality compliance monitoring** audit findings, and other internal/external sources of information available to the organisation on human errors in continuing airworthiness and maintenance.

(d) Human factors training should be delivered by a competent trainer, and may be conducted by the organisation itself, or independent trainers, or any training



organisations acceptable to the competent authority.

(e) Training procedures, including those addressing human factors, should be specified in the continuing airworthiness organisation exposition.”

– It is proposed to rename AMC2 145.A.30(e) into **AMC5 145.A.30(d)** and to modify it to read:

“HUMAN FACTORS

(a) With respect to the understanding of the application of human factors and human performance issues, all maintenance organisation personnel should have received an initial ~~and continuation~~ human factors training, but, in any case, all personnel directly involved in the delivery of the basic maintenance services of the organisation should receive human factors continuation training. This should concern to a minimum:

- (1) Nominated persons (145.A.30(b)), **line managers**, ~~supervisors~~;
- (2) Certifying staff, support staff and mechanics;
- (3) Technical support personnel such as planners, engineers, technical record staff;
- (4) Staff involved in compliance monitoring and having designated safety management responsibilities;
- (5) Specialised services staff;
- (6) Human factors specialist staff including investigators and trainers;
- (7) Logistics and purchasing department staff;
- (8) Ground equipment operators.

The generic term “line managers” refers to departmental head or person responsible for operational departments or functional units directly involved in the delivery of the basic maintenance services of the organisation.

(b) ~~Initial~~ Human factors **initial** training should cover all the topics of the training syllabus specified in GM1 145.A.30(ed) either as a dedicated course or else integrated within other training, **such as safety management training**. The syllabus may be adjusted to reflect the particular nature of the organisation. The syllabus may also be adjusted to meet the particular nature of work for each function within the organisation. For example:

- (1) small organisations not working in shifts may cover in less depth subjects related to teamwork and communication;
- (2) planners may cover in more depth the scheduling and planning objective of the syllabus and in less depth the objective of developing skills for shift working.

All personnel, including personnel being recruited from any other organisation should receive initial human factors training compliant with the organisation’s training standards prior to commencing actual job function, unless their competence assessment justifies that there is no need for such training. Newly directly employed personnel working under direct supervision may receive training within 6 months after joining the maintenance organisation.

(c) The purpose of human factors continuation training is primarily to ensure that staff remain current in terms of human factors, and also to collect feedback on human factors issues. Consideration should be given to the possibility that such training has the involvement of the compliance monitoring manager and safety manager. There should be a procedure to ensure that feedback is formally passed from the trainers to the compliance monitoring manager and safety manager to initiate action where necessary.

Human factors continuation training should be delivered either as a dedicated course or else integrated within other training, **such as safety management training**. It should be of an appropriate duration in each two year period in relation to relevant **quality compliance monitoring** audit findings and other internal/external sources of information on human errors in maintenance available to the organisation.

(d) Human factors training should be delivered by a competent trainer, and may be conducted by the maintenance organisation itself, or independent trainers, or any training



organisations acceptable to the competent authority.
 (e) Training procedures, including those addressing The human factors training procedures, should be specified in the maintenance organisation exposition.”
3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:
 The harmonisation will bring consistency and will benefit from the strengths of the other AMC.
 It is believed that only the personnel directly involved in the delivery of the basic continuing airworthiness management/maintenance services of the organisation should receive continuation human factors training. For example, it is difficult to measure the added value of the continuation human factors training for the accountable manager. This does not mean that he/she should not have notions on human factors and human performance issues (justify the need for the initial human factors training). Similarly, the affected managerial population has been limited to line managers.

response

Accepted.
 The AMCs in Part-CAMO will clarify initial and continuation training, and will also clarify which categories of staff should undergo such training.
 Cf. AMC5 CAMO.A.305(a);(f);(g) Personnel requirements.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — GM1 p. 90
M.A.706(c) Personnel requirements

comment

180 comment by: *Baines Simmons Limited*

GM1 to M.A.706(c) Personnel requirements
 This change appears to be a significant change to previous policy, whereby the former M.A.712(a) Quality Manager was specifically NOT considered part of the M.A.706(c) group of persons, and hence did not need to be accepted in accordance with M.B.702.
 We do not understand the context or need for this change in policy and suggest that this should not have been introduced through the deletion of a regulatory requirement (M.A.712(a)) and its replacement with Guidance Material.
 We do not consider the Compliance Monitoring Manager to be a direct element of “ensuring” compliance with requirements as indeed the Quality Manager is not currently. The M.A.706(c) group of persons is directly responsible for compliance; whereas the CM is responsible for monitoring activities, that indirectly contribute to compliance and continuing improvement. This activity helps “assure” compliance, it cannot “ensure” compliance.
 Equally, we do not fully understand how the compliance monitoring function could be monitored. Is the Agency implying that organisations will be required to employ external auditors to audit the compliance monitoring function? Even if internal resources were used, this would have to be allowed for within the overall headcount, and would require these other resources to be not only competent in their own job role, but also in audit and inspection techniques.
 This would appear to increase the burden on industry without a commensurate increase in safety performance.



response

Not accepted.

Compliance monitoring is part of the functions required by the requirements, hence it is required to ensure compliance and, therefore, must be subject to auditing.

The aim of this GM is simply to clarify the objective of the IR. Monitoring of compliance needs to address all elements and all functions required by Part-CAMO, and one of the functions required by Part-CAMO is the compliance monitoring function. This function must be in place and effective for the organisation to demonstrate compliance with the relevant requirements. Therefore, this function cannot be excluded from the scope of what should be monitored.

comment

400

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 90/218, section B., GM1 M.A.706(c)

NPA 2013-01(C), page 59/184, section B., GM1 145.A.30(c)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

– It is proposed to re-identify GM1 M.A.706(c) into GM1 M.A.706(b) and to modify it to read:

“RESPONSIBILITY FOR ENSURING COMPLIANCE

‘Person or group of persons’ referred to in M.A.706(eb) includes the compliance monitoring manager, as the compliance monitoring function itself is one of the elements to ‘ensure’ compliance with the applicable requirements.

This means that an EASA Form 4 should be provided for this person. It also means that the compliance monitoring function itself should be subject to ~~monitoring~~checking of compliance in accordance with M.A.712(a)(6). This check of compliance should be carried out by competent personnel not pertaining to the compliance monitoring function of the organisation.”

– It is proposed to re-identify GM1 145.A.30(c) into GM1 145.A.30(a) and to modify it to read:

“RESPONSIBILITY FOR ENSURING COMPLIANCE

The compliance monitoring function itself is one of the elements to ‘ensure’ compliance with the applicable requirements.

This means that an EASA Form 4 should be provided for the person referred to in 145.A.30(ea)(3). It also means that the compliance monitoring function itself should be subject to ~~monitoring~~checking of compliance in accordance with 145.A.65(a)(6). This check of compliance should be carried out by competent personnel not pertaining to the compliance monitoring function of the organisation.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

There are three functions in the EASA regulation system:

– The demonstration of compliance: The demonstration of compliance function should consist of the compliance data creation.

– The verification of compliance: The independent checking function of the demonstration of compliance should consist of the verification by a person not creating the compliance data.

– The independent monitoring: The independent monitoring function should consist of the continuing evaluation of the organisation system to ensure that it remains effective.

When applied to the compliance monitoring organisation activities, the verification of



	<p>compliance should be carried out by competent personnel not pertaining to the compliance monitoring organisation. Further, the independent monitoring function should be carried out by the Agency.</p>
<p>response</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The terminology change that has been introduced with this NPA is fully aligned with that introduced with Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012, and does not fundamentally change the quality system requirements as defined in the current rules. Compliance monitoring refers to the organisation’s internal audits and also includes the feedback system of findings. As compliance monitoring is mainly performed by means of audits and inspections, and as by definition an audit is not a 100 % verification of compliance (it always entails sampling), the compliance monitoring function cannot be assimilated with an independent checking function of all ‘compliance demonstrations’. This type of ‘quality control’ is not within the scope of the compliance monitoring function. Also, the independent monitoring function is an organisation responsibility, not an EASA or competent authority responsibility.</p>

<p>SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — GM1 M.A.706(j) Personnel requirements</p>	<p>p. 90</p>
--	--------------

<p>comment</p>	<p>401</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>Airbus</i></p> <p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: NPA 2013-01(B), pages 90-91/218, section B., GM1 & 2 M.A.706(j) [NPA 2013-01(C), page 61/218, section B., GM2 145.A.30(e)]</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – It is proposed to re-identify GM1 M.A.706(j) into GM3 M.A.706(g). – It is proposed to re-identify GM2 M.A.706(j) into GM2 M.A.706(g) and to modify it to read: “HUMAN FACTORS TRAINER A competent Human Factors trainer should meet the following criteria: (a) attended training that is at least equivalent to the EASA Part 145 Maintenance Human Factors Initial training syllabus defined in GM 145.A.30(e) GM1 M.A.706(g); (b) received instruction in training techniques, and training development compatible with the skills to influence attitudes and behaviours; (c) has worked for a minimum of three years within the aviation industry, or possesses a suitable academic background; and (d) has an appropriate level of understanding of Human Factors in the continuing airworthiness management and maintenance environment in relation to the organisation’s HF programme (module 10 of GM1 145.A.30(e) GM1 M.A.706(g)).” <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION: Editorial.</p>
<p>response</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The GM will be changed as proposed and identified as GM to point CAMO.A.305(g).</p>



SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — GM2 p. 91
M.A.706(j) Personnel requirements

comment	<p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></p> <p>332</p> <p>This item c) does not really help and the two criteria are really so different that it leaves open very different level of competency. As there is probably no consensus on which criteria to be applied for FH knowledge, then keep the “aeronotical actual culture acquired through experience, and delete the words “or possesses a suitable academic background”.</p> <p>to become :</p> <p>(c) has worked for a minimum of three years within the aviation industry.</p>
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>This would exclude trainers having a suitable academic background. ‘Human factors’ is a subject that is not specific to the aviation industry.</p>

comment	<p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>British Gliding Association</i></p> <p>209</p> <p>British Gliding Association GM2 M.A.706(j) Personnel requirements The training requirements for a human factors trainer/presenter for small or sporting organisations are too onerous. These should be simplified for subpart F organisations maintaining aircraft not used for commercial air transport and subpart G organisations not involved with CAM to persons trained by the organisation to an appropriate standard leaving the subpart F or G organisation to establish the training as an alternate means of compliance. Persons writing human factors training should be trained in accordance with the GM as proposed.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The GM2 to point (j) of M.A.706 only applies to CAMOs involved in the continuing airworthiness management of complex motor-powered aircraft and aircraft used in CAT. There will be no human factors training requirements in Part-CAO.</p>

comment	<p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>Rega/Swiss Air-Ambulance</i></p> <p>105</p>
---------	--



	<p>The requirements for the human factors trainer as mentioned in GM2 M.A.706(j) are too stringent. It should be in the responsibility of the organisation to select an appropriate person.</p>
<p>response</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The GM2 to point (j) of M.A.706 only applies to CAMOs involved in the continuing airworthiness management of complex motor-powered aircraft and aircraft used in CAT.</p> <p>Experience has shown that the competency of human factors trainers has been inconsistent. This provision reinforces the importance of the human factors trainer knowing and understanding the organisation they are delivering training for and its human factors F programme, policies and procedures. The proposed changes allow an individual from within an organisation with appropriate experience and training to deliver the training or someone with the right academic background but also with an in-depth understanding of the organisation’s human factors programme. Therefore, it is not expected that current trainers would no longer qualify unless they don’t understand the organisation’s own human factors programme.</p>

<p>SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — M.A.708 Continuing airworthiness management</p>	<p>p. 91-92</p>
--	-----------------

<p>comment</p>	<p>333 comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></p> <p>Regarding the d subparagraph, This is a general statement, a wish list that does not help. Rewrite or Delete (d) or at least the words “resulting in good maintenance practices.”.</p>
<p>response</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The text will be reviewed to better clarify the objective, which is to consider HF principles and human performance limitations when planning any maintenance activities under the remit of the CAMO.</p> <p>HF concepts do need to be understood by the CAMO staff as they can contribute to events through their own errors or by causing errors to be made within the contracted Part-145 organisation, therefore there are many common aspects when it comes to HF for Part-M and Part-145 organisations.</p>

<p>comment</p>	<p>414 comment by: <i>Airbus</i></p> <p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: Point M.A.301 NPA 2013-01(B), page 91/218, section B., point M.A.708</p>
----------------	---



2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

The duplication of regulation requirements creates hazards (potential future contradictions, confusion, etc.) and makes the compliance demonstration more complex than necessary. Therefore, it is proposed to simplify point M.A.708(b).

Point M.A.708(d) proposed in NPA 2013-01 should be improved on the basis of point 145.A.47 to ensure a more global consideration of human factors and human performance and limitations.

– It is proposed to modify point M.A.708 to read:

“(a) All continuing airworthiness management shall be carried out according to the prescriptions of M.A Subpart C.

(b) For every aircraft managed, the approved continuing airworthiness management organisation shall:

~~(1) develop and control a maintenance programme for the aircraft managed including any applicable reliability programme,~~

~~(2) present the aircraft maintenance programme and its amendments to the competent authority for approval, unless covered by an approval procedure in accordance with point M.A.302(e), and provide the owner with a copy of the approved aircraft maintenance programme to the owner of aircraft not involved in commercial air transport when the option specified in M.A.201(e)(ii) is selected,~~

~~(3) manage the approval of modification and repairs,~~

~~(4) ensure that all maintenance is carried out in accordance with the approved maintenance programme and released in accordance with M.A. Subpart H,~~

~~(5) ensure that all applicable airworthiness directives and operational directives with a continuing airworthiness impact, are applied,~~

~~(6) ensure that all defects discovered during scheduled maintenance or reported are corrected by an appropriately approved maintenance organisation,~~

~~(7) ensure that the aircraft, engine(s), propeller(s), and components thereof are taken to an appropriately approved maintenance organisation whenever necessary,~~

~~(8) order maintenance, supervise activities, and coordinate decisions scheduled maintenance, the application of airworthiness directives, the replacement of service life limited parts, and component inspection to ensure the work is carried out properly and decisions made are appropriately released and suitable, respectively, for the determination of the final airworthiness of the aircraft,~~

~~(9) manage and archive all continuing airworthiness records and/or operator's technical log.~~

~~(10) ensure that the mass and balance statement reflects the current status of the aircraft.~~

(c) In the case of commercial air transport, when the operator is not appropriately approved to Part-145, the operator shall establish a written maintenance contract between the operator and a Part-145 approved organisation or another operator, detailing the functions specified under M.A.301-2, M.A.301-3, M.A.301-5 and M.A.301-6, ensuring that all maintenance is ultimately carried out by a Part-145 approved maintenance organisation and defining the support of the compliance monitoring function of M.A.712(a)(6). The aircraft base, scheduled line maintenance and engine maintenance contracts, together with all amendments, shall be approved by the competent authority. However, in the case of:

(1) an aircraft requiring unscheduled line maintenance, the contract may be in the form of individual work orders addressed to the Part-145 maintenance organisation.

(2) component maintenance, including engine maintenance, the contract as referred to in paragraph (c) may be in the form of individual work orders addressed to the Part-145 maintenance organisation.

(d) For the cases other than the one described under M.A.708(c), [to be developed]



(de) The organisation shall ensure that human factors and human performance and limitations are taken into account during continuing airworthiness management ~~resulting in good maintenance practices.~~

(1) The organisation shall have a system appropriate to the amount and complexity of the continuing airworthiness management tasks to plan the availability of all necessary personnel, tools, equipment, material, maintenance data and facilities in order to ensure the correct completion of these tasks.

(2) The planning of continuing airworthiness management tasks, and the coordination of shifts if any, shall take into account human performance and limitations.

(3) When it is required to hand over the continuation or completion of continuing airworthiness management tasks for reasons of a shift or personnel changeover, relevant information shall be adequately communicated between outgoing and incoming personnel.

(4) Human factors and human performance and limitations in the accomplishment of maintenance shall be taken into account during the development of deliverables such as work orders to prevent consequential risks.”

– It is proposed to modify point M.A.301 to read:

“The aircraft continuing airworthiness and the serviceability of both operational and emergency equipment shall be ensured by:

[...]

9. delivering to the pilot-in-command, or to the operator in the case of commercial air transport, the mass and balance statement, which reflects the current configuration of the aircraft.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

It appears that point M.A.708(a) covers the requirements of the following sub-paragraphs of M.A.708(b):

- M.A.708(b)(1): refer to M.A.301 point 4. and, M.A.302(a) and (f),
- M.A.708(b)(2): refer to M.A.302(b) and (c). The requirement to provide a copy to the aircraft owner is not covered,
- M.A.708(b)(3): refer to M.A.301 point 6. and M.A.304,
- M.A.708(b)(4): refer to M.A.301 point 3., M.A.305(a) and M.A.306,
- M.A.708(b)(5): refer to M.A.301 point 5., M.A.302(d)(i), and M.A.303,
- M.A.708(b)(6): refer to M.A.301 point 2.,
- M.A.708(b)(7): The requirement (aircraft taken to an appropriately approved maintenance organisation) is not currently covered by M.A.708(a).
- M.A.708(b)(8): The (coordination) requirement is not covered by M.A.708(a),
- M.A.708(b)(9): refer to M.A.305 and M.A.306,
- M.A.708(b)(10): This requirement is not specific to CAMO. Therefore, it should be relocated in the subpart C.

The point M.A.708(c) covers only one case (commercial air transport, when the operator is not appropriately approved to Part-145). The other cases should be addressed to prevent possible confusion or extensive judgment.

With regard to human factors and human performance and limitations, the Part-145 already includes prescriptions (e.g. in point 145.A.47) more detailed than those of the proposal for Part-M, which introduce only a general requirement. In addition, the AMC1 M.A.708(d) proposed in the NPA 2013-01 gives the impression the scope is restricted to the consequences of human factors and human performance and limitations on the maintenance organisation. In other words, the scope is partially covered as it does not consider the consequences of human factors and human performance and limitations in the development of CAMO deliverables (e.g. work order requesting an operational check instead of a functional check... a mistake due to fatigue, etc...) that could not necessarily



response	<p>be detected downstream.</p> <p>Accepted.</p> <p>Consistency between M.A.301 and M.A.708:</p> <p>M.A.301 and M.A.708 (now CAMO.A.315) have been reviewed as suggested in this comment to clearly distinguish between purely ‘technical’ requirements and organisational requirements.</p> <p>Human factors in CAMOs:</p> <p>It is not the intention of the proposed rule changes to limit the scope of human factors to the consequences of human factors and human performance and limitations on the maintenance organisation. The safety risk management requirements introduced with the related opinion are intended to also address the CAMO’s own organisational risks, including those related to human factors. The Explanatory Note to the Opinion provides clarification on this point.</p>
----------	--

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1 p. 92-93
M.A.708(c) Continuing airworthiness management

comment	<p>63 comment by: SVFB/SAMA</p> <p>one rule does not fit all: this is appropriate for airlines and all a/c fleets with a high annual utilisation > 2500 fhrs.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>M.A.708(c) is only applicable to CMPA or aircraft used for CAT, or aircraft used for commercial specialised operations or commercial ATO operations.</p> <p>The new Part-CAO provides proportional requirements for General Aviation organisations.</p>
comment	<p>415 comment by: Airbus</p> <p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: NPA 2013-01(B), pages 92-95/218, section B., AMC & GM for M.A.708 NPA 2013-01(C), pages 77-84/184, section B., AMC & GM for 145.A.47</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – It is proposed to cancel AMC M.A.708(b)(3). – It is proposed to modify AMC1 M.A.708(c) to read: “[...]” <p>(d) For line maintenance, the actual layout of the contract the IATA Standard Ground Handling Agreement may be used as a basis, but this does not preclude the competent authority of operator from ensuring that the content of the contract is acceptable to them, and especially that the contract allows the operator to properly exercise its</p>



~~maintenance supervision~~ responsibility. Those parts of a contract that have no bearing on the technical or operational aspects of airworthiness are outside the scope of this paragraph.

[...]

(g) [...]. Typical examples of such arrangements follow:

– Component maintenance:

[...].

– Aircraft, engine and component maintenance:

The operator may wish to have a maintenance contract with another operator of the same type of aircraft not approved under Part-145. A typical case is that of a dry-leased ~~aeroplane aircraft~~ between operators where the parties, for consistency or continuity reasons (especially for short term lease agreements), find it appropriate to keep the aircraft under the current maintenance arrangement. Where this arrangement involves various Part-145 approved contractors, it might be more manageable for the lessee to have a single contract with the lessor. Such an arrangement should not be understood as a transfer of responsibility to the lessor: the lessee, being the approved operator of the aircraft, remains responsible for the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft in performing the M.A.708 functions, and employing the M.A.706 continuing airworthiness management group of persons and staff.

In essence, this does not alter the intent of M.A.201(h) in that it also requires that the operator has to establish a written maintenance contract acceptable to the competent authority of operator and, whatever type of acceptable arrangement is made, the operator is required to exercise the same level of control on contracted maintenance, particularly through the M.A.706(c) continuing airworthiness management group of persons and management system as referred to in M.A.712.”

– It is proposed to create AMC and GM for M.A.708(e) on the basis of those for point 145.A.47:

– AMC1 M.A.708(e)(1) on the basis of AMC 145.A.47(a),

– AMC2 M.A.708(e) on the basis of AMC1 145.A.47(b),

– AMC3 M.A.708(e) on the basis of AMC2 145.A.47(b),

– AMC1 M.A.708(e)(3) on the basis of AMC 145.A.47(c),

– GM1 M.A.708(e) on the basis of GM1 145.A.47(b),

– GM2 M.A.708(e) on the basis of GM2 145.A.47(b). However, the guidance material should not refer to, but should state the contents of UK CAP716 Appendix P that are retained.

– It is proposed to modify the following paragraphs of the Appendix XI to AMC1 M.A.708(c) to read:

“1. Maintenance contracts

[...].

A maintenance contract is not normally intended to provide appropriate detailed work instruction to the personnel (and is not normally distributed as such). Accordingly there should be established organisational ~~roles and responsibilities~~, procedures and routines in the operator’s M.A. Subpart G & Part-145 organisations to take care of these functions in a satisfactory way such that any person involved is informed about his/her ~~accountabilities, responsibilities and authorities~~, and the procedures which apply. These procedures and routines can be included/appended to the operator’s CAME and maintenance organisation’s MOE or consist in separate procedures. In other words procedures and routines should reflect the conditions of the contract.

[...]



2.3. Subcontracting

The maintenance contract should specify under which conditions the Part-145 approved organisation may subcontract tasks to a third party (whether this third party is Part-145 approved or not). At least the contract should make reference to 145.A.75. Additional guidance is provided by the AMC 145.A.75(b). In addition the operator may require the Part-145 approved organisation to obtain the operator's approval before subcontracting to a third party. Access should be given to the operator to any information (especially the quality compliance monitoring information) about the Part-145 approved organisation's subcontractors involved in the contract. It should however be noted that under operator's responsibility both the operator and its competent authority are entitled to be fully informed about subcontracting, although the competent authority will normally only be concerned with aircraft, engine and APU subcontracting.

[...]

2.5 Monitoring

The terms of the contract should include a provision allowing the operator to monitor the Part-145 organisation in terms of compliance with the applicable requirements and effectiveness of the organisation's safety risk management processes. The maintenance contract should specify how the results of such monitoring are taken into account by the Part-145 organisation (See also paragraph 2.232. 'Meetings').

For Part-145 approved organisations certified in accordance with industry management system standards, such as ISO 9001 or EN 9110, the terms of contract should specify if and how the operator intends to consider this certification for its own monitoring. Where relevant, this should in particular address the elements specified in 2.3 'Subcontracting', 2.22 'Exchange of information' and 2.232. 'Meetings'."

– It is proposed to modify AMC1 145.A.47(b) to read:

"FATIGUE RISK MANAGEMENT

(a) In order to manage the fatigue related risk of personnel, as an aviation hazard, the organisation should:

~~(1) as part of its safety policy develop and maintain a policy for the management of fatigue related risk and define the related procedures;~~

(21) define and use a work schedule scheme with maximum work and minimum rest hours not exceeding the limitations laid down in the Directive 2003/88/EC¹⁰. Where temporary derogations and opt-outs to Directive 2003/88/EC are agreed between the organisation and its personnel, the organisation should conduct and document a risk assessment, and take the necessary actions to mitigate the applicable risks;

(32) ensure existing reporting systems enable the identification of fatigue related hazards;

(43) assess and manage the risks of such fatigue related hazard reports in accordance with the organisation's safety risk management procedures in accordance with AMC1 145.A.65(a)(3), and monitor the effectiveness of related risk mitigation actions implemented; and

(54) provide training on the management of fatigue.

(b) By derogation from point (a)(21) above, when the organisation does not apply the maximum work and minimum rest hours laid down in the Directive 2003/88/EC¹¹, it should establish as part of its management system a fatigue risk management scheme in accordance with AMC2 145.A.65(a)(3) acceptable to the competent authority."

With regard to fatigue risk management, has consideration been given to a consolidation of the requirements, acceptable means of compliance and guidance material?

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The subparagraph (d) of the AMC1 M.A.708(c) is modified to align with M.A.201(c): "Any person or organisation performing maintenance shall be responsible for the tasks



performed”. Therefore, the person or organisation responsible for the continuing airworthiness management is not responsible for the maintenance accomplishment. However, this person or organisation is responsible for ensuring that all maintenance is carried out in accordance with the approved maintenance programme and appropriately released (supervision role).

AMC and GM for M.A.708(e) should be consistent with those for point 145.A.47. This NPA promotes consistency: “the existence of multiple safety/quality management system frameworks with differing, duplicated or inconsistent requirements can have not just negative economic but possibly adverse safety impacts caused by confusions, in particular if implemented within a single organisation”. It is to be noted that although some national regulation materials may help in defining those of the EASA, it is found inappropriate (e.g. in case of contents evolutions) to include references to national guidance materials: the contents that are retained should be restated instead.

The paragraph (a)(1) of the AMC1 145.A.47(b) is proposed for deletion as there is no reason to focus on only one matter involving human factors and human performance and limitations in the definition of the safety policy.

For the consolidation of material on fatigue risk management, for example, more guidance is given in GM7 145.A.65(a)(3) than for point 145.A.47(b). Refer also to [Comment No. 83](#).

response

Partially accepted.

Regarding the proposal to delete AMC M.A.708(b)(3) and review the AMCs to M.A.708, this may be assessed when producing the full set of AMCs and GM to Part-CAMO (Phase I).

Regarding the proposal to modify AMC1 M.A.708(c) and Appendix XI to AMC1 M.A.708(c): accepted. These are mainly editorial and consistency changes.

Regarding the proposal to create AMC and GM to M.A.708(e) on the basis of those for point 145.A.47: not accepted. This comment would require a new rulemaking task; such changes are not covered by the ToR of RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I. A proposal for a new rulemaking task should be submitted to EASA.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1
M.A.708(d) Continuing airworthiness management

p. 93-94

comment 92

comment by: EUROPEAN AVIATION QUALITY GROUP (EAQG)

Appendix IX to AMC M.A.708 (c) – point 3.5 (Engine maintenance)
 [It was previously) Appendix XI to AMC to M.A.708(c)]

Comment:

Same changes proposed in point 2.5 should be implemented also into point 3.5 (Engine maintenance).

Proposed Change to Text:

For Part-145 approved organisations certified in accordance with industry management system standards, such as ISO 9001 or EN 9110 and the associated IAQG Industry Controlled Other Party (ICOP) scheme, the terms of contract should specify if and how the



	operator intends to consider this certification for its own monitoring. Where relevant, this should in particular address the elements specified in 2.3 'Subcontracting', 2.22 'Exchange of information' and 2.23 'Meetings'.
response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>The Appendix has been erroneously referred to as Appendix IX; it remains Appendix XI.</p> <p>Regarding the comment on point 3.5 of the Appendix, please note that with ED Decision 2010/02/R the Appendix has been changed to incorporate all engine-related elements within Section 2 (now referred to as 'Aircraft/engine maintenance').</p>
comment	<p>93 comment by: EUROPEAN AVIATION QUALITY GROUP (EAQG)</p> <p>Appendix IX to AMC M.A.708 (c) – point 4.5 [It previously was Appendix XI to AMC to M.A.708(c)] Comment: Same changes proposed in point 2.5 should be implemented also into point 4.5 (Components maintenance): Proposed Change to Text: For Part-145 approved organisations certified in accordance with industry management system standards, such as ISO 9001 or EN 9110 and the associated IAQG Industry Controlled Other Party (ICOP) scheme, the terms of contract should specify if and how the operator intends to consider this certification for its own monitoring. Where relevant, this should in particular address the elements specified in 2.3 'Subcontracting', 2.22 'Exchange of information' and 2.23 'Meetings'</p>
response	Please see response to comment #92 above.
comment	<p>95 comment by: EUROPEAN AVIATION QUALITY GROUP (EAQG)</p> <p>Appendix IX to AMC1 M.A.708 (c) – point 2.5 [It previously was "Appendix XI to AMC to M.A.708(c)"] Comment: It should be considered that the EN 9110 certification works strictly in conjunction with the relevant IAQG Industry Controlled Other Party (ICOP) Scheme. Proposed Change to Text: For Part-145 approved organisations, certified in accordance with industry management system standards, such as EN 9110 and the associated IAQG Industry Controlled Other Party (ICOP) scheme, the terms of contract should specify if and how the operator intends to consider this certification for its own monitoring. Where relevant, this should in particular address the elements specified in 2.3 'Subcontracting', 2.22 'Exchange of information' and 2.23 'Meetings'.</p>
response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>The Appendix has been erroneously referred to as Appendix IX; it remains Appendix XI.</p> <p>The reference to the ISO 9001 standard should not be deleted and the reference to the</p>



associated IAQG Industry Controlled Other Party (ICOP) scheme is not necessary. The existence of an EN9110 certificate should be sufficient to allow the operator to consider this.

comment 35 comment by: *NFLC, Cranfield University, UK*

Appendix IX to AMC1 M.A.708(c)
 Para 1 - how is the Part M supposed to judge whether the Part 145's SMS is effective. These words are often used but nobody says how this is to be done.
 Para 2 - Surely this paragraph is superfluous. If the Part M wants to take account of ISO 9001 / EN 9110, it will do so and specify how. If the Part M does not want to take these standards into account, it shouldn't be forced to recognise them. This seems to be an excessive level of detail for the AMC material and may be better suited as guidance material. I do not want to have to change a contract to specifically recognise the content of this paragraph as the effort in doing that is not justified.

response Partially accepted.

Regarding the assessment of Part-145’s safety risk management (SRM), this can be done through different means, such as asking for the results of hazard identification or evidence of the risk mitigation actions implemented. This is an important point also with regard to properly interfacing the SRM processes of the operator and those of the maintenance organisation. It is acknowledged that further guidance should be provided.

Implementation support specific to SMS and maintenance and continuing airworthiness management will be provided in the framework of the EASA’s safety promotion programme (a safety promotion task will be proposed for the planning cycle 2017–2021). This may entail templates for manuals, implementation guidelines, assessment tools, etc.

Regarding the reference to industry standards, the paragraph will be amended to only require specification in the contract in cases where the operator does consider this possibility. The way the AMC is worded does not create any obligation on operators to consider certification in accordance with industry standards of the maintenance organisations they contract; the AMC aims to ensure that when operators intend to consider this, the contract should clearly specify the applicable conditions and what this means for the operator’s own monitoring of compliance.

comment 140 comment by: *Federation of Aerospace Enterprises in Ireland*

AMC1 M.A.708(d)(a)(1)
 Flight Safety Sensitive Tasks should be defined in Article 2 Definitions as no definition is provided. It was proposed in NPA 2012-04 that this would happen. (Note, this NPA added the word maintenance i.e. Flight Safety Sensitive Maintenance Tasks)
Proposed text
 Add to Article 2 ‘Definitions’

response Partially accepted.

Amending Regulation (EU) 2015/1536, following Opinion No 06/2013 ‘Critical



maintenance tasks' (RMT.0222 (MDM.020)), will not use the term 'flight safety sensitive task'. Therefore, point (a)(1) of AMC1 M.A.708(d) (now AMC1 to CAMO.A.315) will be amended accordingly.

comment 141 comment by: *Federation of Aerospace Enterprises in Ireland*

AMC1 M.A. 708(d)(2)(i)
Development of the maintenance programme and recommendations for the maintenance planning, taking into account Human performance limitations – quite general, need to provide guidance for human performance or define in Article 2

response Noted.

This comment will be considered when producing the AMCs for Part-CAMO.

comment 142 comment by: *Federation of Aerospace Enterprises in Ireland*

AMC1 M.A. 708(d)(2)(ii)
Development of the maintenance programme and recommendations for the maintenance planning, taking into account
- the content of the work order or tasks, the risks of discovering findings that will delay the release to service, **the slot available for the aircraft during maintenance in line with the operational dispatch of the aircraft without impairing the maintenance programme schedule;**
Not sure what this means, unclear particularly that section in bold cannot suggest alternative wording as the intent is not understood.

response Accepted.

The AMC will be reviewed to clarify its intent.

comment 143 comment by: *Federation of Aerospace Enterprises in Ireland*

AMC1 M.A. 708(d)(3)(i)
Producing maintenance documents according to a procedure, including the following, but not limited to:

(i)

(i) Using a standard format and page layout for the job cards.

The term 'job cards' is used here which is assumed to be a subset of 'maintenance documents' but in item (d)(2)(ii) that precedes this the terms 'work order' and 'tasks' are used. Need a single term to be used consistently.

Proposed text.

(i) Using standard format and page layout for the **maintenance documents** ~~job cards~~



response Accepted.
The AMC will be reworded as suggested.

comment 144 comment by: *Federation of Aerospace Enterprises in Ireland*

AMC1 M.A. 708(d)(3)(ii)
Writing DANGER, WARNING and CAUTION statements using current international standards when appropriate.
What are the international standards? Where simplified english is stated reference is made to ASD-STE-100, a similar reference should be provided here.
Proposed text.
Writing DANGER, WARNING and CAUTION statements using current international standards **ref XXXX** when appropriate.

response Accepted.
The AMC will be reworded as suggested.

comment 145 comment by: *Federation of Aerospace Enterprises in Ireland*

AMC1 M.A. 708(d)(3)(vi)
Validating the documentation by having a sample of users check for usability;
This will not always be practical e.g. calling up work to be done on an urgent basis e.g. Emergency AD requirements it makes the process unworkable.
Proposed text
validating the documentation by having a sample of users check for usability where possible.

response Accepted.
The AMC will be reworded as suggested.

comment 146 comment by: *Federation of Aerospace Enterprises in Ireland*

AMC1 M.A. 708(d)(3)(viii)
(viii) taking into account the aircraft configuration:
(A) using one action per statement; and
(B) ensuring the document delivery system is functional and well maintained.
Not sure of intent, how are the aircraft configuration and document delivery system related?
What does aircraft configuration have to do with one action per statement
Proposed text.
(viii) taking into account the aircraft configuration:
(ix) (A) using one action per statement; and



response	<p>(x)(B) ensuring the document delivery system is functional and well maintained.</p> <p>Accepted.</p> <p>The text will be amended to correct the 'hierarchy' of points as proposed in this comment.</p>
comment	<p>210 comment by: <i>British Gliding Association</i></p> <p>British Gliding Association AMC1 M.A.708(d) Continuing airworthiness management HUMAN FACTORS AND HUMAN PERFORMANCE LIMITATIONS Many topics in this new section are related to aircraft maintenance and not maintenance management so should be part of subpart F.</p>
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>This is related to continuing airworthiness management where work orders and related maintenance documentation are provided by the CAMO to the maintenance organisation. This relates in particular to all the items listed in point M.A.708(b). This does not apply to aircraft maintenance when owners/operators ensure themselves all continuing airworthiness tasks.</p>
comment	<p>244 comment by: <i>FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation</i></p> <p>Regarding the article "AMC1 M.A.708(d) Continuing airworthiness management", the FNAM reminds that the European Union has already established work and rest time limits and their minimum standard in the "Directive 2003/88/EC" and in the "Directive 2000/79/EC". It is not from the scope of the EASA to establish social requirements but it belongs to the States sovereignty. The FNAM is requesting to remove those principles from the SMS requirements.</p>
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The AMC does not interfere with any established work and rest time limits and their minimum standard as per Directive 2003/88/EC and Directive 2000/79/EC. It provides a means to comply with the new requirement proposed in M.A.708(d) (now CAMO.A.3015(e)) to consider human factors and human performance limitations for any continuing airworthiness management task.</p>
comment	<p>251 comment by: <i>Haitec</i></p> <p>NPA 2013 –01 (B) AMC1 M.A.708(d) Haitec believes that this AMC should be revised to be consistent with the requirements of GM1 145.A.71. Currently the AMC and the GM differ and Haitec believes that the content of GM1 145.A.71 gives better guidance in designing technical documents in accordance with good</p>



	<p>human factors principles. Having two sets of guidelines would cause problems for organisations that have both Part 145 and Part M approvals Haitec also proposes that existing technical documents written before a date to be defined should be acceptable in the format that they are currently written. Haitec believes that an exercise to rewrite all documents would impose too large burden on an organisation.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>GM1 145.A.71 refers to how procedures should be written and is more specific to the maintenance environment whereas AMC1 M.A.708(d) is more focused on the Part-M CAMO function in delivering useable maintenance documentation across a wider range of issues, therefore EASA disagrees that the requirements should be the same as per comment #251. It is not the intention to retrospectively amend all the documents that have been produced prior to the proposed new wording.</p>
comment	<p>253 comment by: <i>Kaunas Aircraft Maintenance Services</i></p> <p>Kaunas Aircraft Maintenance Services believes that this AMC should be revised to be consistent with the requirements of GM1 145.A.71. Currently the AMC and the GM differ and Kaunas Aircraft Maintenance Services believes that the content of GM1 145.A.71 gives better guidance in designing technical documents in accordance with good human factors principles. Having two sets of guidelines would cause problems for organisations that have both Part 145 and Part M approvals. Kaunas Aircraft Maintenance Services also proposes that existing technical documents written before a date to be defined should be acceptable in the format that they are currently written. Kaunas Aircraft Maintenance Services believes that an exercise to rewrite all documents would impose too large burden on an organisation.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the response to comment #251.</p>
comment	<p>291 comment by: <i>SEAS</i></p> <p>AMC1 M.A.708(d), SEAS believes that this AMC should be revised to be consistent with the requirements of GM1 145.A.71. Currently the AMC and the GM differ and SEAS believes that the content of GM1 145.A.71 gives better guidance in designing technical documents in accordance with good human factors principles. Having two sets of guidelines would cause problems for organisations that have both Part 145 and Part M approvals SEAS also proposes that existing technical documents written before a date to be defined should be acceptable in the format that they are currently written. SEAS believes that an exercise to rewrite all documents would impose too large burden on an organisation</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the response to comment #251.</p>



comment	<p>334 ❖ comment by: DGAC FRANCE</p> <p>The debate on « safety sensitive maintenance tasks » is part of an already consulted NPA and is in progress. DGAC France will not comment the matter within this NPA. See comments already done. The paragraphs changes here are out of scope of the SGS implementation. (apply for instance to AMC MA708d)</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Regarding ‘critical maintenance tasks’, the final text that will be included in Part-145 will be that resulting from rulemaking task RMT.0222 (MDM.020), cf. Opinion No 06/2013, amending Regulation (EU) 2015/1536. For this task, it was considered necessary to align the amended text in NPA 2013-01(B) with the text of Opinion No 06/2013 in order for stakeholders to be able to assess NPA 2013-01(B) changes in the context of the other <u>relevant</u> amendments proposed.</p> <p>Prior to the adoption of the corresponding rule amendments for all pending tasks, EASA, in close coordination with the European Commission, will ensure that the different amendments stemming from different rulemaking tasks are properly consolidated, without omissions, overlaps or inconsistencies, and that this consolidation does not result in any other unintended effects.</p> <p>Regarding the comment on items being outside the scope of SMS implementation: not accepted. It is critical that HF be fully integrated into SMS as humans remain at the heart of the air transportation system. Adding specific provisions for the management of safety on the basis of the new management system requirements will create an adequate framework for the effective management of HF issues.</p>

comment	<p>335 comment by: DGAC FRANCE</p> <p>d subparagraph, (2) (i) is outside the scope of this NPA as mentioned in our general comments. A specific NPA should be developed on human factors.</p>
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Please refer to the response to comment #334.</p>

comment	<p>336 comment by: DGAC FRANCE</p> <p>about : (3) producing maintenance documents</p>
---------	--



	<p>comment :</p> <p>The Part MG does not produce maintenance documents. This AMC in the point d) 3 is creating a rule that is not addressed by the IR. Delete AMC. A specific NPA should address this issue.</p> <p>In addition, documents used in CAMO are not always written in english, but can be in NAA language. Therefore "simplified english" when to be used should be called in a GM, not an AMC.</p>
<p>response</p>	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>Regarding the statement ‘The Part M/G does not produce maintenance documents’, this is not accepted.</p> <p>This is related to continuing airworthiness management where work orders and related maintenance documentation are provided by the CAMO, for example in the case of licensed air carriers. This relates in particular to all the items listed in point M.A.708(b). This does not apply to aircraft maintenance when owners/operators ensure themselves all continuing airworthiness tasks.</p> <p>Regarding the reference to ‘simplified English’: accepted.</p> <p>The AMC will be amended to consider that other languages may be used.</p>

<p>comment</p>	<p>416 comment by: Airbus</p> <p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: NPA 2013-01(B), page 93/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.708(d)</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: It is proposed to re-identify AMC1 M.A.708(d) into AMC1 M.A.708(e) and to modify it to read: “HUMAN FACTORS AND HUMAN PERFORMANCE AND LIMITATIONS (a) Consideration of human factors and human performance and limitations in the context of continuing airworthiness management should address, at least, the following: (1) identification of flight safety sensitive critical maintenance tasks and procedures; [...]”</p> <p>Can the Agency clarify the meaning of the term ‘recommendations for the maintenance planning’ in the paragraph (a)(2) of this AMC? Is it the consideration of human factors and human performance and limitations in the development of an aircraft maintenance programme or in the implementation of CAMO outputs (e.g. work orders) by the maintenance organisation? This is ambiguous.</p> <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION: The use of the term ‘flight safety sensitive’ is causing concerns. Refer to <u>Comment No. 2</u>. The FAA KSI Team defined in its final report, dated 12-Mar-2007, the following terms (refer to http://www.skybrary.aero/bookshelf/books/1436.pdf): Task: Short description (e.g. a descriptive title) of what is to be accomplished by a procedure. Example: “Operational check of static inverter.” Procedure: Instructions for how a task is to be accomplished. A procedure consists of one or more sequential steps. Procedures are shown in maintenance, operation, or training</p>
----------------	---



manuals.”
 Maintenance tasks (scheduled or unscheduled) are rather listed in the Airworthiness Limitations Section (ALS), the Maintenance Review Board Report (MRBR), the Maintenance Planning Document (MPD), while procedures can be found typically in the Aircraft or Component Maintenance Manual (AMM/CMM), the Trouble Shooting Manual (TSM), the Structural Repair Manual (SRM), the Non-Destructive Testing Manual (NTM), etc...
 Therefore, the terms ‘critical maintenance task’ and ‘critical maintenance procedure’ are preferred to ‘flight safety sensitive task’.

response Accepted.

In line with Opinion No 06/2013, the term ‘flight safety sensitive task’ will be replaced by ‘critical task’ and the difference between task and procedure will be clarified.

Regarding the recommendations for ‘maintenance planning’, this is not related to any design approval holder maintenance data; it is more related to scheduling the different maintenance tasks depending on their length and complexity and sequencing those that need to consider HF principles.

comment 34 comment by: *NFLC, Cranfield University, UK*

AMC1 M.A.708(d) I see the sense in the intent of these comments but if the AMC material is treated as soft law, this will potentially be a significant amount of work which would not justify the benefit. I would suggest that this is Guidance Material so that Part M organisations can implement this as they see fit as appropriate to their organisations. I do not have any evidence of a safety problem or a risk associated with this which would justify the amount of effort involved to comply with this paragraph for every maintenance task.

Are the "maintenance documents" referred to in para a(3) the ones produced by the Part M, or does the Part M have to modify any documentation produced by the TC / STC holder (an enormous task).

The competent authority should be able to judge whether the documents used by a particular Part M / Part 145 / aircraft type combination are suitable without the need to specify this level of detail in AMC material.

response Noted.

This AMC is related to continuing airworthiness management where work orders and related maintenance documentation are provided by the CAMO, for example in the case of licensed air carriers. This relates in particular to all the items listed in point M.A.708(b). This does not apply to aircraft maintenance when owners/operators ensure themselves all continuing airworthiness tasks.

The reference to ‘maintenance documents’ in point (3) covers the documents generated by the CAMO on the basis of design approval holder data. With the exception of the maintenance programme, assessing the suitability of such documents is not within the remit of the competent authority.



comment	228	comment by: <i>Ryanair</i>
	<p>NPA 2013 –01 (B)</p> <p>AMC1 M.A.708(d) Ryanair believes that this AMC should be revised to be consistent with the requirements of GM1 145.A.71.</p> <p>Currently the AMC and the GM differ and Ryanair believes that the content of GM1 145.A.71 gives better guidance in designing technical documents in accordance with good human factors principles. Having two sets of guidelines would cause problems for organisations that have both Part 145 and Part M approvals</p> <p>Ryanair also proposes that existing technical documents written before a date to be defined should be acceptable in the format that they are currently written. Ryanair believes that an exercise to rewrite all documents would impose too large burden on an organisation.</p>	
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the response to comment #251.</p>	

comment	256	comment by: <i>Northern Aerotech</i>
	<p>AMC1 M.A.708(d) Northern Aerotech believes that this AMC should be revised to be consistent with the requirements of GM1 145.A.71.</p> <p>Currently the AMC and the GM differ and Northern Aerotech believes that the content of GM1 145.A.71 gives better guidance in designing technical documents in accordance with good human factors principles. Having two sets of guidelines would cause problems for organisations that have both Part 145 and Part M approvals</p> <p>Northern Aerotech also proposes that existing technical documents written before a date to be defined should be acceptable in the format that they are currently written. Northern Aerotech believes that an exercise to rewrite all documents would impose too large burden on an organisation.</p>	
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the response to comment #251.</p>	

comment	277	comment by: <i>UK CAA</i>
	<p>Page No: 96</p> <p>Paragraph No: AMC1 M.A.708 (d) (a) (2) (iii)</p> <p>Comment: UK CAA recommends that references to “line or base maintenance” contained in the text should be explained in the “Definitions” section, or cross referred to the definition given in AMC 145.A.10 (1)</p> <p>Justification: UK CAA believes that clarity is required in making the rule easier to use, and to give clear understanding of the intent and correct application of the paragraph. UK CAA also recommends that the use of a common “Definitions” section at the beginning of the document would make the rule easier to use, and give users a single place to refer to for explanations of terminology used throughout the rule.</p>	



Proposed Text: Add a reference in parenthesis after the words “line or base maintenance” as follows:
“(refer to AMC 145.A.10 (1) for the definition of line or base maintenance)”
 The above explanation can also be inserted in a common “Definitions” section at the beginning of the document.

response

Accepted.
 A reference will be added for base and line maintenance, as suggested, and a GM1 to Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 will be created to include all the definitions used in AMCs and GM (for Part-CAMO in Phase I, and for the other Parts in Phase II).

comment

104 comment by: Rega/Swiss Air-Ambulance

AMC1 M.A.708(d) Continuing airworthiness management:
 Human factors and human performance limitations:
 The human factors requirements are defined in too much detail. It should be much more open to the operator to define the training (persons to be trained, time, refresher, etc.). Experience shows that an initial training is important. However a human factors training every two years is reducing the awareness, which is counterproductive for this important subject.

response

Not accepted.
 If there is an acceptance that such training is needed, then the periodicity of refresher training is the same, no matter what the size or complexity of the organisation is, as the objective of continued competence remains the same.

comment

229 comment by: LHT

AMC1 M.A. 708 (d) Continuing airworthiness management:
 Duplicate inspections should be obligatory in case of an AAR only.

response

Noted.
 In line with Opinion No 06/2013, amending Regulation (EU) 2015/1536, the term ‘flight safety sensitive task’ will be replaced by ‘critical task’. Opinion No 06/2013, amending Regulation (EU) 2015/1536, defines new provisions for requiring a duplicate inspection. Defining when duplicate inspections should be required is outside the scope of task RMT.0251 (MDM.055).

comment

314 comment by: AEA

AMC1 M.A. 708 (d) Continuing airworthiness management:
 Duplicate inspections should be obligatory in case of an AAR only.



response Please refer to the response to comment #229.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — GM1 M.A. 708(d) Continuing airworthiness management

p. 94

comment 337 comment by: DGAC FRANCE

Delete GM. No reference to the ASD document that is not under aviation authorities review. If it is an example of good practise document, but leave the organisation decide to use it or not.

response Not accepted.

This reference is made in a GM, so no obligation is imposed on the organisation. Other good practice documents may be used.

comment 224 comment by: LHT

GM1 M.A.708 (d) Continuing airworthiness management:
What does ASD stand for? When will the document be attached?

response Noted.

ASD stands for [AeroSpace and Defence Industries Association of Europe](#).

The document is available at <http://www.asd-ste100.org/>.

comment 312 comment by: AEA

GM1 M.A.708 (d) Continuing airworthiness management:
What does ASD stand for? When will the document be attached?

response Please refer to the response to comment #224.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — Appendix IX to AMC1 M.A.708(c) Continuing airworthiness management

p. 94-95



comment	339	comment by: DGAC FRANCE
	<p>This matter about with industry management system standards such as ISO 9001 or EN 9110 shall be addressed in a specific NPA with consistency after an actual assessment of the need. Remove form this NPA.</p>	
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The use of industry management system standards is directly relevant to the subject matter addressed by this rulemaking task and are closely linked with the new management system/compliance monitoring provisions proposed. Processing these changes through a separate rulemaking task would not allow analysing them in the context of the introduction of the new management system framework.</p> <p>Any changes proposing full credits or direct acceptance of industry standards would indeed require a new rulemaking task. However, none of the proposed provisions aims for direct acceptance of or full credit for such certificates; the changes proposed cater for possible consideration of industry certification schemes to ensure most effective use of compliance monitoring and oversight resources.</p>	

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — M.A.709**Documentation**

p. 96

comment	418	comment by: Airbus
	<p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: Point M.A.710 AMC M.A.710</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: – It is proposed to modify point M.A.710 to read: “(a) To satisfy the requirement for the airworthiness review of an aircraft referred to in point M.A.901, a full documented review of the aircraft records shall be carried out by the approved continuing airworthiness management organisation in order to be satisfied that: [...] 8. all maintenance has been released in accordance with Annex I (Part M) this Regulation; and [...] (b) The airworthiness review staff of the approved continuing airworthiness management organisation shall carry out a physical survey inspection of the aircraft. For this survey inspection, airworthiness review staff not appropriately qualified to Annex III (Part-66) shall be assisted by such qualified personnel. (c) Through the physical survey inspection of the aircraft, the airworthiness review staff shall ensure that: [...] (h) The airworthiness review shall be completed within 15 consecutive days. (i) Should the outcome of the airworthiness review be inconclusive as a result of level 1</p>	



findings, the competent authority shall be informed as soon as practicable but in any case within 72 hours of the organisation identifying the condition to which the review relates.”

– It is proposed to modify AMC M.A.710(a), re-identified AMC1 M.A.710(b), to read:

“1. A full documented review is a check of at least the following categories of documents:

– [...]

– modification and SB status

– modification and repair approval sheets

– production concessions and deviations approved by the competent authority

– [...]

As a minimum, sample checks within each document category should be carried out.

2. [...].”

– It is proposed to modify AMC M.A.710(b) and (c), re-identified AMC1 M.A.710(b) and (c), to read:

“1. The physical ~~survey inspection~~ could require actions categorised as maintenance (e.g. operational tests, tests of emergency equipment, visual inspections requiring panel opening etc.). In this case, after the airworthiness review a release to service should be issued in accordance with Part-M this Regulation.

When the airworthiness review staff are not appropriately qualified to Part-66 in order to release such maintenance, M.A.710(b) requires them to be assisted by such qualified personnel.

However, the function of such Part-66 personnel is limited to perform and release the maintenance actions requested by the airworthiness review staff, it not being their function to perform the physical ~~survey inspection~~ of the aircraft. As stated in M.A.710(b), the airworthiness review staff shall carry out the physical ~~survey inspection~~ of the aircraft, and this ~~survey inspection~~ includes the verification that no inconsistencies can be found between the aircraft and the documented review of records.

This means that the airworthiness review staff who are going to sign the airworthiness review certificate or the recommendation should be the one performing both the documented review and the physical ~~survey inspection~~ of the aircraft, it not being the intent of the rule to delegate the ~~survey inspection~~ to Part-66 personnel who are not airworthiness review staff. Furthermore, the provision of M.A.710(d) allowing a 90 days anticipation for the physical ~~survey inspection~~ provides enough flexibility to ensure that the airworthiness review staff are present.

2. The physical ~~survey inspection~~ may include verifications to be carried out during flight.

3. The M.A. Subpart G organisation should develop procedures for the airworthiness review staff to produce a compliance report that confirms the physical ~~survey inspection~~ has been carried out and found satisfactory.

4. To ensure compliance the physical ~~survey inspection~~ may include relevant sample checks of items.”

– It is proposed to modify AMC M.A.710(e), re-identified AMC1 M.A.710(e), to read:

“A copy of both physical ~~survey inspection~~ and document review compliance reports stated above should be sent to the competent authority together with any recommendation issued.”

– It is proposed to create a new AMC1 M.A.710(g) to read:

“An airworthiness review of the aircraft and its continuing airworthiness records is an indivisible assessment. In other words, an individual task or group of tasks of an airworthiness review cannot be subcontracted. However, nothing prevents a continuing airworthiness management organisation to subcontract a whole airworthiness review of the aircraft and its continuing airworthiness records to another organisation approved to carry out such airworthiness reviews.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:



Concerning point M.A.710(a), item 8. is modified to take into account that the release to service can also be issued by an organisation approved under Part-145.

The effectiveness of an airworthiness review (i.e. a spot check) cannot be guaranteed if the review is lasting too long. Therefore, a limit is proposed in point M.A.710(h). Beyond this limit, a new airworthiness review should be required.

With regard to the point M.A.710(i), experience shows that when the airworthiness review is inconclusive, most of the time the aircraft operation is temporarily discontinued to solve the issues, whether the report is sent or not to the competent authority within 72 hours. Therefore, it is believed that the report could be sent to the competent authority within 72 hours only in case of level 1 findings.

Note: the report is still sent to the authority in any case (level 1 or 2 findings, or nil finding), but not within 72 hours when level 2 findings or no findings are identified.

The term survey in this context may be misunderstood. Inspection is found more appropriate and the term survey is kept in the context of the safety management system. Definitions should be consolidated in an AMC or a GM. Refer to [Comment No 74](#).

In the AMC1 M.A.710(b), production concessions and deviations approved by the competent authority are added to the list because experience shows that they are frequently omitted from airworthiness reviews.

Note: MDM.076 outputs (KREs) should be taken into account for sample checks.

The comment on AMC1 M.A.710(g) aims at clarifying what a management system may or may not do with regard to airworthiness review subcontracting.

response

Not accepted.

Amending M.A.710 is outside the scope of this rulemaking task. The change proposed will be assessed as part of rulemaking task RMT.0521 & RMT.0522 'Airworthiness review process'.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — GM1
M.A.709(b) Documentation

p. 96-97

comment 417

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 96/218, section B., GM M.A.709

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

The AMC M.A.709 has been downgraded to the level of guidance material. Some of its contents give a means to comply with M.A.709. It is proposed to re-identify GM1 M.A.709(b) into AMC1 M.A.709(b).

The AMC1 M.A.709(b) gives the impression that a maintenance programme contains only scheduled maintenance tasks. It is therefore proposed to modify AMC1 M.A.709(b) to read:

“‘Baseline’ maintenance programme: it is a maintenance programme developed for a particular aircraft type that includes a maintenance schedule generated following, where applicable, the maintenance review board (MRB) report, the type certificate holder’s maintenance planning document (MPD), the relevant chapters of the maintenance



	<p>manual or any other maintenance data containing information on scheduling. [...] However, this does not mean that this adaptation must be performed for each contracted aircraft registration. The reason is that tThe customer may already have an approved aircraft maintenance programme, which in that case should be used by the continuing airworthiness management organisation to manage the continuing airworthiness of such aircraft. [...]"</p> <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION: For example, “[...] the baseline or generic maintenance programme, as applicable, may be used to establish the M.A.302 aircraft maintenance programme [...]” is an acceptable means of compliance. On the basis of M.A.201(a)(4) requirements, the AMC1 M.A.709(b) should stress that the <u>maintenance schedule is not the only constituent of the aircraft maintenance programme.</u> Refer to <u>Comment No. 9.</u></p>
response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>The GM will be changed back to AMC (now AMC1 CAMO.A.325). GM1 M.A.709(b) is not maintained as there will be no more requirement for generic or baseline maintenance programmes included in Part-CAMO.</p>

<p>SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — M.A.711 Privileges of the organisation</p>	<p>p. 97</p>
--	--------------

comment	<p>419 comment by: Airbus</p> <p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: NPA 2013-01(B), page 97/218, section B., point M.A.711 & GM</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The paragraph (a)(3) refers to subcontracting of “limited continuing airworthiness tasks”. What is the limit to subcontracting continuing airworthiness tasks? It is proposed that the Agency develops an AMC on this matter. – It is proposed to modify the paragraph (c) of point M.A.711 to read: “(c) A continuing airworthiness management organisation whose approval includes the privileges referred to in point M.A.711(b) may additionally be approved to issue a permit to fly in accordance with Part 21.A.711(d) of the Annex (Part-21) to Regulation (EU) No 748/2012 for the particular aircraft for which the organisation is approved to issue the airworthiness review certificate, when the continuing airworthiness management organisation is attesting conformity with approved flight conditions, subject to an adequate approved procedure in the exposition referred to in point M.A.704.” – It is proposed to modify the paragraph (a) of GM1 M.A.711(b) to read: “(a) An organisation may be approved for the privileges of M.A.711(a) only, without the privilege to carry out airworthiness reviews. This An airworthiness review can be contracted to another appropriately approved organisation. In such a case, it is not mandatory that the contracted organisation is linked to an AOC holder, being possible to
---------	---



contract an appropriately approved independent continuing airworthiness management organisation which is approved for the same aircraft type.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:
 The AMC to M.A.711(a)(3) will prevent possible extensive interpretation of this requirement.
 Editorial change in paragraph (c) is in line with changes in paragraph references introduced in Regulation (EU) No 748/2012.
 The change in the paragraph (a) of GM1 M.A.711(b) aims at clarifying what can be contracted.

response Partially accepted.

The need to clarify subcontracting of ‘limited continuing airworthiness tasks’ will be assessed when finalising the AMC and GM to Part-CAMO (Phase I).

The second part of the comment (editorial changes) is accepted.

comment 315 comment by: AEA

GM 1 M.A.711 (b) Privileges of the organisation:
 Where is the added value regarding the replacement of "quality management" by "management system"?

response Please refer to the response to comment #223.

comment 225 comment by: LHT

GM 1 M.A.711 (b) Privileges of the organisation:
 Where is the added value regarding the replacement of "quality management" by "management system"?

response Please refer to the response to comment #223.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — M.A.712 p. 98-99
Management Quality system

comment 115 comment by: CAA-NL

M.A.712(a)(4)
 Personal should be maintained trained and competent for ‘all their tasks’ not only for



response their safety management related tasks.

Accepted.

This specification was considered necessary as the structure of Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 is different from that of Part-ORO. In particular, Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 has specific and detailed provisions in relation to personnel requirements. However, the comment is accepted and consistency will be restored by aligning M.A.712(a)(4) (now CAMO.A.200(a)(4)) with the text of Part-ORO.

comment 116 comment by: CAA-NL

We propose a New GM for M.A.712(a)

Some guidance may be helpful for the method of evaluation of the effectiveness of safety management processes and the various elements of the management system. Having a reference or a starting point for the evaluation of the effectiveness of safety management processes is very important and helpful for both the industry and the competent authorities.

The Safety Management International Collaboration Group produced a SMS evaluation tool which could be identified as a reference for that purpose. The evaluation tool can be found on internet: [SKYbrary - SM ICG SMS Evaluation Tool](#)

With this guidance a common standard and reference and can be ensured the maturity level of implementation of safety management in organisations can be increased.

response Noted.

Guidance for authorities to assess SMS will be provided by the EASA Rulemaking Advisory Group (RAG) working group which is developing a cross-domain SMS assessment methodology and tool. This work is based on the SM ICG SMS Evaluation Tool.

First results should be available in June 2016.

comment 181 comment by: Baines Simmons Limited

M.A.712 Management System

The renaming of M.A.712 from Quality System to “Management System” implies that the “Quality System” requirements have been superseded by the “Management System” requirements, when in reality the “Quality System” has only been renamed as the “Compliance Monitoring Function”, of the broader “Management System”.

We feel this will cause significant confusion between the various contributors and enablers to safety management, and the terms used to describe these.

Hence we suggest that the Management System requirements should have a dedicated paragraph, separate from the Compliance Monitoring requirements (which are fundamentally the former “quality assurance” activity requirements, renamed Compliance Monitoring).

This is consistent with a reorganisation of the rule structure into the “horizontal” structure, separating organisation and technical requirements.



response

Noted.

The new management system provisions build upon those elements that are already in place today in most organisations approved within the scope of Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014, i.e. the quality-system-related provisions that deliver the 'compliance monitoring function' of the new management system requirements, while adding new provisions related to safety policy, safety management, communication and training, etc. Monitoring compliance through requirements is an important element of the new management system provisions and it should not be dealt with as a separate item.

The way the management system requirements have been designed aims to provide maximum flexibility to organisations to decide how to embed these in their existing management system and to determine the most suitable organisational set-up allowing to manage all functions required by the amended requirements. This is why the opinion proposes to embed the safety-management-related and compliance-monitoring-related functions into a set of general management system provisions.

This new management system framework is aligned with existing provisions in the areas of aircrew and air operations (see ORA.GEN.200 of Regulation (EU) No 290/2012 and ORO.GEN.200 of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012).

comment

212

comment by: *British Gliding Association*

British Gliding Association

M.A.712 Management system (a) (5)

How can anyone be expected to keep a regulation up to date when EASA publish a document, then several amending documents each to be read separately. Please only publish consolidated versions.

response

Noted.

EASA is legally obliged to first publish the official amending documents. So, these will always be published first. However, EASA has already started on working to improve the situation as regards the publication of consolidated versions. For example, EASA has already published consolidated versions of the Aircrew and Air Operations Regulations as well as a reference guide for licences and ratings (see [regulations webpage](#), first click on the blue bar 'Aircrew', and then on the current last link 'Consolidated version (provided by EASA)'). For Air OPS, consolidated versions of the [AMC&GM](#) have also been published during February 2015.

In addition to the rules documents, please consult the General Aviation webpages for further useful information. For example, you will be able to find leaflets in PDF format on the [GA Roadmap webpage](#). These leaflets provide useful information on [Pilot Licences & Ratings](#), Maintenance, Safety Analysis, and other themes.

comment

271

comment by: *AIR FRANCE*

AFR Comments : Safety and Quality System are well known and understood by the relevant Part M/G personnel, we suggest to replace the term "Management System" by a



response more adequate/understable term as for example "Compliance and Safety Management System".

response Not accepted.

This new management system framework is fully aligned with existing provisions in the areas of aircrew and air operations (see ORA.GEN.200 of Regulation (EU) No 290/2012 and ORO.GEN.200 of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012). It is important to ensure consistency with these provisions, in particular for organisations holding multiple certificates.

Organisations may refer to the system using different terminology.

comment 296 comment by: AEA

Page 98 - Management system

(a) The organisation shall establish, implement, and maintain a management system that includes:

(1)

(4) maintaining personnel trained and competent to perform their safety **management related duties** and tasks;

These words "management related duties" are not mentioned in ORO.GEN.200. This deviation could cause confusion. It is recommended to either:

- align the ORO regulations and Part M regulations, or
- refer from the Part M regulations to the applicable ORO regulation to avoid deviations.

response Accepted.

This specification was considered necessary as the structure of Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 is different from that of Part-ORO. In particular, Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 has specific and detailed provisions in relation to personnel requirements. However, the comment is accepted and consistency will be restored by aligning point (a)(4) with the text of Part-ORO.

comment 67 comment by: KLM Engineering & Maintenance

Page 98 - Management system

(a) The organisation shall establish, implement, and maintain a management system that includes:

(1)

(4) maintaining personnel trained and competent to perform their safety **management related duties** and tasks;



	<p>These words “management related duties” are not mentioned in ORO.GEN.200. This deviation could cause confusion. It is recommended to either: - align the ORO regulations and Part M regulations, or - refer form the Part M regulations to the applicable ORO regulation to avoid deviations.</p>
<p>response</p>	<p>Accepted. Please refer to the response to comment #296.</p>

<p>comment</p>	<p>133 comment by: EUROPEAN AVIATION QUALITY GROUP (EAQG)</p> <p>Comment: 1. In page 21, it is said that ‘Quality System’ has been replaced by ‘compliance monitoring function’ throughout the text. In the M.A.712, the “quality system” is changed into a “management system” safety oriented that includes a “compliance monitoring function” It is proposed instead to move from a “quality system” to a “Quality Management System” covering safety management and quality management that includes a quality assurance system equivalent to the compliance monitoring system. EN9110 Management Review principles is deemed to meet the intent of safety annual review (AMC1 M.A.712(a)(3)(f)(4) page 103) and half yearly reviews (AMC1 M.A.712(a)(6)(k)(1)(2) page 110). 2. ‘Quality Manager’ has been replaced by ‘compliance monitoring manager’. It gives the impression that the function is only linked to audits. It is proposed to replace Quality Manager by Quality assurance manager</p>
----------------	---

<p>response</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The new management system provisions build upon those elements that are already in place today in most organisations approved within the scope of Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014, i.e. the ‘quality-system-related’ provisions that actually only deliver the ‘compliance monitoring function’ of the new management system requirements. New provisions related to safety management are added. Monitoring compliance through requirements remains an important element of the new management system provisions and it should not be dealt with as a separate item.</p> <p>The way the management system requirements have been designed aims to provide maximum flexibility to organisations to decide how to embed these in their existing management system and to determine the most suitable organisational set-up allowing to manage all functions required by the amended Part-M rules and considering where applicable the existing management system and existing certificates, such as EN9110. This is why the NPA proposes to embed all safety-management-related functions into the general management system provisions.</p> <p>This new management system framework is aligned with existing provisions in the areas of aircrew and air operations (see ORA.GEN.200 of Regulation (EU) No 290/2012 and ORO.GEN.200 of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012). It is important to ensure overall consistency, in particular for organisations holding more than one certificate.</p> <p>Organisations may refer to the different functions using their own terminology, as long as they can demonstrate the correspondence between these and the functions required by</p>
-----------------	--



Part-CAMO.

comment 230 comment by: LHT

M.A.712 Management system
See relevant LHT comments regarding equivalent chapter of NPA 2013-01 (C) Part-145

response Noted.

The changes proposed in NPA 2013-01(C) will also be considered for the related opinion as far as practicable. The need for further consistency changes will be assessed in Phase II.

comment 316 comment by: AEA

M.A.712 Management system
See relevant LHT comments regarding equivalent chapter of NPA 2013-01 (C) Part-145

response Noted.

The changes proposed in NPA 2013-01(C) will also be considered for the related opinion as far as practicable. The need for further consistency changes will be assessed in Phase II.

comment 132 comment by: EUROPEAN AVIATION QUALITY GROUP (EAQG)

Comment:
In the same spirit than the specific provision at AMC M.A.616 level introducing the EN9110 industry standard for Subpart F maintenance organisations, it is proposed to introduce this standard at AMC M.A.712 level for Subpart G continuing airworthiness management organisations.
Proposed New Text:

AMC2 M.A.712(a) Management system:
For approved continuing airworthiness management organisations, a Management system certified in accordance with an industry standard, such as the EN 9110 and the associated IAQG Industry Controlled Other Party (ICOP) scheme, is deemed to meet the intent of M.A.712 (a), providing the frequency of audit programme under the EN 9110 does not exceed 24 months.
The frequency of Management Reviews should not exceed 6 months.
Provided that there are no safety related findings, the audit planning cycle specified in this AMC may be increased by up to 50% subject to an appropriate risk assessment and agreement by the competent authority.



response

Noted.

The comment will be considered when finalising the AMCs and GM to Part-CAMO (Phase I). As the primary focus of EN9110 is maintenance and not continuing airworthiness management, the comment may be more relevant to Part-145. Also, considering that the EN9100 series standards are currently being reviewed, in particular as regards the introduction of the concept of risk-based thinking, it is proposed to reassess the proposal both for Part-CAMO and Part-145 organisations in Phase II.

In the meantime, a cross-reference table showing the common elements in the new EN9110 standard and Part-CAMO (Part-145) should be provided.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1**M.A.712(a)(1);(2);(3);(5) Management system**

p. 99-100

comment

154

comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department
(Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

· **AMC1 M.A.712(a)(1);(2);(3);(5)**

Editorial?

Point (c) mention the safety manager is responsible for the “**safety management system**”. Shouldn’t it be “**safety management related processes and tasks**” as in AMC1 M.A.616(a)?

response

Accepted.

The text will be amended as indicated in this comment. This change will also be reflected in Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012 through the next AR/OR follow-up rulemaking tasks.

comment

340

comment by: *DGAC FRANCE*

a subparagraph :

Such a general sentence cannot be called an AMC. It is just an GM ! Because it is not clear what are the various tools and to determine what is acceptable, it's even written with a « may ». Rename this AMC as a GM ! This is just a « rewriting » of the IR, but without any concrete « means of compliance ».

response

Not accepted.

The Focused Consultation Group recommended reviewing the set of AMCs and GM to M.A.712 (now AMCs and GM to CAMO.A.200) to include only one set of AMCs and GM for all organisations. This means that AMC1 M.A.712(a)(1);(2);(3);(5) ‘Management system (non-complex organisations)’ will not be maintained.



SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1 p. 99-100
M.A.712(a)(1) Management system

comment 242 comment by: Thomson Airways

Paragraph (c) states that the SRB should be composed of the persons nominated in accordance with M.A.706(c) (d). In large commercial operators that will hold a single SMS approval this will not be practical.
 A tiered system of accountability should be introduced through the feeder safety action groups. EASA need to clarify this requirement

response Accepted.

As stated in M.A.712(d) (now CAMO.A.220(d)), in the case of CAT the M.A. Subpart G management system shall be an integral part of the operator’s management system. The AMC will be amended to reflect the text as in Part-ORO, where reference is made to ‘heads of functional areas’. This term is considered more appropriate for the case an organisation holds more than one approval (e.g. Part-M/G and AOC or Part-M/G and ATO) as it may determine who is to be considered head of functional area.
 In addition, GM will be added to clarify how an integrated management system could be implemented and what this would mean in terms of Safety Review Board composition.

comment 68 comment by: KLM Engineering & Maintenance

AMC1 M.A. 712(a)(1) Management system
 Point (b) The functions of the safety manager should be to:
 (1) facilitate hazard identification, risk analysis and management -> replace for: **Ensure the facilitation** of hazard identification, risk analysis and management
 (4) ensure **maintenance** of safety management documentation-> replace for: **Ensure continues improvement** of safety management documentation
 Point (d) The safety review board should ensure that appropriate resources are allocated to achieve the established safety performance, **eventually by recommending the establishment of one or more safety action groups.**
These words “eventually.....groups” are not mentioned in AMC1 ORO.GEN.200(a)(1). This deviation could cause confusion. It is recommended to either:
 - align the ORO regulations and Part M regulations, or
 - refer form the Part M regulations to the applicable ORO regulation to avoid deviations.

response Partially accepted.

The changes proposed to points (b)(1) and (4) are not accepted; they would create a difference with the text in Part-ORO. Moreover, the concept of ‘continual improvement’



primarily applies to the management system, not to documentation.
 The change proposed to point (d) is accepted; the text will be aligned with that in Part-ORO.

comment

284

comment by: AEA

AMC1 M.A. 712(a)(1) Management system
 Point (b) The functions of the safety manager should be to:
 (1) facilitate hazard identification, risk analysis and management -> replace for: **Ensure the facilitation** of hazard identification, risk analysis and management
 (4) ensure **maintenance** of safety management documentation-> replace for: **Ensure continues improvement** of safety management documentation
 Point (d) The safety review board should ensure that appropriate resources are allocated to achieve the established safety performance, **eventually by recommending the establishment of one or more safety action groups.**
 These words “eventually.....groups” are not mentioned in AMC1 ORO.GEN.200(a)(1). This deviation could cause confusion. It is recommended to either:
 - align the ORO regulations and Part M regulations, or
 - refer form the Part M regulations to the applicable ORO regulation to avoid deviations.

response

Partially accepted.
 Please refer to the response to comment #284.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — GM1 p. 101
M.A.712(a)(1) Management system

comment

155

comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

GM1 M.A.712(a)(1)(a)
 Editorial.
 Refers to “AMC1 M.A.712(a)(1) point 2”.
 Should be “AMC1 M.A.712(a)(1) point b”.

response

Accepted.
 The reference will be corrected to read ‘AMC1 M.A.712(a)(1) point (b)’ (now AMC1 CAMO.A.200(a)(1) point (b)).



comment 287

comment by: AEA

GM1 M.A. 712(a)(1) Management system

Point (a) Depending on the size of the organisation and the nature and complexity of its activities, the safety manager may be assisted by additional safety personnel for the performance of all allocated safety management tasks as defined in AMC1 M.A.712(a)(1) point 2

-> replace for: Depending on the size of the organisation and the nature and complexity of its activities, the safety manager may be assisted by additional safety personnel for the performance of all allocated safety management tasks as defined in AMC1 M.A.712(a)(1) point (b) (?)

Point (b): Regardless of the organisational set-up, it is important that the safety manager remains the unique focal point as regards the development, administration, and maintenance of the organisation’s management system as related to safety.

These words “as related to safety” are not mentioned in GM1 ORO.GEN.200(a)(1). This deviation could cause confusion. It is recommended to either:
 - align the ORO regulations and Part M regulations, or
 - refer from the Part M regulations to the applicable ORO regulation to avoid deviations.

response Accepted.

The reference will be corrected to read ‘AMC1 M.A.712(a)(1) point (b)’ (now AMC1 CAMO.A.200(a)(1) point (b)).

The text will be aligned with that in Part-ORO. Please refer also to the response to comment #296.

comment 69

comment by: KLM Engineering & Maintenance

GM1 M.A. 712(a)(1) Management system

Point (a) Depending on the size of the organisation and the nature and complexity of its activities, the safety manager may be assisted by additional safety personnel for the performance of all allocated safety management tasks as defined in AMC1 M.A.712(a)(1) point 2

-> replace for: Depending on the size of the organisation and the nature and complexity of its activities, the safety manager may be assisted by additional safety personnel for the performance of all allocated safety management tasks as defined in AMC1 M.A.712(a)(1) point (b) (?)

Point (b): Regardless of the organisational set-up, it is important that the safety manager remains the unique focal point as regards the development, administration, and maintenance of the organisation’s management system as related to safety.

These words “as related to safety” are not mentioned in GM1 ORO.GEN.200(a)(1). This deviation could cause confusion. It is recommended to either:
 - align the ORO regulations and Part M regulations, or



	- refer form the Part M regulations to the applicable ORO regulation to avoid deviations.
response	Please refer to the response to comment #287.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — GM2 p. 101
M.A.712(a)(1) Management system

comment	343		comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i>
		<p>We can be surprised to find in a GM, a new concept. So as a summary, the IR asks for the safety management. The AMC calls for a safety review board (at high level) and the GM asks for a safety action group !</p> <p>We really suggest to keep it simple and remove all these paragraphs. The safety manager, based on the size of organisation and available ressources will organise the safety management process as necessary. It's his responsibility and he is supposed to be competent.</p> <p>Therefore, delete SAG. Move items, if relevant, under a new GM dealing with tasks assigned to the safety manager. That will help him decide how to comply with the IR.</p>	
response		<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>This new management system framework and related AMCs & GM are aligned with existing provisions in the areas of aircrew and air operations (see ORA.GEN.200 of Regulation (EU) No 290/2012 and ORO.GEN.200 of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012). It is important to ensure consistency, in particular for organisations holding more than one certificate.</p> <p>Therefore, the GM on Safety Action Group will be maintained. This is in line with the recommendations made by the Focused Consultation Group.</p>	

comment	426		comment by: <i>Airbus</i>
		<p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: NPA 2013-01(B), page 101, section B., GM2 M.A.712(a)(1) NPA 2013-01(C), page 96, section B., GM2 145.A.65(a)(1)</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: – It is proposed to modify the GM2 M.A.712(a)(1) to read: “COMPLEX ORGANISATIONS - SAFETY ACTION GROUP (a) A safety action group may be established as a standing group or as an ad hoc group to assist, or act on behalf of the safety manager or safety review board. (b) More than one safety action group may be established depending on the scope of the</p>	



task, and specific expertise required.

(c) The safety action group should report to, and take strategic direction from the safety review board, and should be comprised of managers, and continuing airworthiness management personnel.

(d) The safety action group may be tasked with:

- (1) monitoring safety performance;
- (2) resolving/defining mitigation strategies against the identified safety risks of the consequences of hazards;
- (3) assessing the impact on safety of organisational changes; and
- (4) ensuring that safety actions are implemented within agreed timescales.

(e) The safety action group may also be tasked with the review the effectiveness of previous safety actions and safety promotion.”

– It is proposed to modify the GM2 145.A.65(a)(1) to read:

“SAFETY ACTION GROUP

(a) A safety action group may be established as a standing group or as an ad hoc group to assist, or act on behalf of the safety manager or safety review board.

(b) More than one safety action group may be established depending on the scope of the task and specific expertise required.

(c) The safety action group should report to, and take strategic direction from the safety review board, and should be comprised of managers, supervisors, and maintenance personnel.

(d) The safety action group may be tasked with:

- (1) monitoring safety performance;
- (2) resolving/defining mitigation strategies against the identified safety risks of the consequences of hazards;
- (3) assessing the impact on safety of organisational changes; and
- (4) ensuring that safety actions are implemented within agreed timescales.

(e) The safety action group may also be tasked with the review the effectiveness of previous safety actions and safety promotion.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

It is believed that the role of the safety action group is rather to define mitigation strategies than “resolving” risks. In any case, the term “resolving” is ambiguous as it is not clear whether reference is made to the definition of mitigation strategies or to the deployment of such strategies.

response

Accepted.
The text will be amended as proposed.

comment

99

comment by: Rega/Swiss Air-Ambulance

GM2 M.A.712(a)(1) Management system, para. (c):
The composition of the SAG should be left open to the operator and its organization (as defined by ICAO). Therefore the requirement for participation of continuing airworthiness management personnel should be deleted. If the CAMO is part of the SAG other organizations (Part-145, Part-21, Air Operations, Air Crew) should also be represented and this is counterproductive to the tasks of the SAG. The SAG should be lean and composed only of a small group. In addition there should be a clear distinction between the Safety



response Action Group (SAG) and the Safety Review Board (SRB).
 Accepted.
 The text will be restored to align it with the GM to Part-ORA/-ORO, i.e. the reference to continuing airworthiness management personnel will be deleted.
 It should be noted that as this is GM only (not a requirement), there is no requirement to have a Safety Action Group. Organisations may determine the need for and composition of the Safety Action Group as they see fit.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — GM1 p. 101
M.A.712(a)(2) Management system

comment 70 comment by: *KLM Engineering & Maintenance*

GM1 M.A. 712(a)(2) Management system

SAFETY POLICY
 The safety policy is the means whereby the organisation states its intention to maintain and, where practicable, improve safety levels in all its activities and to minimise its contribution to the risk of an aircraft accident or serious incident as far as it is reasonably practicable.

It reflects the management’s commitment to safety and should reflect the organisations philosophy of safety management and become the foundation on which the organisation’s management system is built. It serves as a reminder as to ‘how we do business here’. The creation of a positive safety culture begins with the issuance of a clear, unequivocal direction.

The safety policy should state that the purpose of internal safety reporting, and internal safety investigations is to improve safety, not to apportion blame to individuals. These yellow high-lighted sentences/words are not mentioned in GM1 ORO.GEN.200(a)(2). This deviation could cause confusion. It is recommended to either:
 - align the ORO regulations and Part M regulations, or
 - refer form the Part M regulations to the applicable ORO regulation to avoid deviations

response Accepted.
 The text will be amended as proposed to remain aligned with ORO.GEN.200 GM.

comment 286 comment by: *AEA*



GM1 M.A. 712(a)(2) Management system

SAFETY POLICY

The safety policy is the means whereby the organisation states its intention to maintain and, where practicable, improve safety levels in all its activities and to minimise its contribution to the risk of an aircraft accident **or serious incident** as far as it is reasonably practicable.

It reflects the management’s commitment to safety and should reflect the organisations philosophy of safety management and become the foundation on which the organisation’s management system is built. It serves as a reminder as to ‘how we do business here’. The creation of a positive safety culture begins with the issuance of a clear, unequivocal direction.

The safety policy should state that the purpose of internal safety reporting, and internal safety investigations is to improve safety, not to apportion blame to individuals. These yellow high-lighted sentences/words are not mentioned in GM1 ORO.GEN.200(a)(2). This deviation could cause confusion. It is recommended to either:
 - align the ORO regulations and Part M regulations, or
 - refer form the Part M regulations to the applicable ORO regulation to avoid deviations

response

Please refer to the response to comment #70 above.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.A.712(a)(3) Management system	p. 100
--	--------

comment

2

comment by: *Stefan Stroeker*

Ladies and Gentlemen,
 referring AMC1 M.A.712(a)(3) Item (g)(2) it should be added
 (v) description of emergency training/drill
 ERP cannot work without a suitable staff training and involvment.
 An alarm drill and a kind of 'Input-Response' (e.g. realistic scenario with involvment of all interfaces; debriefing) drill should be carried out in an appropriate time interval.
 With kind regards
 Stefan Ströker
 - STROEK AIR -

response

Noted.
 Please refer to the response to comment #6.



comment	73	comment by: <i>KLM Engineering & Maintenance</i>
	<p><i>AMC1 M.A. 712(a)(3) Management system</i> Point (e) The management of change The organisation should manage safety risks related to a change. The management of change should be a documented process to identify external and internal change that may have an adverse effect on safety. It should make use of the organisation’s existing hazard identification, risk assessment and mitigation processes</p> <p>-> request for clarification: What is meant by “change” / what is the EASA definition of “change”? (e.g. SB receipt from OEM’s; is this also considered as a change, thus requiring a hazard identification and risk assessment for every single SB issue? Or is it considered that the hazard identification and risk assessment is already performed by OEM prior the SB issue?)</p>	
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the response to comment #297.</p>	

comment	74	comment by: <i>KLM Engineering & Maintenance</i>
	<p><i>AMC1 M.A. 712(a)(3) Management system</i> (f) Continual improvement The organisation should continually seek to improve its safety performance. Continual improvement should be achieved through: (1) proactive and reactive evaluations of facilities, equipment, documentation, and procedures through safety audits and surveys; (2) proactive evaluation of individuals’ performance to verify the fulfilment of their safety responsibilities; (3) reactive evaluations in order to verify the effectiveness of the system for control and mitigation of risk; and (4) an annual review of the safety performance and the effectiveness of the management system.</p> <p>1) In AMC1 ORO.GEN.200(a)(3) this requirement is called “continuous improvement” i.s.o. continual improvement. Subsequently the word continuously is used i.s.o. continually. 2) These yellow high-lighted sentences/words are not mentioned in AMC1 ORO.GEN.200(a)(3). This deviation could cause confusion. It is recommended to either: - align the ORO regulations and Part M regulations, or - refer form the Part M regulations to the applicable ORO regulation to avoid deviations</p>	
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the response to comment #297.</p>	



comment	<p>75 comment by: <i>KLM Engineering & Maintenance</i></p> <p><i>AMC1 M.A. 712(a)(3) Management system</i> (g) Emergency response planning (1) An Emergency Response Plan (ERP) should be established that provides the actions to be taken by the organisation, or specified individuals in an emergency. The ERP should reflect the size, nature, and complexity of the organisation’s scope of work. (2) The ERP should ensure: (i) planned and coordinated action to ensure the risks attributable to a major safety event can be managed and minimised; These yellow high-lighted sentence is not mentioned in AMC1 ORO.GEN.200(a)(3). This deviation could cause confusion. It is recommended to either: - align the ORO regulations and Part M regulations, or - refer form the Part M regulations to the applicable ORO regulation to avoid deviations</p>
response	<p>Noted. Please refer to the response to comment #297.</p>
comment	<p>100 comment by: <i>Rega/Swiss Air-Ambulance</i></p> <p><i>AMC1 M.A.712(a)(3) Management system, para. (f)(2) proactive evaluation of individuals’ performance:</i> Is a very theoretical statement for a CAMO and should therefore deleted (over regulation)</p>
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The AMC suggests that performance evaluation should be an important element of continual improvement. Most companies have such performance evaluation schemes in place in order to determine the need for recurrent training or for other purposes. Such schemes should also focus on safety responsibilities.</p> <p>This new management system framework and related AMCs & GM are based on existing provisions in the areas of aircrew and air operations (see ORA.GEN.200 of Regulation (EU) No 290/2012 and ORO.GEN.200 of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012). These provisions have been defined with the participation of industry and NAAs through Rulemaking Group/Review Group OPS.001/FCL.001 and is the result of lengthy consultation with stakeholders.</p>
comment	<p>289 comment by: <i>AEA</i></p> <p><i>AMC1 M.A. 712(a)(3) Management system</i> (c) Internal occurrence investigation The scope of internal occurrence investigations should extend beyond the scope of the external occurrence reporting in accordance with M.A.202. These yellow high-lighted word is called safety (safety investigation i.s.o. occurrence investigation) in AMC1 ORO.GEN.200(a)(3). This deviation could cause confusion. It is</p>



response	<p>recommended to either: - align the ORO regulations and Part M regulations, or - refer form the Part M regulations to the applicable ORO regulation to avoid deviations</p> <p>(d) Safety performance monitoring and measurement (1) Safety performance monitoring and measurement should be the process by which the organisation’s safety performance is verified in comparison to its safety policy and objectives. (2) This process may include, as appropriate to the size, nature and complexity of the organisation: In AMC1 ORO.GEN.200(a)(3) this process also includes a sub-item “safety studies, that is, rather large analysis encompassing broad safety concerns”. This process towards safety studies is not mentioned in <i>AMC1 M.A. 712(a)(3) Management system</i> . This deviation could cause confusion. It is recommended to either: - align the ORO regulations and Part M regulations, or - refer form the Part M regulations to the applicable ORO regulation to avoid deviations</p> <p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>The text in point (c) will be aligned with that of Part-ORO.</p> <p>The reference to safety studies in point (d)(2) is deleted as it is considered to be too burdensome and not appropriate for CAMOs. This change will also be proposed for the next amendments to the AMCs to Part-ORA and Part-ORO.</p>
----------	--

comment	<p>297 comment by: AEA</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p><i>AMC1 M.A. 712(a)(3) Management system</i> d) Safety performance monitoring and measurement (1) Safety performance monitoring and measurement should be the process by which the organisation’s safety performance is verified in comparison to its safety policy and objectives. (2) This process may include, as appropriate to the size, nature and complexity of the organisation: (iii) audits focussing on the integrity of the organisation’s management system, and periodically assessing the status of safety risk controls; and These yellow high-lighted word is called safety audit in AMC1 ORO.GEN.200(a)(3). This deviation could cause confusion. It is recommended to either: - align the ORO regulations and Part M regulations, or - refer form the Part M regulations to the applicable ORO regulation to avoid deviations</p> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; background-color: #e6f2ff;"> <p><i>AMC1 M.A. 712(a)(3) Management system</i> Point (e) The management of change The organisation should manage safety risks related to a change. The management of change should be a documented process to identify external and internal change that may have an adverse effect on safety. It should make use of the organisation’s existing hazard identification, risk assessment and mitigation processes</p> <p>-> request for clarification: What is meant by “change” / what is the EASA definition of “change”? (e.g. SB receipt from OEM’s: is this also considered as a change. thus</p> </div>
---------	---



requiring a hazard identification and risk assessment for every single SB issue? Or is it considered that the hazard identification and risk assessment is already performed by OEM prior the SB issue?)

AMC1 M.A. 712(a)(3) Management system

(f) **Continual** improvement

The organisation should **continually** seek to improve its safety performance. Continual improvement should be achieved through:

- (1) proactive and reactive evaluations of facilities, equipment, documentation, and procedures through safety audits and surveys;
- (2) proactive evaluation of individuals' performance to verify the fulfilment of their safety responsibilities;
- (3) reactive evaluations in order to verify the effectiveness of the system for control and mitigation of risk; and
- (4) an annual review of the safety performance and the effectiveness of the management system.**

1) In AMC1 ORO.GEN.200(a)(3) this requirement is called "continuous improvement" i.s.o. continual improvement. Subsequently the word continuously is used i.s.o. continually.

2) These yellow high-lighted sentences/words are not mentioned in AMC1 ORO.GEN.200(a)(3). This deviation could cause confusion.

It is recommended to either:

- align the ORO regulations and Part M regulations, or
- refer form the Part M regulations to the applicable ORO regulation to avoid deviations

AMC1 M.A. 712(a)(3) Management system

(g) Emergency response planning

(1) An Emergency Response Plan (ERP) should be established that provides the actions to be taken by the organisation, or specified individuals in an emergency. The ERP should reflect the size, nature, and complexity of the organisation's scope of work.

(2) The ERP should ensure:

(i) planned and coordinated action to ensure the risks attributable to a major safety event can be managed and minimised;

These yellow high-lighted sentence is not mentioned in AMC1 ORO.GEN.200(a)(3). This deviation could cause confusion.

It is recommended to either:

- align the ORO regulations and Part M regulations, or
- refer form the Part M regulations to the applicable ORO regulation to avoid deviations

response Partially accepted.

The text in points (d) and (f) of the AMC will be aligned with that of Part-ORO.

Regarding the definition of change, this is primarily a change related to the management system that may have an impact on safety. This does not necessarily include all product changes as it can be expected that the risks associated with these are normally managed and controlled as part of existing operational procedures. However, the organisation may use its safety risk management processes as necessary to assess product-related changes, for example to assess non-mandatory modifications.



The changes to point (g) 'Emergency Response Plan' will be maintained and is proposed to be included with the next amendments to the AMCs to Part-ORA and Part-ORO, as it is considered necessary to better clarify the intent of Emergency Response Plan.

comment

344

comment by: DGAC FRANCE

about a) 1) subparagraph :

Why are predictive schemes not taken into consideration, although ICAO documents include them?

response

Noted.

Regarding the reference to 'proactive' methods to identify hazards, this is indeed meant to cover everything that is not reactive. EASA chose not to use the term 'predictive' for the sake of simplicity and to prevent misunderstandings that are frequently encountered when discussing the differences between predictive and proactive in relation to hazard identification (contrary to data analysis).

This choice also considers that depending on the type of organisation and nature of the activities it cannot be assumed there is always a continual collection of real-time 'operational data' that would typically be thought of as a prerequisite for proactive schemes. Whereas an operator can rely on flight data monitoring and other sources of operational data, for a maintenance organisation or a continuing airworthiness management organisation there is no such continual flow of routine operational data, which does not imply these organisations should not be actively involved in identifying hazards from a variety of sources.

Amendment 1 to Annex 19 will also reconsider the use of the term 'predictive' in relation to hazard identification. The following change has been agreed:

2. Safety risk management

2.1 Hazard identification

2.1.1 The service provider shall develop and maintain a process ~~that to identify~~ ensures ~~that~~ hazards associated with its aviation products or services ~~are identified~~.

2.1.2 Hazard identification shall be based on a combination of reactive, ~~and~~ proactive ~~and predictive methods of safety data collection~~.

2.2 Safety risk assessment and mitigation

The service provider shall develop and maintain a process that ensures analysis, assessment and control of the safety risks associated with identified hazards.

Note. — The process may include predictive methods of safety data analysis.



comment

345

comment by: DGAC FRANCE

about:

(2) The levels of management who have the authority to make decisions regarding the tolerability of safety risks, in accordance with **(2)(a)**, should be specified.

comment :

This paragraph (2) is not achievable. The way it is written pretends the concept of « tolerability » of a risk is easy to define in different levels, and depending on the level, different persons in the organisation may have or not the privilege to accept or not a risk. **It is like the GM3 145.A.65(a)(3)** that pretends to give a tool to perform the risk assessment. It is similar in some extent to what does a type certificate holder to evaluate occurrences impacting its design. It is done at a fleet level, and no one imagine an airline with 5 aircraft of a given type, making an assessment versus the flight hours of its 5 aircraft. At the TCH level, such a risk evaluation can be done because the type certification basis' « 1309 » requirement defines figures for this likelihood and severity of occurrences. The likelihood and severity criteria in term of maintenance do not exist and it is probably impossible for a maintenance organisation to evaluate such items for a small number of aircraft it maintains. Because today nobody has defined a « 1309 » requirement for the « maintenance » organisations and also for a « CAMO organisation », this NPA should not go so deep in details, when everything is to be built in terms of risk assessment in the maintenance field and CAMO field.

response

Noted.

The objective of this point in the AMCs is to ensure that the organisation properly assigns responsibilities for making decisions on risk acceptance. The organisation will define its own risk acceptance criteria, e.g. by adopting a matrix with likelihood and severity values, working with barrier models (bow-tie) or similar tools (the AMCs/GM do not prescribe any particular method).

The organisation will also need to make explicit what levels of management are entitled to take such decisions depending on the risk values. This is in line with ICAO Annex 19 standard 1.2(e) which requires that the levels of management with authority to make decisions with regard to risk tolerability be defined by the service provider.

The transposition of product certification/product safety logic is not primarily relevant in that respect as the focus of the new management system requirements is broader than product safety — they also address systems and organisational hazards (the organisation's safety performance emerges from both systemic/organisational and operational issues). Therefore, safety risk assessment should not only address product safety/core processes.



comment	<p data-bbox="351 203 406 235">346</p> <p data-bbox="1101 203 1444 235" style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></p> <p data-bbox="351 291 1444 392">About c subparagraph: "The scope of internal occurrence investigations should extend beyond the scope of the external occurrence reporting in accordance with M.A.202."</p> <p data-bbox="351 436 1444 571">comment: The paragraph which is supposed to clarify an IR states the scope of "internal occurrences" extend beyond "external occurrence" but without giving any explanations. It does not help at all and shall be deleted.</p>
response	<p data-bbox="351 593 526 627">Not accepted.</p> <p data-bbox="351 649 1444 896">This clarifies that the organisation, as part of its management system for safety, should not limit its investigations to those occurrences that qualify for mandatory reporting. An important aspect of this management system is to encourage the organisation to investigate potential or actual safety issues that may be below the threshold of what is subject to mandatory reporting as the requirements for mandatory reporting and related list of reportable occurrences do not capture those risks that are specific to the organisation and its operating environment.</p> <p data-bbox="351 918 1444 1131">This new management system framework and related AMCs & GM are based on existing provisions in the areas of aircrew and air operations (see ORA.GEN.200 of Regulation (EU) No 290/2012 and ORO.GEN.200 of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012). These provisions have been defined with the participation of industry and NAAs through Rulemaking Group/Review Group OPS.001/FCL.001 and are the result of lengthy consultation with stakeholders.</p>

comment	<p data-bbox="351 1236 406 1267">347</p> <p data-bbox="1101 1236 1444 1267" style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></p> <p data-bbox="351 1332 614 1366">g subparagraph / ERP</p> <p data-bbox="351 1400 1252 1467">Are we sure the ERP is needed for a CAMO? Maybe it should be only a GM: "this safety manager may decide to implement a ERP"</p>
response	<p data-bbox="351 1489 526 1523">Not accepted.</p> <p data-bbox="351 1545 1444 1646">Following the recommendations made by the Focused Consultation Group and by the European Human factors Advisory Group, all provisions on ERP (included at AMC/GM level) are maintained.</p> <p data-bbox="351 1668 1444 1803">The identification of potential continuing-airworthiness-management-related emergencies, to be addressed with the ERP, would normally form part of the initial system and process analysis to identify hazards, which needs to be done when implementing safety risk management.</p>

comment	<p data-bbox="351 1915 406 1946">430</p> <p data-bbox="1197 1915 1444 1946" style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>Airbus</i></p>
---------	--



1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), pages 102-104/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.712(a)(3)

NPA 2013-01(B), pages 97-99/218, section B., AMC1 145.A.65(a)(3)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

Could the EASA define the terms “emergency” and “major safety event” within the frame of the the activation of the Emergency Response Plan?

– It is proposed to modify the **AMC1 M.A.712(a)(3)** to read:

“COMPLEX ORGANISATIONS — SAFETY MANAGEMENT KEY PROCESSES

(a) Hazard identification processes

[...]

(3) The organisation should in particular focus on:

(i) [...]

(ii) hazards that may stem from the existence of complex, multi-tier, subcontract continuing airworthiness management arrangements, or contract maintenance and operational arrangements, in particular at the interfaces.

(b) Risk management processes

[...]

(2) The levels of management who have the authority to make decisions regarding the tolerability of safety risks, in accordance with (2)(a), should be specified as described in **AMC2 M.A.712(a)(1)**.

[...].

(d) Safety performance monitoring and measurement

[...].

(2) This process may include, as appropriate to the size, nature and complexity of the organisation:

[...]

(ii) safety reviews including trends reviews which would be conducted during introduction and deployment of new Products and components thereof, new equipment/technologies, implementation of new or changed procedures, or in situations of organisational changes that may have an impact on safety;

[...]

(iv) safety surveys, examining particular elements or procedures of a specific area, such as problem areas identified, or bottlenecks in daily maintenance continuing airworthiness management activities, perceptions and opinions of continuing airworthiness management and/or maintenance personnel, and areas of dissent or confusion.

[...]

(f) Continual improvement

The organisation should continually seek to improve its safety performance. Continual improvement should be achieved through:

(1) proactive and reactive evaluations of facilities, equipment, documentation, and procedures through safety audits and surveys;

(2) proactive evaluation of individuals’ performance to verify the fulfilment of their safety responsibilities;

(3) proactive and reactive evaluations in order to verify the effectiveness of the system for control and mitigation of risk; and

(4) an annual review of the safety performance and the effectiveness of the management system.

(g) Emergency response planning

(1) An Emergency Response Plan (ERP) should be established that provides the actions to be taken by the organisation, or specified individuals in an emergency [What is an



emergency?]. The ERP should reflect the size, nature, and complexity of the organisation's scope of work.

(2) The ERP should ensure:

(i) planned and coordinated action to ensure the risks attributable to a major safety event [What is a major safety event?] can be managed and minimised; [...]"

– It is proposed to modify the **AMC1 145.A.65(a)(3)** to read:

“SAFETY MANAGEMENT KEY PROCESSES

(a) Hazard identification processes

[...]

(3) The organisation should in particular focus on:

(i) [...]

(ii) hazards that may stem from the existence of complex, multi-tier, subcontract maintenance and operational arrangements, in particular at the interfaces.

(b) Risk management processes

[...]

(2) The levels of management who have the authority to make decisions regarding the tolerability of safety risks, in accordance with (b)(1), should be specified as described in **AMC2 145.A.65(a)(1)**.

[...]

(d) Safety performance monitoring and measurement

[...]

(2) This process may include, as appropriate to the size, nature, and complexity of the organisation:

[...]

(ii) safety reviews including trends reviews which would be conducted during introduction and deployment of new Products and components thereof, new equipment/technologies, implementation of new or changed procedures, or in situations of organisational changes that may have an impact on safety;

(iii) audits focussing on the integrity of the organisation's management system, and periodically assessing the status of safety risk controls; and

(iv) safety surveys, examining particular elements or procedures of a specific area, such as problem areas identified or bottlenecks in daily maintenance activities, perceptions and opinions of continuing airworthiness management and/or maintenance personnel, and areas of dissent or confusion.

[...]

(f) Continual improvement

The organisation should continually seek to improve its safety performance. Continual improvement should be achieved through:

(1) proactive and reactive evaluations of facilities, equipment, documentation and procedures through safety audits and surveys;

(2) proactive evaluation of individuals' performance to verify the fulfilment of their safety responsibilities;

(3) proactive and reactive evaluations in order to verify the effectiveness of the system for control and mitigation of risk; and

(4) an annual review of the safety performance and the effectiveness of the management system.

(g) Emergency response planning

(1) An Emergency Response Plan (ERP) should be established that provides the actions to be taken by the organisation or specified individuals in an emergency [What is an emergency?]. The ERP should reflect the size, nature, and complexity of the organisation's



	<p>scope of work. (2) The ERP should ensure: (i) planned and coordinated action to ensure the risks attributable to a major safety event [What is a major safety event?] can be managed and minimised; [...]"</p> <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION: A particular emphasis is put on the hazards originating from interfaces between organisations. This is one of the main source of organisational hazards. The paragraph (b)(2) of these AMC and the AMC2 M.A.712(a)(1)/AMC2 145.A.65(a)(1) consolidate each other. "new Products and components thereof" has been added to the paragraph (d)(2)(ii) as it is an important example of significant changes (liveware-hardware interface) that deserves a safety review.</p> <p>The ICAO refers to predictive, proactive and reactive schemes as part of safety management. Does EASA consider that proactive safety management includes predictive schemes or can the EASA confirm that no predictive scheme is required? Refer to <u>Comment No. 71</u>. Reactive schemes are based upon the notion of waiting until "something breaks to fix it" (very serious triggering event). It is believed that relying on a reactive scheme to evaluate the effectiveness of the system for control and mitigation of risk is not ambitious enough. The evaluation should be in accordance with a more predictive/proactive scheme. With regard to the ERP, no definition is given for the terms "emergency" and "major safety event" (only some examples are listed in the GM6 145.A.65(a)(3)). These definitions are needed to ensure a uniform level of ERP triggering. Refer also to <u>Comment No. 80</u>. These AMC use terms such as 'audit', 'survey' and 'investigation' in wordings similar to a definition. The <u>GM1 M.A.712(a)(6)</u> and <u>GM2 145.A.65(a)(6)</u> provide definitions for the terms 'audit' and 'inspection'. It would be appropriate that the Agency consolidates all the definitions (including audit, product audit, survey, review, investigation, etc. taking into consideration the existing ones such as the one for airworthiness review) in a dedicated AMC or GM.</p>
response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>The changes proposed to AMC1 M.A.712(a)(3) (now AMC1 CAMO.A.200(a)(3)) are mostly accepted.</p> <p>The need to add examples of emergencies and major safety events is acknowledged; this will be considered when drafting the Part-CAMO GM and/or providing safety promotion material. The identification of potential continuing-airworthiness-management-related emergencies, to be addressed with the ERP, would normally form part of the initial system and process analysis to identify hazards, which needs to be done when implementing safety risk management.</p> <p>The changes proposed to the Part-145 AMCs & GM will be considered in Phase II.</p> <p>All definitions will be grouped by creating a single GM1 to Part-CAMO.</p> <p>Regarding 'predictive schemes', please refer to the response to comment #427.</p>

comment	431	comment by: Airbus
---------	-----	--------------------



response	<p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: NPA 2013-01(B), pages 102-104/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.712(a)(3) NPA 2013-01(B), pages 97-99/218, section B., AMC1 145.A.65(a)(3)</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT: Could the EASA develop Guidance Material to support the implementation of the safety surveys referred to in the paragraph (d)(2)(iv) of the AMC1 M.A.712(a)(3)/AMC1 145.A.65(a)(3)?</p> <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION: For example, the Agency proposes GM3 145.A.65(a)(3) to provide one method to help organisations with little or no previous experience in safety risk assessment to get familiar with the concept, and to serve as a reference document for the definition of the related safety management procedures. Similarly, guidance material on a method to implement safety surveys could help a lot: e.g. presentation of the Practical Problem Solving (PPS) method, or another...</p>
	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The need to provide implementation support and guidance material, in particular to organisations involved in continuing airworthiness and maintenance, is acknowledged. This will be provided as part of the EASA’s safety promotion programme. A dedicated safety promotion task will be proposed for the planning cycle 2017–2021.</p>

comment	<p>341 comment by: DGAC FRANCE</p> <p>a) subparagraph:</p> <p>Regarding CAMO organisation, it is maybe not so easy to separate what is a complex CAMO or not. It seems disproportionate to ask for a safety review board. Leave flexibility to the organisation to answer to the IR. Here the AMC is too prescriptive and it shall be only a GM ! To help the CAMO organisation decide how to comply with the IR.</p>
	response



comment	<p>342</p> <p>c subparagraph</p> <p>Here again, the AMC goes too far and uses the terms “high level committee” that is not defined. How can the NAA or EASA accept the composition of the board by saying it's not high level enough.... based on which criteria ? If it's debatable for Part 145 that are often larger or more complex organisation, its necessity in CAM may be questionnes. DGAC recommends to delete that here.</p>	comment by: DGAC FRANCE
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The new management system framework and related AMCs & GM are based on existing provisions in the areas of aircrew and air operations (see ORA.GEN.200 of Regulation (EU) No 290/2012 and ORO.GEN.200 of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012). These provisions have been defined with the participation of industry and NAAs through Rulemaking Group/Review Group OPS.001/FCL.001 and are the result of lengthy consultation with stakeholders. It is important to ensure overall consistency, in particular for organisations holding more than one certificate. The Review Group considered it necessary to stress that the Safety Review Board must include senior management as matters of strategic importance should be discussed.</p>	

comment	<p>71</p> <p><i>AMC1 M.A. 712(a)(3) Management system</i></p> <p>(c) Internal occurrence investigation</p> <p>The scope of internal occurrence investigations should extend beyond the scope of the external occurrence reporting in accordance with M.A.202.</p> <p>These yellow high-lighted word is called safety (safety investigation i.s.o. occurrence investigation) in AMC1 ORO.GEN.200(a)(3). This deviation could cause confusion. It is recommended to either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - align the ORO regulations and Part M regulations, or - refer form the Part M regulations to the applicable ORO regulation to avoid deviations <p>(d) Safety performance monitoring and measurement</p> <p>(1) Safety performance monitoring and measurement should be the process by which the organisation’s safety performance is verified in comparison to its safety policy and objectives.</p> <p>(2) This process may include, as appropriate to the size, nature and complexity of the organisation:</p> <p>In AMC1 ORO.GEN.200(a)(3) this process also includes a sub-item “safety studies, that is, rather large analysis encompassing broad safety concerns”. This process towards safety studies is not mentioned in AMC1 M.A. 712(a)(3) Management system . This deviation could cause confusion. It is recommended to either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - align the ORO regulations and Part M regulations, or - refer form the Part M regulations to the applicable ORO regulation to avoid deviations 	comment by: KLM Engineering & Maintenance
response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>The text in point (c) of the AMC will be aligned with that of Part-ORO.</p>	



The reference to safety studies in point (d)(2) is deleted as it is considered to be too burdensome and not appropriate for CAMOs. This change will also be proposed for the next amendments to the AMCs to Part-ORA and Part-ORO.

comment 72 comment by: *KLM Engineering & Maintenance*

AMC1 M.A. 712(a)(3) Management system
 d) Safety performance monitoring and measurement
 (1) Safety performance monitoring and measurement should be the process by which the organisation’s safety performance is verified in comparison to its safety policy and objectives.
 (2) This process may include, as appropriate to the size, nature and complexity of the organisation:
 (iii) audits focussing on the integrity of the organisation’s management system, and periodically assessing the status of safety risk controls; and
 These yellow high-lighted word is called safety audit in AMC1 ORO.GEN.200(a)(3). This deviation could cause confusion. It is recommended to either:
 - align the ORO regulations and Part M regulations, or
 - refer form the Part M regulations to the applicable ORO regulation to avoid deviations

response Noted.
 Please refer to the response to comment #297.

comment 6 comment by: *Stefan Stroeker*

Ladies and Gentlemen,
 referring AMC1 M.A.712(a)(3) Item (g)(2) it should be added
 (v) description of emergency training/drill
 ERP cannot work without a suitable staff training and involvement.
 An alarm drill and a kind of 'Input-Response' (e.g. realistic scenario with involvement of all interfaces; debriefing) drill should be carried out in an appropriate time interval.
 With kind regards
 Stefan Ströker
 - STROEK AIR -

response Accepted.
 The text will be amended as proposed, by adding ‘as appropriate’. Part-ORA/-ORO AMCs will be amended accordingly at the opportunity of their next review (e.g. ARO/ORO follow-up task RMT.0516 & RMT.0517 — NPA 2015-18 ‘Update of the rules on air operations (Air OPS Regulation — all Annexes & related AMC/GM)’).

comment 424 comment by: *Airbus*



1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 100/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.712(a)(1)

NPA 2013-01(C), pages 94-95/184, section B., AMC1 145.A.65(a)(1)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

– It is proposed to modify the AMC1 M.A.712(a)(1) to read:

“COMPLEX ORGANISATIONS — ORGANISATION AND ACCOUNTABILITIES

(a) The management system should encompass safety by including a safety manager, and a safety review board in the organisational structure.

(b) The functions of the safety manager should be to:

(1) facilitate hazard identification, risk analysis and management;

(2) monitor the implementation of actions taken to mitigate risks, as listed in the safety action plan;

(3) provide periodic reports on safety performance;

(4) ensure ~~maintenance of~~ safety management documentation **is maintained**;

(5) ensure that there is safety management training available, and that it meets ~~acceptable standards~~ **the Safety Management training syllabus defined in [a new AMC/GM, to be defined]**;

(6) provide advice on safety matters; and

(7) ensure initiation and follow-up of internal occurrence/accident investigations.

(c) Safety review board

(1) The Safety review board should be a high level committee that considers matters of strategic safety in support of the accountable manager’s safety accountability.

(2) The board should be chaired by the accountable manager, and be composed of the persons nominated in accordance with M.A.706(eb) and (ec).

(3) The safety review board should monitor:

(i) safety performance against the safety policy and objectives;

(ii) that any safety action is taken in a timely manner; and

(iii) the effectiveness of the organisation’s safety management processes.

(d) The safety review board should ensure that appropriate resources are allocated to achieve the established safety performance, eventually by recommending the establishment of one or more safety action groups.

(e) The safety manager or any other relevant person may attend, as appropriate, safety review board meetings. He/she may communicate to the accountable manager all information, as necessary, to allow decision making based on safety data.”

– It is proposed to modify the AMC1 145.A.65(a)(1) to read:

“ORGANISATION AND ACCOUNTABILITIES

(a) The management system should encompass safety by including a safety manager and a safety review board in the organisational structure.

(b) The functions of the safety manager should be to:

(1) facilitate hazard identification, risk analysis, and management;

(2) monitor the implementation of actions taken to mitigate risks as listed in the safety action plan;

(3) provide periodic reports on safety performance;

(4) ensure ~~maintenance of~~ safety management documentation **is maintained**;

(5) ensure that there is safety management training available, and that it meets ~~acceptable standards~~ **the Safety Management training syllabus defined in [a new AMC/GM, to be defined]**;

(6) provide advice on safety matters; and

(7) ensure initiation and follow-up of internal occurrence/accident investigations.

(c) Safety review board

(1) The safety review board should be a high level committee that considers matters of



strategic safety in support of the accountable manager’s safety accountability.
 (2) The board should be chaired by the accountable manager, and be composed of the persons nominated in accordance with 145.A.30(b).
 (3) The safety review board should monitor:
 (i) safety performance against the safety policy and objectives;
 (ii) that any safety action is taken in a timely manner; and
 (iii) the effectiveness of the organisation’s safety management processes.
 (d) The safety review board should ensure that appropriate resources are allocated to achieve the established safety performance, eventually by recommending the establishment of one or more safety action groups.
 (e) The safety manager or any other relevant person may attend, as appropriate, safety review board meetings. He/she may communicate to the accountable manager all information, as necessary, to allow decision making based on safety data.
 [...]”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The use of the term “maintenance” is potentially confusing in this context due to the definition of maintenance given in the article 2 of Regulation (EC) 1321/2014.
 The term “acceptable standards” is confusing as they are not defined. It is proposed to proceed like for training on human factors and human performance and limitations.

response

Not accepted.
 The editorial change is not accepted as it would create a mismatch with the equivalent AMCs in aircrew, air operations and aerodromes rules.
 Training needs to be customised for each category of personnel and adapted to the size and complexity of the organisation. Including a standard syllabus for SMS training may create excessive expectations from the competent authority and may not allow the organisation to integrate SMS training with other training delivered (e.g. HF training). It is proposed to assess the need for inclusion of GM defining an SMS training syllabus in Phase II, also to ensure proper stakeholder consultation.
 Nevertheless, in Phase I, GM on qualifications and experience of the safety manager will be included, based on material to be developed by the EHFAG.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC2 p. 104
M.A.712(a)(3) Management system

comment

200

comment by: *Howard Torode*

Comment by European Gliding Union
 Much of what is in this AMC2 to MA712(a)(3) is only applicable to large complex organisations operating in CAT. It is irrelevant to Sport/GA and this should be clearly noted.
 (There are, I am sure many other areas where this comment could and should be applied).



Response Accepted.

The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT aircraft and are not managing any CMPA).

Those CAMOs will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements, meaning no requirements on safety risk management.

comment 101 comment by: *Rega/Swiss Air-Ambulance*

AMC/GM M.A.712(a)(3) Management system:
 The whole AMC/GM to this paragraph is in too much details (duplicated information, confusing, too much details, over regulated). Reduction is required to the essential requirements! ICAO requirements is much better to understand and suitable for its purpose.

response Not accepted.

Unlike the ICAO Annex 19 framework, the proposed EASA management system framework contains all details at AMC level, which allows flexibility.

The new management system framework and related AMCs & GM are based on existing provisions in the areas of aircrew and air operations (see ORA.GEN.200 of Regulation (EU) No 290/2012 and ORO.GEN.200 of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012). These provisions have been defined with the participation of industry and NAAs through Rulemaking Group/Review Group OPS.001/FCL.001 and are the result of lengthy consultation with stakeholders. It is important to ensure overall consistency, in particular for organisations holding more than one certificate.

Comment 182 comment by: *Baines Simmons Limited*

AMC2 M.A.712(a)(3) Management System
 Whilst the AMC and GM prior to this point can be traced back to AMC1 ORX.GEN.200(x) Management System, a significant proportion of material from AMC2 M.A.712(a)(3) onwards does not appear to have been reflected in the Air Operations rulemaking and therefore requires more detailed scrutiny to ensure consistency with the Air Operations material.

This additional material for example does not state who should be responsible for the safety risk management activities described, i.e. the M.A.706(c) group of persons, rather than the Safety or Compliance Monitoring Managers.

Response Partially accepted.

Following the recommendation of the Focused Consultation Group, all changes proposed to the management-system-related AMCs and GM with this rulemaking task, with the exception of changes that are specific to continuing airworthiness management, will be



proposed to be considered for the next amendment of equivalent AMCs and GM in the other domains.

The new AMC2 has been added in response to a safety recommendation and considers an important aspect of safety risk management, which will also be made more explicit in the first amendment to Annex 19.

The comment on responsibilities for safety risk management activities is accepted: M.A.706 (now CAMO.A.305) now requires the nomination of a person or group of persons responsible for managing the development, administration, and maintenance of effective safety management processes as part of the management system.

Comment	<p>213</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>British Gliding Association</i></p> <p>British Gliding Association AMC2 M.A.712(a)(3) Management system SAFETY RISK MANAGEMENT This should only be applicable to large complex organisations involved in CAT</p>
Response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT aircraft and are not managing any CMPA).</p> <p>Those CAMOs will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements, meaning no requirements on safety risk management.</p>

comment	<p>348</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></p> <p>b subparagraph</p> <p>What are those « consultants » ? Delete or explain, but by a reference to IR. AMC shall not introduce new concepts.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The term ‘consultant’ will be replaced by ‘independent expert’.</p> <p>This AMC has been provided in response to a safety recommendation addressed to EASA following the serious incident to Boeing 737-73V, G-EZJK, which occurred on 12 January 2009 west of Norwich, Norfolk: <i>‘It is recommended that the European Aviation Safety Agency review the regulations and guidance in OPS 1, Part M and Part-145 to ensure they adequately address complex, multi-tier, sub-contract maintenance and operational arrangements.’</i></p> <p>The need for assessment of the overall organisational structure, interfaces, procedures, roles, responsibilities and qualifications/competency of key personnel across all subcontract levels within such arrangements should be highlighted.</p>



comment 432

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 104/218, section B., AMC2 M.A.712(a)(3)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

– It is proposed to modify the AMC2 M.A.712(a)(3) to read:

“SAFETY RISK MANAGEMENT – INTERFACES BETWEEN ORGANISATIONS

(a) Safety risk management processes should specifically address the planned implementation of, or participation in any complex multi-tier contracting/subcontracting arrangements between an operator, one or more continuing airworthiness management organisations or their subcontractors, and different maintenance organisations.

(b) Hazard identification and risk assessment should start with an identification of all parties involved in the arrangement, including consultants and non-approved organisations. It should extend to the overall control structure, assessing in particular the following elements across all subcontract levels and all parties within such arrangements:

(1) coordination and interfaces between the different parties;

(2) applicable procedures;

(3) communication between all parties involved, including reporting and feedback channels;

(4) task allocation, and responsibilities and authorities; and

(5) qualifications and competency of key personnel defined in M.A.706.

(c) Safety risk management should focus on the following aspects:

(1) clear assignment of accountability and allocation of responsibilities;

(2) only one party is responsible for a specific aspect of the arrangement – no overlapping or conflicting responsibilities, in order to eliminate coordination errors;

(3) existence of clear and un-bureaucratic reporting lines, both for occurrence reporting and progress reporting;

(4) possibility for front-line staff in any of the parties to directly notify the operator organisation responsible for the aircraft continuing airworthiness management of any safety significant issue – hazard suggesting an obvious unacceptable safety risk as a result of the potential consequences of this hazard.

(d) Regular communication between all parties to discuss work progress, risk mitigation actions, changes to the arrangement, as well as any other significant issues should be ensured.”

– It is proposed to create the AMC2 145.A.65(a)(3) (reference left available, refer to Comment No. 76) to read:

“SAFETY RISK MANAGEMENT – INTERFACES BETWEEN ORGANISATIONS

(a) Safety risk management processes should specifically address the planned implementation of, or participation in any complex multi-tier contracting/subcontracting arrangements between a maintenance organisation, a continuing airworthiness management organisation or its subcontractors, an operator, and one or more other maintenance organisations.

(b) Hazard identification and risk assessment should start with an identification of all parties involved in the arrangement, including consultants and non-approved organisations. It should extend to the overall control structure, assessing in particular the following elements across all subcontract levels and all parties within such arrangements:

(1) coordination and interfaces between the different parties;

(2) applicable procedures;



	<p>(3) communication between all parties involved, including reporting and feedback channels;</p> <p>(4) task allocation, responsibilities and authorities; and</p> <p>(5) qualifications and competency of key personnel defined in <u>145.A.30</u>.</p> <p>(c) Safety risk management should focus on the following aspects:</p> <p>(1) clear assignment of accountability and allocation of responsibilities;</p> <p>(2) only one party is responsible for a specific aspect of the arrangement – no overlapping or conflicting responsibilities, in order to eliminate coordination errors;</p> <p>(3) existence of clear and un-bureaucratic reporting lines, both for occurrence reporting and progress reporting;</p> <p>(4) possibility for front-line staff in any of the parties to directly notify the organisation responsible for the aircraft continuing airworthiness management of any hazard suggesting an obvious unacceptable safety risk as a result of the potential consequences of this hazard.</p> <p>(d) Regular communication between all parties to discuss work progress, risk mitigation actions, changes to the arrangement, as well as any other significant issues should be ensured.”</p> <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:</p> <p>In this context (management of interfaces between organisations), it is better to refer to the organisation responsible for the aircraft continuing airworthiness management than to the operator. The operational body that will address the subject issues is this organisation.</p> <p>What is a “safety significant issue”? To prevent extensive interpretations, “hazard suggesting an obvious unacceptable safety risk as a result of the potential consequences of this hazard” is found more precise and therefore preferred.</p> <p>It is proposed to create the AMC2 145.A.65(a)(3) as maintenance organisations are facing similar issues (e.g. interfaces between maintenance organisations working at component level vs. maintenance organisations working at Product level).</p>
response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>The Part-CAMO AMC will be amended as proposed in this comment (Phase I).</p> <p>The introduction of an equivalent AMC in Part-145 will be addressed in Phase II.</p>

<p>SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — GM1</p> <p>M.A.712(a)(3) Management system</p>	<p>p. 105</p>
--	---------------

comment	<p>183 comment by: <i>Baines Simmons Limited</i></p> <p>GM1 M.A.712(a)(3) Management System</p> <p>As per our comment to the AMC2 material, it is not clear where this material originates and it contains errors in terminology. For example, it refers to “mitigating outcomes”, rather than “mitigating the consequences of outcomes” and managing remaining risks to avoid outcomes. Avoiding the outcome would suggest that the risk has been eliminated.</p>
---------	--



response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This new GM has been adapted from CASA draft Advisory Circular 145-1(0) — ‘Safety Management Systems for Approved Maintenance Organisations’.</p> <p>Following the recommendations made by the Focused Consultation Group, EASA will determine if this GM should form part of the Part-CAMO regulatory material or whether to include it in the safety promotion material to be created.</p> <p>The text will be reviewed in line with the comment made.</p>
comment	<p>214 comment by: <i>British Gliding Association</i></p> <p>British Gliding Association GM1 M.A.712(a)(3) Management system SAFETY RISK MANAGEMENT This should only be applicable to large complex organisations involved in CAT</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>As indicated in NPA 2013-01(A), all changes proposed to Part-M Subpart G for organisations not involved in the continuing airworthiness management of complex motor-powered aircraft or aircraft used in CAT as well as to Part-M Subpart F were to be considered ‘provisional’.</p> <p>The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT aircraft and are not managing any CMPA).</p> <p>Those CAMOs will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements, meaning no requirements on safety risk management.</p>
comment	<p>349 comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></p> <p>As stated elsewhere, no reference to Part 145 GM. Either copy or create a specific one in Part M/G.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>It is recognised that the Part-145 GM on safety risk assessment should not be incorporated by reference.</p> <p>Following the recommendations made by the Focused Consultation Group, EASA will determine if this GM should form part of the Part-CAMO regulatory material (by copying the Part-145 GM) or whether to include it in the safety promotion material to be created for safety management in maintenance and continuing airworthiness.</p>



comment 433

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 105/218, section B., GM1 M.A.712(a)(3)

NPA 2013-01(C), page 108/184, section B., GM3 145.A.65(a)(3)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

The GM1 M.A.712(a)(3) refers to GM3 145.A.65(a)(3). It is proposed to directly include the GM3 145.A.65(a)(3) contents into the Part-M GM, after adaptation.

It is advisable to develop a flowchart to support the description of the risk assessment process steps (paragraph (e)). An indication, on this flowchart, how this process fits into the general context would be valuable: i.e. how it is connected to other processes, such as the internal and the external occurrence reporting processes and the change management process.

The following terms used in this GM need to be defined:

– Likelihood: ‘frequent’, ‘occasional’, ‘remote’, ‘improbable’, and ‘extremely improbable’; and

– Severity: ‘catastrophic’, ‘hazardous’, ‘major’, ‘minor’, and ‘negligible’.

Finally, it is proposed that this GM refers to the ICAO Safety Management Manual Chapters 3 to 5.

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The use of consolidated (reduction of the number of scattered amendments) and self-contained (reduction of reference to external sources) versions of regulations is simpler (practical reason) and therefore makes the demonstration of compliance process easier.

A flowchart, even basic, will enhance comprehension of this process.

Definitions will help in implementing this process.

response Accepted.

It is recognised that the Part-145 GM on safety risk assessment should not be incorporated by reference.

Following the recommendations made by the Focused Consultation Group, EASA will determine if this GM should be provided with the Part-CAMO regulatory material (by copying the Part-145 GM) or whether to include it in the safety promotion material to be created for safety management in maintenance and continuing airworthiness.

The comment on the inclusion of a flow chart and the need to include relevant definitions will be considered when finalising the GM or when producing such safety promotion material.

comment 19

comment by: Austro Control Ltd.

Comment:

GM1 M.A.712 (a)(3) item (c)

There is wrong reference to Part-145 made within this text.

Justification:

There is a reference made to GM3 145.A.65(a)(3).

Proposal:



response	Revise the text to include the correct Part-M / AMC and guidance material.
	Accepted.
	Please refer to the response to comment #433 above.

SUBPART G – CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION – GM2
M.A.712(a)(3) Management system

p. 105

comment 434

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 105/218, section B., GM2 M.A.712(a)(3)

NPA 2013-01(C), page 100/184, section B., GM2 145.A.65(a)(3)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

The reviewers have faced difficulties to understand the objective/intent of the guidance material GM2 M.A.712(a)(3) and GM2 145.A.65(a)(3). Further, the subparagraph (a) has been found confusing. This combination has made the consolidation of an alternative proposal for this subparagraph not been possible.

– It is proposed to modify the GM2 M.A.712(a)(3) to read:

“SAFETY RISK MANAGEMENT

(a) [clarifications needed].

(b) Other elements of proactive hazard identification may be:

(1) regular assessment of the organisation’s existing management system and processes, including through internal and external audits;

(2) an assessment of any changes that may affect the organisation’s management system and processes, before these become effective.”

– It is proposed to modify the GM2 145.A.65(a)(3) to read:

“SAFETY RISK MANAGEMENT

(a) [clarifications needed].

(b) Other elements of proactive hazard identification may be:

(1) regular assessment of the organisation’s existing management system and processes, including ~~through~~ ~~through~~ internal and external audits; and

(2) an assessment of any changes that may affect the organisation’s management system and processes before these become effective.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The way this guidance material is written gives the impression to the reader that occurrences may be reported externally only when a hazard has been identified in accordance with a reactive scheme. This would mean that a very serious triggering event, with oftentimes considerable damaging consequences, needs to take place in order to launch the reporting process.

Our understanding is the following: the external reporting process is triggered depending on the severity of the consequences of the hazard, taking as reference the worst foreseeable situation, whatever the identification scheme (i.e. occurrence or no occurrence). In other words, both reporting processes (i.e. internal and external) are



response	<p>triggered by predictive, proactive and reactive sources (refer also to Comment No. 71), but only the hazards entailing the most severe consequences are reported externally.</p> <p>Accepted.</p> <p>The purpose of the GM is to clarify that internal safety reporting should not be reactive only — it should also serve to report potential issues and problems not associated with an event. It is correct that the focus should be on the severity of the consequences of the hazard, whether this has resulted in an unwanted outcome or not.</p> <p>The GM will be amended to better clarify the points raised (link between internal safety reporting, voluntary and mandatory reporting), and editorial errors will be corrected.</p>
----------	---

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — GM3 p. 105-107
M.A.712(a)(3) Management system

comment	<p>216 comment by: <i>British Gliding Association</i></p> <p>British Gliding Association GM3 M.A.712(a)(3) Management system MANAGEMENT OF CHANGE This should only be applicable to large complex organisations involved in CAT</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT aircraft and are not managing any CMPA).</p> <p>Those CAMOs will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements, meaning no requirements on safety risk management.</p>

comment	<p>350 comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i></p> <p>This GM asks for an assessment regardless of the magnitude of change, minor or major. It will lead to paperwork and time consumption detrimental to a proper conduct of the maintenance activities. (bullet 10 as example)</p>
response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>This GM does not create any regulatory obligations; it aims to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — ensure proper understanding of the importance of management of change as part of the management system for safety; and — clarify the intent of the management of change provisions at AMC level.



Point (h)(i) of the GM as amended (new ref. GM to CAMO.A.200(a)(3)) specifies that the change management process is relevant in case of major operational changes, major organisational changes, changes to key personnel, and changes that affect the way continuing airworthiness management is carried out. This clarifies that not every change will require an assessment of the safety risks.

To eliminate any ambiguity, the GM will be reviewed to change any language suggesting this is AMC.

Following the recommendations made by the Focused Consultation Group, EASA will determine if this GM should be provided with the Part-CAMO regulatory material (by copying the Part-145 GM) or whether to include it in the safety promotion material to be created for safety management in maintenance and continuing airworthiness.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — GM4

p. 107

M.A.712(a)(3) Management system

comment

217

comment by: *British Gliding Association*

British Gliding Association
GM4 M.A.712(a)(3) Management system
EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN (ERP)

For small organisations an ERP is inappropriate and this should only apply to commercial air transport.

response

Accepted.

The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT aircraft and are not managing any CMPA).

Those CAMOs will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements, meaning no requirements on safety risk management.

comment

435

comment by: *Airbus*
1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 107/218, section B., GM4 M.A.712(a)(3)

NPA 2013-01(C), page 110/184, section B., GM5 145.A.65(a)(3)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

It is proposed to harmonise as much as possible the GM4 M.A.712(a)(3) and the GM5 145.A.65(a)(3). Therefore:

– It is proposed to modify the GM4 M.A.712(a)(3) to read:



~~“(a) The organisation’s ERP needs to reflect the size of the organisation, and nature and complexity of its activities. An ERP typically defines the procedures, roles, responsibilities, and actions of key personnel and third parties that may be affected by an emergency, considering all activities of the organisation which may affect safety of flight, and all locations for such activities. The organisation’s ERP should consider the actions to be taken as a result of an accident.~~

[...]”

– It is proposed to modify the GM5 145.A.65(a)(3) to read:

“(a) An ERP typically defines the procedures, roles, responsibilities, and actions of key personnel and third parties that may be affected by an emergency, considering all activities of the organisation which may affect safety of flight, and all locations for such activities. The organisation’s ERP should consider the actions to be taken as a result of an accident which has occurred to a recently released aircraft or component.

[...]”

Is an accident (as defined in the Annex 13 to the Convention on International Civil Aviation) the only kind of events triggering the ERP? Refer also to [Comment No. 74](#).

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The harmonisation will bring consistency and will benefit from the strengths of the other AMC.

The sentence “The organisation’s ERP needs to reflect the size of the organisation, and nature and complexity of its activities.” is already included in the [AMC1 M.A.712\(a\)\(3\)](#) and [AMC1 145.A.65\(a\)\(3\)](#).

response

Partially accepted.

GM4 M.A.712(a)(3) (now GM4 to CAMO.A.200(a)(3)) will be reviewed as proposed.

GM5 145.A.65(a)(3) will be reviewed in Phase II.

comment

436

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

GM5 M.A.712(a)(3)

NPA 2013-01(C), pages 110-111/184, section B., GM6 145.A.65(a)(3)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

It is proposed to harmonise as much as possible the GM for M.A.712(a)(3) and the GM for 145.A.65(a)(3). Therefore:

– It is proposed to create the GM5 M.A.712(a)(3) on the basis of GM6 145.A.65(a)(3).

– It is proposed to modify the GM6 145.A.65(a)(3) to read:

“EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLANNING

(a) For a maintenance organisation, the ERP needs to be focussed on events involving aircraft or components and which can affect safety of flight ~~for aircraft, or components~~. The need for ERP will vary significantly between different types of maintenance organisation.

(b) For aircraft maintenance organisations, the ERP scenarios may include, amongst others, as required:

(1) emergency response to a major aircraft occurrence during maintenance operations, such as oxygen fire, or engine major failure during a ground run;

(2) response to requests for expert advice from aircraft and/or aerodrome operators during an occurrence; and



(3) response to requests for expert emergency aircraft recovery assistance from aircraft and/or aerodrome operators in the case of occurrence on or around the airfield where the maintenance services are provided.

(c) For component maintenance organisations, the ERP will have less scope. For some non-complex component maintenance organisations, the scope of the ERP might only include:

(1) quarantine of components and/or maintenance documents related to an aircraft occurrence; and

(2) where the organisation detects that measurement tool(s) are found to be out of calibration limits and need a documented and formally agreed process to urgently inform owners/operators at risk.

(d) Both aircraft and component maintenance organisations may also consider including personnel-related considerations in their ERP, such as:

(31) appropriate personal behaviours during and after the incident; and

(42) welfare and deployability of affected personnel immediately following a major occurrence.

(e) The ERP could be documented in a separate manual, or incorporated into the organisation’s MOE, or a combination of these. Many organisations find it effective to document relatively stable information in their MOE (such as ERP policies, roles and responsibilities, succession plans, training requirements, etc.) and immediate response information (such as procedures, checklists, phone numbers, locations, etc.) in separate, easily accessible booklets.”

GM6 145.A.65(a)(3) indicates the ERP needs to be focussed on events which can affect safety of flights. This goes beyond what is stated in GM5 145.A.65(a)(3). Please could the EASA clarify what triggers the ERP activation? Refer to Comment No. 80.

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The creation of the GM5 M.A.712(a)(3) will support continuing airworthiness management organisations like maintenance organisations approved under Part-145 are with GM6 145.A.65(a)(3).

The harmonisation will bring consistency and will benefit from the strengths of the other GM, particularly on what triggers the ERP (in this context).

response

Not accepted.

The GM in Part-145 is only relevant to the performance of maintenance, not to continuing airworthiness management activities.

comment

437 comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:
 GM6 M.A.712(a)(3)
 NPA 2013-01(C), pages 111-114/184, section B., GM7 145.A.65(a)(3)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:
 It is proposed to harmonise as much as possible the GM for point M.A.712(a)(3) and the GM for point 145.A.65(a)(3). Therefore, it proposed to develop the GM6 M.A.712(a)(3) on the basis of the GM7 145.A.65(a)(3) with the necessary adaptation.

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:
 Fatigue is not a risk limited to the maintenance personnel (refer to Comment No. 2).
 The creation of the GM6 M.A.712(a)(3) will support continuing airworthiness



management organisations like maintenance organisations approved under Part-145 are with GM7 145.A.65(a)(3).

response Not accepted.

Introducing explicit fatigue risk management requirements in Part-M would require a new rulemaking task. This cannot be performed in Phase I of RMT.0251 (MDM.055).

The need to address fatigue risks more explicitly, and to align with Part-145 AMCs and GM, may be reassessed in Phase II of RMT.0251 (MDM.055).

comment 438 comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

GM6 M.A.712(a)(3)
 NPA 2013-01(C), pages 111-114/184, section B., GM7 145.A.65(a)(3)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

The EASA has put great emphasis on fatigue risk management by developing the extensive GM7 145.A.65(a)(3). It will be a useful source for the implementation of a fatigue risk management scheme.

However, similar GM should be developed for the other significant human factor hazards such as those listed in the proposed GM1 M.A.706(g) and the GM1 145.A.30(d).

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

Fatigue is not the only significant human factor topic: e.g. what about peer pressure, time pressure and deadlines, or error provoking behaviour? They also affect most aspects of a person’s ability to work safely. They need to be addressed in the GM so that organisations are provided with an agreed source for the implementation of schemes addressing these other topics/subtopics.

The creation of the GM6 M.A.712(a)(3) will support continuing airworthiness management organisations like maintenance organisations approved under Part-145 are with GM7 145.A.65(a)(3).

response Noted.

The need to include further guidance or safety promotion material on HF issues related to CAMOs will be discussed with the EHFAG. If needed, additional guidance (meaning GM as part of rulemaking material) could be produced in Phase II.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1 p. 108
M.A.712(a)(4) Management system

comment 36 comment by: NFLC, Cranfield University, UK

AMC1 MA712(a)(4)b



	<p>In my experience, organisations I come across generally do this as they see appropriate. As AMC material, this is onerous as the organisation will have to potentially explain every risk and hazard (several hundred in our organisation) and why it is introducing every change in a documentable / traceable way. This is likely to produce a large amount of material which will take time to produce, and it does not appear to give organisations the ability to target the most important / significant changes / risks / hazards. I would suggest this is more appropriate to make para b guidance material so that the organisation can publicise material as they see fit; surely quality is better than quantity?</p>
<p>response</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>This point refers to those assessed risks and hazards that constitute safety-critical information that needs to be communicated to relevant staff.</p> <p>The new management system framework and related AMCs & GM are based on existing provisions in the areas of aircrew and air operations (see ORA.GEN.200 of Regulation (EU) No 290/2012 and ORO.GEN.200 of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012). These provisions have been defined with the participation of industry and NAAs through Rulemaking Group/Review Group OPS.001/FCL.001 and are the result of lengthy consultation with stakeholders. It is important to ensure overall consistency, in particular for organisations holding more than one certificate.</p>

<p>comment</p>	<p>218 comment by: <i>British Gliding Association</i></p> <p>British Gliding Association AMC1 M.A.712(a)(4) Management system TRAINING AND COMMUNICATION ON SAFETY This should only be applicable to large complex organisations involved in CAT</p>
<p>response</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT aircraft and are not managing any CMPA).</p> <p>Those CAMOs will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements, meaning no requirements on safety risk management.</p>



comment 440

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

GM M.A.712(a)(4)

GM 145.A.65(a)(4)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

Although the criteria to define a competent human factor trainer are defined, nothing is given for safety management trainer.

– It is proposed to create the GM1 M.A.712(a)(4) (reference left available, refer to Comment No. 85) to read:

“SAFETY MANAGEMENT TRAINER

A competent safety management trainer should meet the following criteria:

(a) attended training that is at least equivalent to the Safety Management training syllabus defined in [a new AMC/GM, to be defined];

(b) received instruction in training techniques, and training development compatible with the skills to influence attitudes and behaviours;

(c) has worked for a minimum of three years within the aviation industry, or possesses a suitable academic background; and

(d) has an appropriate level of understanding of safety management in continuing airworthiness environment.”

– It is proposed to create the GM1 145.A.65(a)(4) to read:

“SAFETY MANAGEMENT TRAINER

A competent safety management trainer should meet the following criteria:

(a) attended training that is at least equivalent to the Safety Management training syllabus defined in [a new AMC/GM, to be defined];

(b) received instruction in training techniques, and training development compatible with the skills to influence attitudes and behaviours;

(c) has worked for a minimum of three years within the aviation industry, or possesses a suitable academic background; and

(d) has an appropriate level of understanding of safety management in maintenance environment.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

Training on safety management is one of the basics for the organisation to achieve the overarching objective of managing safety. Therefore, the criteria a safety management trainer should meet must be defined so that, downstream, the personnel trained can adequately manage the safety risks of the consequences of the hazards the organisation must confront during the activities related to the delivery of services.

response Partially accepted.

As agreed with the Focused Consultation Group, EASA will task the EHFAG Continuing Airworthiness Group to develop GM on qualifications and experience of the safety manager. This should be included in the Part-CAMO AMCs and GM (Phase I).

The addition of such GM for Part-145 will be done in Phase II.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1
M.A.712 (a)(6) Management System

p. 109-110



comment	184	comment by: <i>Baines Simmons Limited</i>
	<p>AMC1 M.A.712(a)(6) Management System – Compliance Monitoring General</p> <p>The text is a revised form of current material, whereas this should read for reasons of consistency as the same as AMC1 ORx.GEN.200(a)(6).</p> <p>We recommend the adoption of common material as the Air Operations rule set and a common structure to that material, so that there is consistency with organisations, for example, involved in Commercial Air Transport.</p> <p>Additional or differentiating material, may be added if this is considered specific to CAMOs, or Maintenance Organisations, etc. within the horizontal structure.</p>	
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>As recommended by the Focused Consultation Group, the more ‘prescriptive’ requirements in the existing Part-M AMCs related to compliance monitoring should not be aligned with those in Part-ORA/Part-ORO.</p> <p>The need to align these with the relevant ORA/ORO AMCs will be assessed in Phase II.</p>	

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — GM1
M.A.712(a)(6) Management system

p. 110

comment	351	comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i>
	<p>DGAC finds confusing the definitions of “audit” or “inspection”. It is funny to see there are defined in a GM, but the word is used everywhere in AMC or IR. In that case, as the difference is “minor” as based on the GM, there should be a unique term used everywhere, and leave the flexibility to call whatever is better from a practical point of view.</p>	
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The terms are used inconsistently in existing Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014. The oversight provisions do refer to audit and inspection, and introduce the notion of unannounced inspection. It was, therefore, considered necessary to clarify the difference between audit and inspection in order to ensure that the provisions are consistently applied.</p> <p>The definitions are based on those contained in ISO 9001:2005 ‘Quality management systems — Fundamentals and vocabulary’.</p> <p>A consistency check could be performed in Phase II.</p>	

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1
M.A.712(b) Management system

p. 110



comment	352	comment by: DGAC FRANCE
	Why this limitation to 10persons for CAMOs where we have 20 for 145 workshop ?	
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Following a recommendation made by the Focused Consultation Group, the application of complexity criteria for the determination of applicable AMCs (complex/non-complex organisations) will not be maintained for the new Part-CAMO, therefore AMC1 M.A.712(b) will be deleted.</p> <p>The reasoning behind the draft AMC was as follows: A CAMO with 10 full-time equivalents (FTEs) actively involved in continuing airworthiness management is considered complex, as with this level of staff dedicated to continuing airworthiness management it can be assumed that the volume of activity is quite significant.</p> <p>As maintenance is more 'labour intensive' than continuing airworthiness management, a larger FTE number was included for the Part-145 draft AMC.</p>	

comment	443	comment by: Airbus
	<p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO: Point M.A.712(b) NPA 2013-01(B), page 110/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.712(b) NPA 2013-01(B), page 111/218, section B., AMC1 M.A.712(e) NPA 2013-01(C), page 123/184, section B., AMC1 145.A.65(b) [NPA 2013-01(C), page 125/184, section B., GM2 145.A.65(b)]</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:</p> <p>– It is proposed to modify the AMC1 M.A.712(b) to read: “SIZE, NATURE AND COMPLEXITY OF THE ACTIVITY (a) An organisation should be considered as non-complex when: (1) it has no more than 10 full-time equivalents (FTEs) actively engaged in continuing airworthiness management including subcontractors; and [...]"</p> <p>– It is proposed to modify the AMC1 M.A.712(e) to read: “For organisations with no more than 5 full-time equivalents (FTEs) (including all M.A.706 personnel), including subcontractors, the compliance monitoring system can be replaced by an organisational review. The combination of aircraft and aircraft types, the utilisation of the aircraft and the number of approved locations of the organisations should also be considered before replacing the quality compliance monitoring system by an organisational review. [...]"</p> <p>– It is proposed to modify the AMC1 145.A.65(b) to read: “SIZE, NATURE AND COMPLEXITY OF THE ACTIVITY (a) An organisation should be considered as complex when it has more than 20 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) maintenance staff, including subcontractors, actively engaged in carrying out maintenance under the Part-145 certificate. [...]"</p> <p>– It is proposed to create the GM2 M.A.712(b) on the basis of the GM2 145.A.65(b) to read:</p>	



	<p>“FULL TIME EQUIVALENT ‘Full time’ for the purpose of Part-M means not less than 35 hours per week except during vacation periods.”</p> <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION: Not including subcontractors in the counting method could lead to extensive interpretations and excessive solutions. The harmonisation will bring consistency and will benefit from the strengths of the other AMC.</p>
response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>Following a recommendation made by the Focused Consultation Group, the application of complexity criteria for the determination of applicable AMCs (complex/non-complex organisations), as well as the organisational review option, will not be maintained for the new Part-CAMO, therefore AMC1 M.A.712(b) and AMC1 M.A.712(e) will be deleted.</p> <p>The inclusion of an FTE definition in Part-CAMO, based on GM2 145.A.65(b), is supported.</p>
comment	<p>18 comment by: <i>Austro Control Ltd.</i></p> <p>Comment: AMC1 M.A.712 (b) Management System As the complexity of CAT operators will also define the complexity of the relating CAMO (also implied by point (c)) this should also be valid for the CMPA. The operation shall define the complexity of the CAMO and not the type of A/C operated. Justification: As CMPA's will have to comply with the operating rules as listed in Air Operations regulation annex NCC, the automatic complex organisation criteria imposed by the AMC should be replaced by the same evaluation requirements as used for CAT operators described in point (c). Proposal: Consider a revision of AMC1 M.A.712(b) Point a (2) to streamline the requirement for complex CAMO organisations with ORO.GEN.200 (b) and associated AMC and GM. This means that more than 10 FTE are complex organisations and up to 10 FTE the organisation should be evaluated relating possible CAT and/or CMPA continuing airworthiness management.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Following a recommendation made by the Focused Consultation Group, the application of complexity criteria for the determination of applicable AMCs (complex/non-complex organisations) will not be maintained for the new Part-CAMO. Consequently, there will be a single set of management system AMCs to be used by all Part-CAMO-approved organisations. Specific needs may be addressed through alternative means of compliance .</p> <p>The Focused Consultation Group further recommended this change to management-system-related AMCs and GM to be also considered for the other domains.</p> <p>The case of approved training organisations (ATOs), air operator certificate (AOC) holders or non-commercial with complex motor-powered aircraft (NCC) operators approved per Part-M Subpart G and currently following the set of Part-ORA/Part-ORO AMCs and GM for non-complex organisations will need to be addressed by means of specific transition</p>



measures to be included in the cover regulation.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1 p. 111
M.A.712(e) Management system

comment 353 comment by: *DGAC FRANCE*

This is not written as an AMC, but as a GM. Rename the AMC in a GM.

response Noted.

Following a recommendation made by the Focused Consultation Group, the organisational review option will not be maintained for the new Part-CAMO; therefore AMC1 M.A.712(e) will be deleted.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — Appendix p. 112-116
XIII to AMC1 M.A.712(e)

comment 156 comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

Appendix XIII to AMC1 M.A.712(e) point (e)
 Editorial?
 Bullet 3,4 & 5. Are the word corrective action and preventive action used as the definition in GM1 M.A.716?

response Noted.

Following a recommendation made by the Focused Consultation Group, the organisational review option will not be maintained for the new Part-CAMO; therefore AMC1 M.A.712(e) and its Appendix will be deleted.

comment 219 comment by: *British Gliding Association*

British Gliding Association
Appendix XIII to AMC1 M.A.712(e) point (12)
 This should only be applicable to large complex organisations involved in CAT

response Noted.



Following a recommendation made by the Focused Consultation Group, the organisational review option will not be maintained for the new Part-CAMO; therefore AMC1 M.A.712(e) and its Appendix will be deleted.

comment 278

comment by: UK CAA

Page No: 113**Paragraph No:** GM1 M.A.712 (a) (6) – See also UK CAA comment on page 73, paragraph GM1 M.A.616 (a) (3)**Comment:** In some places in the document, the word “Definitions” is used to explain words or phrases used. In other places, the word “Terminology” is used. UK CAA recommends that a single common word be used throughout the document in order to minimise the possibility of confusion. UK CAA also recommends the use of a separate “Definitions’ or “Glossary of Terms” section in order to make such definitions easier to find once the rule is in use.**Justification:** UK CAA believes that clarity is required, and common wording, in order to make the rule easier to use. This is particularly required for those whose first language is not English. The use of a common “Definitions” section at the beginning of the document would make the rule easier to use, and give users a single place to refer to for explanations of terminology used throughout the rule.**Proposed Text:** Use the word “Definitions” throughout the document, and provide a separate “Definitions” section at the beginning of the document.

response Accepted.

All definitions will be grouped by creating a GM1 to Part-CAMO to create a ‘Glossary of terms’.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — M.A.713

p. 117

Changes to the approved continuing airworthiness organisation

comment

157

comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department
(Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)***AMC1 M.A.713(b)**

We propose the organization should inform the competent authority within reasonable time, for example at least 20 days before the date of the proposed change of nominated persons.

This because of the need of time for the authority to plan and perform the assessment/meeting with the proposed person.

See also page 79 AMC1 M.A.617(b) and page 138 AMC1 145.A.85(b).

response Not accepted.



The AMC foresees this already:

‘(b) In the case of a planned change of a nominated person, the organisation should inform the competent authority at least 10 days before the date of the proposed change.’

comment 444

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

Point M.A.713

[NPA 2013-01(C), page 138/184, section B., AMC2 145.A.85]

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

– It is proposed to create the AMC2 M.A.713 on the basis of the AMC2 145.A.85 to read:

“MANAGEMENT OF CHANGES

The organisation should manage safety risks related to any changes to the organisation in accordance with AMC1 M.A.712(a)(3) point (e). For changes requiring prior approval, it should provide the safety risk assessment to the competent authority upon request.”

– It is proposed to modify the AMC2 145.A.85 to read:

“MANAGEMENT OF CHANGES

The organisation should manage safety risks related to any changes to the organisation in accordance with AMC1 145.A.65(a)(3) point 5(e). For changes requiring prior approval, it should provide the safety risk assessment to the competent authority upon request.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

The harmonisation will bring consistency and will benefit from the strengths of the other AMC.

response Partially accepted.

The AMC will be amended to create a link with the safety risk management processes to be implemented as per M.A.712(a)(3) (now CAMO.A.200(a)(3)).

Part-145 AMCs will be reviewed in Phase II.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — GM1

p. 118

M.A.713(a) Changes to the organisation

comment 330 ❖

comment by: DGAC FRANCE

MA702 :

This comment deals with the request for a procedure defining the process of « minor » changes to the certificate. It is similar to the question raised on Part 145, although different paragraphs concerned.

It is talking about “changes not requiring prior approval”. But it is unclear to the DGAC if those changes will nevertheless get an authority approval or not after they are notified to



the authority. As an example, the wording in Part 21.A.95 is clearer. DGAC recommends EASA to amend the wording similarly to the Part 21 one.

MA702, MA704 are concerned.
basically to document that :
"changes not requiring prior approval shall be approved by an appropriately approved organisation under a procedure agreed with the authority."

response Not accepted.

These provisions reflect the elements that are currently applicable for aircrew and air operations. A change here would create inconsistencies in the way changes are managed by organisations and competent authorities for the different domains, and would not allow a further streamlining of the competent authority procedures.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — GM2 p. 118
M.A.713(a) Changes to the organisation

comment 257 comment by: Thomson Airways

Whilst in principle I can understand the need to submit a copy of the original documentation in organisations that have held approvals for some time this may not be possible. Also this requirement opens up the organisation to possibility of the competent authority performing re-validation of that approval. If it can be proven by legal documents that it is only a 'name' change to the organisation with no variation to its approval or accountabilities then I see no reason why the original documentation needs to be submitted.

response Not accepted.

The competent authority will need to issue a new certificate and this must be supported by company documentation showing the new name. Whether this is provided upon the change of name or later on before the next audit does not make any difference: the organisation will need to update its documentation in any case to reflect the name change, and this is required to ensure continued validity of the approval.

The text as proposed is fully aligned with the provisions already applicable under Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012; consistency must be ensured with the procedures already being implemented at Member State level in those areas.

comment 354 comment by: DGAC FRANCE

A change of name is not an urgency. The safety is not impacted. And there is no need to



response

send again a copy of the documentation. The authority shall not assess it again, just due to a change of name. It's a waste of time.

Not accepted.

The text as proposed with NPA 2013-01(B) is based on the provisions already applicable under Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012. These provisions have been defined with the participation of industry and NAAs through Rulemaking Group/Review Group OPS.001/FCL.001 and are the result of lengthy consultation with stakeholders. Consistency must be ensured with the procedures already being implemented at Member State level in those areas.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — M.A.714

p. 119

Continuing airworthiness management record keeping

comment

446

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

NPA 2013-01(B), page 119/218, section B., point M.A.714

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

It is proposed to modify point M.A.714 to read:

“M.A.714 Continuing airworthiness management record keeping

~~(a) The continuing airworthiness management organisation shall record all details of work carried out. The records required by M.A.305 and if applicable M.A.306 shall be retained.~~

~~(ba)~~ If the continuing airworthiness management organisation has the privilege referred to in point M.A.711(b), it shall retain a copy of each airworthiness review certificate and recommendation issued or, as applicable, extended, together with all supporting documents. In addition, the organisation shall retain a copy of any airworthiness review certificate that it has extended under the privilege referred to in point M.A.711(a)4.

~~(eb)~~ If the continuing airworthiness management organisation has the privilege referred to in point M.A.711(c), it shall retain a copy of each permit to fly issued in accordance with the provisions of point 21.A.729 of the Annex (Part-21) to Regulation (EU) No ~~748/2012~~ 702/2003.

~~(ec)~~ The continuing airworthiness management organisation shall retain a copy of all records referred to in paragraphs ~~(ba)~~ and ~~(eb)~~ until two years after the aircraft has been permanently withdrawn from service.

~~(ed)~~ The records shall be stored in a manner that ensures protection from damage, alteration and theft ~~in accordance with AMC1 M.A.717.~~

~~(f) All computer hardware used to ensure backup shall be stored in a different location from that containing the working data in an environment that ensures they remain in good condition.~~

~~(g) Where continuing airworthiness management of an aircraft is transferred to another organisation or person, all retained records shall be transferred to the said organisation or person. The time periods prescribed for the retention of records shall continue to apply to the said organisation or person.~~

~~(he)~~ Where a continuing airworthiness management organisation terminates its



	<p>operation, all retained records shall be transferred to the owner of the aircraft.”</p> <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:</p> <p>The paragraph (a) is proposed for deletion as the requirements are already covered by points M.A.305(f) and M.A.306(c).</p> <p>The paragraph (f) is proposed for deletion as the requirement is already covered by point M.A.717.</p> <p>The paragraph (g) is proposed for deletion as the requirements are already covered by point M.A.307.</p>
response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>The deletion of point (a) is not accepted. This is required to maintain the record-keeping provision for the CAMO as M.A.305 and M.A.306 do not apply to the CAMO.</p> <p>The changes proposed to points (f) and (g), as well as other editorial changes, are accepted.</p>

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — M.A.715	p. 119
Continued validity	

comment	<p>255 comment by: Thomson Airways</p> <p>This change replaces the 'Approval' with 'Certificate'. Surely the 'Approval is the authority, the certificate is just a piece of paper. Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704, section 0.1 however states - 'The Approval remains valid'.</p> <p>For consistency the Approval should be stated in all cases (instead of Certificate)</p>
Response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>In line with the recommendations made by the Focused Consultation Group, Appendix V to the CAME AMC will not be maintained and the contents will be considered to issue CAME guidance as part of the EASA safety promotion material. The comment made will be considered for creating such material.</p> <p>Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 in Chapter I Article 3 'Definitions' states: "certificate" shall mean any approval, licence or other document issued as the result of certification.'. In line with this definition, 'certificate' is the correct term and this allows making a distinction between approval processes that affect the certificate and other approval items that may not affect the certificate (such as approving a fatigue risk management scheme).</p>

Comment	<p>447 comment by: Airbus</p> <p>1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:</p> <p>AMC for point M.A.201(j)</p> <p>NPA 2013-01(B), page 80/218, section B., AMC for point M.A.618</p> <p>NPA 2013-01(B), pages 119/218, section B., point M.A.715 and AMC</p>
---------	---



	<p>[NPA 2013-01(C), page 139/184, section B., points 145.A.90 and 145.A.92]</p> <p>2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – It is proposed to develop an AMC for the points M.A.201(j), M.A.618(a)(2) and M.A.715(a)(2) on the basis of the contents of point 145.A.92. – It is also proposed to harmonise the point M.A.715 with points M.A.618 and 145.A.90 to read: <p>“(a) The organisation’s certificate shall remain valid subject to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the organisation remaining in compliance with this Regulation Annex I (Part-M), taking into account the provisions related to the handling of findings as specified under M.B.705 and; 2. the competent authority being granted access to the organisation to determine continued compliance with this Regulation, and; 3. the certificate not being surrendered or revoked. <p>(b) Upon revocation or surrender, the certificate shall be returned to the competent authority without delay.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – It is proposed to create the AMC1 M.A.715(b) to read: <p>“In the case of commercial air transport, suspension or revocation of the approval of the Part M Subpart G continuing airworthiness management approval will invalidate the AOC.”</p> <p>3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:</p> <p>The harmonisation will bring consistency and will benefit from the strengths of the other points/AMC.</p>
Response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>The editorial change is accepted. However, the proposal to add a new AMC is not supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — this does not constitute the ‘means to comply’ with point (b) of M.A.715; and — such clause should be in Part-ORO, as this relates to validity conditions for the AOC holder (this could be considered as part of the ARO/ORO follow-up task RMT.0516 & RMT.0517).

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — M.A.716	p. 119
Findings	

Comment	<p>185 comment by: <i>Baines Simmons Limited</i></p> <p>M.A.716 Findings</p> <p>We support the deletion of the existing text as it has always been irrelevant to Section A (as a requirement) and we generally support the new rules and GM.</p>
Response	<p>Noted.</p>



Comment	<p>298</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: AEA</p> <p>AMC1 M.A. 716 Findings GENERAL</p> <p>The corrective action plan defined by the organisation should address the effects of the non-compliance, as well as its root cause.</p> <p>It is not clear why a corrective action plan should address the effects of the non-compliance.</p> <p>Are hazards / threats / risks meant with these effects? Why should these effects being addressed in the corrective action plan and not in the finding description itself?</p>
Response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This means that the corrective action plan needs to address both the symptoms (the effects) and the cause.</p> <p>For example, if an error was detected during an audit in the airworthiness review file, then the corrective action needs to specify what is being done to correct this error itself and its possible consequences and what is being done to prevent reoccurrence, for example, by training staff or modifying procedures.</p> <p>See also the ISO 9000:2005 definitions:</p> <p>correction</p> <p>action to eliminate a detected nonconformity.</p> <p>NOTE 1: A correction can be made in conjunction with a corrective action</p> <p>NOTE 2: A correction can be, for example, rework or regrade.</p> <p>corrective action</p> <p>action to eliminate the cause of a detected nonconformity or other undesirable situation</p> <p>NOTE 1: There can be more than one cause for a nonconformity.</p> <p>NOTE 2: Corrective action is taken to prevent recurrence whereas preventive action is taken to prevent occurrence.</p> <p>NOTE 3: There is a distinction between correction and corrective action.</p>

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1
M.A.716 Findings

p. 119

Comment	<p>355</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: DGAC FRANCE</p> <p>The modification of « findings » is not related to SGS and shall be processed separately in another NPA. In particular, it does impact all G organisations without any assessment.</p>
---------	--



There is also no transition defined with current level 2 findings being processed. Keep those paragraphs as they are currently written !

Response Not accepted.

This new text on ‘findings’ has been adopted already with Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012. These provisions have been defined with the participation of industry and NAAs through Rulemaking Group/Review Group OPS.001/FCL.001 and are the result of lengthy consultation with stakeholders. It is important to ensure overall consistency, in particular for organisations holding more than one certificate.

This rulemaking task is not only dealing with SMS, it also aims to streamline authority and organisation requirements in the different areas (cf. ToRs issued on 18 July 2011: ‘Improve consistency in organisation approvals’).

Transition measures will be included to consider pending findings upon the entry into force of the amending regulation.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — M.A.717 p. 120
Management system record keeping

Comment 186 comment by: *Baines Simmons Limited*

M.A.717 Management System record keeping
 We support the need for such a new rule, but would recommend that the requirements are added to M.A.714 Record keeping, which has always been deficient in this “organisation” context as it solely refers to “aircraft” records.

We further recommend that the scope of required records extends beyond records of “management system processes” to such matters as Maintenance and Reliability Programme reviews, AD and SB assessment, etc. This could be done through expanding upon the term “management system processes” in GM.

Response Accepted.

The related requirements will be included in the existing M.A.714 to form the new CAMO.A.220.

The second comment will be addressed when producing the set of AMCs and GM for the new Part-CAMO.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1 p. 120-121
M.A.717 Management system record keeping



Comment	258	comment by: <i>Thomson Airways</i>
	In most other EASA regulations two or three years is the norm for record retention - why for SMS has this increased to five years?	
Response	Accepted. The same retention period will be applied in all areas; the AMC will be amended to read '3 years'.	

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — GM2
M.A.716 Findings

p. 119

Comment	106	comment by: <i>Rega/Swiss Air-Ambulance</i>
	GM2 M.A.716 Findings, Root-cause analysis: Do not agree with (b). (c) can be deleted as it is of no value for the analysis.	
Response	Not accepted. This GM is to assist with the determination of all root causes and contributing factors. It is only GM, therefore it does not create any obligations. It can be expected that organisations having implemented a quality system in accordance with industry standards should have available a system or process description referred to in point (c).	

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — M.A.720
Means of compliance

p. 121

Comment	248	comment by: <i>Luftsport Verband Bayern / Germany</i>
	We appreciate that the agency tries to level out the playing field within Europe by putting stronger rules on the application of the AMC material. But we think the new rules applied to the AMC deviations are too strict and too bureaucratic so that it will be practically impossible to use alternative means. First of all it will take a lot of effort for an organization to apply for an alternative because a lot of documentation has to be provided (description, risk analysis etc.). For the authority the effort will be high too to check and approve the alternative and report it to the agency and all member states. Because personnel capacity is always low at the authorities the authority will try to deny such proposals to keep the work load low. Small organisations will have a high demand for such alternatives. The above mentioned	



	<p>bureaucratic effort will be a big burden for them. An additional burden is that they can't use the deviations already being approved for other organisations because the full process has to be passed again for each organization. Proposal: For small organisations (< 5 FTE) it should be possible to grant other means of compliance at the time the authority audit is done.</p>
Response	<p>Noted. Please refer to the response to comment #247.</p>

Comment	<p>270 comment by: RECCHIA Giuseppe Guido</p> <p>M.A.720 point (a) should be removed since the principle addressed in there is already contained in Article 8 of cover regulation. See also other comments on M.B.104, M.A.203 and M.A.620.</p> <p>It could be added in the point (b), which will become point (a), the following statement "<i>Without prejudice to the content of Article 8 of Regulation (EC) no. 1321/2014, when</i>"</p>
Response	<p>Noted. Please refer to the response to comment #267.</p>

Comment	<p>362 ❖ comment by: DGAC FRANCE</p> <p>An alternative AMC concept that modifies the existing balance: It should be noted that an alternative AMC shall only ensure compliance with the implementing rules (IR) and not dual compliance with the provisions contained in the implementing rules (IR) and the associated (not alternative) AMC. However, AMC1 MB104 (d) (3) suggests that this dual compliance is required. Under other regulations, synchronized drafting and review of IR and AMC could possibly justify such a wording but the 1321/2014 Regulation AMCs have not been developed for this purpose. It is therefore requested to either delete AMC1 MB104 (d) (3) or to amend it so that it only includes a reference to the implementing rule to which it guarantees compliance. Finally, it is not unreasonable to consider the revision of that similar paragraph in other texts implementing the Basic Regulation.</p>
response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>As a result of the changes to M.B.104, AMC1 to M.B.104(d)(3) is deleted. The intent is to demonstrate compliance with the safety objectives as defined at IR level.</p> <p>The new Section B requirements proposed on the processing of applications for the approval of alternative means of compliance aim to enhance transparency and support standardisation; they are not intended to change the legal status of the EASA AMCs. With</p>



the current system, any organisation intending to use an alternative means of compliance needs to demonstrate an equivalent level of safety, and this general principle remains unchanged.

It is accepted that a further review of the existing AMCs to Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 may be required to include at AMC level only those elements that genuinely constitute means to comply. Such review, which could be performed in Phase II, would be necessary with or without a requirement on alternative means of compliance processing.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1

p. 121

M.A.720 Means of compliance

comment

362 ❖

comment by: *DGAC FRANCE*
An alternative AMC concept that modifies the existing balance:

It should be noted that an alternative AMC shall only ensure compliance with the implementing rules (IR) and not dual compliance with the provisions contained in the implementing rules (IR) and the associated (not alternative) AMC.

However, AMC1 MB104 (d) (3) suggests that this dual compliance is required.

Under other regulations, synchronized drafting and review of IR and AMC could possibly justify such a wording but the 1321/2014 Regulation AMCs have not been developed for this purpose.

It is therefore requested to either delete AMC1 MB104 (d) (3) or to amend it so that it only includes a reference to the implementing rule to which it guarantees compliance.

Finally, it is not unreasonable to consider the revision of that similar paragraph in other texts implementing the Basic Regulation.

response

Partially accepted.

As a result of the changes to M.B.104, AMC1 to M.B.104(d)(3) is deleted. The intent is to demonstrate compliance with the safety objectives as defined at IR level.

The new Section B requirements proposed on the processing of applications for the approval of alternative means of compliance aim to enhance transparency and support standardisation; they are not intended to change the legal status of the EASA AMCs. With the current system, any organisation intending to use an alternative means of compliance needs to demonstrate an equivalent level of safety, and this general principle remains unchanged.

It is accepted that a further review of the existing AMCs to Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 may be required to include at AMC level only those elements that genuinely constitute means to comply. Such review would be necessary with or without a requirement on alternative means of compliance processing.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — M.A.721

p. 121-122



Internal safety reporting scheme

comment	158	comment by: <i>Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)</i>
	M.A.721 Editorial M.A.721 has a, b and c. Should be point a, b, c and d if you compare with 145.A.62. Maybe it also affect the AMC1 M.A.616 (a)(3).	
response	Accepted. The numbering will be amended to align with that in 145.A.62.	

comment	187	comment by: <i>Baines Simmons Limited</i>
	M.A.721 Internal safety reporting scheme Violations are not mentioned yet are equally significant in relation to the lowering of safety control effectiveness. We recommend inclusion of the word Violation is made within the paragraph.	
Response	Partially accepted. The following wording is proposed for point M.A.721 (now CAMO.A.202): ‘ensure evaluation of all known relevant information relating to errors, the inability to follow procedures, near-misses and hazards, and a method to circulate the information as necessary; and a method to circulate the information as necessary...’ In line with ‘just culture’ principles, the inclusion of the term ‘violation’ is not accepted. The term ‘inability to follow procedures’ is preferred (‘Most violations are committed by people trying to make the systems work, so this needs to be recognised’).	

Comment	221	comment by: <i>British Gliding Association</i>
	British Gliding Association M.A.721 Internal safety reporting scheme An internal reporting scheme is too onerous for small organisations. Competent Authorities should set up a confidential reporting system that is easy to use and research for small organisations. Large sporting organisations should be able to set up their own reporting system that is applicable to the activity concerned. Existing schemes in the UK e.g. CHIRP tend to be too focused on CAT for General Aviation and the bi monthly report tends to be of little interest and does not address HF.	
response	Noted.	



The related opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I (Part-M) will not impose the implementation of SMS on General Aviation CAMOs (CAMOs that are not involved in CAT aircraft and are not managing any CMPA).

Those CAMOs will be eligible for the new Part-CAO, which will mostly consider the existing Part-M Subpart F and G requirements, meaning no requirements on safety risk management.

For information:

The scheme is meant to also collect safety information on organisational and systemic issues that may not be of interest to the whole community. The benefits of implementing 'collective' schemes at the level of large sporting organisations and federations is fully supported.

See also proposed Section B requirement for competent authorities to implement a system to collect, analyse and disseminate safety information and the requirements for the implementation of data collection mechanisms and tools for mandatory and voluntary reporting applicable to competent authorities as defined in Regulation (EU) No 376/2014.

comment

226

comment by: LHT

M.A.715 Continued validity

Due to the change of the title, the title is not understandable without the content.

response

Noted.

The title has been changed to align with the organisation requirements adopted for aircrew and air operations. The title of an IR is not necessarily meant to be self-explanatory.

comment

299

comment by: AEA

M.A.721 Internal safety reporting scheme

(b) The scheme shall also enable the collection and evaluation of those **errors, near-misses, and hazards** (= better also use here 'occurrences', since there is no predetermined difference between a reportable and a non-reportable occurrence to the average employee) reported internally that do not fall under point (a) above.

Through this scheme, the organisation shall:

- (1) identify and address the factors contributing to occurrences in order to reduce the likelihood of reoccurrence;
- (2) identify adverse trends, corrective actions taken, or to be taken by the organisation to address deficiencies; and
- (3) ensure evaluation of all known relevant information relating to **errors, near-misses, and hazards** the occurrence, and a method to circulate the information as necessary.

(c) For all complex motor-powered aircraft and for aircraft used for commercial air transport, the organisation (Which organization? Responsible in accordance with M.A.201 –or- maintaining the aircraft?) shall cooperate on occurrence investigations with the



	relevant maintenance organisation(s).
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Occurrence suggests that only events should be reported, whereas this system should also be used proactively to report conditions and hazards that have not yet resulted in an event. Regarding the question on point (c), whenever reference is made to ‘the organisation’, this relates to the organisation regulated by Subpart G of Part-M (in the future by Part-CAMO).</p>

comment	<p>317 comment by: AEA</p> <p>M.A.715 Continued validity Due to the change of the title, the title is not understandable without the content.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The title has been changed to align with the organisation requirements adopted for Aircrew and Air operations. The title of an IR is not necessarily meant to be self-explanatory.</p>

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1 p. 122
M.A.721 Internal safety reporting scheme

comment	<p>76 comment by: KLM Engineering & Maintenance</p> <p>AMC1 M.A. 716 Findings GENERAL The corrective action plan defined by the organisation should address the effects of the non-compliance, as well as its root cause.</p> <p style="color: red;">It is not clear why a corrective action plan should address the effects of the non-compliance. Are hazards / threats / risks meant with these effects? Why should these effects being addressed in the corrective action plan and not in the finding description itself?</p>
response	<p>Please refer to comment #298 and the related response.</p>

comment	<p>188 comment by: Baines Simmons Limited</p> <p>AMC1 M.A.721 Internal safety reporting scheme</p>
---------	--



	Violations are not mentioned yet are equally significant in relation to the lowering of safety control effectiveness. We recommend inclusion of the word Violation is made within the paragraph.
response	Please refer to comment #187 and the related response.

comment	189 comment by: <i>Baines Simmons Limited</i>
	AMC1 M.A.721 Internal safety reporting scheme (b)(1) reads ‘assure’ – this should read ‘ensure’.
response	Accepted. The AMC will be changed as suggested.

comment	190 comment by: <i>Baines Simmons Limited</i>
	AMC1 M.A.721 Internal safety reporting scheme Violations are not mentioned yet are equally significant in relation to the lowering of safety control effectiveness. We recommend inclusion of the word Violation is made within the paragraph.
response	Please refer to comment #187 and the related response.

SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — GM1	p. 123
M.A.721 Internal safety reporting scheme	

comment	117 comment by: <i>CAA-NL</i>
	GM1 M.A.721 We propose to add the following example to GM1 M.A.721 after bullet 1, near-miss: An example is when [a CAMO staff on rechecking his/her work at the end of a task realises that that] an AD, AWL, CMR task was not properly processed (for instance in the AMP or continuing airworthiness record system) which would have led to a situation that the AD/AWL/CMR would not have been performed on time on the affected (fleet of) aircraft.
response	Accepted. The example will be provided to clarify the meaning of ‘near-miss’ in the Part-M Subpart G (CAMO) context.



comment	<p>191 comment by: <i>Baines Simmons Limited</i></p>
	<p>AMC1 M.A.721 Internal safety reporting scheme The text does not include the content of GM1 145.A.62 Internal safety reporting scheme. We believe for consistency all such AMC and GM should be common to all Parts under Regulation (EC) 216/2008. The use of the word occurrence reinforces that such reporting is reactive whereas, proactive reporting is key in contributing to safety performance. Reporting of safety control (defences) effectiveness including the human contribution (error or violation) is key to ensuring the overall safety performance of the organisation.</p>
response	<p>Accepted. GM1 145.A.62 will be added as new GM1 to CAMO.A.202, and the term ‘occurrence’ will be replaced by ‘safety issue’, where relevant.</p>
comment	<p>192 comment by: <i>Baines Simmons Limited</i></p>
	<p>GM1 M.A.721 Internal safety reporting scheme Violations are not defined yet are equally significant in relation to the lowering of safety control effectiveness. We recommend inclusion of the word Violation is made within the paragraph.</p>
response	<p>Please refer to the response to comment #187.</p>
comment	<p>193 comment by: <i>Baines Simmons Limited</i></p>
	<p>GM1 M.A.721 Internal safety reporting scheme The definition of hazard can serve to confuse. A hazard needs to be brought under organisational control and the risk assessment tool enables this. Once the controls are agreed and deployed they become part of the organisation’s control system and issues such as manpower, culture etc... threaten the effectiveness of the control. Any breach of a control would need to be investigated (not risk assessed) with a view to understanding the breach and restoring its effectiveness.</p>
response	<p>Not accepted. The definition is deliberately simple in light of the context of the paragraph.</p>
comment	<p>194 comment by: <i>Baines Simmons Limited</i></p>



	<p>GM1 M.A.721 Internal safety reporting scheme</p> <p>We do not consider the use of words “gross negligence” and “wilful violations” as helpful. “Gross negligence” has legal connotations and violations are intentional by definition, so the use of the word wilful suggests that this may be otherwise. Most violations are committed by people trying to make the systems work, so this needs to be recognised. We recommend the following definition: ‘Just Culture; A culture in which no staff are punished for erroneous actions, omissions, or decisions; where violation is acknowledged, but not condoned yet reckless behaviour or sabotage is not tolerated.’</p>
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>This is legacy definition that is now widely accepted within Europe; the proposed wording does provide a more practical definition that should be considered to provide support and guidance to organisations over the existing, more legally focused definition.</p>

<p>SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — M.A.722</p> <p>Immediate reaction to a safety problem</p>	<p>p. 123</p>
---	---------------

comment	<p>195</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>Baines Simmons Limited</i></p> <p>M.A.722 Immediate reaction to a safety problem</p> <p>Whilst we accept the value of this requirement, we feel this value could be further enhanced by the publication of GM explaining the potential types of “safety measures” envisaged, thereby helping organisations prepare for their reaction.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>This will be considered when finalising the AMCs and GM for the new Part-CAMO (Phase I).</p>

comment	<p>281</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>AIR FRANCE</i></p> <p>AFR Comment : To avoid misunderstanding, clarify through examples the type of relevant mandatory safety information which could be issued by the agency.</p>
response	<p>Please refer to comment #195 and the related response above.</p>

comment	<p>300</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>AEA</i></p> <p><i>M.A.722 Immediate reaction to a safety problem</i></p> <p>Point (b) The organisation shall implement:</p> <p>(b) any relevant mandatory safety information issued by the Agency</p>
---------	---



-> request for clarification: Shall the implementation take place without the performance of a hazard identification and risk assessment prior the implementation? (e.g. shall an AD be implemented without the performance of a hazard identification and risk assessment in advance?Meaning that an AD is then not considered as a “change”)?

response Noted.

Safety risk management is not required for any instructions that are qualified as mandatory by the competent authority or EASA (the safety risk assessment has already been performed as part of the process to generate the mandatory instruction).

The text proposed is fully aligned with the provisions already applicable under Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012 based on that agreed in the EASA Committee. Consistency must be ensured with the procedures already being implemented at Member State level in those areas.

See also comment #195 and the related response.

comment 356 comment by: DGAC FRANCE

Question about (b) any relevant mandatory safety information issued by the Agency

Where is available such information, and how is it rendered "mandatory"?

response Please refer to comment #195 and the related response.

comment 457 comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:
Point M.A.901

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:
It is proposed to modify the point M.A.901(b) to read:
“(b) An aircraft in a controlled environment is: ~~an aircraft~~
(i) an aircraft continuously managed by a unique continuing airworthiness management organisation approved in accordance with Section A, Subpart G, of this Annex (Part M) during the previous:
(1) 12 months for complex motor-powered aircraft and aircraft used for commercial air transport except balloons,
(2) 6 months for aircraft that are not classified as complex motor-powered aircraft, aircraft not used in commercial air transport and balloons ~~by a unique continuing airworthiness management organisation approved in accordance with Section A, Subpart G, of this Annex (Part M),~~ and
(ii) a complex motor-powered aircraft or aircraft used for commercial air transport except balloons, for which the continuing airworthiness management organisation referred to in paragraph (i) has performed an airworthiness review that is conclusive; and



(iii) an aircraft which has been maintained for the previous 12 months by maintenance organisations approved in accordance with Section A, Subpart F of this Annex (Part M), or with Annex II (Part 145). This includes maintenance tasks referred to in point M.A.803(b) carried out and released to service in accordance with point M.A.801(b)2 or point M.A.801(b)3; or
 (iv) an aircraft managed continuously from the day the EASA Form 52 is issued until the Form 53 is issued, by the continuing airworthiness management body of an organisation approved under both Section A, Subpart G, of this Annex (Part M) and Annex (Part-21) to Regulation (EU) No 748/2012.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:

Experience shows that more than 6 months are usually necessary to have the complete history knowledge of an aircraft (for a large aircraft). This period is shorter for light aircraft and depends on the aircraft complexity.

The notion of controlled environment should also depend on the (first) airworthiness review performed for a complex motor-powered aircraft or aircraft used for commercial air transport (except balloons) recently introduced into the fleet managed (airworthiness review performed by this CAMO), as it gives a clear ‘picture’ of the aircraft airworthiness.

The existing definition of controlled environment should take into account the specific case of the continuing airworthiness management body of an organisation approved under both Part-M Subpart G and Part-21.

response

Not accepted.

This change is outside the scope of RMT.0251 (MDM.055). The comment may be considered as part of RMT.0521 and RMT.0522 ‘Airworthiness review process’.

comment

458

comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

AMC M.A.901(b)

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

It is proposed to re-identify AMC M.A.901(b) into AMC1 M.A.901(b) and to modify it to read:

“1. If the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft is not managed according to a Part-M appendix I arrangement between the owner and the ~~M.A. Subpart G~~ continuing airworthiness management organisation, the aircraft should be considered to be outside a controlled environment. Nevertheless, such arrangement is not necessary when the operator and the ~~M.A. Subpart G~~ continuing airworthiness management organisation are the same organisation.

2. The fact that limited pilot-owner maintenance as defined in M.A.803(b) is not carried out and released by an approved maintenance organisation does not change the status of an aircraft in a controlled environment providing the ~~M.A. Subpart G~~ continuing airworthiness management organisation under contract has been informed of any such maintenance carried out.

3. ‘continuously managed’ means that:

(i) the aircraft is under the responsibility of the continuing airworthiness management organisation without any disruptions.

(ii) the continuing airworthiness management tasks have been done by a continuing airworthiness management organisation (subcontracted by another continuing



airworthiness management organisation) before the aircraft is introduced in the fleet managed by this organisation.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:
 The proposal clarifies the case of an aircraft entering a fleet managed by a CAMO when this organisation has performed, before this introduction, almost all the continuing airworthiness tasks for another organisation.

response Not accepted.

This change is outside the scope of RMT.0251 (MDM.055). The comment may be considered as part of RMT.0521 and RMT.0522 ‘Airworthiness review process’.

comment 459 comment by: Airbus

1. PARAGRAPH / SECTION YOUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:
 AMC M.A.901

2. PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:
 It is proposed to create the AMC1 M.A.901(k) to read:
 “It is acceptable for an airworthiness review staff to send his/her recommendation to the competent authority for issuance or extension of the ARC with level 2 findings still open. These findings should be appropriately managed by the competent authority.”

3. RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION:
 The airworthiness review staff has not to wait for the closure of level 2 findings to send his/her recommendation. This is justified by the fact that the closure of findings is not under his/her responsibility.

response Not accepted.

This change is outside the scope of RMT.0251 (MDM.055). The comment may be considered as part of RMT.0521 and RMT.0522 ‘Airworthiness review process’.

Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART A — GENERAL — M.B.102 p. 124
Competent authority

comment 37 comment by: NFLC, Cranfield University, UK

AMC1 M.A.717 c

In our case, we have a computer based system but we don't have direct control over the backups. Therefore we would find it difficult to demonstrate how we comply with this. We use paper records as well, and therefore we can recreate the computer records from paper records with little effort, going back months or years. Therefore I would suggest that the computer system backup needs to be "appropriate" but not specify any time period. I would find it difficult to show how we comply with the paragraph as written, but we don't have a problem to solve as we have the complete paper records as well. I suspect that this paragraph is written around purely computer based systems but that



response	isn't reflected in the wording.
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>When the computer system is backed up with a paper-based system, the safeguards are indeed not the same. If there are only computer records, the organisation needs to have full control to ensure proper backup. To address particular cases, an alternative means of compliance can be developed. The text is aligned with that used on the area of aircrew and air operations.</p> <p>The text is based on AMCs already adopted for aircrew and air operations. It is suggested to perform a general review of the record-keeping requirements in Phase II.</p>

Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART A — GENERAL — M.B.104

p. 124-125

Means of compliance

comment	77 comment by: <i>KLM Engineering & Maintenance</i>
	<p><i>M.A.721 Internal safety reporting scheme</i></p> <p>(b) The scheme shall also enable the collection and evaluation of those errors, near-misses, and hazards (= better also use here 'occurrences', since there is no predetermined difference between a reportable and a non-reportable occurrence to the average employee) reported internally that do not fall under point (a) above.</p> <p>Through this scheme, the organisation shall:</p> <p>(1) identify and address the factors contributing to occurrences in order to reduce the likelihood of reoccurrence;</p> <p>(2) identify adverse trends, corrective actions taken, or to be taken by the organisation to address deficiencies; and</p> <p>(3) ensure evaluation of all known relevant information relating to errors, near-misses, and hazards the occurrence, and a method to circulate the information as necessary.</p> <p>(c) For all complex motor-powered aircraft and for aircraft used for commercial air transport, the organisation (Which organization? Responsible in accordance with M.A.201 –or- maintaining the aircraft?) shall cooperate on occurrence investigations with the relevant maintenance organisation(s).</p>
response	Please refer to the response to comment #299.
comment	249 comment by: <i>Luftsport Verband Bayern / Germany</i>
	<p>We appreciate that the agency tries to level out the playing field within Europe by putting stronger rules on the application of the AMC material. But we think the new rules applied to the AMC deviations are too strict and too bureaucratic so that it will be practically impossible to use alternative means.</p> <p>First of all it will take a lot of effort for an organization to apply for an alternative because</p>



a lot of documentation has to be provided (description, risk analysis etc.).
 For the authority the effort will be high too to check and approve the alternative and report it to the agency and all member states. Because personnel capacity is always low at the authorities the authority will try to deny such proposals to keep the work load low. Small organisations will have a high demand for such alternatives. The above mentioned bureaucratic effort will be a big burden for them. An additional burden is that they can't use the deviations already being approved for other organisations because the full process has to be passed again for each organization.
 Proposal: For small organisations (< 5 FTE) it should be possible to grant other means of compliance at the time the authority audit is done.

response Please refer to the response to comment #247.

comment 266 comment by: RECCHIA Giuseppe Guido

M.B.104 point (a) and (b) should be removed because their content is already addressed by article 8 of cover regulation. paragraph M.B104 and relevant AMC material should be renumbered accordingly.

It could be added in the point (b), which will become point (c), the following statement "*Without prejudice to the content of Article 8 of Regulation (EC) no. 1321/2014, when*"

response Noted.
 Please refer to the response to comment #267.

Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART A — GENERAL — M.B.106 p. 126
Immediate reaction to a safety problem

comment 357 comment by: DGAC FRANCE

Concerning (d) paragraph, a NAA does not have means to send information to organizations outside its country. This task should be done by the Agency.

response Noted.
 This needs to be read in the context of paragraphs (b) and (c); it is meant to apply to persons and organisations who/which are under the oversight of the competent authority. When this is relevant to an organisation certified by EASA, then EASA is the competent authority.



Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART A — GENERAL — M.B.110 p. 126-127
Management system

comment	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 78 comment by: <i>KLM Engineering & Maintenance</i> </div> <p><i>M.A.722 Immediate reaction to a safety problem</i> Point (b) The organisation shall implement: (b) any relevant mandatory safety information issued by the Agency</p> <p style="color: red;">-> request for clarification: Shall the implementation take place without the performance of a hazard identification and risk assessment prior the implementation? (e.g. shall an AD be implemented without the performance of a hazard identification and risk assessment in advance?Meaning that an AD is then not considered as a “change”)?</p>
response	Please refer to the response to comment #300.

Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART A — GENERAL — AMC1 p. 128-129
M.B.110(a)(1) Management system

comment	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 20 comment by: <i>Austro Control Ltd.</i> </div> <p>Comment: M.B. 104 (d)(3) Means of Compliance The information of all other member states relating the use of an Alt.MC seems not to be useful due to the fact that the other member states are not allowed to use it automatically also as an Alt.MC. Justification: As EASA is the competent authority for the oversight of all EU/EASA the member states, information to EASA and further publication by EASA is considered to be reasonable for standardisation purposes. The current NPA prohibits other member states from directly using the Alt.MC published by one Competent Authority, therefore the information from that approving Competent Authority to all other member states is considered as an administrative burden for this approving CA which should not be within their duties and responsibilities. Proposal: Delete or revise M.B.104 (d)(3) accordingly.</p>
response	Accepted. In line with the changes proposed to Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012, the requirement on the provision of information to other Member States will not be maintained. Information of all Member States can be better ensured through EASA as it will receive a copy of all alternative means of compliance that have been approved.



Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART A — GENERAL — GM1
M.B.110(a)(2) Management system

p. 129-131

comment

21

comment by: *Austro Control Ltd.*

Comment:

GM1 M.B.110 (a) (2):

The text as written relating the end of this item "may be properly implemented" is considered not to be clear because EC 216/2008 and the implementing rules have to be properly implemented.

Justification:

The text as written could be interpreted in such a way that the basic regulation and its implementing rules not really have to be implemented properly, which is not the case.

Proposal:

Revise this paragraph to make sure that the basic regulation and its implementing rules have to be implemented and the AMC, GM and CS maybe used to implement the requirements (or at least an approved Alt.MC).

response

Not accepted.

This point of the GM does not refer to the implementation of rules, AMCs, GM, and CS, but to the functions and processes that the authority needs to implement on the basis of such rules, AMCs, GM, and CS.

The text proposed is fully aligned with the provisions already applicable under Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012. These provisions have been defined with the participation of industry and NAAs through Rulemaking Group/Review Group OPS.001/FCL.001 and are the result of lengthy consultation with stakeholders.

Consistency must be ensured with the procedures already being implemented at Member State level in those areas.

comment

118

comment by: *CAA-NL***GM1 M.B.110(a)(2)**

Please add: '(b)(1)(iv) and number of subcontracted organisations used'

To ensure that the competent authority takes the required man-hours for oversight of subcontractors into account.

response

Accepted.

The GM will be amended as proposed and this change will be considered for the AR/OR follow-up rulemaking tasks to ensure consistency (RMT.0412 & RMT.0413 for Regulation (EU) No 290/2012, and RMT.0516 & RMT.0517 for Regulation (EU) No 965/2012).



comment 361 ❖

comment by: DGAC FRANCE

Too detailed organisational requirements for the Authorities:

This NPA goes way too far in terms of details applicable to the authorities' organisation. The 145.B.20 GM1 (a) (2) indicating how the Authority should compute its human resources needed to perform organisations oversight, for example, is too prescriptive and is not at all justified.

DGAC remind you the contents of letter No. 11-237 of 30 November 2011 relating to air operations, where it indicated that it belonged to Member States to define precisely how to organize themselves in order to comply with the rules contained in the part ARO and that from this point of view, the AMC and GM were written in a way that is too detailed and prescriptive.

response Not accepted.

This is GM to assist competent authorities with the determination of 'sufficient personnel'. It does not constitute any requirement nor means to comply. This GM had been drafted by the OPS.001/FCL.001 Review Group as it considered it was necessary to clarify the notion of 'sufficient personnel' stated in the IRs (DGAC France was represented in the OPS.001/FCL.001 Review Group).

This GM is copied from that already applicable with the Decisions for Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 (RMT.0412 & RMT.0413) and 965/2012. If required, it may be reviewed as part of the follow-up rulemaking tasks (RMT.0412 & RMT.0413 for Regulation (EU) No 290/2012, and RMT.0516 & RMT.0517 for Regulation (EU) No 965/2012).

Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART A — GENERAL — AMC4
M.B.110(a)(3) Management system

p. 133

comment 22

comment by: Austro Control Ltd.

Comment:

AMC4 M.B.110 (a) (3). Competence Assessment

It is not easy to understand for Austro Control Ltd. why the management system of NPA 2013-01 includes and initial and periodic competence assessment for the authority inspectors when such a requirement is not written for inspectors of the same authority in the field of air operations and air crew regulation.

Justification:

If the requirement for a periodic recurrent competence assessment is such important then this should also be required included in the ARX requirements. If this is not the case then it should be deleted because unequal requirements for authority inspectors in the same authority for similar tasks in different fields cannot be understood by the staff of the authority and do not increase the overall level of safety.

Proposal:

revise this AMC or delete the AMC as necessary to streamline the qualification



response	<p>requirements with the Air Operations and Air Crew regulations.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This new AMC was added due to recurrent standardisation findings in this area. This AMC will be proposed to be introduced also for the Air Operations and Aircrew Regulations through follow-up rulemaking tasks (cf. RMT.0412 & RMT.0413 for Regulation (EU) No 290/2012, and RMT.0516 & RMT.0517 for Regulation (EU) No 965/2012).</p>
----------	---

comment	<p>364 comment by: DGAC FRANCE</p> <p>AMC4 M.B.110(a)(3) Management system</p> <p>COMPETENCE ASSESSMENT</p> <p>The competent authority should periodically assess the competence of its inspectors. The current version of ‘Authority Inspectors Qualification Criteria’ defined by the Common Training Initiative Group should be used. The results of such assessment, as well as any actions taken following such assessment, should be recorded.</p> <p>The Common Training Initiative Group (CTIG) developed only recommendations. This is not acceptable to have it given as an AMC. DGAC France wishes this AMC to be deleted</p>
---------	--

response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>This new AMC was added due to recurrent standardisation findings in this area. This AMC will be proposed to be introduced also for the Air Operations and Aircrew Regulations through follow-up rulemaking tasks (cf. RMT.0412 & RMT.0413 for Regulation (EU) No 290/2012, and RMT.0516 & RMT.0517 for Regulation (EU) No 965/2012).</p> <p>The reference to CTIG will be deleted.</p>
----------	--

Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART A — GENERAL — M.B.104 p. 135-136

Record keeping

comment	<p>362 ❖ comment by: DGAC FRANCE</p> <p>An alternative AMC concept that modifies the existing balance:</p> <p>It should be noted that an alternative AMC shall only ensure compliance with the implementing rules (IR) and not dual compliance with the provisions contained in the implementing rules (IR) and the associated (not alternative) AMC.</p> <p>However, AMC1 MB104 (d) (3) suggests that this dual compliance is required.</p> <p>Under other regulations, synchronized drafting and review of IR and AMC could possibly justify such a wording but the 1321/2014 Regulation AMCs have not been developed for this purpose.</p> <p>It is therefore requested to either delete AMC1 MB104 (d) (3) or to amend it so that it</p>
---------	--



	<p>only includes a reference to the implementing rule to which it guarantees compliance. Finally, it is not unreasonable to consider the revision of that similar paragraph in other texts implementing the Basic Regulation.</p>
response	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>As a result of changes to M.B.104, AMC1 to M.B.104(d)(3) is deleted. The intent is that compliance with the safety objectives as defined at IR level be demonstrated.</p> <p>The new Section B requirements proposed on the processing of applications for the approval of alternative means of compliance aim to enhance transparency and support standardisation; they are not intended to change the legal status of the EASA AMCs. With the current system, any organisation intending to use an alternative means of compliance needs to demonstrate an equivalent level of safety, and this general principle remains unchanged.</p> <p>It is accepted that a further review of the existing AMCs to Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 may be required to include at AMC level only those elements that genuinely constitute means to comply. Such review, which could be performed in Phase II, would be necessary with or without a requirement on alternative means of compliance processing.</p>

comment	<p>365 comment by: DGAC FRANCE</p> <p>M.B.104</p> <p>The record keeping durations are more linked to justice issues. It would be easier to state for everything 5 years, and as required by local justice regulations Are all these retention periods defined in accordance to the justice requirements in case of accidents in each European country?</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The text will be amended to specify 5 years for all records (cf. new CAMO.B.220).</p>

<p>Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART A — GENERAL — AMC1</p> <p>M.B.114(a)(1) Record keeping</p>	<p>p. 137</p>
--	---------------

comment	<p>23 comment by: Austro Control Ltd.</p> <p>Comment: M.B.114 (a)(6) Record Keeping: There is a wrong reference made in the text to paragraph 145.B.14 which is considered not to be appropriate. Justification: It seems there is mistake (maybe by copy-paste) relating to the reference made to</p>
---------	---



response	145.B.14 and not to Part-M. Proposal: Revise the text as necessary to refer to the proper paragraph of Annex I of EC 1321/2014.
	Accepted. This copy-paste error will be corrected.

<p>Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART A — GENERAL — M.B.130 Oversight principles</p>	<p>p. 138-139</p>
---	-------------------

comment	367	comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i>
	<p>There should be the word added 'potential' in from of unannounced to leave the authority decide to use of this "tool" compared to a regular inspection.</p> <p>inspections, including “potential” unannounced inspections;</p>	
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The text is fully aligned with that included in Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012. There are no prescriptive requirements included as regards the number and periodicity of such unannounced inspections; authorities should adopt a risk- and performance-based approach to initiating such inspections, considering the results of past oversight, risk and safety priorities under the State Safety Programme as well as safety risk management capability of organisations.</p>	

<p>Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — M.B.604 Continuing oversight Oversight programme</p>	<p>p. 145-146</p>
--	-------------------

comment	24	comment by: <i>Austro Control Ltd.</i>
	<p>Comment: AMC1 M.B.602 (a): paragrah (b) Initial certification procedure The text of this point is considered to be not clear because compliance of the application can only be verified at that stage of investigation concerning the administrative requirements for an application and not for compliance of the organisation to the applicable requirements.</p> <p>Justification: It could be understood in such a way that already at this stage of initial certification compliance of the organisation with applicable requirements have to be satisfied which is not possible at this stage of certification of the organisation. Only the requirements for</p>	



	<p>the application itself for compliance can be verified.</p> <p>Proposal: Revise the text in such way that it is more clear that only the administrative requirements for a proper application has to be satisfied and verified by the competent authority at this stage of initial certification.</p>
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I will not amend Part-M Subpart F. This Subpart is maintained to ensure transition to the new Part-CAO.</p> <p>For information:</p> <p>The changes proposed with NPA 2013-01(B) in relation to initial certification were fully aligned with the corresponding Subpart GEN of the authority and organisation requirements already adopted through Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 (aircrew) and 965/2012 (air operations).</p> <p>The general reference to 'applicable requirements' meant those requirements that apply for initial certification; it is clear that the competent authority may not expect a fully functioning maintenance organisation at this stage, but it should not limit its verification to purely administrative issues.</p>
comment	<p>119 comment by: CAA-NL</p> <p>M.B.604(c) We suggest to make the second paragraph a separate point (g), to make it clear that in any case when the performance deteriorate the oversight planning cycle may be reduced.</p>
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I will not amend Part-M Subpart F. This Subpart is maintained to ensure transition to the new Part-CAO.</p>

Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — AMC2 M.B.604(c) Oversight programme

p. 148

comment	<p>25 comment by: Austro Control Ltd.</p> <p>Comment: AMC2 M.B.604 (c): point (d)(3) It is considered that a competent authority "do not believe something", all decision shall be made based on evidence. Justification: Without proper evidence a competent authority cannot made proper decisions.</p>
---------	--



response	<p>Proposal: Revise the text of the AMC e.g. to the following: "...that there is no evidence that standards have deteriorated in respect of..."</p> <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I will not amend Part-M Subpart F. This Subpart is maintained to ensure transition to the new Part-CAO.</p>
comment	<p>134 comment by: EUROPEAN AVIATION QUALITY GROUP (EAQG)</p> <p>Comment: To get credit and confidence to maintenance organisations being EN9110 certified, it is proposed to allow the extension of the oversight planning cycle to 36 months. Note: same comment and same change could be applied to 145.B.33(c). Proposed Change to Text: (c) For organisations certified by the competent authority, an oversight planning cycle not exceeding 24 months or 36 months if the organisation is also EN9110 certified through the IAQG Industry Controlled Other Party (ICOP) scheme shall be applied.</p>
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I will not amend Part-M Subpart F. This Subpart is maintained to ensure transition to the new Part-CAO.</p> <p>For information:</p> <p>It should be left at the discretion of the competent authority to consider EN 9110 certification.</p> <p>EN 9110 currently does not address safety risk management. Also, being EN 9110-certified is not sufficient to override the generally applicable condition related to the absence of level 1 finding and the timely implementation of all corrective actions. Therefore, it cannot alone justify an extension of the oversight planning cycle to 36 months.</p> <p>Considering that the EN 9100 series standards are currently being reviewed, in particular with regard to the introduction of the concept of risk-based thinking, it is proposed to reassess the proposal for Part-CAMO and Part-145 organisations in Phase II.</p> <p>In the meantime, a cross-reference table showing the common elements in the new EN 9110 standard and Part-CAMO (Part-145) should be provided.</p>

Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.B.604(d) Oversight programme

p. 150

comment	<p>120 comment by: CAA-NL</p> <p>AMC1 M.B.604(d)</p>
---------	--



	We suggest to delete this AMC, Point (a) is first not in ARA nor in ARO included, besides it should be left to the CA how to evaluate the adequacy of the oversight program. Point (b) could be deleted when our previous remark on the article itself has been accepted.
response	Not accepted. The opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I will not amend Part-M Subpart F. This Subpart is maintained to ensure transition to the new Part-CAO.

Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.B.606 Changes

p. 153-154

comment	135	comment by: <i>EUROPEAN AVIATION QUALITY GROUP (EAQG)</i>
	<p>Comment:</p> <p>In line with above modification proposal to M.B.604(c), an extension of the oversight planning cycle beyond 36 months could be allowed for EN9110 certified approved organisations.</p> <p>Note: same comment and same change could be applied to AMC 145.B.33(c) by means of a new AMC3.</p> <p>Proposed New Text:</p> <p>AMC3 M.B.604 (d) Oversight programme EXTENSION OF THE OVERSIGHT PLANNING CYCLE BEYOND 36 MONTHS</p> <p>In order to be able to apply an oversight planning cycle up to 48 months the competent authority should determine the format and contents of the regular reports to be made by the organisation on its safety performance.</p>	
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I will not amend Part-M Subpart F. This Subpart is maintained to ensure transition to the new Part-CAO.</p> <p>See also the response to comment #134.</p>	
comment	250	comment by: <i>Cengiz Turkoglu - City University London</i>
	<p>Without any on site inspection or audit for such a long time, how can competent authorities assure themselves the safety performance reports provided by the organisation itself truly reflect the reality in that organisation? Considering the level of competition in the industry, an organisation having financial difficulties may manipulate performance figures that are sent to the regulatory authority.</p>	
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I will not amend Part-M Subpart F. This</p>	



Subpart is maintained to ensure transition to the new Part-CAO.

For information:

The new oversight principles are not intended to reduce oversight, but to focus it on areas of greater safety concern, which is in line with the ICAO SSP framework and the eight critical elements of oversight.

It is important to stress that prescriptive requirements and compliance are not replaced by safety management — they are complemented to achieve substantial safety improvements by fostering a positive safety culture and building up the capability to address random or unique causes of occurrences, specific to a given aviation system or service provider.

To strengthen the role of effective oversight, EASA proposes to add specific provisions at cover regulation level to require Member States to ensure proper oversight capability and proposes additional requirements for competent authority management systems, requiring internal auditing and safety risk management.

The changes proposed with NPA 2013-01(B) aimed to support the required evolution of the system. Organisations would be in particular required to implement an internal safety reporting scheme and ensure follow-up of reports, and competent authorities would be required to implement systems for immediate reaction to a safety problem (cf. M.B.106, now CAMO.B.135) and providing EASA with safety-significant information related to occurrences it has received (cf. M.B.105, now CAMO.B.125).

Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART F — MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION — GM1 M.B.606 Changes p. 154

comment	<p>26 comment by: <i>Austro Control Ltd.</i></p> <p>Comment: An automatic raise of a level 1 finding in the case of a not in time submission of a CAP by the approved organisation is considered as a much too restrictive action for a problem with a CAP not submitted in time.</p> <p>Justification: Such an action would mean that the approval has to be automatically suspended or limited due to the raise of a level 1 finding. This is considered not to be appropriate for a problem with the CAP because this is still the plan and no time limit for an action to be taken is overdue with a too late CAP only.</p> <p>Proposal: Revise the paragraph in such a way that the first part of the point is deleted and only to fail with the corrective action itself to a finding would cause a level 1 finding.</p>
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The opinion for RMT.0251 (MDM.055) Phase I will not amend Part-M Subpart F. This Subpart is maintained to ensure transition to the new Part-CAO.</p>



For information:

The text in the AMCs is the result of stakeholder consultation that took place for rulemaking tasks OPS.001/FCL.001, which were processed as a rulemaking group task. This text is now applicable to the areas of aircrew and air operations.

Any change to the relevant requirements would need to be assessed across domains. It is, therefore, suggested not to consider this change in Phase I in order to avoid inconsistencies and differences in interpretation and implementation.

**Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART G — CONTINUING
AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — M.B.702 Initial certification procedure**

p. 156-157

comment

159

comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department
(Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

· **M.B.702(e)(1)**

Editorial

Appendix III to this part “EASA Form 3” mentioned.
Should be Appendix VI and EASA Form 14.

response

Accepted.

This copy-paste error will be corrected. The new reference will be ‘CAMO.B.310 “Initial certification procedure”’.

**Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART G — CONTINUING
AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1 702(a) Initial certification
procedure**

p. 158

comment

160

comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department
(Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

· **AMC1 702(a)**

Editorial

Should be AMC1 **M.B.702(a)**

response

Accepted.

This error will be corrected. The new reference will be ‘CAMO.B.310’.



Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.B.702(e)(3) Initial certification procedure	p. 160
---	--------

comment 121 comment by: CAA-NL

AMC1 M.B.702(e)(3)

Please add the following text to AMC1 MB702(e)(3)

(d) For commercial air transport, the approval Aircraft Technical Log as per MA306(b) is done by approving the CAME in which this document should be included.'

response Accepted.

The AMC will be amended as proposed. The new reference will be 'AMC1 CAMO.B.310 (e)(3)'.

Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — M.B.704 Oversight programme	p. 162-163
--	------------

comment 27 comment by: Austro Control Ltd.

Comment:

M.B.704 Oversight programme

The requirement in (d) reflects the conditions to be met for an oversight cycle extension, but the text states during the last 24 months certain conditions have to be met. This would only be true for the first extension of the oversight cycle to 36 months. After the extension the last 36 months should be considered an not 24 months.

Justification:

As per NPA 2013-01 Part A item 28. of the NPA the conditions shall be met within the last planning cycle. This is not in line with the text in the paragraph.

Proposal:

Revise the text "during the previous 24 months" with "during the last oversight planning cycle".

response Not accepted.

The last 24 months should be considered from a continuous monitoring perspective. To benefit from the 48-month extension, continuous reporting should be in place. The competent authority may reconsider the agreed planning cycle at any time if it has evidence that the safety performance of the organisation has decreased.

Also, it would not be advisable that an organisation with a reduced planning cycle be able to benefit from the extension much sooner. The decision should always consider the last 24 months.



comment	<p>136 comment by: EUROPEAN AVIATION QUALITY GROUP (EAQG)</p> <p>Comment: To get credit and confidence to CAMO being EN9110 certified, it is proposed to allow the extension of the oversight planning cycle to 36 months. Proposed Change to Text: (c) For organisations certified by the competent authority, an oversight planning cycle not exceeding 24 months or 36 months if the organisation is also EN9110 certified through the IAQG Industry Controlled Other Party (ICOP) scheme shall be applied.</p>
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Please refer to the response to comment #134.</p>
comment	<p>122 comment by: CAA-NL</p> <p>M.B.704(c) We suggest to make the second paragraph a separate point (g), to make it clear that in any case when the performance deteriorate the oversight planning cycle may be reduced. M.B.704(d) Please change the references to Part 145 para's into the correct Part M para's.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The second paragraph will be included as a separate point (new reference: CAMO.B.305 point (e)). The erroneous references to Part-145 will be corrected (copy-paste error).</p>
comment	<p>162 comment by: Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)</p> <p>· M.B.704(d)(2) Editorial Refers to "145.A.85" Should be "M.A.713"</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The erroneous references to Part-145 will be corrected (copy-paste error).</p>
comment	<p>164 comment by: Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)</p> <p>· M.B.704(d)(4)</p>



	Editorial. Refers to "145.B.50(d)(2)" Should be "M.B.705(d)(2)"
response	Accepted. The erroneous references to Part-145 will be corrected (copy-paste error).

comment	165 comment by: <i>Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)</i>
	<p>M.B.704(b)(1) "audits and inspections, including unannounced inspections and product audits of a relevant sample of aircraft managed by the organisation, and" Should be: "audits and inspections, including unannounced inspections and product audits of a relevant sample of aircraft managed or airworthiness review performed by the organisation, and" This because of some "standalone" CAMO only perform airworthiness reviews and does not manage any aircraft according to appendix I – Continuing Airworthiness Arrangement.</p>
response	Accepted. The text will be amended to include the equivalent to a product audit in the case of airworthiness reviews. The new text (cf. CAMO.B.305) reads as below: [...] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) <i>audits and inspections, including unannounced inspections, and as applicable:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) <i>product audits of a relevant sample of aircraft managed by the organisation; and/or</i> (ii) <i>sampling of airworthiness reviews performed; and/or</i> (iii) <i>sampling of permits to fly issued.</i> [...]

comment	366 comment by: <i>DGAC FRANCE</i>
	There should be the word added 'potential' in from of unannounced to leave the authority decide to use of this "tool" compared to a regular inspection. inspections, including " potential " unannounced inspections;
response	Not accepted. The text is fully aligned with that included in Regulations (EU) Nos 290/2012 and 965/2012. There are no prescriptive requirements included as regards the number and



periodicity of such unannounced inspections; authorities should adopt a risk- and performance-based approach to initiating such inspections, considering the results of past oversight, risk and safety priorities under the State Safety Programme as well as safety risk management capability of organisations.

**Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART G — CONTINUING
AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.B.704(a);(b) Oversight
programme**

p. 163

comment 123

comment by: CAA-NL

AMC1 M.B.704(a);(b)

We are of the opinion that this AMC can be deleted for 2 reasons:

- M.B.704 states that the oversight program shall be developed on the basis of ... “and the result of past certification and oversight results”. This means that when these results points towards a decreasing or increasing level of compliance and safety performance the oversight planning cycle needs to be amended. So there is no need for an extra annual evaluation.
- Consistency reasons as this AMC is not incorporated in Parts ARA and ARO.

response

Not accepted.

Following the recommendations by the Focused Consultation Group, this AMC is maintained (now AMC to CAMO.B.305). The Focused Consultation Group further recommended that the change be introduced in the other domains through the relevant follow-up rulemaking tasks.

**Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART G — CONTINUING
AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.B.704(b) Oversight programme**

p. 163

comment 28

comment by: Austro Control Ltd.

Comment:

AMC 1 M.B. 704 (b): item (a)(6) Oversight programme

The word "rating" is considered to be misleading in relation to Part-M Subpart G.

Justification:

This wording is considered to be one of the typical copy paste failures which originates from duplication of requirements in several parts of the annexes of EC No 1321/2014.

Proposal:

The wording in the text should be replaced with the words "type" or "fleet".



response Accepted.
The wording will be aligned with that used in the EASA Form 14 (aircraft type/series/group).
Cf. AMC1 CAMO.B.305(b), now item (a)(7).

comment 29 comment by: *Austro Control Ltd.*

Comment:
AMC1 M.B.704(b): item (a) Oversight programme
When determining the oversight programme it shall also be considered if an organisation has various number of sub-contractors doing tasks for the organisation.
Justification:
It considered to be very important that the existing number of possible sub-contractors of the CAMO shall be considered when determining the oversight programme for such an approved Part-M Subpart G organisation.
Proposal:
Add the term sub-contractor to the list of items under the point (a) of AMC1 M.B.704 (b).

response Accepted.
The AMC will be amended to consider subcontracting.
Cf. AMC1 CAMO.B.305(b), new item (a)(6).

**Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART G — CONTINUING
AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.B.704(a)(b) Oversight
programme**

p. 163

comment 166 comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department
(Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

AMC1 M.B.704(a)(b)

Editorial.
Refers to " 145.A.60 and 145.B.30(f)".
Should be "M.A.202 and M.B.130(f)".

response Accepted.
The erroneous references to Part-145 will be corrected (copy-paste error).

comment 320 comment by: *Federal Office of Civil Aviation, FOCA, Switzerland*

The text for the oversight programme has been rewritten and does now include the possibility to extend the oversight period to 36 resp. 48 month, New Annual Review,



	Credit for other standards, Form 13 after each oversight planning cycle. We support these possibilities. However, the references in M.A.704(d)2 and (d)4, AMC1M.B.704(a)(b) to Part-145 are wrong and should point to M.A. paragraphs.
response	Accepted. The erroneous references to Part-145 will be corrected (copy-paste error).

comment	30 comment by: <i>Austro Control Ltd.</i>
	<p>Comment: AMC2 M.B.704 (c): item (d)(3) Oversight programme It is considered that a competent authority "do not believe something". All decisions shall be made based on appropriate evidence by the competent authority. Justification: Without proper evidence a competent authority cannot made proper decisions. Proposal: Revise the text of the AMC to e.g. the following proposal: ".....that there is no evidence that standards have deteriorated in respect of....."</p>
response	Accepted. The AMC text will be changed as proposed. Cf. AMC2 CAMO.B.305(c), item (d)(3).

Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC3 M.B.704(c) Oversight programme p. 165-166

comment	124 comment by: <i>CAA-NL</i>
	<p>AMC3 M.B.704(c) We wonder why this AMC has now been restricted to CAT only?</p>
response	Accepted. The reference to ‘commercial air transport operator’ will be deleted. The AMC will apply to all Part-CAMO organisations. References to ‘operator’ will be replaced by references to ‘subcontracting organisation’. The AMC text will be further amended to refer to ‘organisation’ instead of ‘continuing airworthiness management organisation’.



comment	125	comment by: CAA-NL
	<p>AMC3 M.B.704(c) Please amend text in bullet (5): '...to ensure they that the continuing airworthiness management organisation has sufficient control over the subcontracted organisation and that the subcontracted continuing airworthiness management tasks are carried out in compliance with M.A. Subpart G. For these audits, the competent authority auditing surveyor should always ensure that he/she is accompanied throughout the audit by a senior technical member of the operator. All findings should be sent to and corrected by the operator.'. Thus to better explain the intention of the requirement for the competent authority in the oversight of subcontracted organizations.</p>	
response	<p>Accepted. The text will be amended as suggested.</p>	

comment	168	comment by: Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)
	<p>· AMC3 M.B.704(c) Editorial. "Commercial air transport" is mentioned here. Should not "Subpart G" organization be mentioned here? According to current M.A.711(a)(3) even a "standalone" CAMO with a "Quality system" is allowed to subcontract.</p>	
response	<p>Accepted. The AMC will be amended as proposed. Please refer to the response to comment #124.</p>	

**Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART G — CONTINUING
AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.B.704(d) Oversight programme**

p. 166

comment	126	comment by: CAA-NL
	<p>AMC1 M.B.704(d) We suggest to delete this AMC, Point (a) is first not in ARA nor in ARO included, besides it should be left to the CA how to evaluate the adequacy of the oversight program. Point (b) could be deleted when our previous remark on the article itself has been accepted.</p>	
response	<p>Not accepted. Following the recommendations by the Focused Consultation Group, this AMC is maintained (now AMC1 to CAMO.B.305(d)). The Focused Consultation Group further</p>	



recommended that the change be introduced in the other domains, through the relevant follow-up rulemaking tasks.

Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART G — CONTINUING
AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.B.706 Changes

p. 170

comment 127 comment by: CAA-NL

AMC1 M.B.706 points (a) and (d)

Please insert correct references to the CAME and the Part M Subpart G approval.

response Accepted.
References will be corrected.

comment 137 comment by: EUROPEAN AVIATION QUALITY GROUP (EAQG)

Comment:

In line with above modification proposal to M.B.704(c), an extension of the oversight planning cycle beyond 36 months could be allowed for EN9110 certified organisations.

Proposed New Text:

AMC3 M.B.704 (d) Oversight programme

EXTENSION OF THE OVERSIGHT PLANNING CYCLE BEYOND 36 MONTHS

In order to be able to apply an oversight planning cycle up to 48 months the competent authority should determine the format and contents of the regular reports to be made by the organisation on its safety performance.

response Not accepted.
Please refer to the response to comment #134.

comment 169 comment by: Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department
(Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)

AMC1 M.B.706 point (a)

Editorial.

“maintenance organisation exposition” mentioned.

Should be “continuing airworthiness management exposition”

response Accepted.
The reference in point (a) will be corrected (‘CAME’ instead of ‘MOE’).



comment	<p>171</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)</i></p> <p>AMC1 M.B.706(d) Editorial. "Part-M Subpart F" mentioned. Should be "Part-M Subpart G"</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The references in point (d) will be corrected.</p>

comment	<p>31</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>Austro Control Ltd.</i></p> <p>Comment: AMC1 M.B.706 (d) Changes It is considered that the reference to the "Part-M Subpart F approval" is not correct. Justification: The EASA Form 13 mentioned in the above AMC is the form to be used only for Part-M Subpart G approvals. Proposal: Revise the reference to "Part-M Subpart G approval"</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The references in point (d) will be corrected.</p>

comment	<p>321</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>Federal Office of Civil Aviation, FOCA, Switzerland</i></p> <p>Wrong references in AMC1M.B.706(a) and GM1M.B706(a) to the MOE instead of CAME. Wrong references in AMC1M.B.706(d) to Part-M Subpart-F organisation instead of Part-M Subpart G organisation.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>All these references will be corrected to reflect Subpart G (now Part-CAMO).</p>



comment	<p>173</p> <p>comment by: <i>Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)</i></p> <p>· GM1 M.B.706(a) Editorial. “maintenance organisation exposition” mentioned. Should be “continuing airworthiness management exposition”</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The reference in point (a) will be corrected (‘CAME’ instead of ‘MOE’).</p>

Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART G — CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.B.707(c) Suspension, limitation and revocation	p. 171
--	--------

comment	<p>174</p> <p>comment by: <i>Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)</i></p> <p>· M.B.707(c) Editorial “maintenance facilities” mentioned. Should be “facilities”</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>This will be corrected to refer to ‘facilities’ only (new reference: CAMO.B.355 point (c)).</p>

comment	<p>32</p> <p>comment by: <i>Austro Control Ltd.</i></p> <p>Comment: M.B.707 (c) Suspension, Limitation and Revocation The CAMO does not utilise maintenance facilities for its work. Justification: This seems to be one of the typical copy paste failures which originates from duplication of requirements in several parts of the annexes of EC No 1321/2014. Proposal: The wording maintenance facilities shall be replaced with continuing airworthiness management facilities.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p>



This will be corrected to refer to 'facilities' only (new reference: CAMO.B.355 point (c)).

Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART I — AIRWORTHINESS REVIEW p. 172
CERTIFICATE — M.B.904 Exchange of information

comment	<p>128 comment by: CAA-NL</p> <p>We propose to insert a New M.B. 801</p> <p>Please insert the text of ARO.GEN.355 Findings and enforcement measures persons here to give the CA the possibility and the duty to take action when non compliances are found by persons related to the CRS. Text needs of course be amended to fir Part M.</p>
response	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>This new IR will be included in Part-M on the basis of ARO.GEN.355 point (b). Please refer to new M.B.103.</p>

Section B — Procedures for Competent Authorities — SUBPART G — CONTINUING p. 166
AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION — AMC1 M.B.704(d) Oversight programme

comment	<p>322 comment by: Federal Office of Civil Aviation, FOCA, Switzerland</p> <p>The "period of 24 month" is not in line with the oversight period, which could be up to 48 months according the proposal.</p>
response	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The clause should be activated after 24 months in all cases. See also the new provisions on carrying out an annual programme validation inspection.</p>

Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704 - PART 0 GENERAL ORGANISATION — 0.1 Corporate p. 181
commitment by the accountable manager



comment	<p>16</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>Austro Control Ltd.</i></p> <p>Comment: Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704 Continuing Airworthiness Management Exposition It should be considered that a separate headline in Part 0 of the CAME for the subject "Training Policy" should be established. Justification: The training policy is considered to be too important to place it as a sub chapter in chapter 0.3 "Management personnel" of the CAME. Proposal: Consider to revise the Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704 to include an additional header in Part 0 of the CAME for "Training Policy".</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>In line with the recommendations made by the Focused Consultation Group, Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704 will not be maintained and the contents will be considered to issue CAME guidance as part of the EASA safety promotion material. The comment made will be considered for creating such material.</p> <p>For information: There is no requirement in current Part-M to have a dedicated training policy.</p>

Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704 - PART 0 GENERAL ORGANISATION — 0.4 Management organisation charts

p. 184-185

comment	<p>175</p> <p style="text-align: right;">comment by: <i>Baines Simmons Limited</i></p> <p>Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704 Continuing Airworthiness Management Exposition (organisation charts)</p> <p>Part 0 Section 0.4 Management Chart suggests that the Safety Manager has replaced the "Quality Manager" in the hierarchy, which we feel is not appropriate and inconsistent with the intent of the introduction of the Management System Requirements.</p> <p>The chart does not show the "Continuing Airworthiness Management" function, but does show a "maintenance" function. We recommend that the maintenance function is renamed continuing airworthiness management to reinforce the Part-M connection, and to reduce the possible confusion with any in-house Part-145 activity, which could then be shown as reporting into the CAM function.</p> <p>Furthermore, the CAM organisation chart example shows the Compliance Monitor as a report to the Nominated Post Holder for continuing airworthiness with a CAT Operators. This is also quite incorrect. The Compliance Monitoring function of an "AOC holder" (or any other organisation for that matter) should report into the Accountable Manager directly, otherwise its independence from the management structure could be questioned</p>
---------	---



and also suggests there may be a separate CM function (and manager) for the remainder of the organisation.

response Noted.

In line with the recommendations made by the Focused Consultation Group, Appendix V to the CAME AMC will not be maintained and the contents will be considered to issue CAME guidance as part of the EASA safety promotion material.

The comments made will be considered for creating such material to clarify the responsibilities, accountabilities and reporting lines.

comment 324 comment by: *Federal Office of Civil Aviation, FOCA, Switzerland*

CAME content: The organisation charts in Para 0.4 are wrong. According to our interpretation the compliance monitoring function must be a support function and in any case above the nominated postholder.

response Noted.

In line with the recommendations made by the Focused Consultation Group, Appendix V to the CAME AMC will not be maintained and the contents will be considered to issue CAME guidance as part of the EASA safety promotion material.

The comments made will be considered for creating such material.

Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704 - PART 1 CONTINUING AIRWORTHINESS MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES — 1.3 Time and continuing airworthiness records, responsibilities, retention, access p. 189

comment 17 comment by: *Austro Control Ltd.*

Comment:
 Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704 Continuing Airworthiness Management Exposition
 If the safety manager maybe combinded with the compliance monitoring manager both management functions should be at the same level in the organisation chart.

Justification:
 The compliance monitorinmg manager if not combined with the safety manager should be at the same level in the organisation chart as the safety manager and independent from other management fuctions except the accoutable manager. In the case of combination the compliance monitoring manager would be independent as it is described now and if not combined the compliance monitoring manager would not be independent anymore this is als considerd not to be consistent.

Proposal:



	Revise the organisation chart in the Appendix V in such a way that the compliance monitoring manager is at the same level like the safety manager if both functions are not combined in the function of the safety manager.
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>In line with the recommendations made by the Focused Consultation Group, Appendix V to the CAME AMC will not be maintained and the contents will be considered to issue CAME guidance as part of the EASA safety promotion material.</p> <p>The comments made will be considered for creating such material.</p>

Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704 - PART 2 QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM — 2.1 Continuing airworthiness quality safety policy, audit plan and audits procedure

p. 193-194

comment	<p>177</p> <p>comment by: <i>Baines Simmons Limited</i></p> <p>Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704 Continuing Airworthiness Management Exposition (Part 2 Management System)</p> <p>Consistent with our other comments, we recommend this Part is renamed “Compliance Monitoring” (NOT Management System) and that the content of sections 2.1 a) and 2.7 through 2.14 be moved to Part 0</p> <p>We consider there is a significant risk that this layout may give the impression that the activities discussed are the sole responsibility of the “Compliance Monitoring” manager and staff, rather than the Part 0 management structure as a whole.</p> <p>Para c) should be revised to read “The audit is a key element of the Compliance Monitoring Function ...”.</p>
response	<p>Noted.</p> <p>In line with the recommendations made by the Focused Consultation Group, Appendix V to the CAME AMC will not be maintained and the contents will be considered to issue CAME guidance as part of the EASA safety promotion material.</p> <p>The comments made will be considered for creating such material.</p> <p>For information: For the AMCs to M.A.704 (now CAMO.A.300), the following table of contents has been agreed:</p> <p>Part 0 General organisation</p> <p>Part 1 Continuing airworthiness management procedures</p> <p>Part 2 Management system procedures</p> <p>Part 3 Contracted maintenance (for licensed air carriers) — management of maintenance (liaison with maintenance organisations — operations other than by licensed air carriers)</p> <p>Part 4 Airworthiness review procedures (if applicable)</p> <p>Part 5 Supporting documents</p>



Appendix V to AMC1 M.A.704 - PART 2 QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM — 2.9 Safety performance monitoring

p. 195

comment

176

comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

· CAME 2.9

Editorial.

Mention “AMC1 M.A.712(a)(i) point (d).”.

Should be “AMC1 M.A.712(a)(3) point (d).”.

response

Noted.

In line with the recommendations made by the Focused Consultation Group, Appendix V to the CAME AMC will not be maintained and the contents will be considered to issue CAME guidance as part of the EASA safety promotion material.

The comments made will be considered for creating such material.

Appendix VII to AMC1 M.B.702(f) (c) Initial certification procedure EASA Form 13 — M.A. SUBPART G APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT EASA FORM 13

p. 209-218

comment

325

comment by: *Federal Office of Civil Aviation, FOCA, Switzerland*

F13 was updated to reflect changes. In all the Parts of F13 there is the Competent Authority Inspector who signs the respective part, except in Part 3 where it is "audit staff" instead of "Competent Authority Inspector".

response

Accepted.

This will be changed in line with the other EASA Form 13 Parts.

