COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT (CRD) TO NOTICE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT (NPA) 2009-05

for amending Decision No 2003/19/RM of the Executive Director of the Agency of 28 November 2003 on acceptable means of compliance and guidance material to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 of 20 November 2003 on the continuing airworthiness of aircraft and aeronautical products, parts and appliances, and on the approval of organisations and personnel involved in these tasks

"Appendix 1
Aircraft type ratings for Part-66 aircraft maintenance licence"

Explanatory Note

I. General

1. The purpose of the Notice of Proposed Amendment (NPA) 2009-05, dated 13 May 2009 was to propose an amendment to Appendix 1 to Annex IV of Decision No 2003/19/RM[1] of the Executive Director of the European Aviation Safety Agency of 28 November 2003 on acceptable means of compliance and guidance material to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 of 20 November 2003 on the continuing airworthiness of aircraft and aeronautical products, parts and appliances, and on the approval of organisations and personnel involved in these tasks (hereinafter referred to as "Part-66 AMC Appendix 1").

II. Consultation

2. The draft Executive Director Decision amending Decision N° 2003/19/RM was published on the web site (http://www.easa.europa.eu) on 13 May 2009.

   By the closing date of 13 August 2009, the European Aviation Safety Agency ("the Agency") had received 120 comments from 33 National Aviation Authorities, professional organisations and private companies.

III. Publication of the CRD

3. All comments received have been acknowledged and incorporated into this Comment Response Document (CRD) with the responses of the Agency.

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

   - **Accepted** – The comment is agreed by the Agency and any proposed amendment is wholly transferred to the revised text.
   - **Partially Accepted** – Either the comment is only agreed in part by the Agency, or the comment is agreed by the Agency but any proposed amendment is partially transferred to the revised text.
   - **Noted** – The comment is acknowledged by the Agency but no change to the existing text is considered necessary.
   - **Not Accepted** - The comment or proposed amendment is not shared by the Agency

   The resulting text highlights the changes as compared to the current rule.

5. The Executive Director Decision will be issued at least two months after the publication of this CRD to allow for any possible reactions of stakeholders regarding possible misunderstandings of the comments received and answers provided.

6. Such reactions should be received by the Agency not later than **25 November 2009** and should be submitted using the Comment-Response Tool at http://hub.easa.europa.eu/crt.

[1] Decision No 2003/19/RM of the Executive Director of the Agency of 28.11.2003 on acceptable means of compliance and guidance material to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 of 20 November 2003 on the continuing airworthiness of aircraft and aeronautical products, parts and appliances, and on the approval of organisations and personnel involved in these tasks. Decision as last amended by Decision 2009/008/R of 24 March 2009.

IV. CRD table of comments, responses and resulting text

NOTE: The final proposed text, identifying the difference with the current text, is contained in the Appendix A after the responses to the comments.

(General Comments)	-

comment *19* comment by: *Dassault Aviation*

Attachment #1

1. As a general remark, EASA has to think about a quick mean to update this AMC Part-66. The update should be as quick as a new model and/or new commercial designation is put into service. NPA process is too long, and this could put burden onto operators (maintenance) otherwise. For information, on the pilot type rating side, European authorities decided to move the list from JAR-FCL1 onto a JAA JIP which can be updated very quickly to reflect a new model or variant as soon as the Authority (JOEB) recognizes it.

2. In NPA2009-05, the column AEROPLANES is divided into two columns MODEL and NAME. According to paragraph 10 on page 4 of the NPA2009-05, column MODEL should reflect the aircraft model as it appears in the EASA or FAA TCDS, whereas the column NAME should reflect the aircraft commercial designation when available.

As a result, for DASSAULT AVIATION aeroplanes, the two columns MODEL and NAME have to be swapped. Furthermore, DASSAULT AVIATION proposes to rename the column NAME by COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION to make it clearer.

3. Paragraph 10 B on page 5 of the NPA2009-05 says that one proposed modification is to simplify complicated designation (for example, "Dassault Falcon 7X" becomes "Falcon 7X"). It has been done for DASSAULT AVIATION aeroplanes, but not for some other OEMs. EASA should check the consistency of this decision for all OEMs.

response *Partially accepted*

1. Currently the Agency is entitled to process the update of list of type rating through a Rulemaking task, where it is planned that a new Decision is published once a year after publication of the CRD for a 2 months period and also after publication of the NPA for consultation. This has been agreed by SSCC/AGNA. Any wish to change this process would need to be brought to this committee in order to modify the process.
2. The column “Name” has been renamed “Commercial Designation”.
3. The process described to simplify the designations by keeping one designation per rating (example: Falcon 7X) constitutes a general rule that the Agency has adopted. However, for certain aircraft this cannot be followed as it may result in non-determinant designations (example if we reduce Gulfstream G-IV to G-IV only, this designation would become incomprehensible).

comment *31* comment by: *CAA-NL*

Attachment #2

	General comment. This NPA is a huge improvement! It would be good to use the approach as in amongst others group 1 also for group 3-10. Type ratings should be unambiguous. Usually models and variants are specified by adding extensions to the type, such as 747**-400** and 747**-400F**. To keep type ratings simple extensions are used as far as necessary. By using this method, users can assume that all further extensions are included in the type rating: 747-400 includes the 400F, 400SF and 400LCF. In the case that one specific model (identified by a different extension) requires specific type training (and rating), the difference between that model and models without further extensions should be clear. In case of Airbus A300 this is now done by adding "basic model". "Basic model" should have the meaning "without (further)extensions". This approach should be followed by other types as well. It should be clear that the Flacon 50 does not cover the Flacon 50EX and Falcon 900 does not cover 900EX does not cover 900EX EAsy. For this purpose I recommend to add "basic model" in other cases as well. The same principle applies to engines. (RR RB211-500 series and RR RB-211 Trent series or trent-500 series) Annex II aircraft have the same need for standard type ratings. It would be better to include these type ratings (separate) in the list. With regard to the explanatory note on the website (http://www.easa.eu.int/ws_prod/r/doc/Part66AML/Explanatory%20document%2014%20May%202009.pdf) a note could be added that they are only added for standardisation purposes. Also the fact that the aircraft is outside EASA resposibilities does not exclude the possibility to issue a maintenance licence for that aircraft in accordance with Part-66 (and 147). For more general comment see also attached general comment given on NPA 2007-018. Note: In the case of Airbus A300 basic model (GE CF6) this principle is however not properly adhered to. Most Models A300 have an extension like B2 and in addition -102, -220 etc. It is notintuitively clear that -100 series, -200 series and -300 series are considered to be basic model and -600 being not a basic model.
response	*Partially accepted* The tables have been modified to show data from TCDS for aircraft requiring a type rating based on training, which are those today in List 1, List 2 and similar data have been added for helicopters. This will be extended to other Lists depending on further changes in EC Regulations regarding the need for individual type ratings. To keep type ratings simple, the addition of a new type will not be shown in the type rating but by adding the new models in the table in columns 2 and 3, this is the reason why all types are not shown automatically in the type rating (this is typically the case of B.747-400F) The terminology "Basic Model" (used i.e. for A300) will not be used extensively for other models, because the table shows clearly in column 2 which model is

included in a rating.
Some RR RB211 show Trent and others do not show Trent because all RR RB 211 are not Trent engines, this is described in the TCDS of RR engines.
Annex II aircraft are excluded by EC Regulation 2042/2003 Article 1, and can not be included in these Lists. This does not prevent the authorities from issuing similar national licences for these aircraft, however, EASA does not take them under its remit.
Regarding the comment related to Airbus aircraft, the tables show clearly which models are included in a type rating.

comment

87 comment by: *Latvian Civil Aviation Agency*

In the NPA 2009-05 is some mistake in accordance to An-28. Please see new EASA SAS 091. it isn't expired.

EASA.SAS.A.091 Antonov An-28 Page 1 of 9 Issue 01, 30 April 2008 *European Aviation Safety Agency*
EASA SPECIFIC AIRWORTHINESS SPECIFICATION for Antonov An-28

response

Accepted

This aircraft qualifies for SAS only (restricted C of A and non commercial operation). The rating AN 28 remains in the list.

comment

91 comment by: *Federal Office of Civil Aviation (FOCA), Switzerland*

Comments to NPA 2009-05, Annex I, Appendix I. Aircraft Type ratings list for Part-66 AML.

To simplify and harmonize the type ratings listed, The FOCA proposes few amendments of the NPA 2009-05.

Detailed comments are referring to 1.2 list of Type ratings category 1 and 2.2 list of Type ratings category 2.

To harmonize and keep the list simple « Annex I, Appendix I, Aircraft type ratings for Part-66 AML » and also to avoid all confusions in the industry with the never ending change on type ratings listed in Part-66 AML and in Approval schedules of Part-145 & Part-M/F and in Design and Manufacturing Organisations, Informatics systems, etc… , FOCA is asking EASA to stop this never-ending change of aircraft designation which occurs every year in Annex I, Appendix I, as *relocated under… & Changes in designation* On: Boeing Company / Mc Donnell Douglas Corporation; Learjet / Bombardier; Hawker Beechcraft / BAe; Dassault Aviation; etc..

Many thanks in advance for your collaboration and understanding.

Best Regards

response

Not accepted

This list of type ratings is updated once a year in accordance with the Terms of Reference related to this task.
Changes are made when:
- TC holders change their names because of industry reorganisation,
- new aircraft models are produced by industry,
- some aircraft models are classified as Annex II,

- some errors in type ratings are commented.
Changes to this procedure would need to be proposed to AGNA, in order to modify the periodicity of this Rulemaking task.
However knowing the impact for stakeholders when a rating is modified, the Agency considers changes when necessary only.

comment

93 comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

We believe that Categories 3-10 should be organised the same way as Categories 1, 2 & 11-13.

response

Noted

See answer made to comment No. 31 from CAA.NL

Depending on the outcome of Rulemaking task 66.009, the requirement for individual type ratings may vary, resulting in a possible extension of the format of the lists to the remaining lists 3 to 10.

comment

115 comment by: *Luftfahrt-Bundesamt*

The LBA does not agree to the content of NPA 2009-05 as well as to its intent for the following reasons:

The deletion of all so-called Annex II - aircraft as intended by NPA 2009-05 and defined under item IV C) of NPA 2009-05 restricts, in an inadmissible way, the philosophy established in Article (4) paragraph 5 of Regulation EC no 216/2008 of the European Parliament and the Council dated 20 February 2008 as well as the applicability of this Regulation, asking commercial operators of Annex II – aircraft to comply with this Regulation and its Implementing Rules.

In so far, according to paragraph 5 of Article 4 of Regulation EC no 216/2008, for commercially used aircraft falling under Annex II sub-paragraph a), ii) as well as sub-paragraph d) and h), paragraphs 2) and 3) of Article 4 are applicable.

The legal circumstance described above requires for commercial used Annex II - aircraft to operate in accordance with Article 4 paragraphs 2 and 3. Due to the deletion of Annex II aircraft from the list of type ratings in Part - 66, this obligation cannot be any longer fulfilled.

In our view, it is rather necessary to produce a supplement of this list with reference to commercially used aircraft according to Annex II sub-paragraph a (ii) as well as sub-paragraphs d and h.

Moreover OPS 1.180 requires that aeroplanes used for commercial air transport purposes shall have a standard Certificate of Airworthiness issued in accordance with Commission Regulation (EC) No 1702/2003 of 24 September 2003. However, according to Part 21.A.173 a) this requirement cannot be met for aircraft under EC 216/2008 Article 4 paragraph 5. Consequently, it is difficult, if not impossible, for such operators to comply with the Implementing Rules for i.e. maintaining their aircraft according to EU – standards, also affecting corresponding rules, i.e. those for certifying staff.

Due to this inconsistency of European requirements the Federal Republic of

Germany has filed a derogation in accordance with Article 8 paragraphs 2 and 3 of Regulation EEC no. 3922/91 referring to OPS 1.180 of Annex III of Regulation EEC no. 3922/91, which was sent to the European Commission in September 2008, where Germany has shown in an equivalent safety case that national certification and maintenance procedures for commercial air operations of Annex II – aircraft are in line with the corresponding European requirements and regulations.

Hence, we see a real need to refrain from removing Annex II related rules from the European requirements as far as commercial use is affected. Moreover On the contrary, the LBA requests that EASA, member states and industry contribute to the establishment of harmonised requirements for Annex II - aircraft used for air transport operations.

response *Not accepted*

There is currently no Implementing Rule of the Basic Regulation for paragraph 2 and 3 of Article 4, therefore EC Regulation 2042/2003 has currently no request for Annex II aircraft (refer to Article 1 of this regulation).
The rulemaking task for issuing Implementing Rule for operations of Annex II aircraft is planned to start in 2011, which may result in a modification of the position expressed here above.

resulting text Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A**

TITLE PAGE p. 1

comment *107* comment by: *FAA*

The FAA has reviewed NPA 05/2009 and has no comments.

response *Noted*

resulting text Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A.**

A. Explanatory Note - IV. Content of the draft decision p. 4-5

comment *5* comment by: *Juan Ramon MATEOS CASADO*

Column #2 (aircraft model) includes several models for each aircraft type designation (column #3)

For instance:

2 Aeroplanes Model Name	3 Type rating endorsement
A340-210 series	A340 (CFM56)
A340-310 series	

Does this mean that it is necesary to receive type training covering all the

	models of column #2 to get the endorsement on the type rating of column #3? 1. If the answer is YES, if a person got the A340 (CFM56) endorsement following a type training course covering models A340-210 & A340-310 series, what does it happend if a new A340-410 series is launched by Airbus? Could this situation lead to that person to be limited to 210 & 310 series and to need additional type training covering the new 410 series to delete this limitation from his A340 (CFM56) endorsement? 2. If the answer is NO, to get the A340 (CMF56) type rating endorsement, is it only necessary to receive type training in any one of the models? The aim of the Agency developing this NPA can be understood as a good way to clarify the type rating endorsements but can be used by the different NAAs as a way to include limitations on the licenses. We proposed: 1.- To include a clear explanation about how these tables can be understood, in order to: • Define Type Training contents • Issue Type Training Certificates of Recognition • Endorse type ratings on licenses 2.- Clearly define if the list of aircraft models for each type rating means: **"Type Training course for a Type Rating (column #3) should include** **ANY** or **EVERY** **aircraft model of the list of aircraft models from column #2"**
response	*Noted* Whan a licence has been issued with rating endorsed as i.e. A340 (CFM56) which cover currently the types -210 and -310, and a new version is produced (in your example an A340-410), then the licence may be extended under the condition that the list of type ratings is modified to show the 3 types in the column 2 within the same rating in the coumn 3 (A340 (CFM56)). As a result of this, no limitations should be endorsed on the licence when the courses on some of the models within a type rating cannot be shown. However in such case, the Part-145 organisation shall not provide any "certification authorisation" for those models when the training is incomplete, unless the appropriate courses are completed. The Agency cannot provide additional explanations to the Decision because it is not the purpose of the Decision to define the type training courses, nor the certificates of recognition. These are defined by Part-147. Part-147 states in the Certificate of recognition that the type of aircraft shall be specified, i.e. A340 with CFM engines or with RB211 engines. In the case where the course was made for aircraft fitted with CFM engines, it should cover the model -210 and -310.

see also response to comment # 17

comment 17 comment by: EAMTC

IV.
A) Modification of...

comment:
There should be a statement clearely addressing that it is not neccesary to cover all Aeroplane models from colum 2 to get the respective type rating endorsement on the licence.
Example:
777-200
777-200LR
777-300ER
777-F
resulting in Boeing777-200/300 (GE 90)

response *Noted*

A training course on a rating should globally cover all models/versions shown in column 2 which are included in a type rating as defined in column 3 of the list.
When different models are grouped in a single type rating, this means that the Agency has considered that the differences are not important enough to require a separate rating.

The holder of a licence showing a rating because he/she received training on only one model shown in column 2 of the tables, may ask for a modification or reissuance of the licence to cover all types within this particular rating shown in column 3 of the tables.
It is the responsibility of the Part 145 organisation to ensure that the person is duly qualified (Part 145.A.30(e)) and therefore that he/she has received the appropriate training on a new version before providing the 'certification authorisation".

comment 24 comment by: CAA-NL

This NPA uses the word 'category' where part 66 uses 'group'. E.g. bottomline page 4: "the table in the remaining categories 3 to 10..."
In the light of using "Simplified English" term should be defined first. Using 'aircraft category' and 'Part-66 category' with different meanings is confusing.

Propose to include definitions: (for example)
Category means in this NPA A1, A2, A3, A4, B1.1, B1.2, B1.3, B1.4, B2 or C.
Group means a defined set of aircraft with a common approach (due to common characteristic, such as complex or piston engine wooden structure)
Type is the (Aircraft)type as defined by the type certificate data sheet
Aircraft Model is a variant as defined in the TDCS.
Name is the commercial or trade name as used by the manufacturer.

Other suggestion is to contract an organisation to translate the decision into '**Simplified English**'.

response *Partially accepted*

"Category" has been replaced by "List" to avoid any confusion with the

categories used in 66.A.45.
"Name" has been replaced by "commercial designation". Refer to comment No.19 from Dassault.

The Decision to publish the type ratings is not an appropriate place to provide definitions of types, models and names, as these are elements of certification of aircraft. The definition of groups of type ratings is covered by the task 21.039 CS-MCS. In this task, definition of type ratings and case where a new type rating is defined are envisaged.

The Agency is paying attention to use simplified English in NPAs, because this is part of the Agency's rulemaking style guide. The core part of this document is made up of lists with aircraft type designations and therefore, the Agency does not consider it necessary to contract an organisation for a translation into simplified English.

comment *74* comment by: *SAMA Swiss Aircraft Maintenance Association*

SAMA welcomes the move towards TCDS related and simplified/standardised type ratings in Part-66 AMLicences. It appears to be logical in this context that e.g. Annex II aircraft do not appear any more as standard type ratings (letter C under "envisaged changes to Decision 2003/19/RM").
However, in order to avoid any re-introduction of specific national AMLs, the revised AMC should emphasize that any certifying privileges granted under national law for such aircraft 'outside the scope of Part-66' shall be granted and defined in the "Annex to EASA Form 26".

response *Noted*

Part-66 AML EASA Form 26 foresees already a page "Annex to EASA Form 26" dedicated to list national privileges**.** The Agency does not consider it necessary to add this information in the Decision.

resulting text: Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A**

A. Explanatory Note - V. Regulatory Impact Assessment p. 5

comment *25* comment by: *CAA-NL*

The impact of changes in type ratings should not be under estimated.
In some cases it might be better to reissue licences, to avoid confusion. (when type rating for new variant only adds some characters like 900EX and 900EX EASy).
Approvals for approved maintenance, production and training organisations often use the same type ratings in approval, approval schedule or scope of work. This should be updated both in industry and authority.
In most cases tables in computer systems have to be updated.
In some cases limitations have to be amended accordingly.
Type ratings are published in numerous places, most of them should be amended as well.

response *Noted*

The priority in amending the AML licences with changes in type ratings has

been mentioned in the NPA at page 5 "Note to the competent authorities". This can be more extensively discussed at Standardisation meetings.
To assist authorities in updating lists of ratings, the Agency can provide an electronic version of the tables. This can be made available upon request once the Decision has been published.

resulting text | Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A**

B. DRAFT RULE p. 6

comment | *26* comment by: *CAA-NL*

The list should be available in a digital format giving the conversion old to new.

Since most organisations will use the type ratings in computer systems, it will reduce the efforts to update systems and improve standardisation and integrity.

Note: to facilitate track of changes, the use of 'keys' in the table is recommended.

response | *Noted*

An electronic version of the tables will be made available upon request; once the Decision has been published.

The use of keys to trace the ratings from one Decision to the next may be an appropriate tool, but may be complicated by the creation of new types and removals of others for regulatory reasons (Annex II aircraft). We will consider your proposal and discuss it internally.

resulting text | Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A**

B. Draft Decision - Aircraft Type Ratings for Part-66 AML p. 7

comment | *20* comment by: *Association of Dutch Aviation Technicians*

To avoid any non compliances or misinterpretations from Member States, Use the word 'shall' i.s.o. 'should' to express that is mandatory to comply to this decision to unsure a common standard en EU member states.

response | *Not accepted*

As the document is part of the AMC material, the term to be used is "should".

comment | *21* comment by: *Association of Dutch Aviation Technicians*

This NPA has the purpose to formally update the specifications of the various A/C type ratings.

These A/C type ratings are to be defined if applicable on the Part-66 AML

aircraft maintenance license from the particular certifying staff CS.

The certification privileges of the CS are formalized on the 145-certification authorization.

Regarding A/C type ratings, there is no formal synchronization between Part-66 and Part-145, meaning if f.i. the 2 type ratings Boeing 737-300/400/500 and Boeing 737-600/700/800/900 are mentioned on the Part-66 AML, there is no guideline see 145.A.35 in what for a format this type rating should be mentioned on the 145-certification authorization.

Any 145-organization can use any format of type rating for its 145-certification authorizations if it is acceptable to the local aviation authority.

A good example of this mis synchronization was EASA decision 2006/6/R, which had mentioned that the type ratings Boeing 737-600/700/800 en Boeing 737-900 if applicable had to be mentioned separately on the Part-66, a 145-organization had mentioned the type rating Boeing 737-600/700/800/900 as a cluster on the 145-certification authorization. Later on EASA Decision no 2008/003/R had been altered this in type rating into Boeing 737-600/700/800/900.

To the opinion of the NVLT to avoid any confusion, there should be no possibility to defer from the mentioned type ratings according the acceptable means of compliance and guidance material (EC) No. 2042/2003 on the 145-certification authorization.

In other words: use exactly the same the same type ratings on the 145-certification authorization which are mentioned on the Part-66 AML.

The NVLT suggest to ad the following phrase:

Aircraft type ratings mentioned in "Appendix 1" should be indicative for the type ratings on the 145-certification authorization

response

Partially accepted

A Rulemaking task 145.023 "Amendments (rule and AMC/GM)" intends to coordinate the process of granting foreign Part-145 approvals" versus the AML type ratings and will address this issue.
In this future NPA, it is planned that for organisations located outside of Europe instructions should be provided regarding the use of the lists contained in Appendix 1 for the definition of ratings under Part 145.
It must be noted that such tasks for EU organisations is part of another task, and that there is no direct link between the ratings on AML licences and the scopes of an organisation's (also dependent on availability of approved documentation, tooling, facilities etc…).

resulting text

Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A**

1. Large aircraft (LA). Aeroplanes with a maximum take-off mass of more than 5700 kg, requiring type training and individual type rating p. 8

comment

16 comment by: *Juan Ramon MATEOS CASADO*

Attachment #3

MD-88 has been segregated from DC-9-80 (MD-80) Series (they are now

under different type rating) This new change contributes to complicate the current situation.

Basis of this change

According to the Explanatory Note, at the beginning of this NPA, "the tables have been modified to show more data on the types by making a reference to the aircraft models listed in the type certification data sheet(TCDS)"

In the case of MD-80 Series, all these models are include in the same McDonnell Douglas Type Certificate Data Sheet No. A6WE (see attached file):

DC-9-11, DC-9-12, DC-9-13, DC-9-14, DC-9-15, DC-9-15F, DC-9-21, DC-9-31, DC-9-32, DC-9-32 (VC-9C), DC-9-32F, DC-9-32F (C-9A, C-9B), DC-9-33F, DC-9-34, DC-9-34F, DC-9-41, DC-9-51, DC-9-81 (MD-81), DC-9-82 (MD-82), DC-9-83 (MD-83), DC-9-87 (MD-87) MD-88, MD-90-30, 717-200

In the case of DC-9-80 Series and MD-88, importance of differences between between DC-9-87 (MD-87) and MD-88 are similar to ones between DC-9-81 (MD-81) (analogic instruments) and DC-9-87 (MD-87) (digital instruments).

For instance, in the Note 11 of such TCDS No. A6WE is said "DC-9-82 airplanes, S/Ns 49532 through 49539, were converted to MD-88s in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletins 22-89, 34-183, 34-188, and 53-199 and McDonnell Douglas letter 88FAA-C1- E65-3498, dated June 1, 1988."

In order to justify the different type rating, IBE cannot find so many differences between DC-9-80 Series and MD-88 to determine that they can consider as different types.

IBE has a lot of experience on both MD-87 and MD-88 and we think that this change is not properly justified.

Impact of this change

During many years, DC-9-8X (MD-8X) and MD-88 have been included in the same type endorsement and all current certifiying staff have only one type endorsement. The impact of separating some years after MD-88 from the rest of MD-80 series leads to all NAAs to review current licenses, looking for the exact model of type training and limiting the rating to the appropriate model.

But, in the case NAAs to review all type training, now it is not feasible to know the exact model covered by the type training received because, in the few last years, the rating of Part 147 type training courses was generically MD80 Series (PW JT8D).

So, all Part-147 Certificates of Recognition covering either DC-9-80 series or MD-88 were issued as MD80 Series (PW JT8D).

Impact for industry is current certifying staff to be now limited to either MD-88 or DC-9-80 if they cannot demonstrate the received both type training courses.

Impact for maintenance training organizations is to addapt the scope of their approvals to the exact type rating, asking to the NAAs for a renewal of their approvals.

Our proposal is to delete this separation between DC-9-8X models and MD-88 because it may have an important impact in the industry, the type training organizations and NAAs, and keep under the same type rating **MD-80 series (PW JT8D)** all these aircraft models:

- DC-9-81 (MD-81)
- DC-9-82 (MD-82)
- DC-9-83 (MD-83)
- DC-9-87 (MD-87)
- MD-88

response *Accepted*

The list has been corrected to read:
MD-80 Series (PW JT8D) covering:
DC-9-81 (MD-81) Series
DC-9-82 (MD-82) Series
DC-9-83 (MD-83) Series
DC-9-87 (MD-87) Series
MD-88

comment *94* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

Page 8 & 12. Alenia C-27 is not equipped with RR Corp 250 engines. It should say AE 2100 D3.

response *Partially accepted*

The engine designation has been corrected i.a.w. TCDS EASA.A.407, while adopting a simplified engine designation, as to read:

Alenia C-27 (Allison/RR AE2100)

comment *108* comment by: *Austro Control*

Issue and Justification:
List: New aircraft types added: this type designation is not listed in the TC for DC-9

Proposal: last line: "MD-9" should be deleted;

response *Accepted*

The last line in the list "New aircraft types added" has been deleted. Please note that the list of changes will no longer form part of the final Decision.

resulting text: Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A**

1.1. Summary of changes p. 8-10

comment *3* comment by: *Stefan Stroeker*

Ladies & gentlemen,

referring
"Learjet 45 (Honeywell TFE731)"
I would like to propose to look in the EASA Type Certificate Data Sheet (IM.A.020) in order to see that the aircraft type description is Learjet **MODEL** 45.
Learjet MODEL 45 is divided into Learjet 45 (S/N: 45-002 thru 45-2000) and Learjet 40 (S/N: 45-2001 thru 45-4000).
Therefore, the "Learjet 45" in the NPA includes only the S/N: 45-002 thru 45-2000.
So, the specification is incomplete in my opinion.

With kind regards ...
Stefan Ströker

response *Accepted*

For Learjet Model 45, both types (Learjet 45 and Learjet 40) have been included and the designation changed to:

Learjet Model 45 (Honeywell TFE731)

comment *27* comment by: *CAA-NL*

Use of wording especially in type ratings etc. should be consistent; e.g. BAE SYSTEMS or BAE Systems as in List of Type ratings.

The list should be checked for consistency in the use of spaces and hyphens ans slashes etc;
eg:
Gulfstream 100_/_125_/_IAI Astra SPX should be Gulfstream 100/125_/_IAI Astra SPX or Gulfstream 100/125/IAI Astra SPX.
BAe 125/_series and BAe 125/series.

PZL M_28
Arava 101_B

The use of 'series' is not consistently used.

response *Partially accepted*

1.

1. Editorial corrections have been made (use of capital letters, spaces, hyphens...).
2. PZL M_28 and ARAVA 101 B have been adapted as per the applicable TCDS.
3. Regarding the use of "Series", the word is used when more than one type is included in the rating, but not all ratings are modified to minimize the impact.
4. Regarding Gulfstream aircraft, corrections have been brought to:

– show that in this group all aircraft are under Gulfstream TC holder responsibility but manufactured by IAI,

– relevant space has been adapted.

– which results in the following text:

Gulfstream (IAI) 100/1125/Astra SPX (Honeywell TFE731)

comment 28 comment by: CAA-NL

Hawker Beechcraft Corporation 4000(PCW PW 308) is added as new type as well.

response *Accepted*

Corrected. Please note that the list of changes will no longer form part of the final Decision.

comment 29 comment by: CAA-NL

ATP Jeststream 6100 is added as ATP**/**Jeststream 61. Why is "/"added? And not just "ATP Jetstream 61"?

response *Noted*

The type design shown in the UKCAA Data Sheet shows that 2 models exist within a single TCDS which are:

- BAe ATP - JD000J0023-008 Issue 7

(Aircraft Master Definition Drawing No.)

- **Jetstream Series 6100 Model 6102 -** JS-6100/TBS.6102/2

(Type Build Standard for Type Acceptance in UK)

This is the reason why the 2 models are added but separated by a "/".

comment 30 comment by: CAA-NL

Change in designation.
Casa C-295 is changed as well.

response *Accepted*

Corrected.
Please note that the list of changes will no longer form part of the final Decision.

comment 79 comment by: *Richard Moreau*

With regard to the combination of the B767-200/300/400 with GE Engines. (Ref: Appendix 1 Category 1 Page 9 and 15) The grouping of the B767-400 with these other airplanes I feel needs to be reconsidered. Grouping these airplanes together is paramount to grouping the B747-200 and B747-400 airplanes under one designation.

As an instructor on the B767-200/300 and the -400 airplanes I realize the differences between these versions of the 767 are great. The flight decks appear completely different when looked at side by side and the instrument package on the B767-400 is a far leap in technology as compared to the older EICAS equipped airplanes. A person who is qualified to perform maintenance

on the B767-200/300 would be completely lost on the B767-400 without proper education. The terminology is different between the airplane types as are the computer processor names. Locations have changed for many systems on the B767-400 and some systems are either non-exisistant or have been upgraded or changed.

Although structurally the airplanes are similar and some systems are identical the majority of the airplane systems have been changed in some way. Some of these changes are minor and do not require a formal school however most of these changes are great enough to warrant a formal education. For example the LFDS system does not exist on the B767-200/300 only on the -400 and interrogating this system is nothing like performing a test on the EICAS system of the older airplanes. Further the APU installed on the B767-400 is a completely different unit then on the older airplanes and interrogation is performed on the flight deck instead of on the E6 rack in the aft cargo compartment. This only address' two areas of differences, many more exist then can be mentioned in this brief opinion.

By grouping these airplanes together a person can be licensed on all three type of airplanes without being trained on the B767-400. Several licenses have already been issued with this designation. If the training provided these Engineers on the B767-400 is performed to an acceptable level according to EASA then no problem exists here. However, only two airlines in the world operate this airplane. The training that is being provided is often non-existent because the companies providing this training do not have the material for such a course. Even if the company has purchased the information needed to perform this training, practical training would be impossible because access to the airplane is limited to only two companies in the world.

Finally, linking these three type airplanes together is like trying to bridge 1970's technology with 1990's technology. Although the packages may appear quite similar, when you look under the cover the internal workings are completely different as well as the methods used to interrogate and repair these airframes and engines. I feel that consideration needs to be given to breaking these two very different airplanes from a like designation.

Many leaps in technology have been realized since the inception of the B767-200/300. This airplane was designed and built in the 1970's and many of the packages delivered on these airplanes are outdated compared to the B767-400 of the 1990's. I am sure you would agree that much advancement have been made during the two decades that separate these airplanes. Just as the B747-200 and the B747-400 have different designations so should the B767-20.300 and the B767-400.

response *Noted*

Models B767-200 / -300 have been grouped together with B767-400ER following a request from the CAA UK in CRD 19-2006, based on the fact that these three models are defined in the same FAA TCDS. Although your arguments provided on the differences in model -400 are acceptable, the differences are not significant enough to request a separate type rating, similar differences may also be encountered with some other manufacturers, where models have been grouped. As a consequence no further changes should be made to this type rating.

It is the responsibility of the Part 145 organisation to ensure that the person is

duly qualified (Part 145.A.30(e)) with regards to the specific model part of the Part 66 type rating, in line with the organisation's scope of work.

comment *109* comment by: *Austro Control*

Issue and Justification:
Page 10 - List "Types deleted..."
The aircraft type Convair 600/640 (RR Dart) is listed with the remark: "no operation in EU". The title of this List refers to - aircraft type which have not been granted a type certificate under the Basic regulation including Annex II aircraft. Therefore the remark "no operation in EU" is misleading;

Proposal:
Please specify if the aircraft type has not been certificated, etc...

response *Noted*

A best wording would have been to state: "No trace of the types Convair 440 and 600/640 on the EU states' registers".
However the text you refer to is only in the NPA, not in the Decision to be published this year.
As a result, we propose no further change.

comment *120* comment by: *Estonian Civil Aviation Administration*

According to SAS status on EASA webpage http://www.easa.europa.eu/ws_prod/c/c_sas_aircraft.php Antonov AN-28 have a valid EASA.SAS.A.091. AN-28 is not Annex II aircraft. Probably there are mistake on the bottom of page 9 ?!

response *Accepted*

SAS.A.091 is valid and is the basis for acceptance of the AN-28 for certain serial numbers and limited to non-commercial operation (restricted C of A).

The rating AN 28 remains in the list.

resulting text: Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A.**

1.2. List of Type ratings category 1 p. 11-23

comment *10* comment by: *ENAC, Italy, Production and Maintenance Directorate*

We have already many obsolete variants of this rating.
Enac suggest NOT to modify again the classification of ATR 42/72.

In case of split or association of already existing ratings please specify the best policy for the specific case to update (if necessary) the existing licences.

response *Not accepted*

The model -600 has been added as a commercial designation to existing models. No obsolete variants have been listed. It is important to note that no change of the type ratings have been introduced in this NPA for ATR aircraft

compared to the previous version (Decision 2008/003/R).

comment *13* comment by: *Nayak Aircraft Services*

Dear NPA Team,

on Page 22 of the NPA you grouped SA 227 TT (M7 Aerospace) in category 1.

SA 227 is a aircraft below 5,7 t and must grouped in category 2 (page 26) together with SA226-T

The different between SA 227 AC/DC and SA227 TT is primary a shorter Airframe, a bit less wingspan and winglets.

Kind regards

Axel Neitzert

Senior Quality Manager and Commander SA 227

Nayak Aircraft Service GmbH & CO KG

response *Not accepted*

Some of the SA 227 (models AC, AT and TT) should normally be dispatched in List 1 and 2 as initially proposed by the NPA, because depending on modification status they may be certified above or below 5 700 Kg MTOM.

However as those below 5,7T are certified at 30 Kg below the limit and these are few aircraft, the Agency has selected to include them all in List 1 for aircraft above 5,7T.
As you mentioned the differences between these models are not subsequent, do not require specific practical training for the differences, therefore we consider that there is not reason enough to require a separate rating.

The impact for stakeholders of having all models grouped in List 1 is minimal as similar training is required in both cases.

The rating in List 1 is simplified to read Fairchild SA227 Series (Honeywell TPE 331).

comment *18* comment by: *Dassault Aviation*

DASSAULT AVIATION proposes to modify the list of type ratings, (page 16) as shown in the chart below. The substantiation is coming from Falcon TCDS - see associated paragraph below.

1 TC Holder	2 Aeroplanes		3 Type rating endorsement
	Model	Commercial Designation	
DASSAULT AVIATION	Falcon 10		Falcon 10 (Honeywell TFE731)
	Fan Jet Falcon	(Basic) Fan Jet Falcon	Falcon 20 (GE CF700)
	Fan Jet Falcon Series C		
	Fan Jet Falcon Series D		

	Fan Jet Falcon Series E		
	Fan Jet Falcon Series F		
	Mystère Falcon 20-C5		Falcon 20-5 (Honeywell TFE731)
	Mystère Falcon 20-D5		
	Mystère Falcon 20-E5		
	Mystère Falcon 20-F5		
	Fan Jet Falcon Series G		Falcon 200 (Honeywell ATF 3-6)
	Mystère Falcon 200		
	Mystère-Falcon 20GF		
	Mystère-Falcon 50		Falcon 50 (Honeywell TFE731)
		F50EX	Falcon 50EX (Honeywell TFE731)
	Mystère-Falcon 900		Falcon 900 (Honeywell TFE731)
		F900B	
		F900C	Falcon 900C (Honeywell TFE731)
	Falcon 900EX		Falcon 900EX (Honeywell TFE731)
		F900EX EASy	Falcon 900EX EASy (Honeywell TFE731)
		F900DX	
	Falcon 2000		Falcon 2000 (CFE 738)
	Falcon 2000EX		Falcon 2000EX (PWC PW308C)
		F2000EX EASy	Falcon 2000EX EASy (PWC PW308C)
		F2000DX	
		F2000LX	
	Falcon 7X		Falcon 7X (PWC PW307A)

Substantiation:

1. TCDS EASA.A.155 for Model Falcon 7X

1.1 Falcon 7X has PWC PW307A turbofan engines and Honeywell EPIC avionics (EASy). It is a model by itself, knowing that Falcon 7X by itself has no commercial designation.

2 Aeroplanes		3 Type rating endorsement
Model	**Commercial Designation**	
Falcon		Falcon 7X (PWC PW307A)

7X		

2. TCDS EASA.A.008 for Models Falcon 2000 and Falcon 2000EX

2.1 Falcon 2000 has CFE738-1-1B turbofan engines and Collins Proline IV avionics. It is a model by itself, knowing that Falcon 2000 by itself has no commercial designation. CFE738-1-1B can be abbreviated by CFE738 for the purpose of AML in this Part66.

2.2 Falcon 2000EX has PWC PW308C turbofan engines. It is a model with three different commercial designations, knowing that Falcon 2000EX by itself has no commercial designation. Note: Falcon 2000EX is a Falcon 2000 with engines change (PWC PW308C) and increase of fuel capacity - application of M1802 + M1803 + M1804 + M1805 + M1820 + M1838 + M2233 (+ M1826 starting serial number 2).

2.2.1 Falcon 2000EX EASy: basically, Falcon 2000EX EASy is a Falcon 2000EX with avionics change (Honeywell EPIC (EASy)).

Falcon 2000EX EASy is not a new model designation. This is only a commercial designation of a Falcon 2000EX, on which major modifications (M1691 + M1745 + M1504) have been applied.

2.2.2 Falcon 2000DX: basically Falcon 2000DX is a Falcon 2000EX EASy with a reduction in fuel capacity.

Falcon 2000DX is not a new model designation. This is only a commercial designation of a Falcon 2000EX EASy, on which major modification M3000 have been applied.

2.2.3 Falcon 2000LX: basically Falcon 2000LX is a Falcon 2000EX EASy with the addition on winglets.

2 Aeroplanes		3 Type rating endorsement
Model	**Commercial Designation**	
Falcon 2000		Falcon 2000 (CFE 738)
Falcon 2000EX		Falcon 2000EX (PWC PW308C)
	F2000EX EASy	Falcon 2000EX EASy (PWC PW308C)
	F2000DX	
	F2000LX	

Falcon 2000LX is not a new model designation. This is only a commercial designation of a Falcon 2000EX EASy, on which major modification M2846 have been applied.

3. TCDS EASA.A.062 for Models Mystère-Falcon 50, Mystère-Falcon 900, and Falcon 900EX

3.1 Mystère-Falcon 50 has Honeywell TFE731-3-1C turbofan engines (can be abbreviated by Honeywell TFE731 for the purpose of AML in Part66). It is a

model with one commercial designation, knowing that Mystère-Falcon 50 by itself has no commercial designation:

3.1.1 Falcon 50EX: basically, Falcon 50EX is a Mystère-Falcon 50 with engines change (Honeywell TFE731-40-1C, which can be abbreviated by Honeywell TFE731 for the purpose of AML in Part66) and avionics change (Collins Proline IV).

Falcon 50EX is not a new model designation. This is only a commercial designation of Mystère-Falcon 50, on which majors modifications (M1810 + M1939 + M1890 + M1940 + M2159 + M1200) have been applied.

3.2 Mystère-Falcon 900 has AlliedSignal/Honeywell TFE731-5AR-1C turbofan engines (can be abbreviated by Honeywell TFE731 for the purpose of AML in Part66). It is a model and has two different commercial designations, knowing that Mystère-Falcon 900 by itself has no commercial designation:

3.2.1 Falcon 900B: basically, Falcon 900B is a Mystère-Falcon 900 with engine change (AlliedSignal/Honeywell TFE731-5BR-1C, which can be abbreviated by Honeywell TFE731 for the purpose of AML in Part66).

Falcon 900B is not a new model designation. This is only a commercial designation of Mystère-Falcon 900, on which modifications (M1200 + M1548) have been applied.

3.2.2 Falcon 900C: basically, Falcon 900C is a Mystère-Falcon 900 with avionics change (Honeywell Primus 2000).

Falcon 900C is not a new model designation. This is only a commercial designation of Mystère-Falcon 900, on which modification (M1975 or M2695) have been applied. Falcon 900C has AlliedSignal/Honeywell TFE731-5BR-1C turbofan engines.

3.3 Falcon 900EX has AlliedSignal/Honeywell TFE731-60 turbofan engines (can be abbreviated by Honeywell TFE731 for the purpose of AML in Part66) and Honeywell Primus 2000 avionics. It is a model and has two different commercial designations, knowing that Falcon 900EX by itself has no commercial designation. Note: Falcon 900EX is a Mystère-Falcon 900 on which modification M3000 have been applied.

3.3.1 Falcon 900EX EASy: basically, Falcon 900EX EASy is a Falcon 900EX with avionics change (Honeywell EPIC (EASy)).

Falcon 900EX EASy is not a new model designation. This is only a commercial designation of Falcon 900EX, on which modifications have been applied (Step 1: M3083 + M2862 + M2861 + M2963 + M2823).

3.3.2 Falcon 900DX: basically, Falcon 900DX is a Falcon 900EX EASy with a reduction in fuel capacity.

Falcon 900DX is not a new model designation. This is only a commercial designation of a Falcon 900EX, on which major modifications M4000 + M3876 + M5046 + M3755 + M2823 have been applied.

Note concerning the engines Honeywell TFE731-xxx: difference between -5AR-1C and -5BR-1C is a thrust rating difference, but they remain the same engines. -3-1C and -40-1C are different engines.

2 Aeroplanes		3 Type rating endorsement
Model	**Commercial Designation**	
Mystère-Falcon 50		Falcon 50 (Honeywell TFE731)
	F50EX	Falcon 50EX (Honeywell TFE731)
Mystère-Falcon 900		Falcon 900 (Honeywell TFE731)
	F900B	
	F900C	Falcon 900C (Honeywell TFE731)
Falcon 900EX		Falcon 900EX (Honeywell TFE731)
	F900EX EASy	Falcon 900EX EASy (Honeywell TFE731)
	F900DX	

4. TCDS DGAC-F n°103 for Models Fan Jet Falcon, Fan Jet Falcon Series C, Fan Jet Falcon Series D, Fan Jet Falcon Series E, and Fan Jet Falcon Series F

Note: TCDS DGAC-F n°103, 103bis, and 103ter will be merged into a single EASA TCDS.

4.1 Fan Jet Falcon has General Electric GE CF700-2C turbofan engines. It is also called "Fan Jet Falcon (Basic)". It is a model by itself.

4.2 Fan Jet Falcon Series C has General Electric GE CF700-2C turbofan engines. Fan Jet Falcon Series C is a Fan Jet Falcon (Basic) on which modification AMD M1547 has been applied (increase fuel capacity, etc… see TCDS). It is a model by itself.

4.3 Fan Jet Falcon Series D has General Electric GE CF700-2D turbofan engines. Fan Jet Falcon Series D is a Fan Jet Falcon (Basic) on which modification AMD M1200 has been applied (change in engines, increase fuel capacity, etc… see TCDS). It is a model by itself.

4.4 Fan Jet Falcon Series E has General Electric GE CF700-2D-2 turbofan engines. Fan Jet Falcon Series E is a Fan Jet Falcon Series D on which modification AMD M1487 has been applied (change in engines, etc… see TCDS). It is a model by itself.

4.5 Fan Jet Falcon Series F has General Electric GE CF700-2D-2 turbofan engines. Fan Jet Falcon Series F is a Fan Jet Falcon Series D on which modification AMD M1400 has been applied (change in engines, new slats, increase fuel capacity, etc… see TCDS). It is a model by itself.

Note concerning the engines General Electric GE CF700-xx: -2C, -2D, -2D-2 can be considered in the same group for the purpose of AML in Part66, the difference being a thrust rating difference. Therefore, they can be abbreviated GE CF700 for the purpose of AML in Part66.

2 Aeroplanes		3 Type rating endorsement
Model	**Commercial Designation**	
Fan Jet Falcon	Fan Jet Falcon (Basic)	Falcon 20 (GE CF700)
Fan Jet Falcon Series C		
Fan Jet Falcon Series D		
Fan Jet Falcon Series E		
Fan Jet Falcon Series F		

5. TCDS DGAC-F n°103bis for Models Fan Jet Falcon Series G, Mystère-Falcon 200, and Mystère-Falcon 20GF

Note: TCDS DGAC-F n°103, 103bis, and 103ter will be merged into a single EASA TCDS.

5.1 Fan Jet Falcon Series G has Garrett ATF3-6-2C P/N 3001400-1 turbofan engines. It is a Fan Jet Falcon Series F with change in engines, etc… see TCDS. It is a model by itself.

5.2 Mystère-Falcon 200 has Garrett ATF3-6A-4C P/N 3003100-1 turbofan engines. It is a Fan Jet Falcon Series F with change in engines, etc… see TCDS. It is a model by itself.

5.3 Mystère-Falcon 20GF has Garrett ATF3-6A-4C P/N 3003100-1 turbofan engines. It is a Fan Jet Falcon Series F with change in engines, etc… see TCDS. It is a model by itself.

Note concerning the engines Garrett ATF3-6: ATF3-6A-4C P/N 3003100-1 has a new fan compared to ATF3-6-2C P/N 3001400-1 but the technology is the same. The thrust rating is different. Both engines can be considered in the same group for the purpose of AML in Part66, and can be abbreviated Honeywell ATF3-6 for the purpose of AML in Part66.

2 Aeroplanes		3 Type rating endorsement
Model	**Commercial Designation**	
Fan Jet Falcon Series G		Falcon 200 (Honeywell ATF3-6)
Mystère-Falcon 200		
Mystère-Falcon 20GF		

6. TCDS DGAC-F n°103ter for Models Mystère-Falcon 20-C5, Mystère-Falcon 20-D5, Mystère-Falcon 20-E5, and Mystère-Falcon 20-F5

Note: TCDS DGAC-F n°103, 103bis, and 103ter will be merged into a single EASA TCDS.

6.1 Mystère-Falcon 20-C5 has Garrett TFE731-5AR-2C turbofan engines if Service Bulletin BS735 is not installed, and has Garrett TFE731-5BR-2C turbofan engines if Service Bulletin BS735 is installed. It is a Fan Jet Falcon (Basic) with application of Service Bulletin AMD-BA FJF731. It is a model by itself.

6.2 Mystère-Falcon 20-D5 has Garrett TFE731-5AR-2C turbofan engines if Service Bulletin BS735 is not installed, and has Garrett TFE731-5BR-2C turbofan engines if Service Bulletin BS735 is installed. It is a Fan Jet Falcon Series D with application of Service Bulletin AMD-BA FJF731. It is a model by itself.

6.3 Mystère-Falcon 20-E5 has Garrett TFE731-5AR-2C turbofan engines if Service Bulletin BS735 is not installed, and has Garrett TFE731-5BR-2C turbofan engines if Service Bulletin BS735 is installed. It is a Fan Jet Falcon Series E with application of Service Bulletin AMD-BA FJF731. It is a model by itself.

6.4 Mystère-Falcon 20-F5 has Garrett TFE731-5AR-2C turbofan engines if Service Bulletin BS735 is not installed, and has Garrett TFE731-5BR-2C turbofan engines if Service Bulletin BS735 is installed. It is a Fan Jet Falcon Series F with application of Service Bulletin AMD-BA FJF731. It is a model by itself.

Note concerning the engines Garrett TFE731-5AR-2C and TFE731-5BR-2C: both engines can be considered in the same group for the purpose of AML in Part66, the difference being a thrust rating difference. Therefore, they can be abbreviated Honeywell TFE731 for the purpose of AML in Part66.

2 Aeroplanes		3 Type rating endorsement
Model	**Commercial Designation**	
Mystère-Falcon 20-C5		Falcon 20-5 (Honeywell TFE731)
Mystère-Falcon 20-D5		
Mystère-Falcon 20-E5		
Mystère-Falcon 20-F5		

7. TCDS DGAC-F n°142 for Model Falcon 10

7.1 Falcon 10 has Garrett TFE731-2-1C turbofan engines (which can be abbreviated Honeywell TFE731 for the purpose of AML in Part66). It is a model by itself, knowing that Falcon 10 by itself has no commercial designation.

Falcon 100 is a Falcon 10 on which DASSAULT AVIATION Service Bulletins

and modifications have been applied, to install EFIS85, 4th window on the right hand part of the fuselage, etc… however, Falcon 100 is not referenced as a commercial designation in the Falcon 10 TCDS, therefore, the row Falcon 100 is proposed to be deleted.

2 Aeroplanes		3 Type rating endorsement
Model	**Commercial Designation**	
Falcon 10		Falcon 10 (Honeywell TFE731)

response *Accepted*

All changes proposed by Dassault have been incorporated, except one: for types Falcon 2000EX (PWC PW308) and Falcon 2000 EX EASy (PWC PW308), the engine designation will be PW308 instead of PW308C.

Resulting text: see APPENDIX A.

comment *22* comment by: *Oxford aviation academy*

On page 13, in the aeroplanes/model an ATP Jetstream 6100 is listed. The Jetstream 61 was never certified and therefore it should never appear as a type rating.

Suggest delete Jetstream 6100 and Jetstream 61 from the type.

response *Not accepted*

The type design shown in the UKCAA Data Sheet shows that 2 models exist within a single TCDS which are:

- BAe ATP - JD000J0023-008 Issue 7

(Aircraft Master Definition Drawing No.)

- **Jetstream Series 6100 Model 6102 -** JS-6100/TBS.6102/2

(Type Build Standard for Type Acceptance in UK)

comment *32* comment by: *CAA-NL*

Airbus
The use of "**basic model**" does not distinguish covered models adequately, if you assume that basic model means without further extensions. With A300 it means all series but -600 series. see also general comment.

Does the use of engine designation of **RR RB 211 Trent 500, -600 and -700** imply that no difference course for airframe only is possible from A330 to A340, because both airframe and engine are different?

response *Noted*

"Basic model" includes all variants as listed precisely in the table. No other interpretation should be provided.
In the current Regulation, nothing defines how a type training should be built, whether as a new training from an existing training or as a training based on the differences between the two types. This issue is not answered today, but is the issue of the working group CS-MCS (maintenance certification specification) which is a sub-group of task 21.039 (OSC Operator Suitability

Certificate).

comment 33 comment by: CAA-NL

ATR
If the name "**600**" is used, it is not clear from the type rating ATR 42-400/500/72-212A (PWC PW120) that '-600' is covered as well.

response *Not accepted*

The purpose of the updated list is to indicate which variants (including their commercial designations) are covered for each type rating. It is now clear that the -600 is included in the rating ATR 42-400/500/72-212A (PWC PW 120).

comment 34 comment by: CAA-NL

BAE Systems
The use of "ATP/Jetstream" is probably not consistent with the use of the names of other manufacturers. "/" is not used elsewhere in this way and the use of former TC holders is abandoned in the new list.

response *Noted*

The type design shown in the UKCAA Data Sheet shows that 2 models exist within a single TCDS which are:

- BAe ATP - JD000J0023-008 Issue 7

(Aircraft Master Definition Drawing No.)

- **Jetstream Series 6100 Model 6102 -** JS-6100/TBS.6102/2

(Type Build Standard for Type Acceptance in UK)

comment 35 comment by: CAA-NL

Boeing

777 Freighter is included in 777-200/300 (GE 90). But it is not clear from the model designation or the TCDS that the Freighter is a variant of the -200/300. Propose to change to Boeing **777F /** 777-200/300 (GE 90).

response *Not accepted*

As a general rule, freighter versions are not listed separately in the type ratings. With this new table, models included in a type rating are shown in column 2 and the type rating is in column 3. This shows that the 777F is included within the rating B777-200/300 (GE90).

comment 36 comment by: CAA-NL

Bombardier

Bombardier CL-600-2A12/-2B16 (Variant CL 601-3A/3R) (GE CF34) suggests that "601 variant" is not included.
Bombardier CL-600-2B16 (Variant CL604) (GE CF34) suggests that "604 variant" is not included. Also include space in CL_604.

response

Partially accepted

1. 601 varaint: not accepted
The 601 and 604 variants are included in the list of type designations as per EASA TCDS IM.A.023.
Ratings for 2A12/2B16 types as per previous version (Decision 2008/023/R) remain unchanged, in order to minimise impacts.

2. CL604: accepted
A space has been included to read CL 604.

comment

37 comment by: *CAA-NL*

EADS CASA

CASA C-295 should be without Capitals **Casa** C-295.

response

Partially accepted

"Casa" has been changed to "CASA" in accordance with the EASA TCDS'.

comment

38 comment by: *CAA-NL*

Cessna

Cessna 525 has also an 'other than large' model (<5700 kg). The same type rating is listed in group 1 and 2.

Note: from a licensing point of view there is no need to use weight and number of engines as criteria. There are complex aircraft *without* group rating and non-complex *with* group rating. Listing can be split to subcategories and group ratings.

Reims-Cessna F 406 (PWC PT6)
Use of "-" instead of "/" seems not consistent with other ratings.
if this rating covers both Reims F406 and Cessna 406 preferred rating should be
Cessna 406 / Reims F406 (PWC PT6). Putting Cessna in front will list it next to other Cessna's.
Add name "Caravan II".

Citation should be "Citation Jet".

response

Accepted

Corrected: Cessna 525B remains in list 1 only, Cessna 525 and 525A in list 2 only. "Citation Jet" has been added for 525B in column "commercial designation".
Reims-Cessna aircraft: Cessna types from Reims Aviation only will be designated as "Reims-Cessna". Types from both Cessna and Reims Cessna will be designated "Cessna/Reims-Cessna".

Caravan II has been added as commercial designation.

comment

39 comment by: *CAA-NL*

Dassault Falcon

The designations do not distinguish sufficiently. Some type ratings may be considered to cover more basic models as well:
50 - 50EX
900 - 900C - 900EX - 900EASy
2000 - 2000EX - 2000EASy

response *Accepted*

Designations have been reviewed in detail and corrected in line with information provided by Dassault.

see resulting text in APPENDIX A.

comment *40* comment by: *CAA-NL*

Embrear

Embrear EMB-120 has two different engines: PW115 and PW118. Are they different enough to require separate type ratings? Suggest to combine two variants: **Embrear EMB-120 (PWC PW115/118)**.

EMB-135-BJ in column '"model" should be EMB-135BJ (without second Hyphen).

response *Accepted*

The list has been corrected to read:
Embraer EMB-120 (PWC PW115/118) (column 3)
and
EMB-135BJ instead of EMB 135-BJ (column 2)

comment *41* comment by: *CAA-NL*

Gulfstream

Gulfstream GIV/G300/G400 (RRD Tay) does not clearly exclude GIV-X (which is in separate type rating).

response *Partially accepted*

The type ratings for the Gulfstream series have been simplified and now read :

Gulfstream G-IV Series (RRD Tay)

Gulfstream GIV-X Series (RRD Tay)

Gulfstream GV basic model (RRD BR710)
Gulfstream GV-SP Series (RRD BR710)

The purpose of the detailed lists is to show all variants that are covered for a specific type.

comment *42* comment by: *CAA-NL*

Hawker Beechcraft

The coverage of the series with the Honeywell TFE731 is unclear.
Series 700 and series 800 are mentioned but series 1, 3, 400 and 600 are not.
With 750 etc the use of "series" is unnecessary.
It is not clear from the type rating that BAe 125 series 700/800 does not cover the 750XP, 800XP and 850XP, which have another type rating.

The use of "/" between '125' and 'series' is confusing.

response *Accepted*

Type rating modified from:
BAe 125/Series 700/800 to BAe 125 Series/700/800
where the position of the slash shows that the old series of BAe125 are those indicated in column 2.

comment *43* comment by: *CAA-NL*

Kelowna

Model 340 is given type rating 580. Propose to change to **Convair 340 (RR Corp 501).**

response *Not accepted*

Not accepted because the only type accepted in the EU is the version 580 which is basically the model 440 when it is equipped with Rolls-Royce engines by STC (either FAA STC SA4-1100 or SA6088NM).
The model 340 was introduced by mistake, it should have read 440.

comment *44* comment by: *CAA-NL*

McDonnell Douglas

DC-9 is both in **DC-9** (PW JT8D) and in **DC-9**/MD-9 (PW JT8D).

Delete "MD" in name and Hyphen in rating;"MD-717-200" should be **717-200** and **MD 717-200 (RRD BR700-715).**

response *Accepted*

1. DC-9/MD-9: accepted
The list has been corrected to read:
MD-80 Series (PW JT8D) , covering:
DC-9-81 (MD-81) Series
DC-9-82 (MD-82) Series
DC-9-83 (MD-83) Series
DC-9-87 (MD-87) Series
MD-88

2. MD-717-200: accepted
The model has been changed to read:
717-200
The type rating has been changed to read:
MD 717-200 (RRD BR700-715)

comment *45* comment by: *CAA-NL*

M7 Aerospace

Fairchild 227 should be Fairchild **SA**227. see also group 2: SA226.
Why is in this case not 'series' added, compared to "Fokker 50/60 series"?

response *Accepted*

The rating of the M7 AEROSPACE Fairchild 227 has been corrected to read:
Fairchild SA227 Series (Honeywell TPE331)
as well as the one with PT6 engines.
However there is currently no policy agreed regarding the use of "Series". As to minimise the impact of changes, it is proposed not to add "Series" for all other type ratings.

comment *57* comment by: *CAA-NL*

Fokker

Fokker 27 Mark 050 and 0502 add name "Fokker 50".
Fokker 27 Mark 0604 add name "Fokker 60".

response *Accepted*

"Fokker 50" / "Fokker 60" have been added in column "commercial designation".

comment *58* comment by: *CAA-NL*

Lockheed

L-1011's add name "Tristar".

response *Accepted*

"Tristar" has been added in column "commercial designation"

comment *73* comment by: *ENAC, Italy, Production and Maintenance Directorate*

the type rating endorsment for Let L-420 is not consistent with the relocation under A.
suggestion: rename it as Aircraft Industries LET 420 (Walter M601) so that the TC Holder appears in the licence.

The same for Shorts SD3

response *Not accepted*

The TC holder is Aircraft Industries.
The purpose in this NPA was to simply the wording of ratings, by removing unnecessary data. Adding Aircraft Industrie to Let makes the rating heavier may bring confusion.
In this case the column 1 and 2 provide details of:
- who is the TC holder,
- which model is included in the rating shown in column 3.

In addition, when having the name of the TC holder in column 1 instead of having it inside the type rating avoids having to change the ratings when there

is a change of TC holder

comment

76 comment by: *ENAC, Italy, Production and Maintenance Directorate*

in this document I cant find a Cessna 525B over 5700Kg.
Enac proposes to have Cessna 525B only in table 2
http://www.airweb.faa.gov/Regulatory_and_Guidance_Library/rgMakeModel.nsf/0/7897696ff1dfcb5e862572ed005e7b2a/$FILE/A1WI.pdf

response

Accepted

The Cessna 525B over 5700 Kg MTOM remains the only one in list 1.
Other 525 models are in List 2.

comment

77 comment by: *Peter Compitello*

The B767-200/300(GE CF6) and the B767-400(GE CF6) should not be combined into one aircraft type.
Although they are the same engine type the flight deck and other areas of the aircraft are totally different. There is no way that the -300 and -400 are comparable. The -400 flight deck is more similar to a B777 than a -300 aircraft. Finally, there are only 2 airlines in the world that fly the B767-400 and my question is how is practical training being conducted on this aircraft? My guess is it is not being properly done. I will gladly provide documentation on the differences between these two aircraft if requested.

response

Noted

see response to comment 80 (below)

comment

80 comment by: *Richard Moreau*

With regard to the combination of the B767-200/300/400 with GE Engines. (Ref: Appendix 1 Category 1 Page 9 and 15) The grouping of the B767-400 with these other airplanes I feel needs to be reconsidered. Grouping these airplanes together is paramount to grouping the B747-200 and B747-400 airplanes under one designation.

As an instructor on the B767-200/300 and the -400 airplanes I realize the differences between these versions of the 767 are great. The flight decks appear completely different when looked at side by side and the instrument package on the B767-400 is a far leap in technology as compared to the older EICAS equipped airplanes. A person who is qualified to perform maintenance on the B767-200/300 would be completely lost on the B767-400 without proper education. The terminology is different between the airplane types as are the computer processor names. Locations have changed for many systems on the B767-400 and some systems are either non-exisistant or have been upgraded or changed.

Although structurally the airplanes are similar and some systems are identical the majority of the airplane systems have been changed in some way. Some of these changes are minor and do not require a formal school however most of these changes are great enough to warrant a formal education. For example the LFDS system does not exist on the B767-200/300 only on the -400 and interrogating this system is nothing like performing a test on the EICAS system of the older airplanes. Further the APU installed on the B767-

400 is a completely different unit then on the older airplanes and interrogation is performed on the flight deck instead of on the E6 rack in the aft cargo compartment. This only address' two areas of differences, many more exist then can be mentioned in this brief opinion.

By grouping these airplanes together a person can be licensed on all three type of airplanes without being trained on the B767-400. Several licenses have already been issued with this designation. If the training provided these Engineers on the B767-400 is performed to an acceptable level according to EASA then no problem exists here. However, only two airlines in the world operate this airplane. The training that is being provided is often non-existent because the companies providing this training do not have the material for such a course. Even if the company has purchased the information needed to perform this training, practical training would be impossible because access to the airplane is limited to only two companies in the world.

Finally, linking these three type airplanes together is like trying to bridge 1970's technology with 1990's technology. Although the packages may appear quite similar, when you look under the cover the internal workings are completely different as well as the methods used to interrogate and repair these airframes and engines. I feel that consideration needs to be given to breaking these two very different airplanes from a like designation.

Many leaps in technology have been realized since the inception of the B767-200/300. This airplane was designed and built in the 1970's and many of the packages delivered on these airplanes are outdated compared to the B767-400 of the 1990's. I am sure you would agree that much advancement have been made during the two decades that separate these airplanes. Just as the B747-200 and the B747-400 have different designations so should the B767-20.300 and the B767-400.

response *Noted*

Models B767-200/-300 have been grouped together with B767-400ER following a request from the CAA UK in CRD 19-2006, based on the fact that these three models are defined in the same FAA TCDS. Although arguments provided on the differences in model -400 are acceptable, the differences are not significant enough to request a separate type rating, similar differences may also be encountered with some other manufacturers, where models have been grouped. As a consequence no further changes should be made to this type rating.

It is the responsibility of the Part 145 organisation to ensure that the person is duly qualified (Part 145.A.30(e)) with regards to the specific model part of the Part 66 type rating, in line with the organisation's scope of work.

comment *86* comment by: *Airbus SAS*

Airbus comments on the proposal to introduce engine designators „RB211" in addition to "RR Trent 5/7/900" in "Appendix 1 Aircraft type ratings for Part-66 aircraft maintenance licence", Section "1.2. List of Type ratings category 1", lines "A330-2/340 series", "A340-5/640 series" and "A380-840 series", NPA page 12 of 52.

==> Airbus proposes to stay with the old wording "RR Trent 500", "RR Trent 700" and RR Trent 900".

==> Airbus assumes that "RB211" is added between "RR" and "Trent..." for consistency with the denomination of the engines in their respective type certificate data sheets. However Airbus does not support this change for the following reasons:

1. There is no indication that the old wording may cause any confusion. "RR Trent x00" are unique engine identifiers. Airbus position is that this editorial "fine-tuning" has no substantial benefit.

2. Airbus maintenance and maintenance training organizations have introduced the old type rating endorsements in their data processing tools used to manage training and continuing qualification of their and customer maintenance personnel. Although the explanatory note says that previously issued licenses would not need to be immediately adapted, the data processing tools would have to be changed to allow continuing compliance with the rules. In addition, the tools would have to be kept able to handle both the old and the new ratings in parallel, for a certain time. This adaptation process would create significant administrative and economic burden, without any justified substantial benefit (see point 1. above).

response *Not accepted*

The intent for a better harmonisation mentioned in the comment has been considered, but emphasis has been put to harmonize the type ratings with the definitions of all aircraft provided by TCDS in order to standardise the ratings. This was possible in a majority of cases.
Regarding Rolls Royce engines, we have aligned the engine types with their real definitions, some RR RB211 engines are of model Trent, and some others are not. These definitions are provided by the TCDS' E.060, E.042 and E.012.
The benefit mentioned in the comment is that the list shall stay as close as possible to TCDS definition.

In order to minimise the work related to the update on any databases, a copy of the list can be provided in electronic format upon request, following publication of the Decision.

comment *88* comment by: *KLM Engineering & Maintenance*

Content of Part-147 type training should always match and be consistent to the Part-66 type rating endorsed on the AML. The modified tables in the NPA show more data on types by making a reference to the aircraft models listed in their type certification data sheet (TCDS) and covered by type rating designation on the Part-66 AML.

However no clarification/guidance is given how to deal with Part-147 type training which did not cover all models in the type rating designation to be used on the Part-66 AML.

For example: A Part-147 approved training institute only provides training for type/model/engine B767-200/300 (GE CF6), therefore training does not include the -300F and -400ER. How will the type rating be endorsed on the Part-66 AML using the common standard for type rating designation "Boeing B767-200/300/400 (GE CF6)"?

For the issuance of Part-145 authorizations (category B1/B2 & C certifying staff

& B1/B2 support staff) the type rating designation on the Part-66 AML should be clear and unambiguous to avoid authorizations be issued without being appropriately (and completely) trained for the type rating endorsed on the AML.

response

Not accepted

When an AML licence is already endorsed with a type rating showing part of the rating (i.e. B737-500 only) the AML licences may be modified to align with the new type ratings as per this Decision without further notice from the licence holder. However, it is the responsibility of the Part 145 organisation to ensure that the person is duly qualified (Part 145.A.30(e)) with regards to the specific model part of the Part 66 type rating, in line with the organisation's scope of work.

comment

89 comment by: *Federal Office of Civil Aviation (FOCA), Switzerland*

Refer to: 1.2 list of Type ratings category 1:

BOMBARDIER :

CL 600-2B16, 604 Variant **& CL600-2B19,** Regional Jet 100, do not have to be listed together as **Bombardier CL-600-2B16 (variant CL604) (GE CF34).**

Bombardier CL-600-2B16 (variant CL604) (GE CF34) has to be endorsed for:

Challenger 604, CL-604 & Challenger 605, CL-605

Please note:
The CL-605 is a marketing designation of the CL-600-2B16 (604 Variant) starting at S/N 5701 and up.

Bombardier CL-600-2B19 (GE CF34) has to be endorsed for:

Regional Jet Series 100, CRJ100, CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100), CF34-3A1 or CF34-3B1

Regional Jet Series 200, CRJ200, CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100), CF34-3B1

Regional Jet Series 440,CRJ440, CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100), CF34-3B1

Challenger 850, SE, CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100), CF34-3B1, (based on CRJ200).

Please note:

The **CL600-2B19,** Regional Jet 100 has to be listed with the Regional Jet 440 as **Bombardier CL-600-2B19 (GE CF34)** for the following reasons:

The CRJ440 is identical to the Regional Jet Series 100 except for the number of occupants allowed.
The CRJ200 is a marketing designation only for the Regional Jet Series 100 aircraft with the GE CF-34-3B1 engines. All ADs issued against any 100 Series aircraft are similarly applicable to the 200 Series.

For your information: Regional Jet Series 200, CRJ200 & Challenger 850, SE, are not listed on this NPA.

This proposal to correct the list is motivated by the different Bombardier CL-600 Type Designations and existing Type Training courses available for Cat. B1.1 & B2 to be followed according 66.A.45, Training listed on Approval schedules of already approved EASA Part-147 Maintenance Training Organisations.

EMBRAER :

Embraer ERJ-170/190 (GE CF34), this rating has to be separated in two different ratings as:

Embraer ERJ-170 (GE CF34), & **Embraer ERJ-190 (GE CF34)**.

This proposal to correct the list is motivated by the engines existing differences training courses, Theoretical and Practical. Both engines types have the same designations GE CF34 but the differences are separately trained.

FOCA decide to endorse both type ratings separately into Part-66 AMLs to avoid confusion between the 170 and 190 series.
To endorse both "170 with 190" theoretical practical training and experience have to be done on both engines types according 66.A.45.

LEARJET:

(Bombardier) Learjet 60 (PWC PW305) aircraft type ratings have to be separated in two different ratings as:

(Bombardier) Learjet 60 (PWC PW305) for the classic generation and,
(Bombardier) Learjet 60**XR** (PWC PW305) for the updated version.

This proposal to correct the list is motivated by the different existing type training courses available and listed on the Approval schedule of Bombardier Aerospace Maintenance Training Organisation – UK.147.0005. Due to these differences between avionics and other mechanicals, technical systems and construction, the possibility exist to follow (Bombardier) Learjet 60 (PWC PW305) & (Bombardier) Learjet 60**XR** (PWC PW305) full or differences type trainings for Cat. B1.1 & B2.

response

Partially accepted

BOMBARDIER CL-600: accepted
The list has been amended for CL-600-2B16 and 2B19 in line with the information provided.
refer to APPENDIX A for the resulting text.

EMBRAER ERJ-170/190: not accepted
Granting licences with ratings with "Embraer ERJ-170 (GE CF34)", & "Embraer

ERJ-190 (GE CF34)" is not consistent with the Decision. In addition it does not show that the engines are different as said in the comment.
It is the rule within the Agency that:

- there is no separate type rating when the airframe and engines are the same (GS CF34),
- different courses on engines are not a reason enough to separate the type ratings,
- an avionics change of the cockpit is not a reason for separating type ratings.

LEARJET 60 XR: noted – We suggest proposing this change in next NPA in order to have a full consultation with all stakeholders on such change.

comment

95 comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

Page 13. ATR 42. What does "600" in the Name column mean? Is that a column for miscellaneous information?

response

Noted

The column has been renamed "commercial designation".
600 is the new commercial designation for a new version being under development, which will be covered under the rating.

ATR 42-400/500/72-212A (PWC PW120)

comment

104 comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

Page 15. "Boeing 777-200/300 (RR RB 211 Trent 800)" compared to e.g. "Boeing 767-300 (RR RB211)"

response

Not accepted

Not all RR RB211 engines are designated "Trent".

For the Boeing 767-300, the engine type is RB211-524H-36, or RB211-524H-T-36 (cf. FAA TCDS E30NE.)

comment

110 comment by: *UK CAA*

Page 14, Paragraph No: Boeing Company Aircraft model column.

Comment: B737-800ERX missing from list.

Justification: Implications regarding level of type training.

Proposed Text (if applicable): Add B737-800ERX to B737 model list.

response

Noted

Investigation is on process on 737-800 ERX. A mail was sent to UK CAA on this question on September 21 relating to this aircraft model.

comment

111 comment by: *UK CAA*

Page 16, Paragraph No: Cessna Aircraft Company.

Comment: Delete Cessna 525 and 525A from Category 1 list.

Justification: According to TCDS A1WI Cessna 525 and 525A are below 5700kg MTOA.

Proposed Text (if applicable): Type rating endorsement to read "Cessna 525B (Williams FJ 44)".

response *Accepted*

Corrected: Only Cessna 525B will remain in list 1.

Resulting text: please refer to APPENDIX A.

comment *112* comment by: *UK CAA*

Page 20, Paragraph No: Hawker Beechcraft Corporation.

Comment: Incorrect name of model 4000.

Justification: Name differs from rest of Beech series aircraft.

Proposed Text (if applicable): For model 400 type rating to read "Beech 4000 (PWC PW308)".

response *Accepted*

The new designation will be:
Beech 4000 (PWC PW308)

comment *116* comment by: *Austro Control*

A) Issue and Justification:
Aeroplane Models CL-600-2B16 (604 Variant) and CL-600-2B19 are different aircraft types. CL-600-2B16 is a business aircraft and the CL-600-2B19 is a 50 seat passenger aircraft. In addition to that the proposed Type Rating endorsement "CL-600-2B16" for both aircraft types is wrong and misleading.
Furthermore, although "CRJ 200" and Challenger 850" are marketing designations we suggest following the same philosophy as used for the "Regional Jet 440".

We propose the following Type rating endorsements and changes to the List of Type Ratings category 1:

The following Models should be grouped together being part of Type rating endorsement Bombardier
CL-600-2A12/-2B16 (variant CL 601-3A/3R, CL604) (GE CF34):
-CL600-2A12 601 Variant
-CL600-2B16 601-3A Variant
-CL600-2B16 601-3R Variant
-CL600-2B16 604 Variant

The following Models should be grouped together being part of Type rating endorsement Bombardier CL-600-2B19 (GE CF34)
- CL600-2B19 Regional Jet 100

- CL600-2B19 Regional Jet 200
- CL600-2B19 Regional Jet 440
- CL600-2B19 Regional Jet 850

B) Issue and Justification:
The following Cessna Aeroplane models are listed twice in the NPA. They are listed in the List of Type Ratings category 1 as well as category 2. In addition to that we agree to group Cessna 525, 525A and 525B together to one Type Rating Cessna 525 (Williams FJ 44). This type rating should be listed only in one list.

We propose the following change to List of Type Ratings category 1: Deletion of Type Rating Cessna 525 (Williams FJ 44). This type rating should stay in the List of Type Ratings category 2

C) Issue and Justification:
The following aircraft type is not covered by the TC/TCDS of the DC-9: "MD-9"

We propose the following change to List of Type Ratings category 1: "MD-9" should be deleted; The DC-9-80 (MD80) Series should be part of the type rating endorsement MD 80 series (PW JT8D)

response *Accepted*

A. BOMBARDIER CL-600: accepted
The change to separate the models 2B16 and 2B19 in column 2 is accepted; there is no further change on the type ratings.
Refer to response provided to comment 89.
Resulting text: Please refer to APPENDIX A.

B. Cessna 525: accepted
Only 525B will remain in list 1.

C. MD-9/DC-9: accepted
the list has been amended to read:
MD-80 Series (PW JT8D), covering:
DC-9-81 (MD-81) Series
DC-9-82 (MD-82) Series
DC-9-83 (MD-83) Series
DC-9-87 (MD-87) Series
MD-88

resulting text: Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A**

2.1. Summary of changes p. 24

comment *78* comment by: *FlightSafety International*

By grouping the 525 all into one series, the expected timeframe to cover the material for 6 different aircraft would be roughly 4 weeks for the theoretical. It would be better to leave these as different ratings from the standpoint of training. In addition, it would then be assummed that the 525C would fall into

this category when it is released causing the time needed to be extended even more. Making the training cover so many different aircraft when a client would potentially only need one or two of the types is asking them to incur a large additional cost and time for very little extra benifit.

response *Not accepted*

The policy of how type rating may be grouped is made on the basis of TCs, engines, major changes and technical similarities, but the need to group or not to group technical training is not in the principle. This cannot be taken in consideration.
However in the list 2, the modles 525 types which are within the 525/525A type rating are 525 and 525A only, there are not 6 different types.
In the list 1, there is only the 525B.
Therefore we are not sure to understand your views here.

There is currently no TCDS on 525C, therefore cannot be taken on board.

resulting text: Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A.**

2.2. List of Type ratings category 2 p. 25-27

comment *12* comment by: *ENAC, Italy, Production and Maintenance Directorate*

Piaggio 180 Avanti I and Avanti II have different avioncs.
Enac recommends to have two different ratings for these models. Please take note that the right names of the models are: Avanti I and Avanti II

response *Not accepted*

A difference in avionics is not a change significant enough to create a separate type rating.
EASA TCDS EASA.A.059 defines the types as Avanti and Avanti II. It is not the purpose of this Decision to modify TCDS.

comment *23* comment by: *P. Gandolfo*

P180 Avanti I and P180 Avanti II are substanstially different from avionic point of view.
Piaggio is currently undergoing a process of approval as Part 147 maintenance training organisation.
Piaggio will provide under this approval courses for Avanti I only and other courses for Avanti II only.
Piaggio recommends to split the ratings for Avanti I and Avanti II.

response *Not accepted*

A difference in avionics is not a change significant enough to create a separate type rating.
EASA TCDS EASA.A.059 defines the types as Avanti and Avanti II. It is not the purpose of this Decision to modify TCDS.

comment	*38* ❖ comment by: *CAA-NL* Cessna Cessna 525 has also an 'other than large' model (<5700 kg). The same type rating is listed in group 1 and 2. Note: from a licensing point of view there is no need to use weight and number of engines as criteria. There are complex aircraft *without* group rating and non-complex *with* group rating. Listing can be split to subcategories and group ratings. Reims-Cessna F 406 (PWC PT6) Use of "-" instead of "/" seems not consistent with other ratings. if this rating covers both Reims F406 and Cessna 406 preferred rating should be Cessna 406 / Reims F406 (PWC PT6). Putting Cessna in front will list it next to other Cessna's. Add name "Caravan II". Citation should be "Citation Jet".
response	*Partially accepted* **1. Cessna 525: corrected** Cessna 525B remains in list 1 only, Cessna 525 and 525A in list 2 only. "Citation Jet" has been added for 525B in column "commercial designation". **2. use of weight and number of engines as criteria: noted** **3. Reims-Cessna aircraft: changed** Cessna types from Reims Aviation only will be designated as "Reims-Cessna". Types from both Cessna and Reims Cessna will be designated "Cessna/Reims-Cessna". **4. Caravan II: accepted** "Caravan II" added as commercial designation.

comment	*47* comment by: *CAA-NL* Piper Aircraft Draw line in table under PA-42-1000 and Cheyenne 400LS.
response	*Accepted* Corrected. Resulting change: Please refer to APPENDIX A

comment	*48* comment by: *CAA-NL* Twin Commander Why is "Twin" deleted in type rating?
response	*Accepted* "Twin" will remain in the designation. All models listed are designated "Twin Commander" in FAA TCDS 2A4

comment	*52* comment by: *CAA-NL* Thrush Aircraft Delete "Thrush" and brackets in Thrush (Ayres) S2R (PW R-985).
response	*Accepted* Corrected to read: Ayres S2R (PW R-985)

comment	*60* comment by: *CAA-NL* Hawker Beechcraft There are more Beech 200 models covered by this type rating: **200, 200C, 200CT,200T,** B200, B200C, **B200CT, B200T**, B200GT, B200CGT.
response	*Accepted* The list of models in column 2 has been extended to cover the models proposed in your comment.

comment	*71* comment by: *ENAC, Italy, Production and Maintenance Directorate* designation of Cessna 525 is not clear. At page 16 i find Cessna 525 (williams FJ44) at page 25 i find the same. how can i find out if we are speaking about the model over or below 5700Kg?
response	*Accepted* Only Cessna 5252B remains in list 1, Cessna 525 and Cessna 525A remain in list 2.

comment	*75* comment by: *ENAC, Italy, Production and Maintenance Directorate* Cessna 500, 501 and 551 are almost identical from maintenance point of view. Enac proposes to join the ratings for these aircraft
response	*Noted* We propose to incorporate this change with the next NPA (2010), in order to ensure proper consultation on this change.

comment	*81* comment by: *CAA CZ* TC Holder - AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIES **Propsal CAA CZ of Type rating endorsement -** L-410 (Walter M 601) Comment : We recommend to keep L-410 in category 1, because very few aircraft of this type have MTOW below 5700 kg (so-called LW models made according to IB of manufacturer).
response	*Partially accepted* The aircraft variants > 5700 kg MTOW have been added in list 1, with the type rating:

Let L-410 (Walter M601).
The type rating in list 2 has been modified to read:
Let L-410 LW (Walter M601), which covers all "low weight" models listed in column 2.

comment *90* comment by: *Federal Office of Civil Aviation (FOCA), Switzerland*

Refer to: 2.2 list of Type ratings category 2:

CESSNA AIRCRAFT Company:

Cessna 501/551 (PWC JT15D) have to be listed together with the **Cessna 500 (PWC JT15D)** as: **Cessna 500/501/551 (PWC JT15D)**.

The differences between these versions are the number of Pilots ; 501/551= 1 pilot, 500 (550/560) =2 pilots. Maintenance training courses followed by an EASA Approved MTO are for **Cessna 500/550/560 (PWC JT15D) including 501/551 versions.**

PILATUS AIRCRAFT:

Pilatus PC-12 (PWC PT6) series have to be separated in two different ratings as:

PC-12 45/47 (PWC PT6) for the classic generation and,
PC-12/47E (PWC PT6) for the next generation (Glass Cockpit).

This proposal to correct the list is motivated by the two different existing type training courses due to the differences between avionics and other mechanicals, technical systems and construction.

FOCA decide to endorse both type ratings separately into Part-66 AMLs to avoid confusion between these aforesaid versions, classic and next generation (E).
This decision took place after analyses with the manufacturer Pilatus and with the Manufacturer training organization.

VIKING AIR (Bombardier De Havilland):

(De Havilland) DHC-6 (PWC PT6). This rating has to be separated in two different ratings with the addition of the 400 DHC-6 Series as:

(De Havilland) DHC-6 1/100/200/300 (PWC PT6) Series for these **classic generations** and,

(De Havilland) DHC-6 400 (PWC PT6) Series for the **next generation (Glass Cockpit).**

This proposal to correct the list is motivated by the two different existing type training courses an applicant has to follow to get certification privileges on both aforesaid versions, classic and next generation. FOCA decide to endorse both type ratings separately into Part-66 AMLs. Only after differences training on avionics and other mechanicals, technical systems and construction, between Series 300 & Series 400 DHC-6 have been appropriately covered. To avoid confusion

between these aforesaid versions, classic and next generation.

response *Partially accepted*

CESSNA 500/501/551: noted
We propose to incorporate this change with the next amendment (2010), in order to ensure proper consultation on this change.
(see also comment 75)

PC12/47E: not accepted
The introduction of a glass cockpit is not a modification that would require the addition of a separate type rating under the current procedures.

DHC-6 400: partially accepted
DHC-6 400 has been added to the models in column 2 within the same type rating, but the introduction of a glass cockpit is not a modification justifying a separate type rating.

comment *96* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

Page 26. Should ”added” be written in the Name column? Is that a column for miscellaneous information?

response *Noted*

The column has been renamed “commercial designation” for more clarity.

comment *113* comment by: *UK CAA*

Page 25, Paragraph No: Cessna aircraft company.

Comment: Cessna 525B should be deleted from Category 2 list.

Justification: In accordance with TCDS A1WI Cessna 525B is above 5700kg MTOA.

Proposed Text (if applicable): Delete Cessna 525B.

response *Accepted*

Only Cessna 5252B remains in list 1, Cessna 525 and Cessna 525A remain in list 2.

resulting text: Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A.**

3. Aeroplanes multiple turbine engines (AMTE) of 5700 kg and below, eligible for type examinations and manufacturer group ratings p. 28

comment *97* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

Page 28. Is it right understood that it from now on should be possible to have

a "Full group rating" in Category 3 (since as it is now, is the only possible Group rating in Category 3)?

response *Noted*

Depending on the resulting text from NPA 07-2007 (to be finalised by the end of this year) the definition of group ratings may change.

comment *117* comment by: *Austro Control*

Issue and Justification:
3. Aeroplanes multiple turbine engines (AMTE) of 5700 kg and below, eligible for type examinations and ~~manufacturer~~ group ratings

The change of the title to delete manufacturer is not supported by the existing valid Part-66, paragraph 66.A.45 (g) 2.:

Quote
"2. Full group ratings may be granted after complying with the type rating requirements of three aircraft types representative of the group from different manufacturers. **However, no full group rating may be granted to B1 multiple turbine engine aeroplanes, where only manufacturer group rating applies.**
Unquote

The following is proposed: The title should be renamed as follows:

3. Aeroplanes multiple turbine engines (AMTE) of 5700 kg and below, eligible for type examinations and manufacturer group ratings

response *Accepted*

The title has been changed to read:
3. Aeroplanes multiple turbine engines (AMTE) of 5700 kg and below, eligible for type examinations and **manufacturer** group ratings

resulting text: Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A.**

4. Aeroplanes single turbine engine (ASTE) of 5700 kg and below, eligible for type examinations and group ratings p. 29

comment *98* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

Page 28 & 29. "Dornier Do 28 (Walter)" compared to "EADS PZL PZL-106 BT (Walter M601)". The grade of detailed information concerning engine types are different. This and the comment concerning page 15 are just an examples of such inconsistency, and the whole document should be checked again for such inconsistencies.

response *Partially accepted*

Engine designation changed for consistency:
Dornier Do 28 (Walter **M601**).

For other aircraft, harmonisation of the engine designation has been considered. However, as to minimise the impact of changes, these have been made selectively only.

resulting text

Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A.**

4.2. List of Type ratings category 4 p. 29

comment

49 comment by: *CAA-NL*

Pilatus

Pilatus PC-6 exists also in Fairchild variant.

response

Not accepted

The PC-6 was manufactured in the USA by Fairchild-Hiller but these were military versions for the USAF and Army, known as the **AU-23A Peacemaker**. In U.S. Army use, it was designated **UV-20 Chiricahua**.

comment

82 comment by: *CAA CZ*

TC Holder - Moravan Aviation
Propsal CAA CZ of Type rating endorsement - Z 37 T – Series (Walter M 601)

Comment: The type rating endorsement should be in line with TCDS.

response

Accepted

List has been changed in line with latest EASA TCDS dated 24/08/2009. TC Holder is changed to ZLIN AIRCRAFT.

~~Moravan (~~Zlin~~)~~ Z-42 Series ~~/142~~ (LOM)
~~Moravan (~~Zlin~~)~~ Z-43 (LOM)
~~Moravan (~~Zlin~~)~~ Z-50 (LOM)
~~Moravan (~~Zlin~~)~~ Z-50L Series (Lycoming)
~~Moravan (~~Zlin~~)~~ Z-26 Series ~~126/226~~ (LOM)
Zlin Z-26 Series (Walter Minor/M)
~~Moravan (~~Zlin~~)~~ Z-143 L (Lycoming)
~~Moravan (Zlin) Z-326/526/726 (LOM)~~
~~Zlin Z-326/526 (Walter)~~
~~Moravan (~~Zlin~~)~~ Z-242 L (Lycoming)
~~Moravan (~~Zlin~~)~~ Z-526 L (Lycoming)

These aircraft are in List 6 for piston engine aeroplanes, and not in list 4 for turbine aeroplanes.

comment

99 comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

	Page 29. ”PILATUS AIRCRAFT” compared to ”CESSNA AIRCRAFT COMPANY” and ”VIKING AIR (Bombardier De Havilland)”. The line between the two Pilatus types is inconsistend compared to the two other mentioned types (Cessna and Viking). Probably the line between the Cessna and Viking types should be added if one compare with other Categories.
response	*Accepted* The line between the two Pilatus types has been removed.

comment	*114* comment by: *UK CAA* **Page 29, Paragraph No:** Pilatus Aircraft. **Comment:** Pilatus PC-6 (Honeywell TPE 331). **Justification:** Not transferred from previous type list. **Proposed Text (if applicable):** Add " Pilatus PC-6 (Honeywell TPE331).
response	*Accepted* The type rating had been removed by error and has now been restored as: Pilatus PC-6 (Honeywell TPE 331)

resulting text	Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A.**

5.1. Summary of changes p. 30

comment	*62* comment by: *CAA-NL* Types deleted Are all Piper PA-23 Aztec now considered annex II?
response	*Accepted* The early ‘Apache’ Models PA-23 (1954) and PA-23-160 (1957) are considered ‘Annex II’ (production S/N commencing with 23-), but the later three Models PA-23-250 (1959) ‘Aztec’, PA-23-235 (1962) ‘Apache 235’ and PA-E23-250 (1965) ‘Aztec B through F’ (production S/N commencing with 27-) are within the scope of EASA. Piper PA-23 Aztec (Lycoming) will <u>not</u> be removed from list 5.

resulting text	Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A.**

5.2. List of Type ratings category 5 p. 31-32

comment	*7* comment by: *Glasfaser Italiana SpA*

	With reference to § 5.2 "List of type ratings category 5", TC Holder "GeneralAvia Costruzioni Aeronautiche", F20 is a light twin (MEP), "F22 series" is a single engine piston which should not be associated to the F20. (Actually the GeneralAvia F.22 type is properly indicated into § 6.2 "List of type ratings category 6")
response	*Accepted* The two types have been separated. F 20 remains in list 5 and F.22 in list 6.

comment	*15* comment by: *ENAC, Italy, Production and Maintenance Directorate* Enac suggests to have two different ratings for Cessna 337 not pressurised and Cessna P337 pressurised.
response	*Accepted* Two ratings will appear in list 5: • Cessna/Reims-Cessna 337 Series (Continental) (not pressurised) • Cessna/Reims-Cessna 337 Series (Continental) (pressurised)

comment	*48* ❖ comment by: *CAA-NL* Twin Commander Why is "Twin" deleted in type rating?
response	*Accepted* "Twin" will remain in the designation. All models listed are designated "Twin Commander" in FAA TCDS 2A4

comment	*50* comment by: *CAA-NL* Aerostar Piper PA-60 series (Lycoming) should also cover Aerostar 600, Aerostar 601, Aerostar 601P, Aerostar 602P,and Aerostar 700P. This is not clear now.
response	*Not accepted* This modification would require for all lists to adopt the format used in lists 1, 2, 11, 12 and 13. It is currently not foreseen to provide this level of detail for the remaining lists, where group ratings are applicable.

comment	*61* comment by: *CAA-NL* Cessna Cessna 337 has also Reims variants: F337, FA337, FT337 and FTA337 series. Change type rating in: Cessna/Reims 337/P337/337P/F337/FA337/FT337/FTA337 (Continetal)

	or just **Cessna/Reims 337 series (Continetal).**
response	*Accepted* Additional variants are covered by adding "series" in the type rating. For types where both Cessna and Reims-Cessna models exist the type designation has been changed to read "Cessna/Reims-Cessna". Moreover, for the 337 Series, distinct ratings have been included for the pressurised and non pressurised versions.

comment	*63* comment by: *CAA-NL* Vulcanair Add "(Partenavia)".
response	*Not accepted* "Partenavia" is not the TC Holder.

comment	*83* comment by: *CAA CZ* TC Holder - AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIES **Propsal CAA CZ of Type rating endorsement -** L 200 (LOM) Comment: The type rating endorsement should be in line with TCDS.
response	*Accepted* "Series" will be deleted in the type rating.

comment	*100* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)* Page 30/31. "General Avia F22 Series (Lycoming)" is incorrectly grouped with "General Avia F20 (Lycoming)", since the F22 model is a single engined aircraft.
response	*Accepted* The two types have been separated. F 20 remains in list 5 and F.22 in list 6.

resulting text	Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A.**

6.2. List of Type ratings category 6 p. 35-38

comment	*1* comment by: *Yves Ferval* For Mooney type rating in order to simplify endorsement I suggest to rewrite endorsement as following: M 20 LYC for all models with lycoming engine M 20 TCM for all models with continental engine

	Y FERVAL (AOPA FRANCE)
response	*Not accepted* This modification (M 20 LYC and M 20 TCM) would not be consistent with the remaining type ratings.

comment	*51* comment by: *CAA-NL* CPAC Delete "CPAC, Inc" and brackets in CPAC, Inc(rockwell/Commander)114 (Lycoming). Why Rockwell/Commander but Reims-Cessna?
response	*Accepted* Corrections have been made to read: Rockwell Commander 112 (Lycoming) A "/" is used when 2 TC are associated or several models of aircraft are within the same rating. Cessna and Reims-Cessna are seperated with an "/" because in this case there are 2 TC Holders: Cessna aircraft and Reims Aviation aircraft (these latter models are called Reims-Cessna).

comment	*64* comment by: *CAA-NL* Apex aircraft It is not clear that the R2112 is included in the R2000; either add "R2112" or "series". Reference to Alpha is now deleted. May be this can be added to TC holder in brackets.
response	*Partially accepted* **R2112/R2000: not accepted** "Series" is already part of the designation **reference to ALPHA: accepted** ALPHA added in brackets in column "TC Holder" to remind that this is the previous TC holder.

comment	*65* comment by: *CAA-NL* Cessna Cessna **F182** also has SMA engine, so change into **Cessna 180/F182 (SMA).** Does 'F' indicate that these are also Reims aircraft?
response	*Accepted* This type has been added as a separate rating: Reims-Cessna F182 Series (SMA)

comment	*66* comment by: *CAA-NL* General Avia General Avia F20/F22 (Lycoming) should be mentioned in group 6 instead of 5 (single engine).
response	*Accepted* The two types have been separated. F 20 remains in list 5 and F.22 in list 6.

comment	*67* comment by: *CAA-NL* Piper Unclear what aircraft is meant by Piper PA-46 (Lycoming). Furthermore this is also listed as Piper PA-46/PA-46-350P (Lycoming).
response	*Accepted* The line has been deleted, as it is included in PA-46/PA-46-350P(Lycoming).

comment	*84* comment by: *CAA CZ* TC Holder: AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIES **Propsal CAA CZ of Type rating endorsement -** Z-37 – Series (LOM) Comment: The type rating endorsement should be in line with TCDS.
response	*Accepted* The designation has been modified as per EASA TCDS: Let Z-37 Series (LOM)

comment	*85* comment by: *CAA CZ* TC Holder - Moravan Aviation **Propsal CAA CZ of Type rating endorsement -** Z 26 – Series (Walter/LOM) Comment: The type rating endorsement should be in line with TCDS and no difference should be made among particular types/variants.
response	*Partially accepted* **Z26 Series:** accepted The designation has been modified as per latest EASA TCDS dated 24/08/2009: Zlin Z-26 Series (LOM). The TC Holder is now ZLIN AIRCRAFT. **One rating for Walter/LOM:** not accepted It is not possible to combine two engine variants (Walter/LOM) in one type rating.

comment	*101* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

	Page 36. We question that the different Maule types with same engine (e.g. Maule M6, M7 and MX7 Lycoming)), should be divided into different designations. Also on the same page ”Cessna 206 Series (Continental)” and ”Cessna 207 Series (Continental)” should be merged into one type.
response	*Not accepted* It is true that Maule M series aircraft are similar, and that Cessna 206 and 207 are similar aircraft too, but this is also true for numerous other types where grouping could also be made. This list intends only to show a list of type ratings, this does not prevent the authorities from issuing licences with either a group rating or with a manufacturer group rating.

comment	*106* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)* Page 38. We believe that the different SOCATA TB models (9, 10, 20 …..) should be joined into one single type.
response	*Not accepted* See response to comment 101.

resulting text	Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A.**

7. Aeroplane multiple piston engines – wooden structure (AMPE-WS), eligible for type examinations and group ratings p. 39

comment	*53* comment by: *CAA-NL* Suggest to add that this group is reserved or not used. This will make it possible not to mention the group in case of B2 or C rating for All aeroplanes.
response	*Not accepted* This list is really empty and not reserved. Adding “reserved” or “not used” would add doubts and raise many questions.

resulting text	Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A.**

8.2. List of Type ratings category 8 p. 41

comment	*102* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)* • Page 41. ”CERVA CE43 (Lycoming)” and ”CERVA CE43 (Lycoming)”. According to our information, these two types are all metal aircraft (develloped from the ”WA4/21 (Lycoming)), and should accordingly be placed in Category 6.
response	*Accepted*

These 2 aircraft types are transferred to the List 6.

comment

105 comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

Page 41. "AVIAMILANO" should be removed, since the only model from that TC holder is removed from the list.

response

Accepted

The TC Holder name remains in column "TC Holder" but will be striked through when all type ratings for a specific list have been deleted.
The same process will be used with other TC holders:
in list 6:

- Antonov
- CPAC
- Nardi and Piaggio
- Sky Enterprise
- Viking Air.

resulting text

Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A.**

9. Aeroplane multiple piston engines – composite structure (AMPE-CS), eligible for type examinations and group ratings p. 42

comment

68 comment by: *CAA-NL*

Diamond

Suggest to add 'series' to cover variants N, MG and N-MG.

response

Accepted

comment

119 comment by: *Austro Control*

Issue and Justification:
9. Aeroplane multiple piston engines – composite structure (AMPE-CS), eligible fort ype examinations and group ratings
The following aircraft type is mssing: DA42 (Austro Engine). In addition to that the aircraft type DA42 (Thielert) should be amended by adding "series" . - as agreed ealier this year - EASA E-Mail dated 19 May 2009 this rating includes the derivat DA42M

The following Type rating endorsements are proposed:
DA42 Series (Thielert)
DA42 (Austro Engine)

response

Accepted

The new engine variant will be listed.
Proposed:
Diamond DA42 Series (Thielert)
Diamond DA42 Series (Austro Engine)

resulting text	Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A.**

10.2. List of Type ratings category 10 p. 44

comment	*54* comment by: *CAA-NL* Cessna and III Are Cessna C350/C400 and III Sky Arrow 650/710 not considered to be Annex II aircraft (very light aircraft)?
response	*Not accepted* These types are clearly within the remit of EASA : For the Cessna C300/C350/C450, these used to be 'Lancair' and later 'Columbia' aircraft, before Cessna purchased the type design (cf. TCDS EASA.IM.A.079). The 'C400' designation used in TCDS EASA.IM.A.079 is actually an ICAO designator and was adopted on request from Cessna. For information, below are listed the official designations belonging to the formerly 'Lancair' design (as stated in the FAA TCDS): LC40-550FG (now marketed as the Cessna 300, formerly Columbia 300) LC41-550FG (now marketed as the Cessna 400 Corvalis TT, formerly Columbia 400) LC42-550FG (now marketed as the Cessna 350 Corvalis, formerly Columbia 350) Finally, although TCDS EASA.IM.A.079 only refers to the LC41-550FG, the LC40-550FG was validated (by one or more EU MS NAAs) prior to the creation of EASA; however, the process to establish the 'EU' standard for this Model has not been concluded yet. The Model LC42-550FG is not yet validated, but this is anticipated to occur at some stage in the (near) future.

comment	*55* comment by: *CAA-NL* Cirrus Cirrus SR20 and SR22 can be combined to **Cirrus SR 20/22 (Continental).**
response	*Not accepted* It is true that those aircraft are similar, but this is also true for numerous other types where grouping could also be made. This list intends only to show a list of type ratings, this does not prevent the authorities from issuing licences with either a group rating or with a manufacturer group rating. Limiting the impact of modifying the licences and certificates is a reason for not modifying ratings when this is not absolutely necessary.

comment	*59* comment by: *CAA-NL*

Extra

Suggest to add "series" to **Extra EA-300 series (Lycoming)** to cover the different models (S/L/200).

response *Accepted*

"Series" has been added, to read:
Extra EA-300 Series (Lycoming)

comment *69* comment by: *CAA-NL*

Cessna

Suggest to add Lancair LC40/41/42 (Continental) to Cessna C350/C400.

response *Not accepted*

The 'C400' designation used in TCDS EASA.IM.A.079 is actually an ICAO designator and was adopted on request from Cessna. It is not foreseen to change the designation defined in the EASA TCDS.

resulting text: Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A.**

11. Multi-engine helicopters (MEH), requiring type training and individual type rating p. 45

comment *2* comment by: *NAA-PL*

At the request of one of the Polish operators the Polish CAO kindly asks to include "PZL Swidnik Mi-2 Plus (GTD-350 Series)" helicopter on the list of AC types which can be inscribed into Part-66 license.
Mi-2 helicopter was listed in Annex II to Regulation 216/2008. With the previous amendment (Decision 2008/003/R) to Appendix I Aircraft type ratings for Part-66 aircraft maintenance license to Annex IV AMC to Part-66 it was deleted from the list of aircraft types which can be inscribed in Part-66 license.
However, in accordance with **Article 4 paragraph 5 of Regulation 216/2008** these helicopters are operated for remuneration by the Polish Medical Air Rescue in compliance with JAR-OPS3. PZL Świdnik is still the owner of the Type Certificate and operations are conducted with an Certificate of Airworthiness issued in accordance with ICAO Annex 8.
In view of the above and in order to maintain compliance with Regulation 216/2008 & 2042/2003 we kindly request to reinstate the type of "PZL Swidnik Mi-2 Plus (GTD-350 Series)" helicopter to Appendix I Aircraft type ratings for Part-66 aircraft maintenance license to Annex IV AMC to Part-66.
Note 1: PZL Swidnik Mi-2 Plus type and PZL Swidnik W-3A/W-3-AS type are two completely different helicopter types.
Note 2: In our opinion, in view of the above we cannot endorse the Mi-2 Plus as a national privilege – it would not be in accordance with **Article 4 paragraph 5 of Regulation 216/2008**.

response *Partially accepted*

The aircraft is classified as Annex II, therefore no privilege can be given to

certifying staff in accordance with Part-66. However this does not prevent the competent authority from adding this aircraft rating on the page "National priviege" of the page ANNEX TO EASA FORM 26 of the licence.

The paragraph 5 of Article 4 of Basic Regulation 216/2008 states that for the exception mentioned, the rules in § 2 and 3 apply, which is EC Regulation 2042/2003. This last Regulation 2042/2003 in Article 1 paragraph 2 states that the Regulation does not apply to aircraft referred to in Annex II.

comment *6* comment by: *CHC Norway AS Technical Training*

BELL HELICOPTER TEXTRON, 214B and 214B-1 is single engine with (Lycoming T5508), but the multi-engine 214ST (GE CT7) is missing in the list. This helicopter type is stil in operation in our company.

response *Accepted*

The Bell 214B and B-1 has been transferred from List 11 to List 12 for single turbine engine helicopters.

For Bell 214ST, corrected accordingly in list 11:

214ST		Bell 214ST(GE CT7)

comment *103* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency, Civil Aviation Department (Transportstyrelsen, Luftfartsavdelningen)*

- Page 45. The designation for "Bell 222 (RR Corp 250)" has incorrectly been changed to "Bell 222 (RR Corp 230)". Probably has the fact that the version of the engine is "RR Corp 250 C30" been the cause for that misunderstanding.

response *Accepted*

Corrected accordingly

resulting text Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A.**

11.1. Summary of changes p. 45

comment *14* comment by: *SP ZOZ LPR*

We kindly asks to include "PZL Swidnik Mi-2 Plus (GTD-350 engine Series)" helicopter on the list of AC types which can be inscribed into Part-66 license.
Mi-2 helicopter was listed in Annex II to Regulation 216/2008. With the previous amendment (Decision 2008/003/R) to Appendix I Aircraft type ratings for Part-66 aircraft maintenance license to Annex IV AMC to Part-66 it was deleted from the list of aircraft types which can be inscribed in Part-66 license.
However, in accordance with **Article 4 paragraph 5 of Regulation 216/2008** these helicopters are operated in Commercial Air Transport (CAT) by the Polish Medical Air Rescue in compliance with JAR-OPS3.In result, according to **Article 4 paragraphs 2&3** maintenance of type Mi-2 PZL

Swidnik Mi-2 Plus (GTD-350 engine Series)" should be ensured with personnel qualified with Part-145 and Part-66 regulations. PZL Swidnik is still the owner of the Type Certificate and operations are conducted with an Certificate of Airworthiness issued in accordance with ICAO Annex 8.
In view of the above and in order to maintain compliance with Regulation 216/2008 & 2042/2003 we kindly request to reinstate the type of "PZL Swidnik Mi-2 Plus (GTD-350 Series)" helicopter to Appendix I Aircraft type ratings for Part-66 aircraft maintenance license to Annex IV AMC to Part-66.

response *Not accepted*

There is currently no Implementing Rule of the Basic Regulation for paragraph 2 and 3 of Article 4, therefore EC Regulation 2042/2003 has currently no request for Annex II aircraft (refer to Article 1 of this Regulation).
The rulemaking task for issuing Implementing Rule for operations of Annex II aircraft is planned to start in 2011, which may result in a modification of the position expressed here above.

resulting text: Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A.**

11.2. List of Type ratings category 11 p. 45-48

comment *4* comment by: *AgustaWestland*

Dear Gentlemen;
As previously announced to EASA, AgustaWestland finalized the certification of a new variant of the A 109 Series (PWC PW 206/207), this new variant is named AW 109 SP.
We would like the first row of table 11.2 relevant to category 11 amended as follows:

AGUSTA	A109E A109S AW109SP		Agusta A109Series (PWC PW206/207)

AgustaWestland has no further comments on Aircraft Type Ratings List
Thank You.

response *Accepted*

Corrected accordingly

comment *8* comment by: *ENAC, Italy, Production and Maintenance Directorate*

CRD to NPA 19-2006 accepted to associate MBB BK 117 C1 and C2; this was never done; Please clarify if C1 and C2 will be considered in the future as different types

response *Not accepted*

The opinion provided in CRD 19-2006 was incomplete. C-1 and C-2 are different models of the same TC but with significant differences in design for certain areas. Thereby different MMELs exist and the maintenance and servicing manuals are different. The two models remain as different type

ratings.

comment 56 comment by: CAA-NL

Eurocopter

Eurocopter AS 332 (Turbomeca Makila 1) does include 'L' and 'L1' but not 'L2', this is not clear from the rating.
Eurocopter SA 365 N (Turbomeca Arriel 1) does not include 'N1' and 'N2', this is not clear from the rating.

Dauphin 2 should be just "Dauphin".

response *Partially accepted*

To simplify the rating of AS 332C/C1/L/L1 this is shortened to AS 332 but engine must include 1A and 1A1. The result is Eurocopter AS 332~~C/C1/L/L1~~ (Turbomeca Makila 1A/1A1)

The column 2 of the table shows now clearly the models included in each rating, there should be no confusion.

Dauphin 2 corrected to read Dauphin

comment 70 comment by: CAA-NL

Sikorsky

S76 has only models S76A,-B and -C; the '+' and '++' are not model designations.

response *Accepted*

Modified accordingly

comment 72 comment by: ENAC, Italy, Production and Maintenance Directorate

group 11 may include multi turbine engine helicopters or helicopters with two or more piston engines.
I suggest to split the group into two subgroups
one subgroup for B1.3, B2 and C ratings
the other for B1.3, B2 and C ratings

response *Not accepted*

The separation between multi-engined helicopters and others results from the definition of "large aircraft" in EC Regulation 2042/2003.
This is the reason why Group 11 includes multi-engined helicopters whether they are equipped with turbine or piston engine.
Sub-separation between these two sub-groups do add value, therefore the Agency has no evidence that such modification is necessary.

The Kamov KA-26 is removed as there is no SAS on this aircraft.
As a result there is no more piston engine helicopter in the List 11.

comment 92 comment by: Egidijus Šimkus

According to AMC 66B.100 to 115 Competent Authority should endorse 66 licenses with this standard codes. In conversion period Lithuanian CAA converted national licenses with Mil Mi 8 and Mil Mi 17 type ratings. What will happen with these type ratings after this NPA becomes a regulation? Is there the grandfather rights on endorsed type ratings or after renewal of part 66 license these type rating, according to this NPA, must be deleted?

response *Not accepted*

The Mil Mi 8 and Mi 17 types have not been validated within EU; therefore they are not in the remit of the Agency.

However, nothing prevents the competent authority from adding these types on the page "National privilege" of the ANNEX TO EASA FORM 26 of the licence.

comment *121* comment by: *Helisota Ltd.*

Established in 1997, Helisota Ltd. (Kaunas, Lithuania) is the only technical maintenance, overhaul and upgrade facilities for Mi-8/17 helicopters in the Baltic states. We offer maintenance, repair and overhaul of the helicopter and its components, supply of spare parts and consumable materials as well as technical support. Our customers are governmental institutions and private companies in 25 countries worldwide. The helicopters repaired at our facilities perform SAR and various humanitarian missions in Lithuania and abroad. This type of aircraft is used by the Air Forces of different countries worldwide and is recognized as particularly reliable on, suitable to operate in extreme climatic conditions and complicated relief terrains.

We have thoroughly read the Notice of proposed amendment (NPA) No. 2009-05 concerning "Appendix 1. Aircraft type ratings for Part-66 aircraft maintenance licence". The decision to delete Mi-8/17 type helicopters from the list of Type ratings, Category 11, would cause serious problems to our company as well as to many other operators and repair agencies in former East Europe countries and present EU member-states. Since 2007, 36 highly qualified specialists at Helisota Ltd. possessed Part 66 Licenses which would be lost in case of deletion of this type aircraft from ratings. We realise that MI-8/17 type helicopters do not have European type certificate, on the other hand one type, namely MI-171 (Isotov TV3), is recognized to comply with American Federal Aviation Rules, Part 29 "Helicopters of Transport Category".

Such step, if taken, would be hardly comprehensible to our customers as well as to lots of operators worldwide. It would also put in doubt the future of our activities to some extent.

Herewith we apply to you with request to deliberate once again this issue and sincerely expect for a favourable decision, taking into consideration all above reasons as well as those, we are certain, presented by other operators and overhaul agencies in favour for this type of aircraft.

response *Not accepted*

The Mil Mi 8 and Mi 17 types have not been validated within the EU; therefore, they are not in the remit of the Agency.

However, nothing prevents the competent authority from adding these types on the page "National privilege" of the page ANNEX TO EASA FORM 26 of the

licence.

resulting text | Resulting text: **refer to APPENDIX A.**

12.2. List of Type ratings category 12 p. 49-50

comment | *9* comment by: *ENAC, Italy, Production and Maintenance Directorate*

SEI NH500D is now proposed in association with AMD500N. N stands for NOTAR so these helicopters are not totally similar from maintenance point of view. Enac proposes to associate NH500D with MD Helicopters 369 because they are almost the same model.

response | *Accepted*

SEI Helicopters are similar to MDI helicopters but only when non-NOTAR are grouped together on one side, and NOTAR helicopters are grouped on the other side.
The result is that the MDI Helicopters and SEI helicopters groups are modified to read:

non-NOTAR group:
MD Helicopters 369 Series / SEI NH-500D (RR Corp 250)

NOTAR group:
MD Helicopters 500N/600N ~~/ NH500D /~~ AMD500N (RR Corp 250)

resulting text | APPENDIX A - Resulting text

Appendix A – Resulting Text

1. Large aircraft (LA). Aeroplanes with a maximum take-off mass of more than 5700 kg, requiring type training and individual type rating

1 TC Holder	2 Aeroplanes Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
AIRBUS	N 262 N 262 A N 262 B N 262 C	Frégate	~~Aerospatiale (~~Nord~~)~~ 262 (Turbomeca Bastan)
	SN 601	Corvette	Aerospatiale SN-601 (PWC JT15D)
	A300 B1 A300 B2-1A A300 B2-1C A300 B2K-3C A300 B2-202 A300 B2-203 A300 B4-2C A300 B4-102 A300 B4-103 A300 B4-203 A300 C4-203 A300 F4-203		Airbus A300 basic model (GE CF6)
	A300 B2-320 A300 B4-120 A300 B4-220		Airbus A300 basic model (PW JT9D)
	A300 B4-601 A300 B4-603 A300 B4-605 R A300 F4-605 R A300 C4-605 R Variant F		Airbus A300-600 (GE CF6)
	A300 B4-622 A300 B4-622 R A300 F4-622 R		Airbus A300-600 (PW 4000)
	A300 B4-620 A300 C4-620		Airbus A300-600 (PW JT9D)
	A310-304 A310-308 A310-203 A310-221 A310-203 C		Airbus A310 (GE CF6)
	A310-324 A310-325		Airbus A310 (PW 4000)
	A310-322 A310-222 A310-204		Airbus A310 (PW JT9D)

1 TC Holder	2 Aeroplanes Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
AIRBUS (cont.)	A318-120 series		Airbus A318 (PW 6000)
	A318-110 series A319-110 series A320-111 A320-210 series A321-110 series A321-210 series		Airbus A318/A319/A320/A321 (CFM56)
	A319-130 series A320-230 series A321-130 series A321-230 series		Airbus A319/A320/A321 (IAE V2500)
	A330-200 series A330-300 series		Airbus A330 (GE CF6)
	A330-220 series A330-320 series		Airbus A330 (PW 4000)
	A330-240 series A330-340 series		Airbus A330 (RR RB 211 Trent 700)
	A340-210 series A340-310 series		Airbus A340 (CFM56)
	A340-540 series A340-640 series		Airbus A340 (RR RB 211 Trent 500)
	A380-840 series		Airbus A380 (RR RB 211 Trent 900)
	A380-860 series		Airbus A380 (EA GP7200)
	A300F4-608ST	Beluga	Airbus A300-600ST (GE CF6)
	One-Eleven 200 series One-Eleven 300 series One-Eleven 400 series One-Eleven 500 series		Airbus UK (BAC) 1-11 (RRD Spey)
AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIES	L-410 UVP L-410 UVP-E L-410 UVP-E9 L-410 UVP-E20 L-410 UVP-E20 CARGO	Turbolet	Let L-410 (Walter M601)
	L-420		~~Aircraft Industries~~ ~~(~~Let~~)~~ ~~L-410/~~L-420 (Walter M601)
ALENIA AERONAUTICA	C-27J		Alenia C-27 (Allison/RR AE2100)
ANTONOV	~~AN-12~~		~~Antonov AN12 (Ivchenko AI-20)~~
	~~AN-22~~		~~Antonov AN22 (Kusnetsov NK-12MA)~~
	~~AN-24~~ ~~AN-24B~~		~~Antonov AN24 (Ivchenko AI-24A)~~
	AN-26 AN-26B		Antonov AN26 (Ivchenko AI-24)

1 TC Holder	2 Aeroplanes Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
ANTONOV (cont.)	AN-28		Antonov AN28 (Glushenkov TVD-10V)
	~~AN-32~~		~~Antonov AN32 (Ivchenko AI-20M)~~
	~~AN-38~~		~~Antonov AN38 (Honeywell TPE331)~~
	~~AN-72~~ ~~AN-72-100~~ ~~AN-72-100D~~		~~Antonov AN72 (Lotarev D-36)~~
	~~AN-124~~		~~Antonov AN124 (Lotarev D-18T)~~
ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Régional	ATR 42-200 ATR 42-300 ATR 42-320		ATR 42-200/300 series (PWC PW120)
	ATR 72-101 ATR 72-102 ATR 72-201 ATR 72-202 ATR 72-211 ATR 72-212		ATR 72-100/200 series (PWC PW120)
	ATR 42-400 ATR 42-500 ATR 42-500 ATR 72-212 A ATR 72-212 A	 600 600	ATR 42-400/500/72-212A (PWC PW120)
BAE SYSTEMS	BAe 146 Series 100 BAe 146 Series 200 BAe 146 Series 300 AVRO 146-RJ70 AVRO 146-RJ85 AVRO 146-RJ100 AVRO 146-RJ115		~~BAe Systems~~ BAe 146/ AVRO 146-RJ (Honeywell ALF500 Series)
	HS.748 Series 1 HS.748 Series 2 HS 748 Series 2A HS 748 Series 2B		~~BAe Systems~~ HS748 (RRD Dart)
	HP.137 Jetstream Mk.1	Jetstream 1 Jetstream 2	HP.137 (Turbomeca Astazou)
	Jetstream 200		Jetstream 200 (Turbomeca Astazou)
	Jetstream 3101 Jetstream 3201	Jetstream 31 Jetstream 32/32EP	~~BAe Systems~~ Jetstream 31/32 (Honeywell TPE331)
	Jetstream 4100 Jetstream 4101		~~BAe Systems~~ Jetstream 41 (Honeywell TPE331)
	BAe ATP Jetstream Series 6100		~~BAe Systems~~ ATP/Jetstream 61 (PWC PW120)

1 TC Holder	2 Aeroplanes Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
THE BOEING COMPANY	B707-100 B707-100B B707-100B B707-300B Series B707-300C Series B720 B720B	Long Body Long Body Short Body	Boeing 707/720 (PW JT3~~D~~)
	B707-200 B707-200B B707-300 Series		Boeing 707 (PW JT4)
	B707-400 Series		Boeing 707 (RR Conway)
	B727 Series B727-100 Series B727C Series B727-100C Series B727-200 Series		Boeing 727 (PW JT8D)
	~~B727-200F Series~~	-	~~Boeing 727 (PW Tay)~~
	B737-100 B737-200 B737-200C		Boeing 737-100/200 (PW JT8D)
	B737-300 B737-400 B737-500		Boeing 737-300/400/500 (CFM56)
	B737-600 B737-700 B737-700C B737-800 B737-900 B737-900ER		Boeing 737-600/700/800/900 (CFM56)
	B747SR		Boeing 747SR (GE CF6)
	B747-100B		Boeing 747-100B (RR RB211)
	B747SR B747-100 B747-100B B747-100B SUD		Boeing 747-100/747SR (PW JT9D)
	B747-200B B747-200C B747-200F B747-300		Boeing 747-200/300 (GE CF6)
	B747-200B B747-200F B747-200C B747-300		Boeing 747-200/300 (PW JT9D)
	B747-200B B747-200F B747-200C B747-300		Boeing 747-200/300 (RR RB211)

1 TC Holder	2 Aeroplanes Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
THE BOEING COMPANY (cont.)	B747-400 B747-400D B747-400F/SF/LCF		Boeing 747-400 (GE CF6)
	B747-400 B747-400F/SF/LCF		Boeing 747-400 (PW 4000)
	B747-400 B747-400F/SF/LCF		Boeing 747-400 (RR RB211)
	B747-8I B747-8F	Intercontinental Freighter	Boeing 747-8 (GE GEnx)
	B747SP		Boeing 747SP (PW JT9D)
	B747SP		Boeing 747SP (RR RB211)
	B757-200 B757-200PF B757-300		Boeing 757-200/300 (PW 2000)
	B757-200 B757-200PF B757-200CB B757-300		Boeing 757-200/300 (RR RB211)
	B767-200 B767-300		Boeing 767-200/300 (PW 4000)
	B767-200 B767-300		Boeing 767-200/300 (PW JT9D)
	B767-300		Boeing 767-300 (RR RB211)
	B767-200 B767-300 B767-300F B767-400ER		Boeing 767-200/300/400~~ER~~ (GE CF6)
	B777-200 B777-200LR B777-300ER B777F	 Freighter	Boeing 777-200/300 (GE 90)
	B777-200 B777-300		Boeing 777-200/300 (PW 4000)
	B777-200 B777-300		Boeing 777-200/300 (RR RB211 Trent 800)
BOMBARDIER	CL-215-1A10		~~Bombardier (~~Canadair~~)~~ CL-215 (PW R2800)
	CL-215-6B11 (CL-215T Variant)		Canadair CL-215 (PWC PW120)
	CL-215-6B11 (CL-415 Variant)		~~Bombardier (~~Canadair~~)~~ CL-415 (PWC PW12~~3~~0)
	BD-100-1A10	Challenger 300	Bombardier BD-100-1A10 (Honeywell AS907)
	BD-700-1A10 BD-700-1A11	Global Express Global 5000	Bombardier BD-700 Series (RRD BR710)

1 TC Holder	2 Aeroplanes Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
BOMBARDIER (cont.)	CL600-1A11	Challenger 600	Bombardier CL-600-1A11 (Honeywell ALF502)
	CL-600-2A12 (601 Variant)	Challenger 601	Bombardier CL-600-2A12/-2B16 (variant CL 601/601-3A/3R) (GE CF34)
	CL-600-2B16 (601-3A Variant)	Challenger 601-3A	
	CL-600-2B16 (601-3R Variant)	Challenger 601-3B	
	CL-600-2B16 (CL 604 Variant)	Challenger-604 (MSN < 5701) Challenger-605 (MSN ≥ 5701)	Bombardier CL-600-2B16 (variant CL 604) (GE CF34)
	CL-600-2B19	Regional Jet Series 100	Bombardier CL-600-2B19 (GE CF34)
	CL-600-2C10	Regional Jet Series 700/701/702	Bombardier CL-600-2C10/-2D15/-2D24/-2E25 (GE CF34)
	CL-600-2D15	Regional Jet Series 705	
	CL-600-2D24	Regional Jet Series 900	
	CL-600-2E25	Regional Jet Series 1000	
	DHC-8-102	DHC-8 Series 100	Bombardier DHC-8-100/200/300 (PWC PW 120)
	DHC-8-103	DHC-8 Series 100	
	DHC-8-106	DHC-8 Series 100	
	DHC-8-201	DHC-8 Series 200	
	DHC-8-202	DHC-8 Series 200	
	DHC-8-301	DHC-8 Series 300	
	DHC-8-311	DHC-8 Series 300	
	DHC-8-314	DHC-8 Series 300	
	DHC-8-315	DHC-8 Series 300	
	DHC-8-400	DHC-8 Series 400	Bombardier DHC-8-400 (PWC PW150)
	DHC-8-401	DHC-8 Series 400	
	DHC-8-402	DHC-8 Series 400	
BOMBARDIER SHORT BROTHERS PLC	SD3-30	Variant 200	Shorts SD3 Series-30/SD3-60 (PWC PT6)
	SD3-60	Variant 200	
	SD3-SHERPA	Variant 200	
	SD3-60 SHERPA	Variant 200	

1 TC Holder	2 Aeroplanes Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
EADS CASA	C-212-CB	Aviocar	CASA C-212 (Honeywell TPE331)
	C-212-CC	Aviocar	
	C-212-CD	Aviocar	
	C-212-CE	Aviocar	
	C-212-CF	Aviocar	
	C-212-VA	Aviocar	
	C-212-DE	Aviocar	CASA C-212 (PWC PT6)
EADS CASA (cont.)	CN-235 CN-235-100 CN-235-200 CN-235-300		CASA CN-235 (GE CT7) CASA CN-235 (GE CT7) (cont.)
	C-295		~~EADS~~ CASA C-295 (PWC PW127~~7~~0)
CESSNA AIRCRAFT Company	525B	Citation Jet	Cessna 525B (Williams FJ 44)
	550 560 560	Citation Bravo Citation Encore Citation Encore +	Cessna 550/560 (PWC PW530/535)
	550 S550 560 560	Citation II Citation S/II Citation V Citation Ultra	Cessna 550/560 (PWC JT15D)
	560XL 560 XLS 560 XLS+	Citation Excel Citation XLS Citation XLS+	Cessna 560XL/XLS (PWC PW545)
	650 650	Citation III - VI Citation VII	Cessna 650 (Honeywell TFE731)
	680	Sovereign	Cessna 680 (PWC PW306)
	750	Citation X	Cessna 750 (RR Corp AE3007C)
~~F GENERAL DYNAMICS CORPORATION~~	~~PBY 5~~ ~~PBY 5A~~		~~Consolidated PBY 5A (PW R1830)~~
DASSAULT AVIATION	Falcon 10		~~Dassault~~ Falcon 10~~/100~~ (Honeywell TFE731)
	Fan Jet Falcon Fan Jet Falcon Series C Fan Jet Falcon Series D Fan Jet Falcon Series E Fan Jet Falcon Series F	(Basic) Fan Jet Falcon	~~Dassault~~ Falcon 20 (GE CF700)
	Mystère Falcon 20-C5 Mystère Falcon 20-D5 Mystère Falcon 20-E5 Mystère Falcon 20-F5		~~Dassault~~ Falcon 20-5 (Honeywell TFE731)
	Fan Jet Falcon Series G Mystère Falcon 200 Mystère Falcon 20GF		~~Dassault~~ Falcon 200 (Honeywell ATF 3-6)
	Mystère Falcon 50		~~Dassault~~ Falcon 50 (Honeywell TFE731)

1 TC Holder	2 Aeroplanes Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
DASSAULT AVIATION (cont.)	Mystère Falcon 50	F50EX	~~Dassault~~ Falcon 50EX (Honeywell TFE731)
	Mystère Falcon 900 Mystère Falcon 900	 F900B	~~Dassault~~ Falcon 900 (Honeywell TFE731)
	Mystère Falcon 900	F900C	~~Dassault~~ Falcon 900C (Honeywell TFE731)
	Falcon 900EX		~~Dassault~~ Falcon 900EX (Honeywell TFE731)
	Falcon 900EX Falcon 900EX	F900EX EASy F900DX	~~Dassault~~ Falcon 900EX EASy~~/DX~~ (Honeywell TFE731)
	Falcon 2000		~~Dassault~~ Falcon 2000 (CFE 738)
	Falcon 2000EX		~~Dassault~~ Falcon 2000EX (PWC PW308)
	Falcon 2000EX Falcon 2000EX² Falcon 2000EX	F2000 EX EASy F2000 DX F2000 LX	~~Dassault~~ Falcon 2000EX EASy~~/DX~~ (PWC PW308)
	Falcon 7X		~~Dassault~~ Falcon 7X (PWC PW307A)
(DORNIER) RUAG Aerospace	228-100 series 228-200 series		Dornier 228 (Honeywell TPE331)
(DORNIER) 328 SUPPORT SERVICES	328-100 series		Dornier 328-100 (PWC PW119)
	328-300 series		Dornier 328-300 (PWC PW306)
EMBRAER Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica	EMB-120 EMB-120RT EMB-120ER EMB-120FC EMB-120QC	Brasilia Brasilia Brasilia Brasilia Brasilia	Embraer EMB-120 (PWC PW115/118)
	EMB-135ER EMB-135LR EMB-135BJ EMB-145 EMB-145ER EMB-145EU EMB-145EP EMB-145LR EMB-145LU EMB-145MP EMB-145MK		Embraer EMB-135/145 (RR Corp AE3007A)
	ERJ-170-100 STD ERJ 170-100 LR ERJ 170-200 STD ERJ 170-200 LR ERJ 190-100 STD ERJ 190-100 LR ERJ 190-100 IGW ERJ 190-100 ECJ ERJ 190-200 STD ERJ 190-200 LR ERJ 190-200 IGW	ERJ-170 ERJ-170 ERJ-175 ERJ-175 ERJ-190 ERJ-190 ERJ-190 AR Lineage 1000 ERJ-195 ERJ-195 ERJ-195 AR	Embraer ERJ-170/190 (GE CF34)

1 TC Holder	2 Aeroplanes Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
(FOKKER-FAIRCHILD) MARYLAND AIR INDUSTRIES	F-27A to -M FH-227 FH-227B FH-227C FH-227D FH-227E		Fokker F27 / Fairchild F-27/FH-227 (RRD Dart)
FOKKER Services	F27 Mark 100 F27 Mark 200 F27 Mark 300 F27 Mark 400	Friendship Friendship Friendship Friendship	
	F27 Mark 500 F27 Mark 600 F27 Mark 700	Friendship Friendship Friendship	
	F27 Mark 050 F27 Mark 0502 F27 Mark 0604	Fokker 50 Fokker 50 Fokker 60	Fokker 50/60 Series (PWC PW 125/127)
	F28 Mark 1000 F28 Mark 1000C F28 Mark 2000 F28 Mark 3000 F28 Mark 3000C F28 Mark 3000R F28 Mark 3000RC F28 Mark 4000	Fellowship Fellowship Fellowship Fellowship Fellowship Fellowship Fellowship Fellowship	Fokker F28 Series (RRD Spey)
	F28 Mark 0100 F28 Mark 0070	Fokker 100 Fokker 70	Fokker 70/100 (RRD Tay)
GULFSTREAM AEROSPACE LP (GALP) c/o Israel Aircraft Industries	1125 Westwind Astra Astra SPX G100	Gulfstream 100	Gulfstream (IAI) 100/~~IAI~~ 1125/~~IAI~~ Astra SPX (Honeywell TFE731)
	Gulfstream G150	Gulfstream G150	Gulfstream (IAI) G150 (Honeywell TFE731)
	Gulfstream 200 / Galaxy	Galaxy 200	Gulfstream (IAI) 200/Galaxy (PWC PW306)
GULFSTREAM AEROSPACE Corporation	G-159	Gulfstream I	Gulfstream G-159 (RRD Dart)
	G-1159 G-1159A G-1159B	Gulfstream II Gulfstream IIB Gulfstream III	Gulfstream G-1159 Series (RRD Spey)
	G-IV/GIV-SP GIV (G300) GIV (G400)	Gulfstream G-IV/GIV-SP Gulfstream G300 Gulfstream G400	Gulfstream G–IV Series ~~/ G300/G400~~ (RRD Tay)

1 TC Holder	2 Aeroplanes Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
GULFSTREAM AEROSPACE Corporation (cont.)	GIV-X (G450)	Gulfstream G450	Gulfstream GIV-X Series ~~/G450/G350~~ (RRD Tay)
	GIV-X (G350)	Gulfstream G350	
	GV	Gulfstream GV	Gulfstream GV basic model (RRD BR710)
	GV-SP (G550)	Gulfstream G550	Gulfstream GV-SP Series ~~/G500/G550~~ (RRD BR710)
	GV-SP (G500)	Gulfstream G500	
HAWKER BEECHCRAFT Corporation	HS.125 series 700	"Hawker Siddeley"	~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ BAe 125~~/~~ Series /700/800 (Honeywell TFE731)
	BAe.125 series 800		
	Hawker 800		
	DH.125 series 1	"Hawker Siddeley"	
	DH.125 series 3	"Hawker Siddeley"	
	HS.125 series 3	"Hawker Siddeley"	
	HS.125 series F3	"Hawker Siddeley"	
	BH.125 series 400	"Beechcraft Hawker"	
	DH.125 series 400	"Hawker Siddeley"	
	HS.125 series F400	"Hawker Siddeley"	
	BH.125 series 600	"Beechcraft Hawker"	
	HS.125 series 600	"Hawker Siddeley"	
	HS.125 series F600	"Hawker Siddeley"	
	Hawker 750		~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ BAe 125~~/~~Series 750/800XP/850XP/900XP (Honeywell TFE731)
	Hawker 800XP		
	Hawker 850XP		
	Hawker 900XP		
	DH.125 series 1	"Hawker Siddeley"	~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ BAe 125 Series (RR Viper)
	HS.125 series 1	"Hawker Siddeley"	
	DH.125 series 3	"Hawker Siddeley"	
	HS.125 series 3	"Hawker Siddeley"	
	HS.125 series F3	"Hawker Siddeley"	
	DH.125 series 400	"Hawker Siddeley"	
	HS.125 series 400	"Hawker Siddeley"	
	BH.125 series 400	"Beechcraft Hawker"	
	HS.125 series F400	"Hawker Siddeley"	
	BH.125 series 600	"Beechcraft Hawker"	
	HS.125 series 600	"Hawker Siddeley"	
	HS.125 series F600	"Hawker Siddeley"	
	BAe.125 series 1000		~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ BAe 125 Series 1000 (PWC PW305)
	Hawker 1000		
	300	Super King Air	~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech 300 Series (PWC PT6)
	300LW	Super King Air	
	B300	Super King Air 350	
	B300C	Super King Air 350 C	

1 TC Holder	2 Aeroplanes Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
HAWKER BEECHCRAFT Corporation (cont.)	400 400A 400T MU-300 MU-300-10	Beechjet Beechjet (Hawker XP) (TX) Beechjet Diamond I/IA Diamond II	~~Hawker Beechcraft~~ Beech 400 / Mitsubishi MU-300 (PWC JT15)
	1900 1900C (C-12J) 1900D	Airliner	~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech 1900 (PWC PT6)
	4000		Beech 4000 (PWC PW308)
ISRAEL AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIES	IAI 1121 IAI 1121A IAI 1121B IAI 1123	Jetcommander Jetcommander Jetcommander Commodore Jet	IAI 1121/1123 (GE CJ610)F
	IAI 1124 IAI 1124A	Westwind	IAI 1124 (Honeywell TFE731)
~~ILYUSHIN AVIATION COMPLEX~~	~~Il-14~~		~~Ilyushin IL-14 (Shvetsov Ash-82T)~~
	~~Il-18~~		~~Ilyushin IL-18 (Ivchenko AI-20M)~~
	~~Il-62~~		~~Ilyushin IL-62 (Kuznetsov NK-8-4)~~
	~~Il-62~~		~~Ilyushin IL-62 (Soloviev D-30KU)~~
	~~Il-76~~		~~Ilyushin IL-76 (Soloviev D-30KP)~~
	~~Il-86~~		~~Ilyushin IL-86 (CFM56)~~
	~~Il-86~~		~~Ilyushin IL-86 (Kuznetsov NK-86)~~
	~~Il-86~~		~~Ilyushin IL-86 (Soloviev PS-90)~~
	~~Il-96~~		~~Ilyushin IL-96 (Soloviev PS-90A)~~
	~~Il-96MK~~		~~Ilyushin IL-96MK (PWC PW2037)~~
	~~Il-114~~		~~Ilyushin IL-114 (Klimov TV7)~~
	~~Il-114PC~~		~~Ilyushin IL-114PC (PWC PW127)~~
KELOWNA (Convair)	~~440~~		~~Kelowna (Convair) 440 (PW R2800)~~
	440		~~Kelowna (~~Convair~~)~~ 580 (RR Corp 501)
	~~440~~		~~Kelowna (Convair) 600/640 (RR Dart)~~
LEARJET	24 /24A 24B / 24B-A 24C 24D / 24D-A 24E 24F / 24F-A 25 25A 25B 25C 25D 25F		~~(Bombardier)~~ Learjet 24/25 (GE CJ610)
	28 29		Learjet 28/29 (GE CJ610)

1 TC Holder	2 Aeroplanes Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
LEARJET (cont.)	31 / 31A		~~(Bombardier)~~ Learjet 31 (Honeywell TFE731)
	35 / 35A 36 / 36A		~~(Bombardier)~~ Learjet 35/36 (Honeywell TFE731)
	Learjet 45 Learjet 40	LJ45 LJ45	~~(Bombardier)~~ Learjet Model 45 (Honeywell TFE731)
	55 / 55B / 55C		~~(Bombardier)~~ Learjet 55 (Honeywell TFE731)
	Learjet 60 Upgraded Learjet 60	LJ60 LJ60XR	~~(Bombardier)~~ Learjet 60 (PWC PW305)
LOCKHEED MARTIN Corporation	1329-25	JetStar II	Lockheed 1329 (Honeywell TFE731)
	1329-23A 1329-23D 1329-23E	 JetStar JetStar (-8 version)	Lockheed 1329 PW (PW JT12)
	~~Model 18~~		~~Lockheed 18 (Wright Cyclone)~~
	Model 188C Model L-188	Electra Electra	Lockheed 188 (RR Corp 501)
	382 382B 382E 382F 382G	Hercules Hercules Hercules Hercules Hercules	Lockheed 382 (RR Corp 501)
	382J	Hercules II	Lockheed 382 (RR AE2100)
	L-1011-385-1 L-1011-385-1-14 L-1011-385-1-15 L-1011-385-3	TriStar TriStar TriStar TriStar	Lockheed L-1011 (RR RB211)
McDONNELL DOUGLAS Corporation	~~DC3-G102~~ ~~DC3-G102A~~ ~~DC3-G202A~~		~~McD DC3 (PW R1830)~~
	~~DC-4~~		~~McD DC-4 (PW R2000)~~
	~~DC-6~~		~~McD DC-6 (PW R2800)~~
	~~DC-7~~ ~~DC-7B~~ ~~DC-7C~~		~~McD DC-7 (Wright R3350)~~
	DC-8 Series 70 DC-8 Series 70F		~~Boeing~~ DC-8 (CFM56)
	DC-8 Series 50 DC-8F DC-8 Series 60 DC-8 Series 60F		~~Boeing~~ DC-8 (PW JT3D)
	DC-8 Series 10/20/30		~~Boeing~~ DC-8 (PW JT4A)
	DC-8 Series 40		~~Boeing~~ DC-8 (RR Conway)
	DC-9-10 Series DC-9-20 Series		~~Boeing~~ DC-9 (PW JT8D)

1 TC Holder	2 Aeroplanes Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
McDONNELL DOUGLAS Corporation (cont.)	DC-9-30 Series DC-9-40 Series DC-9-50 Series		~~Boeing~~ DC-9 (PW JT8D) (cont.)
	DC-9-81 (MD-81) Series DC-9-82 (MD-82) Series DC-9-83 (MD-83) Series DC-9-87 (MD-87) Series MD-88		~~Boeing~~ MD-80 Series (PW JT8D)
	MD-90 Series		~~Boeing~~ MD-90 (IAE V2500)
	717-200		~~Boeing~~ MD 717-200 (RRD BR700-715)
	DC-10-10 DC-10-10F DC-10-15 DC-10-30 DC-10-30F		~~Boeing~~ DC-10/MD-10 (GE CF6)
	DC-10-40 DC-10-40F		~~Boeing~~ DC-10 (PW JT9D)
	MD-11 MD-11F		~~Boeing~~ MD-11 (GE CF6)
	MD-11		~~Boeing~~ MD-11 (PW 4000)
M7 AEROSPACE	SA227-AT SA227-TT SA227-CC SA227-DC SA227-AC SA227-BC	 Swearingen Metro Swearingen Metro	~~M7 Aerospace (Fairchild) SA226/SA227~~ Fairchild SA227 Series (Honeywell TPE331)
	SA227-PC	Swearingen Metro	~~M7 Aerospace (Fairchild) SA227 Metro III~~ Fairchild SA227 Series (PWC PT6)
POLSKIE ZAKLADY LOTNICZE	PZL M28 00 PZL M28 02 PZL M28 05		PZL M 28 (PWC PT6)
SABRELINER Corporation	NA-265-65		Sabreliner ~~(Rockwell)~~ NA-265 (Honeywell TFE731)
	NA-265-80		Sabreliner ~~(Rockwell)~~ NA-265 (GE CF700)
	NA-265 NA-265-20 NA-265-30 NA-265-40 NA-265-60 NA-265-65 NA-265-70 NA-265-80		Sabreliner ~~(Rockwell)~~ NA-265 (PW JT12)

1 TC Holder	2 Aeroplanes Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
SAAB AB, SAAB Aerosystems	340A(SF340A) 340B	Saab-Fairchild 340A	Saab (SF) 340 (GE CT7)
	2000		Saab 2000 (RR Corp AE2100)
TUPOLEV PSC	~~TU-134~~		~~Tupolev TU-134 (Soloviev D-30-II)~~
	~~TU-154~~		~~Tupolev TU-154 (Kusnetsov NK-8)~~
	~~TU-154~~		~~Tupolev TU-154 (Soloviev D-30KU)~~
	~~TU-204-120CE~~		~~Tupolev TU-204 (Soloviev PS-90AT)~~
	TU 204-120CE		Tupolev TU 204 (RR RB211)
~~YAKOVLEV~~	~~Yak-40~~		~~Yakovlev Yak-40 (Ivchenko AI-25)~~
	~~Yak-42~~		~~Yakovlev Yak-42 (Lotarev D-36)~~
VIKING AIR (Bombardier) (De Havilland)	DHC-7-1 DHC-7-100 DHC-7-101 DHC-7-102 DHC-7-103 DHC-7-110 DHC-7-111		~~Viking Air~~ ~~(~~De Havilland~~)~~ DHC-7 (PWC PT6)

2. Aeroplanes of 5700 kg and below, requiring type training and individual type rating (A-tr)

1 TC Holder	2 Aeroplanes Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
AERO VODOCHODY	Ae 270		Aero Ae-270 (PWC PT6)
AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIES	L-410M L-410 UVP L-410 UVP-LW L-410 UVP-FG L-410 UVP-E-LW	Turbolet Turbolet	Let L-410 LW (Walter-M601)
CESSNA AIRCRAFT Company	~~P337~~		~~Cessna P337 (Continental)~~
	425	Corsair / Conquest I	Cessna 425 (PWC PT6)
	441		Cessna 441 (Honeywell TPE331)
	500	Citation / Citation I	Cessna 500 (PWC JT15D)
	501 551	Citation Citation II	Cessna 501/551 (PWC JT15D)
	510		Cessna 510 (PWC PW615)
	525	Citation Jet	Cessna 525/525A (Williams FJ 44)
	525A	Citation Jet	
DORNIER Seastar	Seastar CD2		Dornier Seastar CD2 (PWC PT6)
ECLIPSE AEROSPACE Inc.	EA500		Eclipse EA500 (PWC PW610)
EMBRAER Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica	EMB-110P1 EMB-110P2	Bandeirante Bandeirante	Embraer EMB-110 (PWC PT6)
	EMB-121A EMB-121A1 EMB-121V	Xingu I Xingu II Xingu III	Embraer EMB-121 (PWC PT6)
	EMB-500	Phenom 100	Embraer EMB-500 (PWC PW617)
EXTRA Flugzeugproduktions- und Vertiebs GmbH	EA 400-500		Extra EA-400-500 (RR Corp 250)
HAWKER BEECHCRAFT Corporation	65-90 65-A90 65-A90-1 65-A90-4 65-A90-2 B90 C90 C90A C90GT C90GTi E90 F90 H90	King Air King Air King Air King Air King Air King Air King Air King Air King Air King Air King Air King Air King Air	~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech 90 Series (PWC PT6)

1 TC Holder	2 Aeroplanes Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
HAWKER BEECHCRAFT Corporation (cont.)	200 200C 200CT 200T B200 B200C B200CT B200T B200GT B200CGT		~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech 200 Series (PWC PT6)
	99 99A A99 A99A B99 C99 100 A100 A100A	 Airliner Airliner Airliner Airliner King Air King Air King Air	~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech 99/100 Series (PWC PT6)
	B100		~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech B100 (Honeywell TPE331)
	390	Premier I	~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech 390 (Williams FJ44)
ISRAEL AIRCRAFT Industries	Arava 101B		Arava 101B (PWC PT6)
LEARJET	LJ 23		~~(Bombardier)~~ Learjet 23 (GE CJ610)
M7 AEROSPACE	SA226-T SA226-TC SA226-AT SA226-T(B)		Fairchild SA226 (Honeywell TPE331)
MITSUBISHI Heavy Industries	MU-2B MU-2B-10 MU-2B-20 MU-2B-15 MU-2B-30 MU-2B-35 MU-2B-25 MU-2B-36 MU-2B-26		Mitsubishi MU-2B (Honeywell TPE331)
PIAGGIO Aero Industries			~~Piaggio P166 (Lycoming)~~
	P.166 DP1		Piaggio P166 (PWC PT6)
	P180	Avanti	Piaggio P180 Avanti/Avanti II (PWC PT6)
	P180	Avanti II	

1 TC Holder	2 Aeroplanes Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
PILATUS AIRCRAFT	PC-12 PC-12/45 PC-12/47 PC-12/47E		Pilatus PC-12 (PWC PT6)
PIPER AIRCRAFT	PA-42-1000	Cheyenne 400LS	Piper PA-42-1000 (Honeywell TPE-331)
	PA-42 PA-42-720 PA-42-720R	Cheyenne III Cheyenne IIIA	Piper PA-42 (PWC PT6)
	~~PA-46-310P~~	~~Malibu~~	~~Piper PA-46-310 P (Continental)~~
	~~PA-46-350 P~~	~~Malibu Mirage~~	~~Piper PA-46-350 P (Lycoming)~~
	PA-46-500TP	Malibu Meridian	Piper PA-46-500TP (PWC PT6)
REIMS AVIATION	F 406	Caravan II	Reims-Cessna F 406 (PWC PT6)
SOCATA	TBM 700 A TBM 700 B TBM 700 C1 TBM 700 C2		Socata TBM 700/850 (PWC PT6)
	TBM 700 N	TBM 850	
TWIN COMMANDER AIRCRAFT Corporation	680-T 680-V 680-W 681 690 690A 690B 690C 690D 695 695A 695B		Twin Commander ~~(Gulfstream/Rockwell/Aerocommander)~~ 680/681/690/695 Series (Honeywell TPE331)
VIKING AIR (Bombardier) (De Havilland)	DHC-6-1 DHC-6-100 DHC-6-200 DHC-6-300 DHC-6-400	Twin Otter Twin Otter Twin Otter Twin Otter Twin Otter	~~Viking Air (~~De Havilland~~)~~ DHC-6 (PWC PT6)
VULCANAIR	AP68TP300 AP68TP600	Spartacus Viator	Vulcanair AP-68TP Series (RR Corp 250)
	SF600 SF600A		Vulcanair SF600 (RR Corp 250)

3. Aeroplanes multiple turbine engines (AMTE) of 5700 kg and below, eligible for type examinations and manufacturer group ratings

TC holder	Type rating endorsement
GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT FACTORIES (ASTA)	~~ASTA (GAF) (~~Nomad~~)~~ N24A (RR Corp 250)
B-N GROUP Ltd. (Britten-Norman)	~~B-N Group~~ ~~(~~Britten-Norman~~)~~ BN-2T (Islander) (RR Corp 250)
DORNIER	Dornier Do 28~~D-6/128-6~~ (PWC PT6)
	Dornier Do 28 (Walter M601)
M7 AEROSPACE (Fairchild-Swearingen Corp)	Fairchild SA26-T (PWC PT6)
	~~M7 Aerospace~~ ~~(~~Fairchild~~)~~ SA26-AT(Honeywell TPE331)
PIPER AIRCRAFT Corporation	Piper PA-31T (PWC PT6)
SHORT BROTHERS	Short~~s~~ SC7 ~~Skyvan 3 Variant 100~~ (Honeywell TPE331)

4. Aeroplanes single turbine engine (ASTE) of 5700 kg and below, eligible for type examinations and group ratings

TC holder	Type rating endorsement
AIR TRACTOR	Air Tractor AT-400/500/800 (PWC PT6)
AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIES	~~Moravan~~ Zlin Z-37 T Series ~~/137T~~ (Walter M601)
ALENIA AERMACCHI	Aermacchi SF260~~TP~~ (RR Corp 250)
ALLIED AG CAT Productions	Grumman G-164 (PWC PT6)
CESSNA AIRCRAFT Company	Cessna (Soloy) 206/207 (RR Corp 250) Cessna 208 Series (PWC PT6) Cessna 210 (RR Corp 250)
EADS PZL "WARSZAWA-OKECIE"	EADS PZL PZL-106 BT (Walter M601) EADS PZL PZL-106 BTU (PWC PT6)
GROB Luft- und Raumfahrt	Grob G 520 (Honeywell TPE331)
MAULE AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY	Maule MX-7 (RR Corp 250)
PACIFIC AEROSPACE Corporation	PAC 750XL (PWC PT6)
PILATUS AIRCRAFT	Pilatus PC-6 (PWC PT6) Pilatus PC-6 (Turbomeca Astazou) Pilatus PC-6 (Honeywell TPE 331)
THRUSH AIRCRAFT	~~Thrush (~~Ayres ~~)~~ S2R~~ T Series~~ (PWC PT6)
VIKING AIR (Bombardier) (De Havilland)	Viking Air DHC-2 (PWC PT6) Viking Air DHC-3 (PWC PT6)

5. Aeroplane multiple piston engines – metal structure (AMPE-MS), eligible for type examinations and group ratings

TC holder	Type rating endorsement
~~AERO~~	~~Aero Ac-45/145 (LOM)~~
AEROSTAR AIRCRAFT Corporation	~~Aerostar (~~Piper~~)~~ PA-60 Series (Lycoming)
AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIES	~~Aircraft Industries (~~Let~~)~~ L 200 ~~Series~~ (LOM)
B-N GROUP (Britten-Norman)	~~B-N Group (~~Britten-Norman~~)~~ BN2 Islander (Lycoming) ~~B-N Group (~~Britten-Norman~~)~~ BN2A Trislander (Lycoming)
CESSNA AIRCRAFT Company/ REIMS AVIATION	Cessna 310/320 Series (Continental) Cessna 335 (Continental) Cessna 336 (Continental) Cessna/Reims-Cessna 337 Series (Continental) (not pressurised) Cessna/Reims-Cessna 337 Series (Continental) (pressurised) Cessna 340 (Continental) Cessna 401/402 (Continental) Cessna 404 (Continental) Cessna 411 (Continental) Cessna 414 (Continental) Cessna 421 (Continental) Cessna T303 (Continental)
GENERAL AVIA Costruzioni Aeronautiche	General Avia F20 Series (Lycoming)
HAWKER BEECHCRAFT Corporation	Beech 50 (Lycoming) ~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech 55 (Continental) ~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech 58 (Continental) ~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech 58P (Continental) Beech 58TC (Continental) ~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech 60 (Lycoming) ~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech 65-80 (Lycoming) ~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech 76 (Lycoming) ~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech 95 Series (Lycoming)
PIAGGIO Aero Industries	Piaggio P166 (Lycoming)
PIPER AIRCRAFT	Piper PA-23 Aztec (Lycoming) Piper PA-30 (Lycoming) Piper PA-31 (Lycoming) Piper PA-31P (Lycoming) Piper PA-34 (Lycoming) Piper PA-34 (Continental) Piper PA-39/40 (Lycoming) Piper PA-44 Series (Lycoming)
PZL MIELEC	PZL-M20 (PZL)
RUAG AEROSPACE	Do 28/128 (Lycoming)
SOCATA	~~EADS Socata (~~Grumman~~)~~ GA-7 (Lycoming)
STOL AIRCRAFT Corporation	~~STOL (~~Republic~~)~~ UC-1 (Lycoming)

TC holder	Type rating endorsement
TECNAM Costruzioni Aeronautiche	Tecnam P2006T (Rotax)
TWIN COMMANDER AIRCRAFT Corporation	~~Twin~~ Commander ~~(Gulfstream/Rockwell/ Aerocommander)~~ 685 (Continental) ~~Twin~~ Commander ~~(Gulfstream/Rockwell/ Aerocommander)~~ 500 Series/680 Series (Lycoming) Rockwell 700 (Lycoming)
VULCANAIR	Vulcanair P.68 ~~P.~~ Series (Lycoming)

6. Aeroplane single piston engine – metal structure (ASPE-MS), eligible for type examinations and group ratings

TC holder	Type rating endorsement
AERMACCHI	SIAI-Marchetti S.205/S.208 (Lycoming) SIAI-Marchetti S.205 (Franklin)
AERO VODOCHODY	Aero AT-3 (Rotax)
AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIES	~~Aircraft Industries (~~Let~~)~~ Z-37 Series (LOM)
~~ANTONOV~~	~~Antonov AN2 (Shvetsov)~~
AIR TRACTOR	Air Tractor AT-301 (PW R1340)
ALENIA AERMACCHI	Aermacchi AL60 (Continental) Aermacchi AL60 (Lycoming)
ALLIED AG CAT Productions	Grumman G-164 (Continental) Grumman G-164 (Jacobs) Grumman G-164 (PW R Series)
APEX Aircraft (ALPHA)	~~APEX (~~Robin~~)~~ HR 100 series (Lycoming) ~~APEX (~~Robin~~)~~ HR 100 series (Continental) ~~APEX (~~Robin~~)~~ R 1180 series (Lycoming) ~~Alpha (APEX/~~Robin~~)~~ HR 200/ R 2000 series (Lycoming) ~~APEX (~~Robin~~)~~ R 3000 series (Lycoming)
ARV Aviation	ARV 1 Super 2 (Hewland)
BÖLKOW	Bölkow BO 208 (Continental) Bölkow BO 209 (Lycoming)
~~CPAC~~	~~CPAC, Inc (~~Rockwell~~/~~Commander~~)~~ 112 (Lycoming) ~~CPAC, Inc (~~Rockwell~~/~~Commander~~)~~ 114 (Lycoming)
DE HAVILLAND Support	~~De Havilland Support~~ Beagle B.121 series 1 (Continental) ~~De Havilland Support~~ Beagle B.121 series 2/3 (Lycoming)
DYNAC AEROSPACE Corporation	Aerocommander 100 (Lycoming)
CESSNA AIRCRAFT Company / REIMS AVIATION	~~Cessna 140 Series (Continental)~~ Cessna 150 Series (Rotax) Cessna/Reims-Cessna 150/F150 Series (Continental) Cessna/Reims-Cessna 152/F152 Series (Lycoming) ~~Cessna 170 Series (Continental)~~ Cessna/Reims-Cessna 172/F172 Series (Lycoming) Cessna/Reims-Cessna 172/F172 Series (Continental) Cessna 172 Series (Thielert) Cessna 175 Series (Lycoming) Cessna 175 Series (Continental) Cessna 177 Series (Lycoming) Cessna 180 Series (Continental) Cessna/Reims-Cessna 182/F182 Series (Lycoming) Cessna/Reims-Cessna 182/F182 Series (Continental) Reims-Cessna F182 Series (SMA) Cessna 185 Series (Continental) Cessna 188 (Continental)
	~~Cessna 195 (Jacobs)~~ Cessna 206 Series (Continental)

TC holder	Type rating endorsement
CESSNA AIRCRAFT Company/ REIMS AVIATION (cont.)	Cessna 206 Series (Lycoming) Cessna 207 Series (Continental) Cessna 210~~/P210~~ Series (Continental) ~~Regal Air (Cessna) 305 Series (Continental)~~ ~~Cessna 336 (Continental)~~
EVEKTOR	Evektor EV-97 (Rotax)
FFA ALTENRHEIN	AS202 Series (Lycoming)
FLS AEROSPACE	OA7 Optica Series (Lycoming) Club Sprint/Sprint 160 (Lycoming)
FUJI Heavy Industries	Fuji FA-200 Series (Lycoming)
GARDAN	Gardan GY 80 (Lycoming)
GENERAL AVIA Costruzioni Aeronautiche	General Avia F.22 (Lycoming)
GIPPSLAND Aeronautics	Gippsland GA8 (Lycoming)
HAWKER BEECHCRAFT Corporation	~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech 23 Series (Lycoming) ~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech A23 (Continental) ~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech 24 Series (Lycoming) ~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech 33 Series (Continental) ~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech 35 Series (Continental) ~~(Hawker Beechcraft)~~ Beech 36 Series (Continental) Beech 77 (Lycoming)
IAROM	IAROM IAR-46 (Rotax)
INTERCEPTOR AIRCRAFT Corporation	Aerocommander 200 (Continental)
LAKE AIRCRAFT	Lake 250 (Lycoming)
LAVIA ARGENTINA S.A. (LAVIASA)	~~Lavia (~~Piper~~)~~ PA-25 Series (Lycoming)
MAULE AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY	Maule M4 (Continental) Maule M4 (Franklin) Maule M5 (Lycoming) Maule M5 (Franklin) Maule M5 (Continental) Maule M6 (Lycoming) Maule M7 Series (Lycoming) Maule MX-7 (Lycoming)
METEOR	Meteor FL53 (Continental) Meteor FL54 (Continental) Meteor FL55 (Lycoming)
MOONEY AIRPLANE Company	Mooney M20B to M20S/M22 (Lycoming) Mooney M20 (Continental)
~~NARDI~~	~~Nardi FN333 (Continental)~~
~~PIAGGIO~~	~~Piaggio P 149 D (Lycoming)~~
PILATUS AIRCRAFT	Pilatus PC-6 (Lycoming)
PIPER AIRCRAFT	Piper PA-22 Series (Lycoming) Piper PA-24 Series (Lycoming) Piper PA-28 Series (Lycoming) Piper PA-28 Series (Continental)

TC holder	Type rating endorsement
PIPER AIRCRAFT (cont.	Piper PA-28 Series (Thielert) Piper PA-32 Series (Lycoming) Piper PA-36 Series (Lycoming) Piper PA-36 Series (Continental) Piper PA-38 Series (Lycoming) Piper PA-46/46-310P (Continental) Piper PA-46/46-350P (Lycoming) Piper PA-46R-350T (Lycoming)
SKY ENTREPRISE	~~Sky Enterprises (Republic) RC-3 (Franklin)~~
	~~Sky International (Christen/~~Aviat~~) A-1~~ Husky A (Lycoming)
EADS PZL "WARSZAWA-OKECIE"	PZL-101A Gawron (Ivchenko) PZL-104A Wilga (Ivchenko) PZL-104 Wilga Series (PZL) PZL M 18 (PZL) PZL M 26 (Lycoming) PZL-104 Wilga (Lycoming)
SOCATA	SOCATA MS 880/885/890 (Continental) SOCATA MS 881 (Potez) SOCATA MS 883/886/887 (Lycoming) SOCATA ~~(Morane Saulnier)~~ MS 892/893 / PZL Koliber (Lycoming) SOCATA ~~(Morane Saulnier)~~ MS 894 / PZL Koliber (Franklin) SOCATA ~~(Morane Saulnier)~~ Rallye 100 (Continental) SOCATA ~~(Morane Saulnier)~~ Rallye 110ST (Lycoming) SOCATA ~~(Morane Saulnier)~~ Rallye 150 (Lycoming) SOCATA ~~(Morane Saulnier)~~ Rallye 180T (Lycoming) SOCATA ~~(Morane Saulnier)~~ Rallye 235~~E~~ (Lycoming) SOCATA ST10 (Lycoming) SOCATA TB 9 (Lycoming) SOCATA TB 10 (Lycoming) SOCATA TB 20 (Lycoming) SOCATA TB 21 (Lycoming) SOCATA TB 200 (Lycoming)
SYMPHONY AIRCRAFT Industries	Symphony OMF-100-160 (Lycoming)
TECNAM Costruzioni Aeronautiche	Tecnam P92 (Rotax) Tecnam P96/P2002/P2004 (Rotax)
THRUSH Aircraft	~~Thrush (~~Ayres~~)~~ S2R (PW R-985)
TRU FLIGHT Holdings	~~Tiger (~~Grumman/American~~)~~ AA-1/-1A (Lycoming) ~~Tiger (~~Grumman/American~~)~~ AA-5/AG-5B (Lycoming)
~~VIKING AIR~~	~~Viking Air (Bombardier) DHC-2 (PW R985)~~ ~~Viking Air (BombardieSeries r) DHC-3 (PW R1340)~~
VULCANAIR	Partenavia P.64 (Lycoming) Partenavia P.66 (Lycoming)
WASSMER	CERVA CE43 (Lycoming) CERVA CE44 (Continental)

TC holder	Type rating endorsement
YAKOVLEV	Yakovlev YAK-18T (Vedeneyev) ~~Yakovlev YAK-50 (Vedeneyev)~~ ~~Yakovlev YAK-52 (Vedeneyev)~~ Yakovlev YAK-54/55/55M (Vedeneyev) ~~Yakovlev YAK-12A/M (Ivchenko)~~
ZLIN AIRCRAFT (MORAVAN AVIATION)	~~Moravan (~~Zlin~~)~~ Z-42 Series ~~/142~~ (LOM) ~~Moravan (~~Zlin~~)~~ Z-43 (LOM) ~~Moravan (~~Zlin~~)~~ Z-50 (LOM) ~~Moravan (~~Zlin~~)~~ Z-50L Series (Lycoming) ~~Moravan (~~Zlin~~)~~ Z-26 Series ~~126/226~~ (LOM) Zlin Z-26 Series (Walter Minor/M) ~~Moravan (~~Zlin~~)~~ Z-143 L (Lycoming) ~~Moravan (Zlin) Z-326/526/726 (LOM)~~ ~~Zlin Z-326/526 (Walter)~~ ~~Moravan (~~Zlin~~)~~ Z-242 L (Lycoming) ~~Moravan (~~Zlin~~)~~ Z-526 L (Lycoming)

7. Aeroplane multiple piston engines – wooden structure (AMPE-WS), eligible for type examinations and group ratings

No aircraft in this list.

8. Aeroplane single piston engine – wooden structure/metal tube-fabric (ASPE-WS), eligible for type examinations and group ratings

TC holder	Type rating endorsement
ALEXANDRIA Aircraft	~~Alexandria Aircraft (~~Bellanca~~)~~ 17-30/17-31 Series ~~A~~ (Continental)
APEX	Robin ATL / ATL S (JPX 4T60) Robin ATL L (Limbach L2000) ~~APEX~~ CAP 10 (Lycoming) ~~APEX (~~Robin~~)~~ DR 300 series (Lycoming) ~~APEX (~~Robin~~)~~ DR 400 series (Lycoming) ~~APEX (~~Robin~~)~~ DR 400RP (Porsche) ~~APEX (~~Robin~~)~~ DR 400RP (Thielert)
~~AVIAMILANO~~	~~Aviamilano P.19 (Continental)~~
BELLANCA Aircraft Corporation	~~Bellanca (~~Champion~~)~~ 7 Series (Continental)
	~~Bellanca (~~Champion~~)~~ 7 Series (Lycoming)
	~~Bellanca (~~Champion~~)~~ 8 Series (Lycoming)
BÖLKOW	~~Bölkow (~~Klemm~~)~~ K1.107/F.207 (Continental) Bölkow F.207 (Lycoming)
MOONEY AIRPLANE Company	Mooney M20/M20A (Lycoming) Mooney M18L (Continental)
NIPPER	Nipper T-66 (Stark)
RENE FOURNIER	RF 6B (Continental) RF 6B (Lycoming)
SCHEIBE Flugzeugbau	SF 23 Series (Continental)
SKY INTERNATIONAL	~~Sky International (~~Pitts~~)~~ S-1 Series (Lycoming) ~~Sky International (~~Pitts~~)~~ S-2 Series (Lycoming)
SLINGSBY Aviation	Slingsby T67~~A~~ Series (Lycoming)
SPORTAVIA PUETZER	RS 180 (Lycoming)
TAYLORCRAFT 2000	Taylorcraft F22/F22A (Lycoming)
VULCANAIR	Partenavia P57 (Lycoming)
WACO Aircraft Company	Waco YMF (Jacobs)
WASSMER	WA40 Series (Lycoming) WA41 (Lycoming) WA4/21 Series (Lycoming)

9. Aeroplane multiple piston engines – composite structure (AMPE-CS), eligible for type examinations and group ratings

TC holder	Type rating endorsement
DIAMOND AIRCRAFT Industries	Diamond DA42 Series (Thielert) Diamond DA42 Series (Austro Engine)

10. Aeroplane single piston engine – composite structure (ASPE-CS), eligible for type examinations and group ratings

TC holder	Type rating endorsement
AQUILA Technische Entwicklungen	Aquila AT01 (Rotax)
CESSNA AIRCRAFT COMPANY	Cessna C300/C350/C400 (Continental)
CIRRUS Design Corporation	Cirrus SR20 (Continental) Cirrus SR22 (Continental)
DIAMOND AIRCRAFT Industries	Diamond DA20/DV20 (Rotax) Diamond DA20 (Continental) ~~Diamond DV22 (Rotax)~~ Diamond DA40 (Lycoming) Diamond DA40 D (Thielert)
AIRCRAFT Design and Certification	~~Aircraft Design~~ (WD) D4 Fascination (Rotax)
EXTRA Flugzeugproduktions- und Vertriebs-GmbH	Extra EA-300 Series (Lycoming) Extra EA-400 (Continental)
FFT GYROFLUG	SC01 Series (Lycoming)
GROB Luft- und Raumfahrt	Grob G115/120 Series (Lycoming)
INSTYTUT LOTNICTWA	Instytut Lotnictwa I-23 Manager (Lycoming)
INIZIATIVE INDUSTRIALI ITALIANE	III Sky Arrow 650/710 (Rotax)
ISSOIRE AVIATION	Issoire APM 20/30 (Rotax)
LIBERTY AEROSPACE Incorporated	Liberty XL-2 (Continental)
RUSCHMEYER Luftfahrttechnik GmbH	Ruschmeyer R90-230RG (Lycoming)
SUKHOI	Sukhoi SU-29 (Vedeneyev) Sukhoi SU-31 (Vedeneyev) Sukhoi SU-26 (Vedeneyev) Sukhoi Su-29/31 (MGA)
SLINGSBY AVIATION	Slingsby T67B/T67C/T67M Series (Lycoming)

11. Multi-engine helicopters (MEH), requiring type training and individual type rating

1 TC Holder	2 Helicopter Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
AGUSTA	A109E		Agusta A109 Series (PWC PW206/207)
	A109S		
	AW109SP		
	A109		Agusta A109 Series (RR Corp 250)
	A109A		
	A109AII		
	A109C		
	A109K2		Agusta A109 (Turbomeca Arriel 1)
	A109E		Agusta A109 Series (Turbomeca Arrius 2)
	A109LUH		
	AB139		Agusta AB139 / AW139 (PWC PT6)
	AW139		
	EH101-500 Series EH101-300		Agusta/Westland EH-101 (GE CT7~~00~~)
~~BELL HELICOPTER TEXTRON CANADA LIMITED~~	~~206LT~~	~~Twin Ranger~~	~~Bell 206LT (RR Corp 250)~~
AGUSTA	A.B.212		Bell 212 / Agusta AB212 (PWC PT6)
BELL HELICOPTER TEXTRON	212		
	~~214B~~ ~~214B-1~~		~~Bell 214 (GE CT7)~~
	214ST		Bell 214ST(GE CT7)
	222SP		Bell 222 (RR Corp 230)
	412		Bell 412 / Agusta AB412 (PWC PT6)
	412EP 412CF		
AGUSTA	A.B.412 A.B.412 EP		
BELL HELICOPTER CANADA	427		Bell 427 (PWC PW207D)
	222 222B 222U		Bell 222 (Honeywell LTS 101)
	230	230 Executive 230 Utility 230 EMS	Bell 230 (RR Corp 250)
	430		Bell 430 (RR Corp 250)
COLUMBIA HELICOPTERS			~~Boeing 107-II (GE CT58)~~
	234 234UT		Boeing 234 (Honeywell 5512)
ERICKSON AIR-CRANE	EAC S64F		Erickson ~~(Sikorsky)~~ S-64 (PW JFTD 12)

1 TC Holder	2 Helicopter Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
EUROCOPTER	SA330F SA330 G SA330 J		Eurocopter SA 330 (Turbomeca Turmo)
	AS332 C AS332 L AS332 C1 AS332 L1		Eurocopter AS 332~~C/C1/L/L1~~ (Turbomeca Makila 1A/1A1)
	AS332 L2		Eurocopter AS 332 L2 (Turbomeca Makila 1A2)
	AS355 E AS355 F AS355 F1 AS355 F2		Eurocopter AS 355 (RR Corp 250)
	AS355 N AS355 NP		Eurocopter AS 355 (Turbomeca Arrius 1)
	SA 365 N	Dauphin	Eurocopter SA 365 N (Turbomeca Arriel 1)
	SA 365 N1		Eurocopter SA 365 N1, AS 365 N2 (Turbomeca Arriel 1)
	AS 365 N2		
	AS 365 N3		Eurocopter AS 365 N3 (Turbomeca Arriel 2C)
	EC 155 B EC 155 B1		Eurocopter EC 155 (Turbomeca Arriel 2)
	EC 225 LP		Eurocopter EC 225 (Turbomeca Makila 2A)
	SA365 C SA365 C1 SA365 C2 SA365 C3	Dauphin	Eurocopter SA 365 C Series (Turbomeca Arriel 1)
EUROCOPTER DEUTSCHLAND GMBH	BO 105 A BO 105 C/CBS-4/-5 BO 105 D/DB BO 105 DB-4 BO 105 DBS Series BO 105 LS A-1/A-3 BO 105 S		BO 105 series (RR Corp 250)
	EC135P1 Series EC135P2 Series EC635P2+		Eurocopter EC 135 (PWC PW206)
	EC135T1 Series EC135T2 Series EC635T1 EC635T2 Series		Eurocopter EC 135 (Turbomeca Arrius 2B)
	MBB-BK 117 A Series		Eurocopter MBB-BK 117 A/B (Honeywell LTS 101)

1 TC Holder	2 Helicopter Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
	MBB-BK 117 B Series		
	MBB-BK 117 C1		Eurocopter MBB-BK 117 C1 (Turbomeca Arriel 1)
	MBB-BK 117 C2	EC145	Eurocopter MBB-BK 117 C2 (Turbomeca Arriel 1)
KAMOV			~~Kamov KA-25 (Glushenkov GTD-3BM)~~
			~~Kamov KA-27 (Isotov TV3)~~
	KA-32A/T		Kamov Ka 32 (Klimov)
	~~KA-26D~~		~~Kamov Ka-26D (Vedeneyev)~~
MD HELICOPTERS, INC.	MD900		MD Helicopters MD900 (PWC PW206/207)
~~MIL~~			~~Mil Mi-6 (Soloviev D-25V)~~
			~~Mil Mi-8 (Isotov TV2)~~
			~~Mil Mi-10 (Soloviev D-25V)~~
			~~Mil Mi-17 (Isotov TV3)~~
			~~Mil Mi-26 (Lotarev D-136)~~
PZL-ŚWIDNIK	W-3A W-3AS		PZL-Swidnik W-3A/W-3AS (Rzeszow PZL-10W)
	PZL Kania		PZL Kania (RR Corp 250)
AGUSTA	AS61N AS61NI		Agusta AS61N/Sikorsky S-61N (GE CT58)
SIKORSKY AIRCRAFT	S-61N S-61NM		
SIKORSKY AIRCRAFT	~~S-70 A~~		~~Sikorsky S-70 (GE T700)~~
	S-76A		Sikorsky S-76A (RR Corp 250)
	S-76A S-76A	S-76A+ S-76A++	Sikorsky S-76A (Turbomeca Arriel 1)
	S-76B	S-76B	Sikorsky S-76B (PWC PT6)
	S-76C		Sikorsky S-76C (Turbomeca Arriel 1)
	S-76C S-76C	S-76C+ S-76C++	Sikorsky S-76C (Turbomeca Arriel 2)
	S-92A		Sikorsky S-92A (GE CT7-8)

12. Helicopters – Single turbine engine (HSTE), eligible for type examinations and group ratings

1 TC Holder	2 Helicopter Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
AGUSTA	A119 AW-119MkII	Koala	Agusta A119/ Agusta AW119MkII (PWC PT6)
~~BELL HELICOPTER TEXTRON~~	~~47 series~~		~~Bell (Soloy) 47 (RR Corp 250)~~
BELL HELICOPTER TEXTRON	214B 214B-1		Bell 214 (Honeywell T5508)
BELL HELICOPTER CANADA	407		Bell 407 (RR Corp 250)
AGUSTA	AB 204 B Series AB 205 A1		Agusta AB204, AB205 / Bell 204, 205, ~~210~~ (Honeywell T53)
BELL HELICOPTER TEXTRON, INC.	204B 205A-1		
AGUSTA	AB 206A AB 206B		Agusta AB206 / Bell 206 (RR Corp 250)
BELL HELICOPTER TEXTRON CANADA LIMITED	206 series from A to L		
THE ENSTROM HELICOPTER CORPORATION	480 480B		Enstrom 480 (RR Corp 250)
EUROCOPTER	AS350 AS350B1 AS350B2 AS350BA AS350BB	Écureuil	Eurocopter AS 350 (Turbomeca Arriel 1)
	AS350B3		Eurocopter AS 350 (Turbomeca Arriel 2B)
	AS350D		Eurocopter AS 350 (Honeywell LTS 101)
	EC 120 B	Colibri	Eurocopter EC 120 (Turbomeca Arrius 2F)
	EC130B4		Eurocopter EC 130 (Turbomeca Arriel 2B)
	SA315B	Lama	Eurocopter SA 315B (Turbomeca Artouste)
	SA3180 SA318B SA318C	Alouette-Astazou	Eurocopter SE 313/SA 318 (Turbomeca Astazou)
	SA319B	Alouette III	Eurocopter SA 319 (Turbomeca Astazou XIV)
	SA 341 G	Gazelle	Eurocopter SA 341 (Turbomeca Astazou)

1 TC Holder	2 Helicopter Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
EUROCOPTER (CONT.)	SA 342 J	Gazelle	Eurocopter SA 342 J (Turbomeca Astazou XIV)
	SA 360C	Dauphin	Eurocopter SA 360 (Turbomeca Astazou XVIIIA)
			~~Eurocopter SE 313 B (Turbomeca Artouste)~~
	SE3160 SA316B SA316C	Alouette III	Eurocopter SA 316 B/SA 316 C (Turbomeca Artouste)
KAMAN AEROSPACE CORPORATION	K-1200		Kaman K-1200 (Honeywell T5317)
MD HELICOPTERS INC. (MDHI)	369 H series 369 D to FF		MD Helicopters 369 Series / SEI NH-500D (RR Corp 250)
S.E.I SERVIZI ELICOTTERISTICI ITALIANI	NH-500D		
MD HELICOPTERS INC. (MDHI)	600N 500N		~~MD Helicopters 600N (RR Corp 250)~~ MD Helicopters 500N/600N ~~/ NH500D /~~ AMD500N (RR Corp 250)
S.E.I SERVIZI ELICOTTERISTICI ITALIANI	AMD-500N		
PZL-ŚWIDNIK	SW-4		PZL SW-4 (RR Corp 250)
SCHWEIZER AIRCRAFT CORPORATION	269D		Schweizer 269D (RR Corp 250)

13. Helicopters – Single piston engines (HSPE), eligible for type examinations and group ratings

1 TC Holder	2 Helicopter Model	Commercial Designation	3 Type rating endorsement
ANTARES INTERNATIONAL	SH-4		Silvercraft SH-4 (Franklin)
~~AGUSTA~~	~~47~~		~~Bell/Agusta/Westland 47 (Lycoming)~~
~~BELL HELICOPTER TEXTRON~~	~~47G series~~ ~~47J series~~ ~~47K~~		
~~BELL HELICOPTER TEXTRON~~	~~47~~ ~~47B series~~ ~~47D series~~ ~~47E~~ ~~47G~~ ~~47H-1~~		~~Bell 47 (Franklin)~~
AGUSTA	102		Agusta AB-102 (PW S1H4)
BRANTLY HELICOPTERS INDUSTRIES U.S.A. CO., LTD.	305		Brantly 305 (Lycoming)
BRANTLY INTERNATIONAL, INC.	B-2		Brantly B2 (Lycoming)
HELICOPTÈRES GUIMBAL	G2	Cabri	Cabri G2 (Lycoming)
THE ENSTROM HELICOPTER CORPORATION	F-28 series 280 series		Enstrom F-28/280 (Lycoming)
SEI (BREDA-NARDI)	NH 300C	Model 300C	Schweizer / Breda Nardi ~~(Hughes)~~ 269/300 (Lycoming)
SCHWEIZER AIRCRAFT CORPORATION	269A 269B 269C 269C-1		
ROBINSON HELICOPTER COMPANY	R22 R22 ALPHA R22 BETA R22 MARINER R44 R44 II		Robinson R22/R44 Series (Lycoming)
~~SEI (BREDA-NARDI)~~			~~SEI (Breda-Nardi) NH-300 Series (Lycoming)~~

Appendix B - Attachments

DGT576628_DA comments NPA 2009-05 rating mecanos.pdf
Attachment #1 to comment #19

General comment on determination of type rating[1].pdf
Attachment #2 to comment #31

A6WE.pdf
Attachment #3 to comment #16