

## Airworthiness review

### **Can an airworthiness review certificate (ARC)/recommendation be issued after an airworthiness review with open findings?**

#### **Answer**

Neither an ARC nor a recommendation can be issued with open findings. Each finding requires a corrective action before the issue of the ARC or recommendation. The corrective action should be adequate to the open finding and it should be carried out and verified by the airworthiness review staff (ARS) before the issue of the ARC/ recommendation.

#### **Last updated:**

15/12/2014

#### **Link:**

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/fr/faq/19048>

### **Can the extension of an ARC be anticipated more than 30 days?**

#### **Answer**

Assuming the aircraft satisfies the conditions for extension established in M.A.901 or ML.A.901, 30 days is the maximum allowed period for which the ARC extension can be anticipated without losing the continuity of the airworthiness review pattern. This means that the new expiry date is established as one year after the previous expiry date (AMC M.A.901(c)2, (e)2 and (f), ML.A.901(d)).

If the extension is anticipated by more than 30 days, the new expiry date will be established as one year after the date of extension.

#### **Last updated:**

06/09/2023

#### **Link:**

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/fr/faq/19050>

### **Can an Airworthiness Review Staff (ARS) perform an airworthiness review**

## on an aircraft in which he/ she had released some maintenance as Certifying Staff (CS)?

### Answer

To avoid possible conflict of interests, the ARS (Airworthiness Review Staff) should not be or have been involved in the release of the maintenance for the aircraft on which he or she intends to perform the airworthiness review (AR), except in one of the following cases:

1. Such maintenance has been released as part of the airworthiness review's physical survey of the aircraft (e.g. release necessary after visual inspections requiring panel opening);
2. Such maintenance has been released as a result of findings discovered during the physical survey of the aircraft (defect rectification)

**Note:** cases 1 and 2 are justified by the fact that such specific maintenance activity is part of the AR and therefore does not require independence between maintenance and the AR.

3. Such maintenance has been released as part of the 100-h/annual inspection contained in the maintenance programme conducted together with the Airworthiness Review of the Part-ML aircraft:
  - by an approved maintenance organisation (145.A.75(f) or CAO.A.095(c)(2)) (see also ML.A.901(b)(3)); or
  - by independent certifying staff holding an ARS authorisation (see ML.A.901(b)(4)) for aircraft operated under Annex VII (Part-NCO) to Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 or, for balloons not operated under Subpart-ADD of Annex II (Part-BOP) to Regulation (EU) 2018/3951 or for sailplane, not operated under Subpart DEC of Annex II (Part-SAO) to Regulation (EU) 2018/1976.

### Remark

From regulatory perspective, cases 1 and 2 are explicitly considered by 'AMC M.A.707(a)' and 'AMC1 CAMO.A.310(a)' [2nd bullet of point (5), respectively point (e)] for an ARS belonging to a CAMO also holding a AMO approval. Although not explicitly mentioned in any AMC, considering the Note above, the Agency understands that this principle is also permitted in other cases where the ARS happens to be also Certifying staff (including independent certifying staff).

### Remark:

*law M.A.901(l) or ML.A.903(b), when the ARS is not Certifying Staff, he/she must be assisted by a Certifying Staff to release the maintenance mentioned in cases 1 and 2.*

**Last updated:**

28/01/2021

**Link:**<https://www.easa.europa.eu/fr/faq/19049>**Can the airworthiness review certificate (ARC) of the Part-M aircraft be extended during the extensive maintenance/long term storage?****Answer**

An ARC extension could be performed as long as:

1. the conditions established for controlled environment (M.A.901 (b)) are met. This means:
  - a. continuously managed during the previous 12 months by a unique CAMO or CAO, and
  - b. maintained for the previous 12 months by Part-145, Part-M Subpart F or Part-CAO organisations.

AND

2. there is no evidence or reason to believe that the aircraft is not airworthy, as stated in M.A.901(j).

Thus, the procedure for the extension established in the CAMO or CAO has to address verification of the compliance with 3 above mentioned conditions. An aircraft going through the lengthy maintenance/modification or long-term storage is not considered to meet the condition number 2.

**Last updated:**

29/01/2021

**Link:**<https://www.easa.europa.eu/fr/faq/19062>**Is an aircraft considered to be in controlled environment at the end of the ARC validity when that aircraft was received by the CA(M)O during the 90/30 days anticipation of the ARC issue/extension performed by the preceding CA(M)O?****Answer**

CA(M)O 1 uses the anticipation when performing the airworthiness review or extension for 90 or 30 days correspondingly. After the issue or extension of the ARC, the aircraft is transferred during the anticipation period from CA(M)O 1 to CA(M)O 2. As the consequence CA(M)O 2 has solely continuously managed the aircraft for more than 12 months due to the term of the validity of the ARC accordingly being more than 12 months. Are the requirements of the M.A.901(b) point 1 satisfied?

The intent of the point M.A.901(b) point 1 is to define the 'controlled environment' (see also ML.A.901(c)(1)) by indicating that the aircraft must be managed during last 12 months by unique CA(M)O, which indirectly refers to a standard term of validity of the ARC. Therefore, if the aircraft has been managed by more than one CA(M)O since the date of issue of the last ARC or the date of issue of the ARC extension, it actually indicates that controlled environment was discontinued.

In addition, in accordance with M.A.901(n) or ML.A.903(d) the 90 days anticipation for the ARC issue shall be used to allow the physical review to be performed during a maintenance check. Hence the intention of the rule is not to address the transfer of the aircraft within those 90 days with the purpose of avoiding the forthcoming airworthiness review.

Concerning the ARC extension and its 30 days anticipation, point M.A.901(f) [AMC M.A.901(c)2, (e)2 and (f)] or ML.A.901(d) are intended for 2 consecutive extensions by the same CA(M)O managing the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft from the date of issue of the ARC. Therefore, an ARC extended for the first time by an organisation cannot be extended a 2nd time by another organisation, because this constitutes a 'breach' in controlled environment.

#### **Last updated:**

29/01/2021

#### **Link:**

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/fr/faq/19063>

## **Are EASA Forms 1 required during the import in the EU of an aircraft subject to Part-M?**

### **Answer**

For the import of an aircraft in the EU under Part-M regime, the provisions of M.A.904 require the accomplishment of an airworthiness review in accordance with point M.A.901.

Note: AMC M.A.904(a)(2) defines specific elements to be considered for imported aircraft.

However, when performing the airworthiness review of an imported aircraft in accordance with

point M.A.901 and its AMC, it may happen that 'AMC M.A.901(k)' is not fully satisfied in which certain components subject to the review may not hold an EASA Form 1 (or equivalent under a bilateral agreement) In such a case, other component releases to service or serviceable tags may be acceptable for the competent authority of the importing Member State.

Nevertheless, it is important to ensure that the information required by M.A.305(c) and (d) related to the status of ADs, life accumulated by life-limited parts and time-controlled components, modifications and repairs is available.

**Last updated:**

28/01/2021

**Link:**

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/fr/faq/19060>